

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:  
H.R. 13247. A bill for the relief of Maria Odete Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:  
H.R. 13248. A bill for the relief of Rocco Croce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13249. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Croce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONAN:  
H.R. 13250. A bill for the relief of Polixene Vaitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:  
H.R. 13251. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:  
H.R. 13252. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo F. Mendez, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:  
H.R. 13253. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 1966

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

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

Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, ruler of the world, by whose law the shadows of evening fall and the gates of morning are opened. In wisdom Thou hast established the changes of times and seasons, and ordered the ways of the stars in their heavenly courses. Creator of Heaven and Earth, O living God, rule Thou over us forever.

Rule Thou over us, then, this day, for this is our brief day to do Thy will. The day will soon be past, gone forever beyond our mortal reach. But the deeds and decisions of this hour will live on—for evil or for good—in the on-going life of our Nation and our world.

Grant us, O Lord, wisdom and perspective as we choose our words and discharge our duties, that all our works—begun, continued and ended in Thee—may glorify Thy holy name and benefit Thy human family in this dear land and across the world.

In the name of Christ. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 1, 1966, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 1, 1966, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1407) for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,  
The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the Presi-

dent of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9302) for the relief of Lt. Charles W. Pittman, Jr., U.S. Navy, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 251) to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9302) for the relief of Lt. Charles W. Pittman, Jr., U.S. Navy, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Government Operations Committee.

The Subcommittee on Improvements in the Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

#### TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce traffic accidents and the deaths, injuries, and property damage which

occur in such accidents (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT

A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to act favorably on the Employment Security Amendments of 1965, H.R. 8282. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

#### RHODE ISLAND RESOLUTION

(Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon the Employment Security Amendments of 1965 bill (H.R. 8282) now before it)

Whereas the Federal-State unemployment insurance system, established in 1935, has stood the test of time remarkably well; and

Whereas it has kept millions of men and women and their children from what could have been bankruptcy, personal as well as financial, in assisting by payments received as a matter of right in overcoming the hardships of involuntary unemployment; and

Whereas with the passage of years changes in the economic pattern require adjustments; and

Whereas recognizing the need for economic adjustment, the basic objectives of H.R. 8282 are to provide benefits for longer periods, under justifiable circumstances, to additional workers in presently uncovered occupations, in more adequate amounts, while insuring that only those entitled to benefits receive them, and that the balance of Federal and State responsibility be readjusted to reflect the economic developments and the administrative experience of the past 30 years; and

Whereas the passage of H.R. 8282 will strengthen the Federal-State unemployment insurance system with its recognition of the Federal and State responsibilities and relationship; and

Whereas although many improvements in the Federal-State system have been made by action of the States, the fear that the costs of an adequate program might cause employers to transfer their operations to other States which do not meet their responsibilities, has been an impediment to additional improvements in State laws; and

Whereas measures are necessary to provide that employees in a few States are not handicapped with a disproportionate share of the costs of developments benefiting the whole Nation; and

Whereas Federal action was required to bring the system into being, it is now required to stimulate necessary adjustments and improvements nationwide: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the general assembly does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to take favorable action upon H.R. 8282, the Employment Security Amendments of 1965 bill now before it; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this reso-

lution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States in the hope that they will exert every effort to assure passage of this legislation.

#### TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC SAFETY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 399)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON) in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on transportation and traffic safety. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and appropriately referred.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this message be jointly referred to the Committee on Government Operations and the Committee on Commerce.

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

The President's message was referred to the Committees on Government Operations, and Commerce, as follows:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

Two centuries ago the American Nation came into being. Thirteen sparsely populated Colonies, strung out along the Atlantic seaboard for 1,300 miles, joined their separate wills in a common endeavor.

Three bonds united them.

There was the cultural bond of a single language.

There was the moral bond of a thirst for liberty and democratic government.

There was the physical bond of a few roads and rivers, by which the citizens of the Colonies engaged in peaceful commerce.

Two centuries later the language is the same. The thirst for liberty and democracy endures.

The physical bond—that tenuous skein of rough trails and primitive roads—has become a powerful network on which the prosperity and convenience of our society depend.

In a nation that spans a continent, transportation is the web of union.

#### THE GROWTH OF OUR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

It is not necessary to look back to the 1760's to chronicle the astonishing growth of American transportation.

Twenty years ago there were 31 million motor vehicles in the United States. Today there are 90 million. By 1975 there will be nearly 120 million.

Twenty years ago there were 1.5 million miles of paved roads and streets in the United States. Today this figure has almost doubled.

Twenty years ago there were 38,000 private and commercial aircraft. Today there are more than 97,000.

Twenty years ago commercial airlines flew 209 million miles. Last year they flew 1 billion miles.

Twenty-five years ago American transportation moved 619 billion ton-miles of cargo. In 1964, 1.5 trillion ton-miles were moved.

The manufacturing of transportation equipment has kept pace. It has tripled since 1947. Last year \$4.5 billion was

spent for new transportation plant and equipment.

Transportation is one of America's largest employers. There are: 737,000 railroad employees, 270,000 local and interurban workers, 230,000 in air transport, almost a million men and women in motor transport and storage.

Together with pipeline and water transportation employees, the total number of men and women who earn their livelihoods by moving people and goods is well over 2½ million.

The Federal Government supports or regulates almost every means of transportation. Last year alone, more than \$5 billion in Federal funds were invested in transportation—in highway construction, in river and harbor development, in airway operation and airport construction, in maritime subsidies. The Government owns 1,500 of the Nation's 2,500 oceangoing cargo vessels.

Our transportation system—the descendant of the horse-drawn coaches and sailing ships of colonial times—accounts for one in every six dollars in the American economy. In 1965, that amounted to \$120 billion—a sum greater than the gross national product of this Nation in 1940.

#### SHORTCOMINGS OF OUR SYSTEM

Vital as it is, mammoth and complex as it has become, the American transportation system is not good enough.

It is not good enough when it offers nearly a mile of street or road for every square mile of land—and yet provides no relief from time-consuming, frustrating, and wasteful congestion.

It is not good enough when it produces sleek and efficient jet aircraft—and yet cannot move passengers to and from airports in the time it takes those aircraft to fly hundreds of miles.

It is not good enough when it builds superhighways for supercharged automobiles—and yet cannot find a way to prevent 50,000 highway deaths this year.

It is not good enough when public and private investors pour \$15 million into a large, high-speed ship—only to watch it remain idle in port for days before it is loaded.

It is not good enough when it lays out new freeways to serve new cities and suburbs—and carelessly scars the irreplaceable countryside.

It is not good enough when it adheres to custom for its own sake—and ignores opportunities to serve our people more economically and efficiently.

It is not good enough if it responds to the needs of an earlier America—and does not help us expand our trade and distribute the fruits of our land throughout the world.

#### WHY WE HAVE FALLEN SHORT

Our transportation system has not emerged from a single drawing board, on which the needs and capacities of our economy were all charted. It could not have done so, for it grew along with the country itself—now restlessly expanding, now consolidating, as opportunity grew bright or dim.

Thus investment and service innovations responded to special needs. Research and development were sporadic,

sometimes inconsistent, and largely oriented toward the promotion of a particular means of transportation.

As a result, America today lacks a coordinated transportation system that permits travelers and goods to move conveniently and efficiently from one means of transportation to another, using the best characteristics of each.

Both people and goods are compelled to conform to the system as it is, despite the inconvenience and expense of—

Aging and often obsolete transportation plant and equipment.

Networks chiefly designed to serve a rural society.

Services long outstripped by our growing economy and population, by changes in land use, by new concepts in industrial plant location, warehousing, and distribution.

The failure to take full advantage of new technologies developed elsewhere in the economy.

Programs and policies which impede private initiative and dull incentives for innovation.

The result is waste—of human and economic resources—and of the taxpayers' dollar.

We have abided this waste too long.

We must not permit it to continue.

We have too much at stake in the quality and economy of our transportation system. If the growth of our transport industries merely keeps pace with our current national economic growth, the demand for transportation will more than double in the next 20 years.

But even that is too conservative an estimate. Passenger transportation is growing much faster than our gross national product—reflecting the desires of an affluent people with ever-increasing incomes.

#### PRIVATE AND PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

The United States is the only major Nation in the world that relies primarily upon privately owned and operated transportation.

That national policy has served us well. It must be continued.

But private ownership has been made feasible only by the use of publicly granted authority and the investment of public resources—by the construction of locks, dams, and channels on our rivers and inland waterways; by the development of a vast highway network; by the construction and operation of airports and airways; by the development of ports and harbors; by direct financial support to the merchant marine; by grants of eminent domain authority; by capital equipment grants and demonstration projects for mass transit—in years past, by grants of public land to assist the railroads.

Enlightened government has served as a full partner with private enterprise in meeting America's urgent need for mobility.

That partnership must now be strengthened with all the means that creative federalism can provide. The costs of a transportation paralysis in the years ahead are too severe. The rewards of an efficient system are too great. We cannot afford the luxury of drift—or proceed with business as usual.



We must secure for all our travelers and shippers the full advantages of modern science and technology.

We must acquire the reliable information we need for intelligent decisions.

We must clear away the institutional and political barriers which impede adaptation and change.

We must promote the efforts of private industry to give the American consumer more and better service for his transportation dollar.

We must coordinate the executive functions of our transportation agencies in a single coherent instrument of government. Thus policy guidance and support for each means of transportation will strengthen the national economy as a whole.

#### A DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

I urge the Congress to establish a Cabinet level Department of Transportation.

I recommend that this Department bring together almost 100,000 employees and almost \$6 billion of Federal funds now devoted to transportation.

I urge the creation of such a Department to serve the growing demands of this great Nation, to satisfy the needs of our expanding industry and to fulfill the right of our taxpayers to maximum efficiency and frugality in Government operations.

In so doing, I follow the recommendations of many outstanding Americans.

In 1936, a Select Committee of the U.S. Senate recommended a Department of Transportation, or, in the alternative, the consolidation of all transportation programs in the Department of Commerce.

In 1949, the Hoover Commission Task Force on Transportation recommended a Department of Transportation.

In 1961 President Eisenhower recommended such a Department in his budget message.

In 1961 a Special Study Group of the Senate Committee on Commerce recommended that all promotional and safety programs of the Federal Government be concentrated in a Department of Transportation.

Many distinguished Members of Congress have offered bills to create the Department. Private citizens, the Nation's leading experts in the field, have made the same recommendation to me.

It is time to act on these recommendations.

#### SCOPE OF THE DEPARTMENT

I propose that the following agencies and functions be consolidated in the Department of Transportation:

1. The Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, and its policy, program, emergency transportation, and research staffs.

2. The Bureau of Public Roads and the Federal-aid highway program it administers.

3. The Federal Aviation Agency. This key agency, with its functions in aviation safety, promotion, and investment, will be transferred in its entirety to the new Department. It will continue to carry out these functions in the new Department.

4. The Coast Guard, whose principal peacetime activities relate to transportation and marine safety. The Coast

Guard will be transferred as a unit from the Treasury Department. As in the past, the Coast Guard will operate as part of the Navy in time of war.

5. The Maritime Administration, with its construction and operating subsidy programs.

6. The safety functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the responsibility for investigating and determining the probable cause of aircraft accidents and its appellate functions related to safety.

7. The safety functions and car service functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, principally the inspection and enforcement of safety regulations for railroads, motor carriers, and pipelines, and the distribution of rail car supply in times of shortage.

8. The Great Lakes Pilotage Administration, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Alaska Railroad, and certain minor transportation-related activities of other agencies.

As this list indicates, I am recommending the consolidation into the Department of those Federal agencies whose primary functions are transportation promotion and safety.

#### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

No function of the new Department—no responsibility of its Secretary—will be more important than safety. We must insure the safety of our citizens as they travel on our land, in our skies, and over our waters.

I recommend that there be created under the Secretary of Transportation a National Transportation Safety Board independent of the operating units of the Department.

The sole function of this Board will be the safety of our travelers. It will review investigations of accidents to seek their causes. It will determine compliance with safety standards. It will examine the adequacy of the safety standards themselves. It will assume safety functions transferred from the ICC and the CAB.

I consider the functions of this Board so important that I am requesting authority from the Congress to name five Presidential appointees as its members.

#### RELATION TO OTHER GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

The activities of several departments and agencies affect transportation promotion and safety. Sound management requires that an appropriate and intimate relationship be established between those activities and the new Department of Transportation.

1. The subsidy functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Aviation subsidies—now provided only for local airline service—clearly promote our domestic transportation system. But subsidy awards are an integral part of the process of authorizing air carrier service. This is a regulatory function.

Therefore the airline subsidy program should remain in the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Secretary of Transportation, however, will develop principles and criteria which the Board will take into consideration in its proceedings. In this way the subsidy program will be coordinated with overall national transportation policy.

2. The navigation program of the Corps of Engineers.

The Corps of Engineers—through its construction of locks and harbor facilities and its channel deepening and river bank protection work—makes a major contribution to water transportation. The Department of Transportation should not assume the responsibility for that construction, but its Secretary should be involved in the planning of water transportation projects.

With the approval of the President the Secretary of Transportation should also issue standards and criteria for the economic evaluation of Federal transportation investments generally. In the case of transportation features of multipurpose water projects, he should do so after consulting with the Water Resources Council.

#### 3. International Aviation.

The Secretary of Transportation should provide leadership within the executive branch in formulating long-range policy for international aviation. While foreign policy aspects of international aviation are the responsibility of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Transportation should insure that our international aviation policies are consistent with overall national transportation policy.

Subject to policy determinations by the President, the Civil Aeronautics Board regulates international aviation routes and fares as they affect the United States. This function has far-reaching effects on our foreign policy, our balance of payments, and the vitality of American aviation. The Secretary of Transportation should participate in Civil Aeronautics Board proceedings that involve international aviation policy.

#### 4. Urban Transportation.

The Departments of Transportation and Housing Urban Development must cooperate in decisions affecting urban transportation.

The future of urban transportation—the safety, convenience, and indeed the livelihood of its users—depends upon wide-scale, rational planning. If the Federal Government is to contribute to that planning, it must speak with a coherent voice.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development bears the principal responsibility for a unified Federal approach to urban problems. Yet it cannot perform this task without the counsel, support, and cooperation of the Department of Transportation.

I shall ask the two Secretaries to recommend to me, within a year after the creation of the new Department, the means and procedures by which this cooperation can best be achieved—not only in principle, but in practical effect.

#### ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT

The Department of Transportation will—

Coordinate the principal existing programs that promote transportation in America.

Bring new technology to a total transportation system, by promoting research and development in cooperation with private industry.

Improve safety in every means of transportation.

Encourage private enterprise to take full and prompt advantage of new technological opportunities.

Encourage high quality, low-cost service to the public.

Conduct systems analyses and planning, to strengthen the weakest parts of today's system.

Develop investment criteria and standards, and analytical techniques to assist all levels of government and industry in their transportation investment.

#### THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Cabinet-level Department I recommend will not alter the economic regulatory functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, or the Federal Maritime Commission.

I do recommend, however, a change in the manner of selecting the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Today, the Chairman of this vital Commission—alone among the Federal regulatory agencies—is selected, not by the President, but by annual rotation among the 11 Commissioners.

This is not sound management practice in an agency whose influence on our rail, highway, waterway, and pipeline industries is so far reaching.

The ICC bears the demanding and challenging responsibility to keep Federal regulation attuned to the needs and opportunities of a dynamic industry. Its jurisdiction extends to 18,000 transport companies. It handles 7,000 cases each year. No private corporation of such size and importance would change its chief executive officer once each year.

I shall shortly submit to the Congress a reorganization plan to give the President authority to designate the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission from among its members, and to strengthen his executive functions.

#### SAFETY

One hundred and five thousand Americans died in accidents last year.

More than half were killed in transportation, or in recreation accidents related to transportation.

Forty-nine thousand deaths involved motor vehicles.

One thousand three hundred involved aircraft.

One thousand five hundred involved ships and boats.

Two thousand three hundred involved railroads.

Millions of Americans were injured in transportation accidents—the overwhelming majority involving automobiles.

Each means of transportation has developed safety programs of varying effectiveness. Yet we lack a comprehensive program keyed to a total transportation system.

Proven safety techniques in one means have not always been adapted in others.

Last year the highway death toll set a new record. The prediction for this year is that more than 50,000 persons will die on our streets and highways—more than 50,000 useful and promising lives will be lost, and as many families stung by grief.

The toll of Americans killed in this way since the introduction of the automobile is truly unbelievable. It is 1.5 million—more than all the combat deaths suffered in all our wars.

No other necessity of modern life has brought more convenience to the American people—or more tragedy—than the automobile.

#### WHY WE ARE FAILING

The carnage on the highways must be arrested.

As I said some weeks ago, we must replace suicide with sanity and anarchy with safety.

The weaknesses of our present highway safety program must be corrected—

Our knowledge of causes is grossly inadequate. Expert opinion is frequently contradictory and confusing.

Existing safety programs are widely dispersed. Government and private efforts proceed separately, without effective coordination.

There is no clear assignment of responsibility of the Federal level.

The allocation of our resources to highway safety is inadequate.

Neither private industry nor Government officials concerned with automotive transportation have made safety first among their priorities. Yet we know that expensive freeways, powerful engines, and smooth exteriors will not stop the massacre on our roads.

#### WHAT CAN BE DONE

State and local resources are insufficient to bring about swift reductions in the highway death rate. The Federal Government must provide additional resources. Existing programs must be expanded. Pioneer work must begin in neglected areas.

Federal highway safety responsibilities should be incorporated into the Department of Transportation, in a total transportation safety program.

I have already set in motion a number of steps under existing law:

1. To strengthen the Federal role, I am assigning responsibility for coordinating Federal highway safety programs to the Secretary of Commerce. I am directing the Secretary to establish a major highway safety unit within his Department. This unit will ultimately be transferred to the Department of Transportation. The President's Committee on Traffic Safety will be reorganized, strengthened, and supported entirely by Federal funds. The Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board will be reconstituted and the Secretary's role strengthened.

2. To give greater support to our safety programs, I am requesting increased funds for research, accident data collection, improved emergency medical service, driver education, and testing and traffic control technology.

I have also asked the Secretary of Commerce to evaluate systematically the resources allocated to traffic safety, to insure that we are receiving the maximum benefits from our present efforts.

3. To improve driving conditions, I have ordered that high priority be given to our efforts to build safety features into the Federal-aid highway network.

4. To save those who are injured, I have directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, immediately to initiate projects to demonstrate techniques for more effective emergency care and transportation. He will work in full cooperation with State, local, and private officials.

5. To help us better understand the causes of highway accidents, I have asked the Secretary of Commerce to establish accident investigation teams, who will bring us new understanding of highway accidents and their causes.

6. To make Government vehicles safer, I have asked the Administrator of General Services, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, to begin a detailed study of the additional vehicle safety features that should be added to the Federal fleet.

#### THE TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966

More, much more, remains to be done. The people of America deserve an aggressive highway safety program.

I believe that the Congress—the same Congress which last year gave the Secretary of Commerce broad authority to set uniform standards for State highway safety programs—will join in our efforts to bring that program into being.

I urge Congress to enact the Traffic Safety Act of 1966.

I urge greater support for State highway safety programs.

I urge the creation of a National Highway Research and Test Facility.

To begin, I recommend a \$700 million, 6-year program.

The three components of this program are as critically important as the problems they address.

First, Federal grants to the States for highway safety will be increased. With these funds, a comprehensive highway safety program can be developed by each State under standards approved by the Secretary of Commerce. Included will be measures such as driver education and licensing, advanced traffic control techniques, regular vehicle safety inspections, police and emergency medical services.

Second, automobile safety performance will be improved. Proper design and engineering can make our cars safer. Vehicles sold in interstate commerce must be designed and equipped for maximum safety. Safe performance design standards must be met in tomorrow's cars.

I recommend that the Secretary of Commerce be given authority to determine the necessary safety performance criteria for all vehicles and their components.

If, after a 2-year period, the Secretary finds that adequate voluntary standards are not satisfactory, he would be authorized to prescribe nationwide mandatory safety standards. He would be also authorized to prohibit the sale in interstate commerce of new vehicles and their components which failed to meet those standards.

Third, the Federal Government's highway safety research efforts will be expanded.



I recommend construction of a national highway safety research and test center.

Funds are needed to support research and testing in many disciplines related to highway safety. The public interest demands a better understanding of the human, highway, and vehicle factors which cause death and injury. We must develop more effective countermeasures and objective standards to guide our national programs. Special accident teams should be organized—accurate data collection should be enlarged on a national basis—fellowship grants and research support should be made available to attract the best minds and talents of our Nation to this urgent work.

This new highway safety program would be transferred to the Secretary of Transportation upon the creation of the new department.

Congress has not hesitated to establish rigorous safety standards for other means of transportation when circumstances demanded them.

Today's highway death toll calls for an equally vigorous and effective expression of concern for our millions of car-owning families. For unless we avert this slaughter, one out of every two Americans will one day be killed or seriously injured on our highways.

#### SAFETY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLE TIRES

I urge the Congress to act speedily and favorably on S. 2669, a bill establishing safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce.

Most tires sold to American drivers are produced and properly tested by reputable companies. Nevertheless, evidence has shown that increasing numbers of inferior tires are being sold to unwitting customers throughout the country. The dangers such tires hold for high-speed automobiles and their occupants is obvious.

S. 2669 provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall establish, and publish in the Federal Register, interim minimum safety standards for tires. The Secretary would be required to review these standards 2 years from the enactment of the bill, and to revise them where necessary. A research and development program under his direction would improve the minimum standards for new tires, and develop such standards for retreaded tires.

Our driving public deserves the prompt passage of S. 2669, and the protection it will afford them from accidents caused by tire failures.

#### SAFETY AT SEA

Last year 90 men and women lost their lives when the cruise ship *Yarmouth Castle* burned and sank in the calm waters of the Caribbean.

The *Yarmouth Castle* was exempt from U.S. safety standards—partially because of its "grandfather rights" under law. It was built before 1937.

We cannot allow the lives of our citizens to depend upon the year in which a ship was built.

The Coast Guard is presently completing its investigation of the *Yarmouth Castle* disaster. The Maritime Administration has already finished its investigation of financial responsibility.

Later in this session—when our inquiries are accomplished and our findings reported—we will submit to the Congress legislation to improve safety measures and guarantees of financial responsibility on the part of owners and operators of passenger-carrying vessels sailing from our ports.

#### AIR ACCIDENT COMPENSATION

The United States has declared its intention to withdraw from the Warsaw Convention. Under this pact, the financial liability of a member nation's airline is limited to \$8,300 for a passenger's death.

Discussions are underway in the International Civil Aviation Organization to increase this liability for passengers flying anywhere in the world. We have expressed our opinion that the limit of liability should be raised to \$100,000.

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Today the United States ranks as the world's leader in technology.

Despite this—and despite the importance of transportation in the competition for international trade—exclusive of national security and space, the Federal Government spends less than 1 percent of its total research and development budget for transportation.

Under our system of Government, private enterprise bears the primary responsibility for research and development in the transportation field.

But the Government can help. It can plan and fashion research and development for a total transportation system which is beyond the responsibility or capability of private industry.

Through Government-sponsored research and development we can—

Fully understand the complex relationships among the components of a total transportation system.

Provide comprehensive and reliable data for both private and public decisions.

Identify areas of transportation which can be exploited by private industry to provide safer and more efficient services to the public.

Build the basis for a more efficient use of public resources.

Provide the technological base needed to assure adequate domestic and international transportation in times of emergency.

Help make significant advances in every phase of transport—in aircraft, in oceangoing ships, in swifter rail service, in safer vehicles.

#### SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

The United States is preeminent in the field of aircraft design and manufacture.

We intend to maintain that leadership. As I said in my state of the Union message, I am proposing a program to construct and flight test a new 2,000-mile-per-hour supersonic aircraft.

Our supersonic transport must be reliable and safe for the passenger.

It must be profitable for both the airlines and the manufacturers.

Its operating performance must be superior to any comparable aircraft.

It must be introduced into the market in a timely manner.

We have underway an intensive research and design program on the supersonic transport, supported by appropriations of \$231 million.

The design competition for this aircraft and its engines is intense and resourceful.

I am requesting \$200 million in fiscal year 1967 appropriations to initiate the prototype phase of the supersonic transport. My request includes funds for the completion of design competition, expanded economic and sonic boom studies, and the start of prototype construction.

We hope to conduct first flight tests of the supersonic transport by 1970, and to introduce it into commercial service by 1974.

#### AIRCRAFT NOISE

The jet age has brought progress and prosperity to our air transportation system. Modern jets can carry passengers and freight across a continent at speeds close to that of sound.

Yet this progress has created special problems of its own. Aircraft noise is a growing source of annoyance and concern to the thousands of citizens who live near many of our large airports. As more of our airports begin to accommodate jets and as the volume of air travel expands, the problem will take on added dimension.

There are no simple or swift solutions. But it is clear that we must embark now on a concerted effort to alleviate the problems of aircraft noise. To this end, I am today directing the President's Science Adviser to work with the Administrators of the Federal Aviation Agency and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Secretaries of Commerce, and of Housing and Urban Development, to frame an action program to attack this problem.

I am asking this group to:

Study the development of noise standards and the compatible uses of land near airports.

Consult with local communities and industry.

Recommend legislative or administrative actions needed to move ahead in this area.

#### ADVANCED OCEAN VESSEL CONCEPTS

After years of U.S. leadership, maritime technology in other countries has caught up with and, in some instances, surpassed our own.

The U.S. merchant marine suffers in world competition because it bears much higher costs than its competitors. This can be offset in some measure by technological improvements.

The Department of Defense recently launched the fast deployment logistics ship program. This concept introduces to the maritime field the same systems approach that has proven so successful in other defense and aerospace programs.

To achieve comparable improvements throughout the maritime industry, I am directing the Secretary of Commerce, with the Secretary of Defense, the President's Scientific Adviser, and the Atomic Energy Commission, to conduct a study of advanced vessel concepts.

The work of this team will include:

Research, development and planning of high speed, large capacity ships, de-

voted primarily to transporting pre-loaded containers of varying types between the major ports in the world.

Research on an oceangoing surface effects vessel capable of skimming over the water at speeds more than 100 knots.

Continued exploration of the application of nuclear propulsion to merchant marine ships.

Our private shipyards should continue to serve the needs of the country. They can become more productive and competitive through research and development and through standardization of ship construction. With a new Department of Transportation, we will increase our efforts to bring a modern, efficient merchant marine fleet to this Nation.

#### ADVANCED LAND TRANSPORT

Last year Congress took a long step toward advanced land transportation by enacting the high-speed ground transportation research and development program. This program will be continued at the most rapid pace consistent with sound management of the research effort.

Similar vision and imagination can be applied to highway transport.

Segments of the interstate highway network already in operation are the most efficient, productive roads ever built anywhere in the world. Motor vehicles move at higher rates of speed, more safely and in greater number per lane than on conventional roads. Transportation costs are reduced, and less land area is needed for this volume of traffic.

With the network about half completed after 10 years, it is apparent that interstate highways, as well as other roads and streets can become even more productive and safe.

Accordingly, I am directing the Secretary of Commerce to:

Investigate means for providing guidance and control mechanisms to increase the capacity and improve the safety of our highway network.

Conduct research into the means of improving traffic flow—particularly in our cities—so we can make better use of our existing roads and streets.

Investigate the potential of separate roadways for various classes of vehicles, with emphasis on improving mass transportation service.

#### SYSTEMS RESEARCH

Some of our brightest opportunities in research and development lie in the less obvious and often neglected parts of our transportation system.

We spend billions for constructing new highways, but comparatively little for traffic control devices.

We spend millions for fast jet aircraft—but little on the traveler's problem of getting to and from the airport.

We have mounted a sizable Government-industry program to expand exports, yet we allow a mountain of red-tape paperwork negate our efforts. Worldwide, a total of 810 forms are required to cover all types of cargo imported and exported. In this country alone, as many as 43 separate forms are used in one export shipment. Eighty separate forms may be needed to process

some imports. This is paperwork run wild.

I am directing the Secretaries of Treasury and Commerce and the Attorney General to attack these problems, through the use of effective systems research programs. And I have directed them to eliminate immediately every unnecessary element of redtape that inhibits our import and export programs.

#### TRANSPORTATION FOR AMERICA

The Founding Fathers rode by stage to Philadelphia to take part in the Constitutional Convention. They could not have anticipated the immense complexity—or the problems—of transportation in our day.

Yet they, too, recognized the vital national interest in commerce between the States. The early Congresses expressed that interest even more directly, by supporting the development of road and waterway systems.

Most important, the Founding Fathers gave us a flexible system of government. Cities, States, and the Federal Government can join together—and in many cases work with private enterprise—in partnerships of creative federalism to solve our most complex problems.

For the very size of our transportation requirements—rising step by step with the growth of our population and industry—demands that we respond with new institutions, new programs of research, new efforts to make our vehicles safe, as well as swift.

Modern transportation can be the rapid conduit of economic growth—or a bottleneck.

It can bring jobs and loved ones and recreation closer to every family—or it can bring instead sudden and purposeless death.

It can improve every man's standard of living—or multiply the cost of all he buys.

It can be a convenience, a pleasure, the passport to new horizons of the mind and spirit—or it can frustrate and impede and delay.

The choice is ours to make.

We build the cars, the trains, the planes, the ships, the roads, and the airports. We can, if we will, plan their safe and efficient use in the decades ahead to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

The program I have outlined in this message is the first step toward that goal. I urge its prompt enactment by the Congress.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 1966.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the administration's bill will be introduced later to supplement the message.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 12752. An act to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect of self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated in-

come tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1010).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1213. A bill for the relief of Richard K. Jones (Rept. No. 1024);

S. 2265. A bill for the relief of Konstadyna Byni Deliroglou and her minor child, Alexandros Deliroglou (Rept. No. 1025);

S. 2307. A bill for the relief of certain civilian employees and former civilian employees of the Bureau of Reclamation at the Columbia Basin project, Washington (Rept. No. 1026);

S. 2696. A bill for the relief of Abraham Ezekiel Cohen (Rept. No. 1027);

H.R. 1484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loneta Hackney (Rept. No. 1028);

H.R. 1918. An act for the relief of Eligio Ciardiello (Rept. No. 1029);

H.R. 2627. An act for the relief of certain classes of civilian employees of naval installations erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to misinterpretation of certain personnel instructions (Rept. No. 1030);

H.R. 3236. An act for the relief of Louis Shchuchinski (Rept. No. 1031);

H.R. 4928. An act for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki (Rept. No. 1032);

H.R. 4995. An act for the relief of Muhammad Sarwar (Rept. No. 1033);

H.R. 5231. An act for the relief of Jack Ralph Walker (Rept. No. 1034); and

H.R. 6112. An act for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Phil Su Park) (Rept. No. 1042).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 146. A bill for the relief of Delma S. Pozas (Rept. No. 1035);

S. 926. A bill for the relief of Laura Hui-Wai Wong and her children, Janet Wong and Simon Wong (Rept. No. 1036);

H.R. 2752. An act for the relief of Kock Kong Fong (Rept. No. 1037);

H.R. 2938. An act for the relief of Przemyslaw Nowakowski (Rept. No. 1038);

H.R. 2939. An act for the relief of Manojlo Verzhich (Rept. No. 1039);

H.R. 3875. An act for the relief of Mrs. Panagiotis Vastakis and Soteris Vastakis (Rept. No. 1040);

H.R. 4743. An act for the relief of Ralph Tigno Edquid (Rept. No. 1041); and

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Ki Sook Jun (Rept. No. 1043).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1375. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain individuals are entitled as reimbursement for damages sustained by them as a result of the cancellation of their grazing permits by the U.S. Air Force, and to provide for payments of amounts so determined to such individuals (Rept. No. 1045); and

H.R. 10403. An act for the relief of Edward F. Murzyn and Edward J. O'Brien (Rept. No. 1044).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the fourth week in April of each year as "Youth Temperance Education Week" (Rept. No. 1011); and

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution designating February of each year as American History Month (Rept. No. 1012).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment, without recommendation:

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance



with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States (Rept. No. 1047).  
By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1923. A bill to amend chapter XI of the Bankruptcy Act to give the court supervisory power over fees paid from whatever source (Rept. No. 1013).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 153. A bill for the relief of Matsusuke Tengan (Rept. No. 1015);

S. 1960. A bill for the relief of Capt. Rey D. Baldwin (Rept. No. 1016);

H.R. 3076. An act for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased (Rept. No. 1017);

H.R. 5530. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert A. Ethridge (Rept. No. 1018);

H.R. 5973. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Hower (Rept. No. 1019);

H.R. 7667. An act for the relief of Donald F. Farrell (Rept. No. 1020); and

H.R. 10338. An act for the relief of Joseph B. Stevens (Rept. No. 1021).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1661. A bill for the relief of Samuel C. Neuburg (Rept. No. 1022).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2177. A bill for the relief of Donald I. Abbott (Rept. No. 1014).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2356. A bill for the relief of Raymond J. Grachek (Rept. No. 1023).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2153. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use appropriated funds for the payment of medical care of temporary and seasonal employees and employees located in isolated areas who become disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1046).

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Andrew F. Brimmer, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

By Mr. TOWER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

William W. Sherrill, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

Elmer Boyd Staats, of Kansas, to be Comptroller General of the United States.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Theodore Jaffe, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission;

Archie Craft, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky;

William K. Thomas, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio; and

Gilbert S. Merritt, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Anthony J. Furka, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. JAVITS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Wilfred Feinberg, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit; and

James L. Watson, of New York, to be judge of the U.S. Customs Court.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William J. Lynch, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois; and

James J. Moos, of Illinois, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Illinois.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 3001. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the first stage of the Oahe unit, James division, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3002. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the first stage of the Oahe unit, James division, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3003. A bill for the relief of Sai Ok Oh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3004. A bill to require certain buildings to be equipped with emergency lighting systems; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3005. A bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce traffic accidents and the deaths, injuries, and property damage which occur in such accidents; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 3006. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, so as to prohibit the use for political purposes of certain funds collected by labor organizations from their members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3007. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Chamizal National Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3008. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of comprehensive health planning and public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds for such planning and services, and for other purposes; and

S. 3009. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, to further promote and assist in modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities through grants for amortization of indebtedness incurred for that purpose, direct loans, and guarantees of loans, and through grants for the planning of such modernization, and to authorize grants for development of new technology systems and concepts in the provision of health services; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3010. A bill to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3011. A bill to require that certain offices in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture be filled by appointment by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BAYH, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. McGEE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. FONG, and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

S. 3012. A bill to provide grants to the States for the strengthening of adult educational programs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

#### RESOLUTION

#### DISTRIBUTION AMONG THE STATES OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. DOMINICK, and Mr. THURMOND), submitted a resolution (S. Res. 231) relating to the distribution among the States of research and development funds made available by Government agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### THE OAHÉ IRRIGATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize construction of the initial stage of the Oahe unit, an irrigation project in South Dakota and a part of the overall Missouri River Basin project. My colleague [Mr. MUNDT] will introduce a similar bill.

In its entirety the Oahe unit comprises 495,000 acres of farmland in the north-central portion of South Dakota. This bill provides for development of its first stage—190,000 acres in the Lake Plain area of the James River Basin of Brown and Spink Counties. Under its provisions, Missouri River waters would be brought to South Dakota farmlands for the first time. The hopes and dreams of those who long visualized the vast local and national benefits which would accrue from greater utilization of this

precious water resource would finally be realized.

South Dakota became the 40th State of this great Nation on November 2, 1889. Even prior to statehood, however, pioneer settlers in the James River Basin had developed artesian wells to irrigate lands in the area known as the Lake Plains. The wells seemed inexhaustible. Unfortunately, salts were heavily concentrated in the ground water. This seriously affected the productivity of the soil after only a few years. Irrigation from wells quickly ceased. The meager and erratic flows of the James River were not adequate to sustain irrigation activities.

Irrigation-minded farmers began turning hopeful eyes toward the Missouri River, nearly 100 miles to the west, as the only possible source of plentiful water supply. But it took only preliminary study to discover that at that time, the huge pump lifts required to lift Missouri River waters over the divide to the James River Basin would seriously affect the feasibility of such a plan.

In the late 1930's, the Bureau of Reclamation entered the Missouri River Basin to conduct comprehensive investigations. These were designed to establish a plan for harnessing the water and land resources in seven States of the basin. Concurrently, the Corps of Engineers studied potential measures to effect essential flood control and improve navigation. Findings of the Bureau of Reclamation were presented to the Congress in 1944 and are contained in Senate Document No. 191 of the 78th Congress. Plans of the Corps of Engineers are contained in House Document No. 475 of the same Congress. The plans of the two agencies were merged in the Missouri River Basin project and authorized for construction in the Flood Control Act of 1944. The Oahe project was thus authorized over 20 years ago.

The Oahe unit plan of development envisioned diversion of water from Oahe Reservoir on the Missouri River to irrigate some 750,000 acres in the James River Basin. More detailed studies over the years have reduced the area capable of sustained irrigated productivity to 495,000 acres, of which 445,000 acres are in the Lake Plain area and 50,000 acres in the Missouri slopes nearer to Oahe Reservoir.

The initial stage has been carefully formulated as the beginning of a development that can eventually lead to the irrigation of the full 495,000 acres without duplication or redundancy of facilities to be constructed. There is vigorous local support for this undertaking. Over a year ago two irrigation districts were formed, which along with the already established Oahe Conservancy Subdistrict, are prepared to accept the responsibility for repayment of reimbursable project costs. Formation of both districts was overwhelmingly supported by an 85 percent favorable vote.

Among the units authorized for construction in the Flood Control Act of 1944 were Gavins Point, Fort Randall, Big Bend, and Oahe Reservoirs, all in South Dakota, to be built by the Corps

of Engineers. Today these dams are in place, and they have changed the entire 547 mile length of the Missouri River in our State into a series of reservoirs.

Thus far we have given up a total of 509,000 acres of prime bottomland to inundation under the four main-stem reservoirs. We have given up more land to lakebed than will ultimately be irrigated when the entire 495,000 project envisioned now is completed. It is estimated that the loss of these lands to productive use represents a loss of potential income or business volume of more than \$20 million annually.

The people of South Dakota were willing to make this permanent sacrifice for two central reasons. First, they believed that the multipurpose development of the Missouri Basin was in the national interest. These main-stem facilities have assured the navigability of the lower Missouri River. They permit the generation of billions of kilowatt-hours of electric power. They have averted millions of dollars in flood damage in downstream States. These benefits have been realized primarily by people outside of South Dakota but we have not taken a parochial view. We have heartily endorsed them because they are of great value to the Nation as a whole.

Second, my State was willing to make the sacrifice of lands and potential income because we had the assurance of the Congress that the loss would ultimately be repaid with the economic thrust of a half-million-acre irrigation project. We believed that our claim to Missouri River water would be recognized, and we have long looked forward to new irrigation replacing and justifying the loss of bottomlands.

We are pleased that 90 percent of the facilities for navigation, flood control, and hydroelectric power generation of the multipurpose Missouri Basin plan have been completed to date. We are now looking forward to parallel progress on our irrigation potential, of which only 10 percent has been attained.

Of the 17 reclamation States of the West, South Dakota ranks 14th in terms of numbers of acres of land under irrigation through Federal reclamation projects. North Dakota ranks last, but is beginning to move up by virtue of authorization of a first stage of the magnificent Garrison Diversion Unit last year.

More than 9 million acres of land in the West is being irrigated under the Federal reclamation program. Of this a little over 78,000 acres are in South Dakota, and just slightly more than 30,000 acres are receiving project water in North Dakota. Kansas, with 63,000 acres, and Oklahoma, with 47,000, rank 15th and 16th. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to place in the RECORD a table of federally irrigated lands in the 17 Western States.

The reclamation program is a great program. Its role in the economic and social development of the West is unmatched. My purpose in pointing out these figures is to demonstrate that we in the Missouri Basin have not shared

in the reclamation program as much as elsewhere. We have been most happy to support the projects of other States, because we believe that the development of resources anywhere in the Nation strengthens the national economy of which we are a part. We will continue to support the projects of other States, whether they be irrigation or other essential economic development works. We ask that you support us in our endeavors.

Public Law 442, enacted in the 2d session of the 88th Congress, requires that construction of further units of the Missouri River Basin project be reauthorized. This makes it necessary to bring the Oahe unit before the Congress again. I am sure that Congress will find it to be a splendid project.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks a table setting forth irrigable acreages by States during the period 1902 to 1964.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the initial-stage, 190,000-acre unit will require an investment of \$200,684,000. Ten percent of this figure represents nonreimbursable costs allocated to flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with existing law and policies. All of the investment but this 10 percent will be directly returned to the Federal Treasury by water and power users.

Moreover, the Federal investment will be repaid in other ways. The increased farm income generated by large-scale irrigation in South Dakota will beget an estimated increase of \$3,306,000 in Federal income tax revenues from farmers. Over the 50-year payout period, this will total about \$175 million over and above the contract repayment, and will equal another 85 percent of the project costs allocated to irrigation.

But the economic impact will not stop at the farmers' fencelines. It will course through the towns and cities—not only in South Dakota but throughout the Nation—where the capital inputs of agriculture are manufactured, distributed, and sold. It will be noticed in the cash registers of any and all kinds of business, as the rural demand for consumer goods grows. At each point, more new income and, consequently, more new tax revenues will be promulgated, further adding to the financial wisdom of the investment.

The foundation of the South Dakota economy is agriculture. It is our largest industry. But the greatest share of our production has been devoted to those crops commonly referred to as surplus commodities. Our farmers are confined by the climate to a limited range of alternatives. When prices are low, they endeavor to increase their efficiency—to produce more of the same thing. They have no choice.

Irrigation water is the key to breaking this cycle. Construction of the initial stage of the Oahe Unit will expand the



scope of agriculture in South Dakota—both in the immediate area and statewide. New flexibility will stabilize and increase farm income.

The logical shift will be away from crops in surplus supply, toward feed and forage to support an expanded livestock economy. The 190,000 acres of the first stage are interspersed throughout a 328,000-acre project area. About 75,500 of those acres are presently devoted to wheat. Under irrigation, that figure would drop by nearly 50,000 acres, and no wheat is expected to be grown on acres receiving project water. Wheat production in my State would thus drop by about 850,000 bushels as a result of construction of the first stage. The total project would reduce wheat production by more than 2 million bushels.

The Oahe Unit is a good project from every standpoint. The ratio of direct benefits to costs is 1.6 to 1. When secondary benefits are considered it is 2.5 to 1. This means that for every dollar invested, \$2½ in measurable benefits will be returned.

Translated from tables into tangibles, the first stage would support an increased project area population of 14,000 people,

through substantial progress in overcoming the outmigration problem that has plagued all of rural America. Annual farm receipts would be boosted by more than \$30 million. As this new income is spent and invested, business volume in South Dakota would receive a \$71 million thrust. State and local tax revenues, as well as those of the Federal Government, would be increased, and would be returned in the form of improved public services such as schools, roads, and other community facilities.

Development of the Oahe unit would mean a fuller and more abundant life for both rural and urban areas in the James River Basin. Associated public outdoor recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement would help to meet the growing needs of America's population, and would add to the economic impact through stimulation of tourism and sales of sporting goods, boating, fishing, and recreational equipment.

The first stage of the Oahe irrigation unit in South Dakota is soundly conceived, eminently justified, and represents a great progressive step in the orderly development and use of the resources of the Missouri Basin.

Six sections constitute this authorization bill. The first outlines the principal purposes as "furnishing a surface irrigation water supply for approximately 190,000 acres of land, furnishing water for municipal and industrial uses, controlling floods, enhancing the generation of power, conserving and developing fish and wildlife resources, and enhancing outdoor recreation opportunities and other purposes."

Also included in the first section is a brief description of the principal features of the first stage of the Oahe unit. These are:

The Oahe pumping plant to pump water from the Oahe Reservoir, a system of main canals, regulating reservoirs, and the James diversion dam and the James pumping plant on the James River. The remaining works include appurtenant pumping plants, canals, and laterals for distributing water to the land, and a drainage system.

Section 2 of the bill authorizes construction, operation, and maintenance of public outdoor recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities.

The third section coordinates the Oahe unit with other Federal works constructed or authorized under the Food Control Act of 1944.

Section 4 is a prohibition against production of any agricultural commodity which is in surplus according to Federal law.

Section 5 provides for determination by the Secretary of the Treasury of the interest rate on the interest-bearing features.

Section 6 authorizes the Federal appropriation of \$200,684,000 plus such additional amounts as may be required for operation and maintenance. It should be noted that the reimbursement features of the Oahe irrigation unit will provide for a return to the Federal Treasury of most of these funds.

Of this amount of \$200,684,000, some \$11,500,000 would be earmarked for facilities designed to serve the entire 495,000 acres. These include such items as foundations for pumps and main canals of a size sufficient to carry water for the total project.

The Oahe unit project plan provides that water would be diverted from the existing Oahe Reservoir near Pierre, our State capital, on the Missouri River.

The area proposed for initial stage development is comprised of irrigable land in the Lake Plain area in Brown and Spink Counties. The entire 495,000-acre unit, in addition to Brown and Spink Counties, includes Marshall and Day Counties at the northern end of the James River Basin within South Dakota, the Missouri Slope area in northwestern Sully County, and southwestern Potter County just east of the Oahe Reservoir.

In addition to irrigation, 17 towns and cities in the project area would be furnished municipal and industrial water. In the ultimate stage of Oahe unit development, 23 communities would receive municipal and industrial water supplies.

The regulating reservoirs included among the principal features would be formed by Blunt, Cresbard, and Byron Dams. Blunt Reservoir, on the north branch of Medicine Knoll Creek, would

#### EXHIBIT 1

##### Irrigable acreage for service by States, 1902-64

State	Through 1915	Irrigable acreage for service by time period					Complete total
		1916-25	1926-35	1936-45	1946-55	1956-64	
California.....	26,840	11,141	16,540	663,717	833,205	726,724	2,308,167
Idaho.....	350,000	722,040	145,827	150,245	131,409	119,012	1,618,533
Colorado.....	69,500	76,030	-34,996	77,105	632,890	147,035	967,564
Washington.....	126,856	181,244	71,718	56,875	264,571	241,820	943,084
Arizona.....	285,611	96,238	8,924	10,836	68,903	22,385	492,897
Oregon.....	55,000	45,580	46,216	189,786	94,707	53,617	484,906
Nebraska.....	137,764	182,477	-26,337	-14,277	54,961	91,426	426,014
Utah.....	50,000	23,390	72,091	146,774	44,944	33,696	370,895
Montana.....	97,699	110,842	71,480	52,032	19,176	-10,822	340,407
Wyoming.....	42,816	64,433	67,443	20,784	53,718	61,094	310,288
New Mexico.....	53,776	53,769	2,510	0	70,219	125,377	308,651
Nevada.....	65,000	385	4,139	64,367	3,780	3,655	141,326
Texas.....	19,350	91,150	33,500	-59,207	20,035	236	105,064
South Dakota.....	78,591	3,229	-8,959	-430	2,840	2,921	78,192
Kansas.....					9,785	53,228	63,013
Oklahoma.....					47,809	-549	47,260
North Dakota.....	13,969	5,250	1,029	10,426	1,655	-2,027	30,302
Undistributed in 1945.....				17,208	-17,208		
Total.....	1,472,772	1,670,198	471,125	1,416,241	2,337,399	1,668,828	9,036,563

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

The bill (S. 3001) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the first stage of the Oahe unit, James division, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McGovern, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### OAHE IRRIGATION PROJECT, SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an identical bill with that introduced by my colleague [Mr. McGovern] in connection with the Oahe irrigation project.

Our colleagues in the House of Representatives, Mr. BERRY and Mr. REIFEL, today are also introducing bills identical to the ones which Senator McGovern and I are introducing here.

The introduction of this bill and the companion bills in the House represents a joint effort on the part of the South Dakota congressional delegation, in cooperation with our officials of State government in South Dakota, to achieve congressional authorization of the first stage development of the Oahe irrigation unit.

The first stage comprises some 190,000 acres in South Dakota of what eventually will be an irrigation unit of 495,000 acres in our State.

Our bill is the product of many hands working together to achieve enactment of the last major development of the Missouri River Basin program in South Dakota. We have worked with officials in our State government, we have consulted with landowners and farmers and their representatives in various conservation and reclamation organizations, we have met with officials of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior in drafting the proposal which is presented today.

have an active capacity of 381,000 acre-feet; Cresbard Reservoir on Cresbard Creek, an active capacity of 30,400 acre-feet; and Byron Reservoir, 62,100 acre-feet.

Mr. President, the proposal we introduce today is the outgrowth of an effort which started more than two decades ago and which was officially recognized as a Federal project when the Missouri River Basin project was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 and which was subsequently supplemented and extended by the Flood Control Act of 1946.

Under these acts, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior were authorized to construct facilities in accordance with the coordinated plan for the comprehensive development of the water and land resources of the Missouri River Basin.

At the time the Flood Control Acts were adopted, I was serving in the House of Representatives, along with a distinguished member who later served here in the Senate until his untimely death in 1962—Francis Case. In the Senate then, were Harlan Bushfield and Chan Gurney.

So as one who has had the opportunity to work for, and vote for this comprehensive program since its inception and passage by Congress, the introduction of the Oahe irrigation authorization bill has special significance for me.

While a substantial amount of the Missouri River Basin program—at least in our State—has been completed, and even though one feels a sense of satisfaction over that part of the development which is now in operation, it still is an exciting and rewarding experience for me to continue working in behalf of that which is unfinished, even though that which has been accomplished is probably more dramatic and awesome, such as the construction involved in building the huge rolled-earth Oahe Dam on the Missouri.

To my mind, the events preceding the enactment of the flood control laws of 1944 and 1946 remain most fresh, because it was then that full demonstration was given of what can be accomplished when the people join together in a worthy cause. And the basin project is truly an effort by the people as they planned and worked cooperatively in the vast undertaking that stands today as the Missouri River development program.

In the early 1940's, an extensive series of public meetings were held, up and down the river, to discuss the plans for flood control, plans which eventually would also lead to irrigation which we are now ready to start as part of the basin program of operation.

Virtually all of our congressional recess periods in those days were used by the delegation to meet with the Governor, other State officials, and various groups and organizations to lay the groundwork for this multipurpose development, so much of which is now a reality.

South Dakota Governors during this period were Harlan Bushfield, from 1939 to 1943 when he came to the Senate to continue his efforts in behalf of the program, and M. Q. Sharpe, who served until

1947. All of our succeeding Governors also gave the basin program maximum support.

Among the hardest drivers in the effort were two men whose names became household words in South Dakota—and no doubt in the other Missouri River States—and for whom the program was originally named, the Pick-Sloan plan.

Gen. Lewis A. Pick, then the Army Corps of Engineers division engineer, and W. G. Sloan, Bureau of Reclamation regional director, accomplished a tremendous job, and if ever two men dedicated themselves to a program with all their hearts and energies, Glen Sloan and Lewis Pick did as they met and talked with our people in South Dakota and with officials here in Washington in their advocacy of Missouri River development.

In fact, I recall on one occasion, over a 2-week period one summer, Governor Sharpe, General Pick, Glen Sloan, and I visited all nine States in the Missouri River watershed and held public meetings from St. Joseph and Kansas City to Fort Peck, Mont., drumming up support for what became the Pick-Sloan plan.

In any summation of the great work involved in this program and the contributions which have been made, it perhaps is not appropriate to try to single out individual citizens for credit because there are so many involved and no doubt important contributors would be overlooked. But it would likewise be inappropriate, to my way of thinking, in discussion of this program if no mention were made at all of the two men I have cited, General Pick and Glen Sloan.

And what of this great Missouri Basin project, which we once knew as the Pick-Sloan plan?

It was the intention of this plan to prosper and stabilize the agriculture of the seven-State Missouri Basin, provide effective flood control and navigation benefiting the downstream States along the Mississippi River, establish new recreational areas, and provide low cost hydroelectric power and irrigation.

My great State of South Dakota gave up more than 500,000 acres of good river bottomland to the great dams constructed on the Missouri River, and as the Missouri River courses through South Dakota today, it passes from one reservoir to another for its full length of about 550 miles.

These dams and reservoirs now effectively provide in large measures all of the benefits claimed for them, except the promised irrigation.

We gave up that good river bottomland unselfishly, with confidence that the plan to irrigate some hundreds of thousands of acres from the Oahe Reservoir in our State would compensate us for this sacrifice. The legislation we introduce today would make a small start on that pledge of more than 20 years' standing.

The economy of South Dakota is founded firmly on agriculture. But because of the vagaries of nature, we have never been blessed with dependable and adequate moisture during the critical growing season to realize fully the great potential of our wonderful soil. We have

never been able to remove the ever-present threat of drought and crop failure. We have never been able to stabilize and expand our agricultural economy, and we have been continually faced with the emigration of our youth to those States which have been more bountifully blessed.

But South Dakota's faith has not wavered over these 20-odd years as we waited and watched while over 90 percent of the works planned for flood control, navigation, recreation, and power production in the Missouri River Basin project have been constructed.

In the 2d session of the 88th Congress, we passed Public Law 442, which requires that all further construction on the Missouri River Basin project be separately authorized. For many years prior to that, no authorized irrigation development of major size in the basin has been able to secure the funding essential for construction.

Last year, however, North Dakota was benefited by the passage of legislation authorizing construction of the initial stage of the Garrison diversion unit. That legislation also included authorization of accounting and financial concepts and procedures that assure that the Missouri River Basin project will continue on a sound financial basis.

It assures that all of the reimbursable Federal expenditures associated with the project will be returned to the Treasury. In the case of the Oahe unit, I am pleased to report, the reimbursable costs amount to 90 percent of the proposed Federal expenditures. The remaining 10 percent that is nonreimbursable represents costs associated with flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

For every dollar of Federal expenditure for the initial stage of the Oahe unit, Mr. President, benefits totaling \$2.50 will flow back into the economy.

The annual volume of farm receipts and associated business volume created will total more than \$100 million annually.

This development will generate local, State, and Federal taxes of more than \$6 million each and every year.

Over the 50-year period during which the Federal costs of the unit would be returned to the Treasury, Federal income taxes in excess of those that would be collected from the area if dryland farming were to continue will amount to more than \$175 million.

For the more than 76 years that South Dakota has been one of these great United States, we have been unable to contribute our full share to growth of the national economy. The legislation which we are introducing today would authorize the Secretary of Interior to make an investment in America that would permit us to do so, and to return handsome dividends on that investment.

And, Mr. President, the time has now arrived for achieving the return on South Dakota's own investment of our rich river bottomlands to this program by setting in motion this irrigation project which also makes the Federal Government's contribution a national investment in yielding to the Nation economic dividends far surpassing the cost.



Mr. President, in closing, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD*, at the end of my remarks a resolution adopted by the Oahe Conservancy Subdistrict board of directors at their meeting on January 12, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, since this organization has been in the forefront of the irrigation planning for our State, I think it is most appropriate that some recognition be given for their valued service and outstanding contributions and by way of doing so wish to include the board's resolution which endorses the authorization bill introduced today.

#### EXHIBIT 1

##### A RESOLUTION

Whereas the board of directors of the Oahe Conservancy Subdistrict on December 19, 1964, adopted a motion requesting the Bureau of Reclamation to revise the report for the Oahe irrigation unit so as to redefine the unit as a whole; and

Whereas the board also requested the Bureau of Reclamation to prepare a feasibility report on a proposed 190,000-acre first stage of the Oahe irrigation unit; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has prepared such reports as requested: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the board does request the Congress to enact legislation to redefine the Oahe unit as originally defined in Senate Document 191 of the 78th Congress and authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 so as to conform to the definition provided in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation on the Oahe unit of May 1965 and that the Congress also authorize construction of the 190,000-acre first stage of the Oahe unit as designated in the supplemental report of the Bureau of Reclamation of June 1965; be it further

*Resolved*, That the subdistrict pledges its best efforts to seek authorization to additional acreages in the Oahe project as soon as local support is indicated by formation of irrigation districts.

JAMES L. LEWIS,  
Manager-Treasurer.

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

The bill (S. 3002) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the first stage of the Oahe unit, James division, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### ANTIBLACKOUT EMERGENCY POWER BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require the installation of emergency electric power equipment in hotels, theaters, restaurants, office buildings, retail establishments, and transportation terminals engaged in interstate commerce.

Designed to forestall wholesale public inconvenience and possible panic in power blackouts such as the one in the Northeast last November, and the more recent occurrence in El Paso, Tex., the

bill requires installation of power equipment capable of providing emergency lighting. The measure contemplates the use of inexpensive, battery-operated facilities to provide adequate power. Emergency power to light a theater could be made available for under \$100 by using these battery-powered facilities, which are presently in widespread use in Pennsylvania.

November 9, 1965, will long be remembered in New York State—indeed in the entire Northeast—as the night of the great blackout. In the midst of the homebound rush hour, millions were plunged into total darkness and deprived of all electric power. In the city of New York, this meant that thousands were trapped in elevators, hundreds of thousands were in subways and trains under the ground, and countless others moved homeward either on foot or in automobiles through dark and congested streets—or were stranded as were thousands that night. Tens of thousands of apartment dwellers were also without water due to the failure of electric pumps.

To the surprise of many, and to the great credit of urban man's endurance, there was no panic during the blackout and, except for the extreme inconvenience, New Yorkers appear to have muddled through virtually unscathed. The same could be said of El Paso, Tex., which experienced a blackout even more recently. In the next blackout for whatever cause—if there ever is a next blackout—we may not be as fortunate.

The Federal Power Commission and the American Public Power Association have both prepared extensive reports on the causes of the Northeast blackout, and have made suggestions to prevent a recurrence. These include a more extensive power grid, new authority for the Federal Power Commission, tighter technical regulation of power distribution systems and a complete reevaluation of our resources and equipment.

One relatively simple precaution although recommended, has not been acted upon. That is to require that all public buildings be equipped with emergency power facilities sufficient to provide electric light in the event of a power failure. Pennsylvania has such a law. New York has one which applies to hospitals, theaters, and it will be noted that emergency lights were available in these institutions during the blackout.

Certainly, there are other forms of emergency electric power which would be desirable in the event of a blackout, but to require that all public buildings be equipped with entire auxiliary power systems would be both enormously expensive and impractical. Manual devices operating without electric power can be provided in elevators, for example, which would permit their being lowered to the nearest floor.

But lights are essential, both to eliminate the possibility of panic, and to permit orderly exit. And power for lights can be provided by single unit, battery powered facilities at very little cost. Power to light a theater, for example, could be assured by the installation of such a device costing well under \$100.

My bill would require the installation of such a device in all hotels, theaters, restaurants, office buildings, retail establishments, and transportation terminals engaged in interstate commerce. The Secretary of Commerce is given primary enforcement powers, but both inspection and enforcement functions would be delegated to appropriate State agencies where effective State laws exist.

This proposal is simple, inexpensive, and practical. It would greatly alleviate inconvenience and would protect the public safety should power failures occur in the future. It is regrettable that such a law was not on the books last November 9, but I urge that it be considered at the forthcoming Commerce Committee hearings.

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

The bill (S. 3004) to require certain buildings to be equipped with emergency lighting systems, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, 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.

#### TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the administration and on behalf of myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "Traffic Safety Act of 1966." The proposed legislation will provide for a coordinated national safety program and the establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce traffic accidents and the deaths, injuries, and property damage resulting from such accidents. This proposed measure has been recommended in the President's transportation message to the Congress.

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

The bill (S. 3005) to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce traffic accidents and the deaths, injuries, and property damage which occur in such accidents, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, no domestic public issue has so captured the interest and concern of the American public as automobile safety. We have now come face to face with the realization that the deaths of tens of thousands of Americans on the highways each year are not inevitable.

We have come to understand that no dramatic safety program is possible which does not act upon the entire complex of factors which create hazard on the highways.

Driver education alone is not enough. The design of highways alone is not

enough. Encouragement of vigorous State automobile inspection is not enough.

No meaningful safety program can ignore any of these elements. And no meaningful program can shortchange the basic role of the automobile itself and its principal component—the automobile tire. The events of the last several months have made us realize that safer cars and safer tires can be engineered and economically produced. And the awful toll of highway deaths has brought us to the realization that safer automobiles and safer tires must be produced.

The Highway Safety Act which the President has sent us today represents a comprehensive, many-faceted program for promoting automobile safety. It is a program which should receive the wholehearted, vigorous attention of the Senate.

I am particularly pleased to note that the President has endorsed the Magnuson-Nelson Tire Safety Act of 1966, S. 2669, as an integral part of the Nation's safety programs.

Several bills relating to automobile safety have been introduced by various Senators in particular the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. Vigorous hearings have been held by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. The Committee on Commerce has held hearings on several bills relating to automobile safety. The committee is about ready to report an automobile tire safety bill, which is, of course, included in this many-facet program.

The bill just introduced is, of course, in the nature of an overall bill which, it is hoped, will reach generally all the facets and will add up to a good national safety program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in this connection, to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks letters from the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, which contain the administration's endorsement of S. 2669, and also a section-by-section summary of the proposed Traffic Safety Act of 1966.

There being no objection, the letters and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, necessary and immediate Federal action to halt the tragedy that occurs daily on the highways of our Nation is clearly indicated by the alarming growth in motor vehicle accidents. These mishaps claim each day over 134 lives or nearly 50,000 lives annually. They cause more than 3 million injuries in a year and result in economic losses of nearly \$9 billion.

Over the years 1.5 million American citizens have died as a result of highway accidents. The President recently stated that, "the gravest problem before this Nation—next to the war in Vietnam—is the death and destruction, the shocking and senseless carnage that strikes daily on our highways and takes a higher and more terrible toll every year." We can no longer be indifferent to or accept

as inevitable the economic loss and the untold tragedy that results from the mounting toll of traffic accidents.

We know how to build safer vehicles and safer highways, and we know how to train safer drivers and enforce safety regulations. But, for too long our traffic efforts have been diversified under many, many programs of varying levels of government and civic activity. The Nation's resources must be organized into a national traffic safety program which provides the financing needed for research and for establishing effective countermeasures to reverse the accident trend.

Our transportation system must be made the safest in the world. This means increased attention to automotive traffic safety, since this mode will involve travel reaching over a trillion vehicle miles a year within the next decade with 125 million drivers and 120 million vehicles involved. So the need for the proposed legislation is obvious.

The President's transportation message also set forth certain immediate corrective action steps which he is taking under existing authority. He will assign to a single agency responsibility for coordinating widely dispersed Federal safety programs. He has proposed in his budget for 1967 an expansion in the scope and upgrading in the quality of existing safety efforts.

The President has stated that the authority available to him must be broadened if the Federal Government is to promote a unified and vigorous national safety effort. The Traffic Safety Act of 1966 has been proposed by the President to accomplish this goal. It is a 6-year program directed toward the immediate reduction of accidents and the ultimate development of a safe highway transportation system. The legislation would authorize Federal financing support of \$700 million over the 6-year period—a little more than \$100 million a year.

Congress acted wisely in the last session by its enactment of a broad charter, under provisions of Public Law 89-139, which urges creation of State traffic safety programs and assigns responsibility for a long-range program of continued Federal-State cooperation.

The President has proposed a program of grants to support the States' highway safety programs which will operate under national uniform standards covering such areas as vehicle safety standards and inspection, driver education, driver licensing, advanced traffic control technology, support for specialized accident investigation teams, expansion of data collection efforts and improvement in the quality and availability of police and emergency medical service.

Funds also will be authorized to permit the Secretary of Transportation to carry forward necessary program support at the Federal level. He would be enabled to support training, fellowship grants, and research to institutions and individuals in all safety areas. Funds also would be used to augment on-going programs of other agencies with highway safety activities such as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In this way Federal funds could be properly allocated to areas where greatest

benefit could be derived under policy guidelines established by the Secretary of Transportation. Creation of effective countermeasures also requires adequate research capability so that we may establish a better understanding of the fundamental causes of traffic accidents and support creation of effective standards to guide formulation of future corrective actions. To accomplish this the President has requested authority to plan and construct needed Federal research facilities and the creation of an accident data information system.

The almost universal usage of the automobile makes it a vital component of our economy in supporting the mobility and livelihood of every individual American. This critical role requires that we no longer avoid the responsibility for assuring that vehicles sold and used in interstate commerce are designed, manufactured, and equipped to provide optimum safety. The public interest requires that safety be a primary consideration of vehicle design.

The President has requested that the Secretary of Transportation be given authority to assure that in the future all vehicles sold in interstate commerce be designed, built, and equipped to minimize both the possibility and the severity of accidents. To accomplish this objective the Secretary of Transportation would be given authority to investigate and to develop safety performance criteria for highway vehicles and their components. It is important that the Federal role in traffic safety focus upon all elements of the accident phenomena which include the vehicle as well as the driver and the highway. Authority is also proposed to allow the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe mandatory standards if by 1970, adequate voluntary standards have not been adopted by the industry. The timing of this authority will provide ample time for the Federal Government to devise constructive performance design criteria as guidelines for future actions.

In other modes of transportation, the Federal Government has never hesitated to assure that safety standards are provided when necessary to protect the public. Defining the Federal role in this area is needed to respond to the Nation's growing concern for the mounting toll of highway accidents.

We spend nearly \$100 billion a year for automotive transportation and the benefits to our Nation from this investment are immeasurable. But we also must avoid the unnecessary cost in economic loss and untold human tragedy which grows out of these traffic accidents.

The number and severity of accidents without question exceed tolerable limits and surely we can devote some small fraction of this expenditure to a program to reduce this human suffering and loss. In my view, the President's program as proposed is justified by this need. We must go forward with this effort until we have substantially reduced the hazards of highway accidents and made it possible for those Americans who depend upon the automobile to drive in safety and comfort upon our highways.

We have the most efficient and economic transportation system in the



world. The President's proposed program as contained in the Traffic Safety Act of 1966 can bring it within our power to provide the safest—and that is our goal.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, of which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is chairman, which has handled this subject. Do I understand that this bill is to be referred to both the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Government Operations?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. This is an automobile safety bill and will be referred to the Committee on Commerce. The other bill is an executive department reorganization bill to create a Department of Transportation. The President has just sent to Congress a message on that subject, and it will be referred jointly to the Committee on Government Operations and the Committee on Commerce.

It is expected that the Committee on Government Operations, of which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is the chairman, will hold hearings on the technical reorganization features with respect to executive departments.

If substantive legislation is required—and it will be, in some instances, because the proposal involves, for instance, the Coast Guard, the Federal Aviation Agency, and certain segments of the Interstate Commerce Commission—such proposed legislation would naturally be considered by the Committee on Commerce. If the Committee on Government Operations and the Committee on Commerce approve the establishment of a new Department of Transportation, that Department's functions would be under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce.

Certain features of the traffic safety bill affecting public roads may involve the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works, with which the other committees will work.

This proposal is a comprehensive approach to the regulation of the whole transportation system of the United States.

The administration's bill to establish a Department of Transportation will, I hope, be received today, and I shall introduce it with the same request.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was necessary to move in this broad way. I mentioned that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and other Senators have sponsored specific bills. The Committee on Commerce has before it eight or nine bills relating to different facets of traffic safety. We are trying to combine them. I am sure that no one feels any particular pride of authorship of legislation that will ultimately be designed to make our highways safe and to provide a better transportation system.

Mr. JAVITS. I certainly agree with the Senator from Washington as to that.

# EXHIBIT 1

## GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,

Washington, D.C., February 4, 1966.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in further reply to your request for the views of this Department with respect to S. 2669, a bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

This bill would require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the tire safety standards of the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission as interim mandatory standards, and to issue revised standards, if necessary, after 2 years based upon the research and development authorized by the bill. The Secretary would be authorized to conduct testing and inspection necessary for the enforcement of the act. The act authorizes enforcement either by seizure and condemnation of substandard tires or by injunction. The Secretary also would be directed to develop a uniform grading system for tires and to make recommendations to the Congress by January 31, 1971, for its implementation.

The Department of Commerce believes there is a need for appropriate legislation relating to tire standards. Subject to the comments below, we strongly favor enactment of S. 2669.

In the hearings on an earlier bill (S. 1643) on the subject of tire standards held by your committee on May 25, 1965, Assistant Secretary of Commerce J. Herbert Hollomon, in testifying for the Department, emphasized the need for research, as well as civil enforcement procedures, in an effective tire safety program. He also stated that the Department normally preferred the voluntary approach to standardization, but in this case would have no objection to discretionary authority in the Secretary of Commerce to issue mandatory standards, if the voluntary approach did not offer sufficient protection to the public.

S. 2669 includes provisions for research and civil enforcement, as the Department suggested. In addition, section 3 requires interim mandatory standards and provides that the Secretary shall review and revise them to the extent necessary in light of the results of the research and testing program. We believe it would be preferable simply to provide discretionary authority to issue mandatory safety standards. However, we would defer to your committee as to the necessity for promulgating interim mandatory standards as provided in S. 2669.

In any event we recommend that amendments along the following lines be made in the bill.

Section 2(b) defines motor vehicle in a manner which excludes not only vehicles subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but also many other vehicles used on the highways, such as light trucks and trailers. Accordingly, we suggest that section 2(b) be rewritten to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'motor vehicle' means any motor vehicle or drawn vehicle, primarily for use on the public roads and highways, other than a vehicle subject to safety regulations under part II of the Interstate Commerce Act."

The above suggested language is similar to that used in Public Law 88-201, establishing seat belt safety standards and would exclude vehicles occasionally used on the highways, but primarily adapted for other uses, such as, for example, farm tractors or construction equipment.

Among the activities authorized by section 4(c) in support of improved safety standards

is research and development on standards for retreaded tires. Developing a safety standard for retreaded tires is extremely difficult. There are unpredictable variations in carcasses used for retreading, and tests of small samples for data gathering purposes would be almost meaningless. We have estimated that a minimum of 4 years would be required to develop suitable tests. Assuming that a satisfactory test can be developed, the nature of tire remanufacturing could pose problems of enforcement under the provisions of the bill, and additional authority may well be needed to permit adequate enforcement.

Another suggestion we have relates to load standards for tires. Section 4(c)(4), which mentions factors to be considered in developing safety standards, could be construed together with section 4(b) to mean that load standards should be established for each type of expected use for tires. This would be a formidable task from both the technical and enforcement point of view. The Department believes that there should be a minimum safety requirement for load, considering all uses. Separate standards should not be required or permitted for a car traveling a few miles to and from work with only the driver, since such a car may at any time be used for severe service. A passenger car, for example, frequently has a full load of passengers and luggage and travels at maximum legal speed on interstate highways for prolonged periods. Furthermore, it is not practical to develop methods and to test tires for every possible road hazard as suggested by this section. Even safe tires may be cut or damaged accidentally or through abuse in ways that a standard cannot prevent. We recommend that section 4(b) be rewritten as follows:

"(b) In such revised minimum standards, the Secretary shall prescribe such maximum permissible loads for each motor vehicle tire, and the application of such maximum permissible load standards, as he determines to be necessary to achieve the purpose of section 3."

We further recommend that section 4(c)(4) be rewritten as follows:

"(4) Shall take into consideration such factors as size, load carrying ability under the conditions likely to be encountered in regular highway travel, resistance to impact and fatigue, resistance to cornering and skidding, resistance to detachment from rim, and such other factors as he deems relevant."

As rewritten, section 4(c)(4) would permit the consideration of factors such as the characteristics of tires in their interaction with road surfaces.

We note that while S. 1643 refers to labeling standards as well as safety and grading standards, S. 2669 does not expressly require labeling. We assume that there is no intent in S. 2669 to restrict authority to require reasonable labeling as part of establishing safety standards, since the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission regulation V-1 on tire safety includes certain labeling requirements. We feel that reasonable labeling requirements would include information such as the name of the manufacturer or distributor, tire size, load rating, and inflation pressure.

Finally, the enforcement provisions of the bill are not entirely clear. It appears that condemnation proceedings could be brought by private parties, and that substandard tires could be condemned while in the hands of the ultimate user. We question whether either of these would be desirable or practical.

In summary, we feel that enactment of S. 2669, subject to our comments above, would contribute importantly to the traffic safety program which President Johnson called for in this year's state of the Union message.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to

the submission of this report to your committee and further that the enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 2669 would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. GILES,  
General Counsel.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1966.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of October 20, 1965, requesting the Commission's views on S. 2669, 89th Congress, 1st session, a bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

The bill provides that it may be cited as the "Tire Safety Act of 1966." As we interpret the bill, it would delegate to the Secretary of Commerce the authority to promulgate minimum safety standards for tires used on motor vehicles, which is defined in the bill as meaning passenger cars and station wagons used on the highways, except those regulated under certain specific provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. The bill further authorizes and directs the Secretary of Commerce to develop a uniform grading system for motor vehicle tires.

It specifically provides that the Secretary shall establish and publish as interim minimum safety standards in the Federal Register the tire safety standards substantially as prescribed by the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission, an interstate agency which was established pursuant to a joint resolution of Congress.

Two years after the effective date of the bill and thereafter as he deems necessary the Secretary is required to review and revise to the extent necessary the aforementioned interim minimum safety standards. In such revised minimum standards, the Secretary is required to prescribe the maximum permissible loads for each motor vehicle tire and the application of such standards. The bill then sets out what the Secretary shall do in carrying out this requirement. Among the activities that the Secretary is directed to undertake in carrying out the safety standard provisions of the bill is the conducting of a research and development program to (1) improve minimum safety standards for new tires, and (2) develop minimum safety standards for retreaded tires.

He is also directed to take into consideration such factors as size, load-carrying ability and its relation to the type of expected uses, skid resistance, blowout resistance, resistance to curb-striking and pot-hole or bump damage, cornering ability and rim resistance. He is further required to consult with interested industries, technical organizations, Federal, State, and local agencies.

The bill requires the Secretary to make recommendations to Congress by January 31, 1971, with respect to the implementation of the grading system of motor vehicle tires he is directed to establish.

The Secretary is authorized to conduct such testing and inspection as he deems necessary for the enforcement of the provisions of the bill.

The bill prohibits the manufacture for sale, the sale, or the offering for sale, in interstate commerce, or the importation to the United States as well as the introduction, delivery for introduction, or transportation, in interstate commerce, or for the purpose of sale, or delivery after sale, in interstate commerce of any tire which does not comply with the safety standards prescribed by the Secretary.

Any tire manufactured or introduced into commerce in violation of the prohibited acts

is liable to seizure in any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction in which the tire is found. Such seizure is to be in conformity as nearly as may be to that followed in cases in admiralty, except that a jury trial may be accorded when demanded.

The bill provides for the issuing of injunctions and restraining orders and contains provisions concerning criminal contempt for violations thereof.

Tire manufacturers are required by the bill to maintain such records and make such reports as requested by the Secretary to insure compliance.

The Federal Trade Commission wholeheartedly supports the objectives and purpose of S. 2669.

As your committee is aware, the Commission in January of 1965 held 3 days of public hearings on various aspects of tire marketing. Among the subjects considered was the need for minimum safety standards, the adequacy of existing standards and the need for a system of tire grading. Since the hearings, the Commission's staff has continued to study the problems to encompass current developments including the recent revisions in the existing standards of the Vehicle Safety Equipment Commission effective October 10, 1965, and of the Rubber Manufacturers Association, effective January 1, 1966.

In our opinion, the need for minimum safety standards for automotive tires is now beyond question. The industry, by its adoption of such standards has recognized their necessity. The activity of the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission in adopting tire standards only serves to buttress our conclusion, based on our hearings and our study of all the authorities, that minimum safety standards are necessary and that the present industry standards are inadequate for that purpose.

The Commission has received substantial evidence that, even with their recent revisions, the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission's standards fail to provide realistic and adequate safeguards against unsafe tires. Both sets of existing standards fail to make any provision for the problem of overload. It is our understanding that overload is a situation which exists when the curb weight of a vehicle plus the designed load capacity in terms of passengers and luggage exceed the load-carrying capacity of tires mounted on the vehicle. Much evidence was presented at the Commission hearing, including a statement by a tire manufacturer, that many original equipment tires mounted on new cars may be inadequate to safely carry the passenger and baggage load the vehicle is intended to carry.

Our study has also raised grave doubts whether the performance requirements and the allowable tolerances in the existing standards, as revised, are sufficiently stringent in light of current high-speed turnpike and other highway use. The specific levels of desirable performance and tolerance are technical matters which we are not equipped to evaluate adequately. Although our staff has discussed this problem with the National Bureau of Standards and has been advised that the requirements and tolerances of the current standards are too slow, we shall leave specific comments to the Secretary of Commerce, who we understand will present his views to this committee.

A further defect in the existing minimum safety standards, which we feel is of utmost significance, is their enforcement provisions. The Rubber Manufacturers Association's standards are described as "voluntary." Manufacturers whose tires fail to meet the standards suffer only the withdrawal of its name from the association's certified tire directory and the right to advertise that its tires meet the standards. The manufacturer may still offer these tires for sale without restriction. In our opinion reliance only on

voluntary standards for a product involving the life and safety of the purchaser is not a sufficient safeguard of the public interest.

Enforcement of the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission's standards is also voluntary at the present time and their implementation will be left to the individual member States and the statutory authority available to each. There is no assurance that all of the member States will adopt the proposed standards and even if they do, this will still leave the six States which are not members and which accordingly are not parties to these standards. Moreover, even adoption of these standards by all members will provide no assurance that the standards will be enforced equally in each State. In our opinion, the motoring public of the entire United States is entitled to uniform protection of mandatory minimum safety standards.

With respect to the grading system which is provided for in the bill under consideration, the testimony received during our proceeding indicated that a great deal of consumer confusion and deception exists as a result of grade representations and claims currently used in the marketing of tires.

We believe confusion and deception are the results inherent in the existing situation where approximately 950 different tire names currently marketed represent the products of approximately 120 private-label marketers and 14 tire manufacturers; where tires may be designated as to grade; i.e., "premium," "first line," "second line," etc., regardless of the tire's performance or safety; where the price of the tire has no discernible relation to its grade or safety level; and where many of the descriptive terms employed, such as "ply rating," "100 level," and other grade designations, have no fixed meaning or definitive value under existing industry practices.

Testimony adduced at the hearing reflects that one manufacturer's "first-line" tire may be inferior to another manufacturer's "third-line" tire; and a manufacturer may supply a tire represented by him as a "third-line" tire to a private-label marketer who is free to designate it as his "premium" tire.

We feel that S. 2669 goes a long way in providing a solution to both the safety and the grade problems which hearings and our study demonstrated exist in the marketing of automobile tires. Section 3 eliminates the voluntary nature of existing standards by adopting the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission's standards as an interim measure. Although, as we have indicated, we are not satisfied as to the adequacy of these standards, we feel that their interim adoption immediately under this bill will be at least an initial step toward the establishment of minimum safety standards.

Section 4 of the bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to review and revise the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission's standards prescribed in section 3 and specifically provides for the establishment of maximum load capacities for tires. These actions are of absolute necessity and will eliminate ultimately the defects and inadequacies of the requirements and tolerances which are now present in the existing standards.

Section 5 of the bill authorizes and directs the Secretary to develop a uniform grading system for motor vehicle tires. In our opinion, this is a most salutary provision in that there are no adequate industrywide standards for grading tires.

The Commission reiterates its support of the objectives and purpose of S. 2669 and unequivocally supports its enactment.

By direction of the Commission.

PAUL RAND DIXON,  
Chairman.

Pursuant to regulations, this report was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget on January 20, 1966, and on January 28, 1966, the Bureau of the Budget advised that there



is no objection to the submission of this report and that enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 2669 would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

JOSEPH W. SHEA,  
Secretary.

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY: TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966

##### Section 1. Short title.

Section 2. Declaration of purpose: This is a succinct statement of purposes, designed to summarize the major concepts of the bill, and to emphasize that it proposes a comprehensive program directed at all aspects of motor vehicle accidents.

#### TITLE I—MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS

Section 101. This section contains definitions of terms used in the title, including "motor vehicle," "motor vehicle equipment," "motor vehicle safety," and "motor vehicle safety standard." The term "motor vehicle safety" is defined as the performance of motor vehicles or motor vehicle equipment in such a manner that the public is protected against unreasonable risk of (1) highway accidents occurring as a result of the design of motor vehicles and (2) death, injury, or property damage occurring when highway accidents do occur. The term "State" is defined as the States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States. The term "Secretary" is defined as the Secretary of Transportation.

Section 102. This section states the conditions under which the Secretary may by order issue a Federal motor vehicle safety standard, or amend or withdraw any such standard. A standard may be issued if the Secretary finds that no safety standard exists, or if an existing safety standard is inadequate to protect the public, is not based upon all necessary standards of performance, or is not sufficiently complied with to achieve adequate motor vehicle safety. Federal standards must be issued in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act and when in effect will preempt State and local law issuing a standard on the subject matter covered by the Federal standard. For adequate leadtime, any standard issued shall take effect no sooner than 180 days nor later than 2 years from the date of issuance.

Section 103. This section provides that orders issuing standards are subject to judicial review by U.S. courts of appeals. The procedure of review follows that in effect for orders issued under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Section 104. This section authorizes research, testing, and development for motor vehicle safety and safety standards, in cooperation with other Federal departments and agencies as required by section 113. For example, this provision would provide for the use of the expertise and the facilities of the National Bureau of Standards under existing authority of the Secretary of Commerce (15 U.S.C. 272). More specifically, it authorizes data collection, contract for fabrication of motor vehicles, and grants to States, interstate agencies, and nonprofit institutions. It also authorizes acquisition of equipment and facilities, and fabrication of motor vehicle equipment, for research and development for the purposes of this title, and further authorizes purchasing, disposal, and destructive testing of motor vehicles used for research and testing purposes notwithstanding other laws, including laws limiting purchase and use of motor vehicles for passenger carrying purposes.

Section 105. This section authorizes advice or cooperative agreements to assist in the planning or development of motor vehicle safety standards, safety standards inspection and testing methods and test equipment.

Section 106. This section authorizes training programs for the purpose of achieving

motor vehicle safety. This training may include testing, inspection, use of test methods and test equipment, and interpretation of motor vehicle safety standards. Also, an administrative provision authorizes acquisition, use, and disposal of motor vehicles in such training programs in the manner authorized for research and testing in section 104.

Section 107. This section prohibits various acts and transactions, other than exports, related to commerce with respect to new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle equipment subject to, but not complying with, a Federal motor vehicle safety standard. It also prohibits failure or refusal to allow entry, inspection, or access to and copying of records, or to provide reports and information, as required by section 110. Non-complying vehicles or vehicle equipment may not be imported, except under regulations (1) allowing importation under bond to insure compliance, export or abandonment to the United States, or (2) allowing temporary importation of certain vehicles, such as vehicles of tourists visiting the United States.

Section 108. This section sets a civil penalty of not to exceed \$1,000 for each violation of section 107, or regulations issued thereunder. The penalty would be enforced by civil action in any State, as defined in section 101, under section 2461 of title 28 of the United States Code.

Section 109. This section authorizes U.S. courts to restrain violations of this title. Trial for criminal contempt or violation may be by jury. Subpoenas may run to witnesses residing outside the district in which proceedings to enforce this title are held.

Section 110. This section authorizes seizure, prior to sale to the ultimate purchaser, while in interstate commerce of motor vehicles or motor vehicle equipment manufactured or introduced into interstate commerce in violation of section 107. The procedures follow those applicable to seizure under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Section 111. This section authorizes testing and inspection to aid in the enforcement of Federal vehicle safety standards. Information obtained indicating noncompliance is to be forwarded to the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary is also authorized to require the keeping of records and the provision of reports and information to determine compliance with this title. Section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code would apply to disclosure of trade secrets and proprietary information, except when relevant to proceedings under this act.

Section 112. This section repeals laws authorizing the Secretary to issue brake fluid and seat belt standards, but preserves the standards issued under the repealed laws, and makes them enforceable and subject to amendment as if issued as Federal vehicle safety standards under this title.

Section 113. This section calls for cooperation with other departments and agencies in carrying out the provisions of the act. The Secretary is directed to utilize the services of other departments and agencies to the maximum to avoid duplication.

Section 114. This section authorizes the issuance of regulations to carry out the provisions of this act.

Section 115. This section authorizes appropriations for carrying out the provisions of this title.

#### TITLE II—TRAFFIC ACCIDENT AND INJURY RESEARCH AND TEST FACILITY

Section 201. This section provides the authorization for the Secretary of Transportation to plan, build, and operate appropriate research facilities in which the Federal agencies participating in the traffic safety program may conduct research.

Section 202. The Secretary is authorized to expend \$3 million from the highway trust

fund for feasibility studies and for planning the organization and construction of the facility or facilities authorized by section 201.

Section 203. The Secretary is authorized to spend an as yet to be determined amount from the highway trust fund to build the facility or facilities authorized by section 201.

#### TITLE III—HIGHWAY SAFETY

Section 301. This section would add a new chapter (Chapter 4—Highway Safety) to title 23, United States Code, and provide the necessary codifying and repealing language. The Secretary of Commerce is now charged with the administration of the provisions of title 23. This responsibility will be transferred to the Secretary of Transportation if the Congress approves the creation of that Department.

The new chapter would contain the following sections:

Section 401. This section authorizes the Secretary to carry out the highway safety program envisioned in the act, and in doing so, to assist and cooperate with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, private industry, and others. This section is a revision and enlargement of title 23, United States Code, section 313, which is repealed in its entirety elsewhere in the bill. New section 401 would give the Secretary a broader directive than now contained in title 23, United States Code, section 313, to provide unified Federal leadership in highway safety by cooperation with all public and private groups involved in highway safety activities. By repealing title 23, United States Code, section 313, the limitation of \$150,000 from the highway trust fund to support the President's Committee on Traffic Safety (which is to be replaced by an advisory committee in an executive order planned for early issuance) would be removed. Highway safety activities would be made eligible for highway trust fund support generally by other legislation but this section provides the basis for continuing Federal financial support to the advisory committee. Present plans call for the financing of the advisory committee solely from the administrative portion of the highway trust fund, without private financial support and the executive order will provide this. The President's Committee has been supported by a combination of trust fund and private financing.

Section 402(a). This is a restatement of the Baldwin amendment (23 U.S.C. 135) which is repealed elsewhere in the draft bill. It has been reworded slightly to eliminate the December 31, 1967, target date (to allow the Secretary whatever time is necessary to develop meaningful standards) and to spell out the idea of Federal assistance in developing uniform State programs on all highways and roads. The Baldwin amendment and the standards which will be developed by the Secretary pursuant thereto form the foundation for a cooperative system involving State projects which under existing law, cannot now be financially supported by the Federal Government, e.g., driver licensing, vehicle inspection, police enforcement and driver-teacher training. This subsection preserves most of the language of the Baldwin amendment which is broad enough to cover all areas in which State participation through comprehensive programs is desired.

Section 402(b). This subsection provides the mechanism by which Federal financial support for State highway safety programs can be accomplished. Specifically, it provides that 75 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 402(a) will be apportioned among the several States on the basis of population, and 25 percent as the Secretary deems appropriate. In this fashion, it provides the Secretary with flexibility to provide additional moneys to States which have particularly promising innova-

tive projects or to any State with a pressing need to improve one or another aspect of its total program. This section also would provide for a deduction from the authorized appropriations for the cost of administering the State aid programs in the amount necessary to provide adequate Federal administrative support. To the extent applicable, provisions of chapter 1 of title 23 (relating to highway construction) are to be followed in the financial administration of the program, it being expressly intended that the same statutory procedures for authorization, approval, obligation, Federal share payable, period of availability and the like, of the Federal-aid primary highway program will apply to the Federal-aid highway safety program. This section provides, however, that any funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1967 will be apportioned when authorized since the ordinary operation of chapter 1 of title 23 would have required apportionment on January 1, 1966. By section 303 of the bill, the funds for the States under proposed section 402(b) of title 23 would be appropriated from the highway trust fund. By incorporation the formula for cost sharing of the Federal-aid primary highway program, a Federal-State matching program, with each partner sharing equally, is created.

Section 402(c). This subsection would permit the Secretary to obtain the assistance of any Federal agency having special expertise, for example, the Public Health Service or the National Bureau of Standards, in developing standards for elements of State programs, for example, emergency medical services. He could also arrange to have another agency administer the expenditure of funds for certain State program areas which are particularly within that agency's competence. This will aid him in a unified handling of needed project funding and permit the investment of funds in the areas which will provide the greatest returns. Thus, the Secretary could make money available from appropriations under this act to augment programs being carried on in other agencies, under existing law and appropriations, which programs relate to the State efforts under this section, e.g., the activities of the Public Health Service in accident investigation and emergency medical services and the methods of driver and traffic safety education carried on by the Office of Education.

Section 403. This section authorizes an expanded highway safety research effort to augment the research now done pursuant to 23 United States Code 307(a) and specifies that all areas of highway safety and their interactions will be included in this research, thus permitting augmentation of on-going activities of other agencies. The Secretary may, as provided in 23 United States Code 307(a), act cooperatively with other agencies and he could make these funds available to such agencies as HEW to carry out the programs for which they have existing related research authority as an intensification of programs in which they are already involved. This section also authorizes the Secretary to use the funds appropriated for expanded research for grants to States, institutions and individuals for research, training and education grants, demonstrations, and other necessary activities. Thus, he can augment Federal research and development activities now performed outside of Federal facilities.

Section 404. This section is a restatement of the driver register legislation and includes an amendment which would expand the reportable information to cover license denials (as well as terminations and withdrawals). The amendments which are included are identical to last session's Department-sponsored bills, S. 1350 and H.R. 5866 (D-15 in the Department program). This section codifies the driver register legislation; the public laws now constituting this

legislation are repealed in section 302(a) of the draft bill.

Section 302. These subsections constitute the necessary repealer and conforming language associated with the proposed chapter 4, title 23.

Section 303. This section authorizes a total of \$420 million for fiscal years 1967 through 1972 from the Highway Trust Fund to aid the States in carrying out the activities envisioned in proposed section 402, title 23, and the standards approved thereunder by the Secretary.

Section 304. This section authorizes a total of \$160 million for fiscal years 1967 through 1972 from the Highway Trust Fund for the expanded highway safety research and development referred to in proposed 23 United States Code 403 in addition to the funds otherwise available under 23 United States Code 104(a), 307(a) for safety research activities now conducted by the Bureau of Public Roads. This section provides for the costs of administration and allows funds to remain available until expended.

Section 305. This section adds to 23 United States Code 101 a definition of "State highway safety agency" to simplify the Federal-State relationships in the administration of the State highway safety programs of proposed section 402, title 23, and to clarify the applicability of pertinent sections of chapter 1, title 23.

Section 306. This section adds to 23 United States Code 105 a subsection which directs the Secretary to give priority in approving Federal-aid highway programs to projects which incorporate improved safety standards and features.

Section 307. This section would provide that any highway accident report of a Federal agency or official made as a part of the work of any Federal-State-local accident investigating team would not be available for use in any civil or criminal action arising out of the accident nor would the investigator be required to testify in such a proceeding. The reports would be available only to persons having a bona fide research interest, as approved by the Secretary and any published compilation could not identify individuals or an individual accident. However, the language of this section would not prevent the use of these records in enforcement proceedings under title I of the act. This provision is designed to induce a high degree of candor on the part of persons involved in accidents and to promote maximum cooperation with the investigators.

Section 308. This section provides that the act shall not be interpreted as superseding the existing authority of any department or agency. It is designed to make clear that there is no intention that the statutory authority for programs relating to the medical aspects of driver licensure, injury producing accidents, emergency medical care and transportation of the injured, now carried out by HEW, or the activities of the National Bureau of Standards, for example, are to be nullified in any way.

#### AMENDMENT TO THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, so as to prohibit the use for political purposes of certain funds collected by labor organizations from their members, and for other purposes.

Direct use of union dues money for supporting presidential, senatorial, or congressional candidates in campaigns is now illegal under title 18, section 610, of the United States Code. However,

labor leaders can and do use dues money in State and local elections; and, as we all know, it is quite simple to get around this law by setting up a separate committee to support political candidates. This is frequently accomplished with only the thinnest veil of disguise.

When this happens, the individual union member from whom these funds are obtained has no choice of how the monies are to be used. The choice of financially supporting particular candidates is that of the union leader, not of the individual union member. The individual member is often put in the position of contributing to the support of a candidate with whom he does not agree.

The only remedy available to a union member is to bring a law suit to get back part of his dues if he does not agree with the union leader's choice of candidates. This remedy is expensive, inadequate, and, in reality, impractical. The cost of such a law suit, even in the nature of a class action, would be many times that of the dues paid. The remedy is fine in theory; in reality, it is non-existent.

Mr. President, ours is an increasingly sophisticated nation. An ever-improving communications network has been increasingly able to develop the pros and cons of the various political issues for our citizens. The 1960 televised debates between the two major presidential candidates is an excellent example of this. Newspapers are widely read. Books, periodicals, pamphlets are more available now than ever before. Education opportunities for our citizens are increasing; the educational level of our people is the highest it has ever been.

If there ever was a time when we could justifiably restrict the right of individuals to effectively use their money, time, and votes to support the candidate and party of their choice, this is not the time. Here in 1966, I think we must finally recognize that our people are capable of choosing for themselves.

We must restore to our working men and women the right to choose which candidate they will support. Doing so is both fair and democratic; it is certainly in keeping with the times.

My bill would do exactly this. It would preclude a labor organization's directly or indirectly using any part of dues, collected from a person covered by an agreement requiring membership in such labor organization as a condition of employment, for political purposes—in other words, a union shop system.

I might add that it would not harm the legitimate goals of the labor movement. It would not affect expenditures authorized for lobbying or other activities directly related to legitimate labor purposes. Nor would it preclude the establishment of a separate contributory fund for political purposes, if contributions were collected separately from dues and paid voluntarily.

I think this bill is fair and equitable; I think it is in keeping with the times. I would hope that my colleagues in the Senate would give it their full support.

Mr. President, to enable others to join with me in sponsoring this legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may



lie on the table for additional cosponsors until the close of business on March 10, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested.

The bill (S. 3006) to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, so as to prohibit the use for political purposes of certain funds collected by labor organizations from their members, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### A BILL FOR A CHAMIZAL NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to further carry out the objectives of the Chamizal Treaty between the United States and Mexico by authorizing the creation of a National Memorial in El Paso, Tex. The Chamizal Treaty National Memorial would stand in commemoration of the historic treaty of 1964 which ended 100 years of disagreement with our neighbor to the south.

Under the Chamizal Treaty, 630 acres of land in El Paso, Tex., were returned to Mexico and 193 acres of Mexican land north of the Rio Grande were returned to the United States. Under this bill, it is proposed to set aside 55 acres of this returned 193 acres for the erection of a suitable monument and a museum-information center. The remainder of the 193 acres will be transferred to the city of El Paso; it is expected to be developed in a manner harmonious with the National Memorial.

Extensive changes have been required in El Paso as a result of the January 17, 1964 Chamizal Treaty. The bed of the Rio Grande is to be relocated northward to reflect the new boundary; many families and businesses are having to relocate to accomplish the change.

Basic legislation authorizing the compensation of those relocating was passed in 1964 and that program is proceeding. Another feature of the overall Chamizal Treaty plan is the authorization of a border highway along the new riverbank. That proposal is now pending before the Senate as S. 2630, a bill I introduced last October.

The bill I introduce today has the endorsement of the Interior Department. The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments has heartily endorsed the proposal as a symbol of international good will and friendship with Mexico. My bill will be a companion to H.R. 7402, sponsored by Representative RICHARD WHITE, of El Paso.

The Chamizal Treaty has been a signal accomplishment in proving the ability of nations to solve their differences by peaceful negotiation, no matter how long standing the dispute or how easy to maintain an unyielding position if in defense of a historic claim. The Chamizal Treaty is a noble example of the fine re-

lations we enjoy with the Republic of Mexico. A Chamizal Treaty National Memorial should stand as a lasting monument to that friendship, and a constant reminder to preserve it.

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

The bill (S. 3007) to provide for the establishment of the Chamizal National Memorial, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for confirmation by the Senate of certain officers of the executive branch who exercise policymaking authority and jurisdiction over vast publicly owned resources of the United States.

These officers, all of whom except the Chief Forester serve in the Department of Interior, have power and responsibility for the care and administration of untold billions of dollars' worth of property belonging to all the people of all of the States—lands, minerals, forests, grasses for livestock feeding, dams producing millions of kilowatts of electricity, industrial sites, and many other natural resources. The authority exercised extends from the Virgin Islands far out in the Atlantic to the trust territory in the Pacific Basin on the edge of the Asiatic Continent and to Samoa in the distant South Seas.

In the Department of the Interior, for example, the appointment of certain of the officers who have direct responsibility and policymaking power over vast areas, economically and politically, of publicly owned property and our offshore dependent areas is subject to the provision in article II, section 2 of the Constitution for the advice and consent of this body, but a number of other officers who wield as great or even greater power are not subject to our scrutiny in any way.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement of the officers of the Interior Department whose appointments are subject to confirmation and those who are not subject to confirmation be set forth at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### POLICYMAKING OFFICERS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR WHOSE APPOINTMENT IS SUBJECT TO CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE

1. Secretary.
2. Under Secretary.
3. Assistant Secretaries (four) other than Assistant Secretary for Administration.
4. Solicitor.
5. Director, Bureau of Mines.
6. Director, Geological Survey.
7. Commissioner, Fish and Wildlife Service.
8. Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs.
9. Governor of the Virgin Islands.
10. Governor of Guam.

#### POLICYMAKING OFFICERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR WHOSE APPOINTMENT IS NOT SUBJECT TO SENATE CONFIRMATION

1. Assistant Secretary for Administration.
2. Director of the Bureau of Land Management.
3. Director of the National Park Service.
4. Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.
5. Commissioner of Reclamation.
6. Director of the Office of Territories.
7. Governor of American Samoa.
8. High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the bill I am introducing today would make the appointment of the policymaking officers in the latter category subject to the provisions of the Constitution.

Plainly, an assistant secretary for administration of a department which spends as much money and has responsibility for as vast amounts of public property as does the Interior Department is a man of considerable power with respect to policy. So too with the Director of the Bureau of Land Management. This Bureau has administrative responsibilities for over 400 million acres of land, many of them possessing incalculable mineral wealth, as well as tremendous surface resources.

The Bureau will produce this coming year, it is estimated, some \$600 million in revenues from this property. Again, the Chief Forester, who is head of the Forest Service, has responsibility for administration of nearly 187 million acres of Federal forest lands in 44 States and Puerto Rico. These areas and their known resources are valued at some \$7.6 billion.

The position of Director of Outdoor, to return to the Interior Department, is relatively new, but the Bureau last year spent nearly \$125 million and has authority to acquire substantial amounts of land from private property owners.

The Bureau of Reclamation is charged with the administration of vast irrigation and reclamation projects on which the prosperity of whole regions of our country depend. The Director is called upon to make a number of policy decisions that affect directly the life and well-being of many citizens. Also this Bureau has a budget of approximately \$300 million a year. The National Park Service spends some \$120 million a year and controls over 25 million acres of our land.

The Office of Territories is responsible for the administration of offshore areas stretching from the mid-Atlantic to the far Pacific and the South Seas. Subordinate officers of the Office deal directly with representatives of foreign governments. I refer particularly to the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands which we administer as trustee, with certain responsibilities to the United Nations. Also, it seems desirable that the principal administrative officer of the area, who is in some respects a representative and spokesman of the Government of the United States, should have the status of a Governor. Such an official designation would more accurately describe his

functions, and would help solve problems of protocol that now occasionally arise.

In American Samoa, with the advent of the jet age, these islands have become a key link between the United States and the southwest Pacific. The governorship of American Samoa is surely as important as those of the Virgin Islands and Guam both of which are now subject to confirmation.

The measure I am introducing, Mr. President, will give consistency to the appointment of policymaking officers of the Department of the Interior and the Chief of the Forest Service.

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

The bill (S. 3011) to require that certain offices in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture be filled by appointment by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 491

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, an amendment to the bill, S. 1019, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin, so as to provide for the inclusion of the west Texas area as part of the Colorado River Basin.

The bill to which I am adding this amendment provides a "program for the further comprehensive development of water resources of the Lower Colorado River Basin and for the provision of additional and adequate water supplies for use in the Upper as well as in the Lower Colorado River Basin."

The term "west Texas," as used herein, encompasses the high plains area and the irrigable areas in the upper portions of the Red, Brazos, and Colorado River Basins which lack adequate local water resources. Due to the heavy irrigation needs of this area, water in large amounts must be imported from out-of-State sources—if Texas agriculture is to continue its vital contribution to the State of Texas.

Potential sources of water for such irrigation, which must be imported, may be determined by the study provisions of the bill.

Also, Mr. President, I would like to point out that Texas alone could not obviously finance this importation of water. Any feasible water importation plan must be a part of some larger, more comprehensive plan for conservation and distribution of water resources.

At the hearings of this act last year, the Secretary of the Interior stated that the needs of all of the 11 Western States should be considered in this regional plan, adding that the Columbia River below Bonneville Dam is one of the principal sources of surplus water for importation that would be studied.

It appears quite logical, Mr. President, that the west Texas area should

thus be included in the study. At least a part of the answer to the needs of west Texas for additional surplus water may be forthcoming from this study.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would hope that Senators would agree that it is necessary, feasible, and logical that west Texas should be included in any western regional water development planning studies undertaken by the Federal Government, and thus I propose this amendment insuring the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 491) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 1, 17a, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, AND 70c OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 492

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 136) to amend sections 1, 17a, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT RELATING TO LIMITING THE PRIORITY AND NONDISCHARGEABILITY OF TAXES IN BANKRUPTCY—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 493

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 3438) to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 494

Mr. TOWER (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 12752) 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, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 495

Mr. PROUTY (for himself, Mr. FONG, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COTTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. GRUENING) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 12752, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR NEEDY SCHOOLCHILDREN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to express my support of S. 2921, a bill to provide a special milk program for needy schoolchildren and make it permanent. I ask that my name be added as a cosponsor to this measure.

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

Mr. TOWER. The needy children who should be covered by this program would benefit greatly from it, and at minimum cost to the Government. Many of these children who are now receiving the surplus milk under the program which expires on July 1, 1967, do not receive any other milk at all. This milk which they receive from the school program is their entire daily consumption. Certainly, Mr. President, it is not too much for the Government to continue to make available to the school districts our surplus milk from the CCC, most of which is now stored in Government warehouses at taxpayer expense. It certainly makes more sense for the Nation's needy schoolchildren to have the milk.

The administration contends that the cut in this program is needed in order to support other measures. Mr. President, this statement when first observed seems commendable. However, this statement is hardly believable when we review the many proposals for new funds that continually come before us in the Congress. Some of the administration's proposals are of questionable value, others are simply not required. The school milk program, however, is a valuable and a valid one. The health of many children depend on it.

Mr. President, the funds asked for this program are quite justified; at most the appropriation will be \$120 million annually. When compared to many expenditures, this program is a vital one.

I therefore urge that the Senate swiftly enact this bill so that our Nation's needy schoolchildren may be assured of the continuance of their milk program. We cannot afford to risk its curtailment.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] be added as a cosponsor at the next printing of S. 2928, a bill to provide Federal assistance to correct problems of racial imbalance in the public schools.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2943) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend for an additional year the eligibility of certain areas of substantial unemployment.

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

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last May I introduced a bill, S. 1976, calling



for the repeal of provisions in the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 commonly known as the Byrd amendment, which prevent the Highway Trust Fund from proceeding with construction of the Interstate System unless and until funds are in hand for distribution. This prohibition on deficit financing is holding us back from adding to these safer highways as rapidly as we could otherwise, and the result is more deaths on the older and less safe highways because these are not fully available.

I am pleased that Senator MONDALE has expressed his desire to join as a cosponsor in this bill. I ask unanimous consent that his name may be added at the next printing.

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

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 25, 1966, the names of Mr. GRUENING, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. TYDINGS were added as additional cosponsors of Amendment No. 488, intended to be proposed by Mr. YARBOROUGH, to the bill (S. 2933) to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes, submitted by Mr. YARBOROUGH on February 25, 1966.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 2, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 251) to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

#### PAYMENT OF AN ALLOWANCE TO EMPLOYEES ASSIGNED TO NEVADA TEST SITE OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 795, S. 2271.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2271) to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed \$10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with amendments on page 1, line 8, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "words" and insert "word"; and, in line 9, after the word "Energy",

to strike out "Commission," and insert "Commission"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2271

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide authority for the payment of certain amounts to offset certain expenses of Federal employees assigned to duty on the California offshore islands, and for other purposes", approved August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 745; 5 U.S.C. 70c), is amended by inserting after the word "islands" the words "or at the United States Atomic Energy Commission Nevada Test Site, including the Nuclear Rocket Development Station,".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, my bill, S. 2271, is a bill aimed at correcting a longstanding inequity which has impeded recruitment and retention of U.S. employees at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. A similar bill, authored by Congressman HOLIFIELD, passed the House of Representatives late last year. My proposal has the support of the Atomic Energy Commission, the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and other interested agencies.

The purpose of S. 2271 is to amend the act of August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 745; 5 USC 70c), to provide authority for the payment, in accordance with regulations prescribed, of an allowance not to exceed \$10 per day to certain Federal employees assigned to duty at the AEC's Nevada Test Site, including the Nuclear Rocket Development Station.

When Public Law 88-538 was enacted to correct a similar situation at the California offshore islands, the hardship consideration at the Nevada Test Site became increasingly pressing. There are approximately 100 Federal employees who are assigned to the Nevada Test Site who must commute for distances as much as 184 miles per day requiring as much as 4 hours of driving time to and from the site.

It is apparent that this hardship situation is further aggravated for these U.S. employees by the fact that employees of private contractors are paid a travel allowance of approximately \$7.50 per day.

As has been pointed out by the Civil Service Commission, the unusual commuting time and distance associated with working at the site and the fact that employees are not given the option of living closer to their jobs because of the remoteness of the site, have created a particularly severe recruitment and retention problem.

The remedy sought by S. 2271 would merely place a few Government employees on an equal footing with their fellow civilian workers having approximately the same duties.

I would point out, Mr. President, that the number of employees who would be affected now or in the future would be not less than 50 nor more than 150, according to the best estimates of the

various Federal agencies with employees at the site.

Mr. President, at this time I am offering an amendment which is designed to rectify a situation which did not come to light until this bill was placed on the calendar.

It appears that the General Accounting Office undertook on its own initiative an investigation at the test site which very recently disclosed that payments were made to Federal employees stationed at the Nevada Test Site by the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Geological Survey. These employees were paid per diem in lieu of subsistence under section 3 of the Travel and Expense Act of 1949, as amended, for periods during which they performed all or a major part of their duties at the Nevada Test Site. According to the Comptroller General in a letter to the chairman of the Government Operations Committee, it was pointed out that these payments were incorrectly made since it was erroneously believed by the three agencies that the duty station or principal place of duty was a place other than the Nevada Test Site where a majority of the work performed was located.

It was further pointed out by the Comptroller General that the act of August 31, 1964, which provided for relief for the employees of the California Off-Shore Islands, also provided for relief of those employees who received erroneous payments.

For this reason, I ask consideration of my amendment to S. 2271 which would relieve the employees concerned of their obligation to refund the erroneous payments. The amendment makes no provisions for a general or mandatory retroactive payment of the allowances proposed by the bill; however, it does authorize the President to provide by regulation for retroactive payment of the proposed allowance to employees who have been receiving erroneous payments of per diem in lieu of subsistence. I am informed that this sum will amount to somewhere between \$110,000 and \$175,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dated February 9, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### COMPTROLLER GENERAL

OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., February 9, 1966.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 27, 1966, Mr. Glenn Shriver of the committee staff requested that we furnish your committee a report on the bill, S. 2271, to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed \$10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada test site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

The bill is designed to provide for the payment of a special allowance to Government employees who are assigned to duty at the Nevada test site in recognition of the fact employees so assigned are required to work in a remote desert area and to maintain their

homes at a considerable distance from their work stations. There are approximately 130 employees of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Public Health Service, the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Geological Survey assigned to duty at the Nevada test site. We understand that the nearest community affording family living accommodations is Las Vegas, Nev., which is from 66 to 92 miles away from the employees' work sites. Employees assigned to the Nevada test site must, therefore, spend as much as 4 hours each day in traveling to and from work.

The proposed allowance would be paid under an amendment to the authority contained in section 1 of the act of August 31, 1964, Public Law 88-538 (78 Stat. 745, 5 U.S.C. 70c), which provides that an allowance of not to exceed \$10 per day may be paid to Federal employees stationed on the California offshore islands in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President.

In the audit of payments made to employees stationed at the Nevada test site by the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Geological Survey we found that those agencies were paying their employees per diem in lieu of subsistence under section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 836), for periods during which they performed all or the major part of their duties at the Nevada test site. Since such per diem may not be paid to an employee while he is at his official duty station or principal place of duty those payments were erroneous and in the absence of a relief provision we would be required to issue exceptions against the amounts so paid.

The act of August 31, 1964, provided relief for employees who had received similar erroneous payment of per diem from the Department of the Navy while stationed on the California offshore islands and the committee may wish to consider amending S. 2271 to provide relief for employees stationed at the Nevada Test Site who have received erroneous payments.

We enclose the draft of an amendment to S. 2271 including an amendment to the title thereof which would relieve the employees concerned of their obligation to refund the erroneous payments which they have received and provides for the return to such employees of any amounts they have paid in refund to the United States of such erroneous payments. The enclosed draft amendment to S. 2271 makes no provision for a general or mandatory retroactive payment of the allowance proposed by the bill; however, the President would be authorized to provide by regulation for a retroactive payment of the proposed allowance to employees who have been receiving erroneous payments of per diem in lieu of subsistence. Such retroactive payments could be made only from the date erroneous payments of per diem were discontinued as a result of the decisions of our Office. Also enclosed is an explanation of the amendment which includes statements of the number of employees involved and the total amount of erroneous payments which we identified on the basis of the facts which were available to us at the time our audit was performed.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,  
Acting Comptroller General of the  
United States.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning with line 3, page 2, strike out all to and

including line 5, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. Sections 2 and 3 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. (a) Each employee or former employee of the United States who was erroneously paid per diem in lieu of subsistence under section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 836) for the period he was assigned to one of the California offshore islands or the United States Atomic Energy Commission Nevada Test Site, including the Nuclear Rocket Development Station, as his principal place of duty is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the amounts of per diem in lieu of subsistence so paid.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the employee, former employee, or other appropriate party concerned, in accordance with law, all amounts paid by, or withheld from amounts otherwise due, an employee or former employee of the United States in complete or partial satisfaction of his liability to the United States for which relief has been granted by section 2 of this Act.

"SEC. 3. In accordance with regulations issued under the first section of this Act, the allowance authorized by such section may be made retroactively effective from the date erroneous payments of per diem in lieu of subsistence were discontinued as a result of the decision of the Comptroller General of the United States dated May 4, 1964 (B-153571), or as the result of administrative action taken by reason of that and similar decisions of the Comptroller General of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from the further consideration of the companion House bill, H.R. 10722, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10722), to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed \$10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of House bill 10722 and insert in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 2271, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in urging approval of H.R. 10722.

The bill is designed to correct an inequity and will permit an allowance not to exceed \$10 per day to certain Federal employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site and the Nuclear Rocket Development Station. The employees who will be included are primarily those of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Public Health Service, who are assigned to remote sites from established communities and are required to travel 2 to 4 hours daily to

commute distances up to 100 miles to their duty station.

Employees of private contractors at the Nevada Test Site have long enjoyed travel subsistence and it is only just that Federal employees receive the same consideration.

Passage of the bill will assist in solving some of the problems now faced by the governmental agencies in recruiting of, and retention of, capable personnel.

The Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and the Atomic Energy Commission have issued favorable reports.

I am advised that approximately 100 employees would be affected under the terms of the bill. Similar legislation passed the Congress previously when favorable action was taken to correct a similar inequity and permit payment of certain amounts to offset expenses of Federal employees assigned to duty on the California offshore islands. This legislation was approved in August of 1964.

There are no residence quarters on or near the work stations suitable for family living quarters. At one time the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy gave serious consideration to the erection of a townsite. Congressional action for the proposed townsite did not develop.

As a result, Federal employees travel from 66.5 to 92.3 miles from their homes to the Nuclear Rocket Development Station and to Camp Mercury.

The bill merely provides extra compensation for the unusual circumstances of employment at the Nevada Test Site.

Present law does not permit compensation and the Bureau of the Budget has estimated costs will range from \$5 to \$7.50 per day per employee at a total cost not to exceed \$170,000 annually to the Government.

The Bureau of the Budget also has stated they know of no other comparable situation in the United States where such allowances are needed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. What bill are we considering?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a companion bill, H.R. 10722, from the consideration of which the committee has been discharged, and the text of the Senate bill substituted for H.R. 10722. The Senate has just considered Calendar No. 795.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

There being no objection, the title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed \$10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2271 is indefinitely postponed.



## ECONOMY IN WRONG PLACE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the administration's recommendation to slash appropriations for the school milk program by 80 percent is false economy. Congress voted \$103 million for the school milk program for the current fiscal year. The Bureau of the Budget ordered the actual spending reduced to \$100 million. Now in the proposed budget for the fiscal year commencing next July administration leaders announced plans to cut the milk program to \$21 million.

Ninety-three thousand schools in our Nation are participating in the present program. Children in many schools pay 3 cents a half-pint for milk while the Government contributes 3 to 4 cents.

The cost of our huge war effort in Vietnam should not be paid by depriving thousands of American schoolchildren of what is now one of the most important elements in their daily diet. Taking milk from a needy school child should be just about the last program to be eliminated.

If the administration's recommendation is accepted, the morning and afternoon milk breaks which are so common in many schools throughout the Nation will largely be a thing of the past. For many youngsters this is the only milk they drink during the day. I doubt that there is another Federal program in which there has been as sharp a cut as that proposed by the administration for the school milk program.

Probably no other program has resulted in greater dividends in health and in the strength of children for so little cost as has this special milk program. At a time when we are spending millions—indeed, billions—of dollars to feed hungry people throughout the world in our foreign aid programs, we should not be cutting down on the diets of our own American children.

Mr. President, free school lunches for needy children in poor schools without regular lunchroom services and low-cost milk in other schools are worthwhile programs for the future of America. Here is a program where Congress is right if we insist on maintaining the school milk program and the bureaucrats in the executive branch are wrong in cutting it so drastically.

I fervently hope that the Congress will not reduce this program by one cent for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. President, Editor Dwight C. Wetherholt of the *Gallipolis Daily Tribune*, an important daily newspaper in Ohio, published a very fine editorial under the caption "Economy in Wrong Place," and I ask unanimous consent that his very fine editorial be printed in the *Record* at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

ECONOMY IN WRONG PLACE  
(By Dwight C. Wetherholt)

This is an election year, and it is rather interesting to read the comments of our elected representatives in Congress as they hand out comments for the homefront consumption, and at the same time vote overwhelmingly for the very things that they

complain about. Just yesterday there was a vote that overwhelmingly passed in one Chamber the restoration of telephone and automobile taxes that have only been in effect as cuts for a period of months. The House passed the measure with only 4 hours of debate, and now we will see what the Senate does to the bill, which is designed to help pay for the war in Vietnam.

Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, our junior Senator, speaks out boldly against the raising of taxes so soon after they were cut. Among his criticisms is that present income taxes, in spite of a cut about 2 years ago, are already too burdensome on those in the lower brackets, and he suggests an increase in corporate taxes from 48 up to 52 percent. His suggestion to stop a possible tax squeeze would be a cease-fire and armistice negotiations in Vietnam. He foresees that if the Johnson administration goes for "guns and butter," taxes will go up. The platitude spoken by Johnson in the state of the Union message, which expressed the view that we could wage war and still build the Great Society, without additional taxes has now gone by the board.

The cutback in nonmilitary expenditures is going to put the pinch on many programs. One of the most unfortunate moves, and one that strikes home in our community is the announcement of a drastic cut in the milk program. This program which allows children in Gallipolis schools, and many others in the area, enables the purchase of milk at reduced prices.

Young characterizes this move as unsound as the commitment of our Armed Forces in Vietnam. Congress gave the program \$103 million for school milk programs last fiscal year. The administration now plans to cut the amount allotted to \$23 million, and if children are to get the milk the extra cost will come from those less able to pay.

Children in the 93,000 schools that now have the program have been paying 3 cents, but with the cut they will have to make up most of the 3 to 4 cents now paid for by the Government. The bureaucrat that dreamed up that cut was rather heartless.

A look at some of the billions that are now being allotted, we are sure that even a humble person like myself could cut in other quarters, rather than handicap a program designed to improve the diet of the young children.

We are sure Mr. Young could give them some good ideas for cuts, as he has often outlined the expensive junkets that have taken high officials to events that have no connection with the military establishments and in no way help in the war on poverty. One could lop off a few dozen high salaried bureaucrats that accomplish nothing and easily make up the difference.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. As Chairman of the Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I am shocked by the President's support of the proposal that would deny milk to schoolchildren. I do not know what has happened to the Great Society program, unless it has become an empty, semantic preaching.

## FAILURE OF FEDERALLY INSURED BANKS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on In-

vestigations, of which I am chairman, during 1965 held hearings upon the failure of several federally insured banks. Testimony disclosed that a small number of banks had been infiltrated by corrupt and dishonest persons for the purpose of obtaining control of banks in order to loot them of their assets.

The subcommittee also inquired into inefficiency and lack of cooperation upon the part of the agencies of Government which have supervisory and administrative responsibilities in the banking field.

One of the banks we studied, the San Francisco National Bank, is the subject of a newspaper article in the *San Francisco Sunday Examiner & Chronicle* for February 20, 1966. The author of this article suggests that the bank was permitted to operate "somewhat in the manner of a second-rate pool hall." I am inclined to agree with that assessment of the situation. The bank was placed in receivership on January 22, 1965.

Following the subcommittee's investigation, the president and board chairman of the bank, Don C. Silverthorne, was indicted. He was recently tried, and on February 18, 1966, he was convicted on 11 counts of misapplication of bank funds, on 1 count of falsification of banking records, and on 1 count of aiding and abetting in larceny of bank funds.

Indicted and tried with him was William S. Bennett, a real estate operator who was Silverthorne's associate in numerous banking transactions. Bennett was convicted on one count of larceny of bank funds. Both of these men were principal witnesses in the subcommittee's hearings, although William S. Bennett refused to testify on the grounds that he might incriminate himself.

The timely newspaper article, written by Yancey Smith, correctly states that certain important issues remain unresolved in the wake of Silverthorne's conviction. These matters were of much concern to the subcommittee during its hearings.

The evidence clearly showed that the Comptroller of the Currency, James J. Saxon, had available in June of 1964 information from one of his national bank examiners that he had found many violations of the banking statutes in the operations of the San Francisco National Bank. The bank examiner wrote a letter on June 22, 1964, to the U.S. attorney reporting these violations of law, but the Comptroller of the Currency took no action. He did not even forward the letter to the Department of Justice until February 26, 1965—8 months later—and about a month after the bank had been closed, and not until more than a month after the subcommittee had started its investigation.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which was compelled by law to insure the deposits in the San Francisco National Bank, was never informed by the Comptroller of the Currency prior to the bank's closing that, in Mr. Saxon's words, the bank was "so mired down in rot and corruption that there was no hope." As a result, the FDIC has filed a civil suit for as much as \$32 million, including \$2 million in punitive damages,

against Don C. Silverthorne and other parties of interest in the bank's operations. It is pretty obvious at this time that the loss and the FDIC's ultimate liability will be at least \$25 million.

Mr. President, I point this out because it establishes the fact that had there been proper supervision and proper action from the Comptroller of the Currency's Office, this great loss could certainly have been prevented, or at least a substantial part of it could have been, because the Federal Reserve bank continued to loan money to tide the bank over without knowing of its condition.

The information about the bank's condition was in the hands of the Comptroller for more than 8 months before the bank closed, and it was not passed on to the agencies of Government that were interested and that were responsible in connection with the bank's operations.

Additionally, there are almost 100 other civil law suits already filed or in preparation as a consequence of the bank's failure. The subcommittee is informed that many of these suits contend that at least one Federal agency, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, knew long before the bank was closed that it was insolvent and in danger of failing. The claimants allege that, notwithstanding its insolvency, certain Federal officials took most unusual steps to keep the bank open and to avoid disclosure of its true condition.

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

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

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the newspaper article to which I have referred points up some of the important issues that have not been resolved by the convictions of Silverthorne and Bennett by posing four questions for its readers:

1. Whatever possessed Comptroller of Currency James J. Saxon to grant Silverthorne a bank charter in the first place? A routine check on his application would have disclosed what the Government now alleges: that Silverthorne listed \$112,000 in assets he didn't possess.

2. Why didn't Saxon's bank examiners find that Silverthorne was diverting loan fees into his personal accounts sooner?

3. When the examiners finally did discover them—a plain violation of law—why wasn't something done about it sooner? A bank examiner set forth the implications in a letter to U.S. Attorney Cecil Poole in June 1964.

4. Why didn't the letter reach Poole until nearly 8 months later, after the bank was closed in January 1965? The letter was forwarded through channels and Saxon obviously sat on it. Why?

These issues and many others will be discussed in the forthcoming interim report of the subcommittee covering its investigation into federally insured banks. The report will provide additional information and will no doubt make certain recommendations regarding unresolved issues in the banking field.

The conditions disclosed in our hearings call for remedial legislative action. During the past session of Congress, on

September 28, 1965, I introduced a bill, S. 2575, cosponsored by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, which is intended to improve administrative practices and procedures in the Federal agencies concerned with banking, and to stop the abuses and improper activities to which I have referred today. It is to be hoped, Mr. President, that the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which it was referred, will hold hearings soon and will promptly report the bill favorably for action in this session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the San Francisco Sunday Examiner & Chronicle be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that a copy of the bank examiner's letter of June 22, 1964, to U.S. Attorney Poole, together with its attachment, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Sunday Examiner & Chronicle, Feb. 20, 1966]

THE WHY'S OF DON'S CASE—ISSUES ON DON REMAIN—BANKER COULD GET 70 YEARS

The trial of Don C. Silverthorne today left a number of issues bouncing around like bad checks on his collapsed San Francisco National Bank.

The 7-week-long trial disposed of Silverthorne.

A Federal court jury found him guilty of plundering his own bank of some \$190,000, and he could get up to 70 years and \$65,000 in fines.

But the trial did not dispose of the question of how a national bank was permitted to operate, judging by the testimony, somewhat in the manner of a second-rate pool hall.

The questions, lingering on like the bad taste after a late night, include these:

Whatever possessed Comptroller of Currency James J. Saxon to grant Silverthorne a bank charter in the first place? A routine check on his application would have disclosed what the Government now alleges: that Silverthorne listed \$112,500 in assets he didn't possess.

Why didn't Saxon's bank examiners find that Silverthorne was diverting loan fees into his personal accounts sooner? The bank opened in June 1962, and the misapplications weren't found until late May and early June 1964.

When the examiners finally did discover them—a plain violation of law—why wasn't something done about it sooner? A bank examiner set forth the implications in a letter to U.S. Attorney Cecil Poole in June 1964.

Why didn't the letter reach Poole until nearly 8 months later, after the bank was closed in January 1965. The letter was forwarded through channels and Saxon obviously sat on it. Why?

But these are only a few of the questions. There's the whole broad field of banking reform and regulation in matters such as usury, commissions to money brokers for certificates of deposit, points charged borrowers, and fees to money finders or loan scouts.

These free-wheeling practices all figured in Silverthorne's operations and the collapse of the San Francisco National.

Silverthorne, a sort of Falstaff on banking, took the crushing verdict with apparent calm, in contrast to his earlier outbursts on the witness stand.

He said afterward that he was "fine, fine." His codefendant, William S. Bennett, a Peninsula developer, flinched and covered

his face with his hands when he heard the jury find him guilty of larceny.

The jury cleared him of 10 other counts, but the larceny carries a maximum sentence of 10 years and a \$5,000 fine.

They were acquitted of conspiracy, but the pudgy ex-banker was convicted of all 14 other counts, including aiding in Bennett's larceny, making a false entry, and 11 charges of misapplication.

Best guess was that it was a compromise verdict.

Presumably, the jurors agreed early in the 24 hours they were out that Silverthorne was guilty. But then they failed to agree on the extent to which Bennett aided and abetted the principal defendant.

The Government charged that Bennett was a full-fledged partner in the misapplications.

The testimony showed Bennett obtained heavy fees from borrowers and then returned part of these to Silverthorne in the form of checks made out to San Francisco National Bank.

Silverthorne then diverted these to his personal use.

The verdict disclosed that the jury bought Bennett's contention that he earned his fees by arranging the loans, going as guarantor on them and performing other services for borrowers.

But Silverthorne's two-point defense obviously fell on deaf ears.

He vociferously claimed that a bank examiner told him to put the fees in his personal account. The Government shot this down by producing the examiner, Victor Del Tredici.

The latter testified that he not only did not tell Silverthorne to put the money into his personal account, but warned him that such a practice would be illegal.

Banker Don's other defense was that he spent the some \$700,000 to \$750,000 he got in loan fees for banking purposes and not on himself.

The Government shot this down even quicker.

Prosecuting Assistant U.S. Attorney James J. Brosnahan produced evidence that many of these "banking expense" checks went to his clubs, his daughter, to buy stock, and for a luxury apartment for himself.

The Government also produced evidence that Silverthorne, a man with an obvious zest for life, lived it up in the Nevada gambling resort of Las Vegas.

The puffy-cheeked former banker didn't do himself any good when he claimed he hadn't lost a cent gambling, and then the Government produced a statement he had given the FBI.

Silverthorne had told the FBI he lost about \$200,000.

When Silverthorne left the stand after 9 days of argumentative and frequently angry testimony marked by contradiction after contradiction, it was obvious that he'd had it.

His attorney, George Martinez, was ashen faced.

Martinez, however, had both an in-the-court and out-of-the-court defense.

The latter consisted of frequent appeals in chambers to Federal Judge Charles L. Powell for a mistrial on the basis of all the publicity accorded his colorful client.

This ploy, presumably designed to lay the foundation for an appeal, was ironic in view of the fact that there have been few figures in San Francisco who have courted publicity so ardently as Don Carlos Silverthorne.

He embarked on a highly personalized public relations campaign as soon as he launched his bank.

He issued brochures on how to be successful, gave lavish gifts to customers and employees, and took officers and friends to Las Vegas on a junket.

Another side of Silverthorne that came out during the trial was the sometimes carnival-like atmosphere at the bank.



JUNE 22, 1964.

Silverthorne was pictured in the testimony as a man not above lightening the normally stuffy atmosphere with a prank or two.

He had a pen with vanishing ink, and took delight in squirting it on someone's white shirt. It was always good for a belly laugh when the ink gradually disappeared, much to the relief of the victim.

Then there was the time he scissored off the necktie of a visiting banker, and promptly gave him his own. "He didn't have very good ties," Silverthorne explained.

Once he seized the hat of a bank examiner and put it on a chair just as a visitor was sitting down.

Silverthorne then extracted the flattened hat, threw it on the floor and jumped on it. Of course, he had a new hat to give the examiner, but the latter apparently didn't think it funny.

"He didn't have much sense of humor," Don remarked.

Nor was there much humor when the jury came in Friday evening.

Judge Powell, who came here from Spokane to hear the trial, indicated he will lose no time passing sentence. He asked for probation reports on the pair by Wednesday.

He will hear motions for a new trial and acquittal, preliminaries to an appeal, that day.

The verdict probably will solve one problem for Silverthorne. The Government undoubtedly now will drop numerous other charges pending against the ex-banker.

He and Bennett, however, still face a civil suit for \$32 million brought by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, now engaged in liquidating the San Francisco National.

But the chances of getting any money out of Silverthorne at this point seem more remote than those of putting a man on Mars next year.

FEBRUARY 26, 1965.

HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,  
The Attorney General,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KATZENBACH: We are enclosing two copies of a letter addressed to the U.S. attorney at San Francisco under date of June 22, 1964, by National Bank Examiner Victor E. Del Tredici in further reference to transactions at the San Francisco National Bank, San Francisco, Calif., which was placed in receivership on January 22, 1965.

Most of the information contained in this enclosure was covered in our communications with you under dates of January 27, 1965, and February 1, 1965.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. SAXON,  
Comptroller of the Currency.

MR. CECIL F. POOLE,  
U.S. Attorney,  
Post Office Building,  
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. POOLE: During the course of an examination of the San Francisco National Bank, 260 California Street, San Francisco, Calif., commenced May 6, 1964, the transactions, set forth in detail hereinbelow, initiated by President Don C. Silverthorne, which may be in contravention of Section 18, paragraph 215 of the United States Code, were disclosed.

It appears that fees collected by the San Francisco National Bank from its borrowers in the form of checks payable to the San Francisco National Bank and fees collected by William S. Bennett, a bank customer, from borrowers who obtained loans from San Francisco National Bank have been deposited to the account of Don C. Silverthorne during the period January 2, 1964, through May 13, 1964.

Fees collected by William S. Bennett were deposited to the account of Suisun Properties, a sole ownership of William S. Bennett, carried with the San Francisco National Bank and portions of these funds were disbursed by checks drawn by Suisun Properties on its account with the San Francisco National Bank made payable to the San Francisco National Bank.

Date of deposit to account of Don C. Silverthorne	Amount of deposit	Description and comments	Date of deposit to account of Don C. Silverthorne	Amount of deposit	Description and comments
Jan. 10, 1964	\$2,500	A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Suisun Properties dated Jan. 9, 1964, in the amount of \$2,500 payable to the San Francisco National Bank. On Jan. 7, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to William S. Manning in the amount of \$100,000. A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Manning Enterprises (William S. Manning) dated Jan. 7, 1964, in the amount of \$10,000 payable to and endorsed by W. S. Bennett was deposited to the commercial account of Suisun Properties carried with the San Francisco National Bank on Jan. 7, 1964.	Jan. 30, 1964	\$7,500	A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Suisun Properties dated January 29, 1964, in the amount of \$7,500 payable to the San Francisco National Bank. On January 30, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to Ide & Scott Mortgage Service, Inc., in the amount of \$110,000. A check drawn on the San Francisco National Bank by Ide & Scott Mortgage Service, Inc., dated Jan. 30, 1964, in the amount of \$13,000, payable to and endorsed by W. S. Bennett, was credited to the commercial account of Suisun Properties, carried with the San Francisco National Bank on Feb. 3, 1964.
Jan. 16, 1964	5,000	A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Joseph L. Giraudo dated Jan. 14, 1964 in the amount of \$5,000 payable to the San Francisco National Bank. On Jan. 15, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to Joseph L. Giraudo in the amount of \$155,000 to be used for a partial downpayment on some real estate.	Feb. 5, 1964	5,000	A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Peter Pappas dated Feb. 4, 1964, in the amount of \$5,000, payable to the San Francisco National Bank. On Feb. 5, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to Peter Pappas in the amount of \$90,000 for working capital, to pay off land on 23 unit lots, and Federal withholding taxes.
Do	10,000	A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Pacific Western Contractors, Inc. (John and Harry Risks) dated Jan. 16, 1964, in the amount of \$10,000, payable to the San Francisco National Bank. On Jan. 16, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to Pacific Western Contractors, Inc., in the amount of \$75,000, to be used to purchase some land.	Feb. 17, 1964	20,000	A check drawn on the San Francisco National Bank by Suisun Properties dated Feb. 10, 1964, in the amount of \$20,000, payable to San Francisco National Bank. On Feb. 17, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to James D. Claitor in the amount of \$240,000 to pay off various loans and for working capital. A check drawn on the San Francisco National Bank by James D. Claitor dated Feb. 10, 1964, in the amount of \$40,000 payable to and endorsed by W. S. Bennett was credited to the commercial account of Suisun Properties carried with the San Francisco National Bank on Feb. 17, 1964.
Jan. 28, 1964	18,000	A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Suisun Properties dated Jan. 22, 1964, in the amount of \$4,000 payable to the San Francisco National Bank. A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Suisun Properties dated Jan. 24, 1964, in the amount of \$4,000 payable to the San Francisco National Bank. A check drawn on the San Francisco National Bank by Suisun Properties dated Jan. 27, 1964, in the amount of \$10,000 payable to the San Francisco National Bank. Check was rejected on Jan. 28, 1964, and charged against the account of Suisun Properties on Jan. 29, 1964. On Jan. 23, 1964, the bank granted a loan to William R. Atkinson in the amount of \$58,000 to be used to pay off a 2d deed of trust and current expenses. A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by William R. Atkinson dated January 22, 1964, in the amount of \$8,000 payable to the San Francisco National Bank was exchanged for cashier's check No. 8690 dated January 23, 1964, payable to and endorsed by W. S. Bennett and was deposited to the commercial account of Suisun Properties carried with the San Francisco National Bank on January 28, 1964. On January 28, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to Consolidated Holdings, Inc. (John S. Hoffmire) in the amount of \$120,000 to be used for working capital. A check drawn on the San Francisco National Bank by Consolidated Holdings, Inc., dated January 27, 1964, in the amount of \$20,000 payable to and endorsed by W. S. Bennett was deposited to the commercial account of Suisun Properties carried with the San Francisco National Bank on January 29, 1964.	Feb. 18, 1964	10,000	A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Greystone Building account (Myron Feigenberg & David Rosenberg) dated Feb. 18, 1964, in the amount of \$10,000 payable to the San Francisco National Bank. On Feb. 18, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to Myron Feigenberg and David Rosenberg in the amount of \$150,000 for the purchase and remodeling of the Greystone Building.
			Mar. 2, 1964	20,000	A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Suisun Properties dated Feb. 28, 1964, in the amount of \$20,000 payable to the San Francisco National Bank. On Mar. 2, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to Pacific Western Contractors, Inc., in the amount of \$190,000. No CR-115B on file; however, there is one for \$100,000 for the same date, which says funds are to be used to assist in the construction of 40-unit apartment at 17th and Market Sts. A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Pacific Western Contractors, Inc., dated Mar. 2, 1964, in the amount of \$30,000 payable to and endorsed by W. S. Bennett was deposited to the commercial account of Suisun Properties carried with the San Francisco National Bank on Mar. 2, 1964.

Date of deposit to account of Don C. Silverthorne	Amount of deposit	Description and comments	Date of deposit to account of Don C. Silverthorne	Amount of deposit	Description and comments
Mar. 3, 1964	\$19,500	A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Paul D. Apfelbaum dated Mar. 2, 1964, in the amount of \$10,000 payable to the San Francisco National Bank. Check was rejected on Mar. 3, 1964, and posted to Paul D. Apfelbaum's account on Mar. 4, 1964. A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Phillips Realty (Charles Mosser) dated Mar. 2, 1964, in the amount of \$2,000 payable to San Francisco National Bank. A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Dunn Construction Co. (Morden Dunn) dated Mar. 2, 1964, in the amount of \$7,500 payable to San Francisco National Bank. On Mar. 2, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to Paul D. Apfelbaum in the amount of \$100,000 to purchase a 60-unit apartment house. On Mar. 2, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to Charles Mosser in the amount of \$45,000 to purchase a 62-unit apartment house on 10th Ave. On Mar. 3, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to Morden Dunn in the amount of \$75,000 to pay off a \$70,000 loan on some property at 27 August St.	Mar. 6, 1964	\$25,000	A check drawn on the San Francisco National Bank by Suisun Properties dated Mar. 5, 1964, in the amount of \$25,000 payable to the San Francisco National Bank. On Mar. 5, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to Inglis Associates in the amount of \$250,000 to close a sale on 24.2 acres in Novato. A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Inglis Associates dated Mar. 5, 1964, in the amount of \$50,000 payable to and endorsed by W. S. Bennett was credited to the commercial account of Suisun Properties carried with the San Francisco National Bank on Mar. 6, 1964.
			May 1, 1964	15,000	A check drawn on the San Francisco National Bank by Paul D. Apfelbaum dated April 30, 1964 in the amount of \$15,000 payable to the San Francisco National Bank. On May 1, 1964 the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan to Paul D. Apfelbaum in the amount of \$122,000 to complete purchase of the Paisley Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
			Total	157,500	

The bank's records also disclosed the following checks drawn on and payable to the San Francisco National Bank which were cash paid without endorsements.

Date account charged	Amount	Drawn by	Comments	Date account charged	Amount	Drawn by	Comments
Feb. 20, 1964	\$5,000	Suisun Properties' check dated Feb. 20, 1964.	On Feb. 20, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan in the amount of \$80,000 to John S. Hoffmire. A check drawn on San Francisco National Bank by Consolidated Holdings, Inc. (John S. Hoffmire) dated Feb. 19, 1964, in the amount of \$10,000 payable to and endorsed by W. S. Bennett was credited to the account of Suisun Properties on Feb. 20, 1964. Consolidated's check was rejected on Feb. 20, 1964, and subsequently paid on Feb. 21, 1964.	Apr. 10, 1964	\$5,000	Suisun Properties' check dated Apr. 10, 1964.	On Apr. 9, 1964, the San Francisco National Bank granted a loan in the amount of \$132,000 to Matthew L. Biscotti. A check drawn on Bank of America NT & SA, Millbrae branch, by Matthew L. Biscotti dated Apr. 9, 1964, in the amount of \$17,000 payable to and endorsed by W. S. Bennett was credited to the account of Suisun Properties on Apr. 10, 1964.
				Total	10,000		

Also deposited to the account of Don C. Silverthorne were funds aggregating \$650,-471.01. These funds represent proceeds of loans granted by the San Francisco National Bank to numerous customers for the purchase of San Francisco National Bank stock at various prices, in many instances substantially in excess of local market quotations. Generally, securities were subsequently purchased by Don C. Silverthorne for delivery to said customers. It would appear that Don C. Silverthorne personally received commissions through the aforementioned transactions for loans granted, represented by the difference between his cost and the price he received for the bank stock delivered to customers of the bank.

Very truly yours,  
VICTOR E. DEL TREDICI,  
National Bank Examiner.

#### ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on this date 130 years ago the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Texas was adopted by the delegates of the people of Texas meeting at Washington-on-the-Brazos, thereby severing Texas ties with Mexico whose flag had flown over Texas since 1821. For almost 10 years thereafter Texas was to remain an independent republic until its admission to the Union.

In addition to being Independence Day, March 2 is observed in Texas as Texas Flag Day and as Sam Houston Day.

I hope that in today's times of international crisis all Texans and all other

Americans, and indeed all free people, can be inspired by the example of courage shown by the men who signed the Texas Declaration of Independence, determined to go forth with renewed spirit to fight oppression and tyranny, knowing that peace is best sustained by strength and will.

I hope also that all nations will come to live together in the spirit of brotherhood and cooperation which now exists and continually grows between Texas and the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Texas Declaration of Independence be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### TEXAS DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

The Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Texas was adopted by the delegates of the people of Texas in general convention in the town of Washington-on-the-Brazos, March 2, 1836. Richard Ellis, president of the convention, appointed a committee of five to write a declaration of independence for submission to the convention. However, there is much evidence that George C. Childress, one of the members, wrote the document with little or no help from the other members. Childress is therefore generally accepted as the author of the Texas Declaration of Independence.

Following is the text of the Texas Declaration of Independence, copied word for word from the original text and punctuated exactly as in the original text. Following the text of the declaration are the names of the signers with their surnames and given names

written, abbreviated, and punctuated, exactly as on the original copy of the declaration:

When a government has ceased to protect the lives, liberty and property of the people from whom its legitimate powers are derived, and for the advancement of whose happiness it was instituted; and so far from being a guarantee for the enjoyment of those inestimable and inalienable rights, becomes an instrument in the hands of evil rulers for their oppression, when the Federal Republican Constitution of their country, which they have sworn to support, no longer has a substantial existence, and the whole nature of their government has been forcibly changed without their consent, from a restricted federative republic, composed of sovereign states, to a consolidated central military despotism, in which every interest is disregarded but that of the army and the priesthood—both the eternal enemies of civil liberty, and the ever-ready minions of power, and the usual instruments of tyrants; When, long after the spirit of the constitution has departed, moderation is at length, so far lost, by those in power that even the semblance of freedom is removed, and the forms, themselves, of the constitution discontinued; and so far from their petitions and remonstrances being regarded, the agents who bear them are thrown into dungeons; and mercenary armies sent forth to force a new government upon them at the point of the bayonet; When in consequence of such acts of malfeasance and abdication, on the part of the government, anarchy prevails, and civil society is dissolved into its original elements: In such a crisis, the first law of nature, the right of self-preservation—the inherent and inalienable right of the people to appeal to first principles and take their political affairs into their own hands in extreme cases—enjoins it as a right towards themselves and a sacred obligation to their posterity, to abolish such government and create another in its stead,



calculated to rescue them from impending dangers, and to secure their future welfare and happiness.

Nations, as well as individuals, are amenable for their acts to the public opinion of mankind. A statement of a part of our grievances is, therefore, submitted to an impartial world, in justification of the hazardous but unavoidable step now taken of severing our political connection with the Mexican people, and assuming an independent attitude among the nations of the earth.

The Mexican government, by its colonization laws, invited and induced the Anglo-American population of Texas to colonize its wilderness under the pledged faith of a written constitution, that they should continue to enjoy that constitutional liberty and republican government to which they had been habituated in the land of their birth, the United States of America. In this expectation they have been cruelly disappointed, inasmuch as the Mexican nation has acquiesced in the late changes made in the government by General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, who, having overturned the constitution of his country, now offers us the cruel alternative either to abandon our homes, acquired by so many privations, or submit to the most intolerable of all tyranny, the combined despotism of the sword and the priesthood.

It has sacrificed our welfare to the state of Coahuila, by which our interests have been continually depressed, through a jealous and partial course of legislation carried on at a far distant seat of government, by a hostile majority, in an unknown tongue; and this too, notwithstanding we have petitioned in the humblest terms, for the establishment of a separate state government, and have, in accordance with the provisions of the national constitution, presented to the general Congress, a republican constitution which was without just cause contemptuously rejected.

It incarcerated in a dungeon, for a long time, one of our citizens, for no other cause but a zealous endeavor to procure the acceptance of our constitution and the establishment of a state government.

It has failed and refused to secure on a firm basis, the right of trial by jury, that palladium of civil liberty, and only safe guarantee for the life, liberty, and property of the citizen.

It has failed to establish any public system of education, although possessed of almost boundless resources (the public domain) and, although, it is an axiom, in political science, that unless a people are educated and enlightened it is idle to expect the continuance of civil liberty, or the capacity for self-government.

It has suffered the military commandants stationed among us to exercise arbitrary acts of oppression and tyranny; thus trampling upon the most sacred rights of the citizen and rendering the military superior to the civil power.

It has dissolved by force of arms, the State Congress of Coahuila and Texas, and obliged our representatives to fly for their lives from the seat of government; thus depriving us of the fundamental political right of representation.

It has demanded the surrender of a number of our citizens, and ordered military detachments to seize and carry them into the Interior for trial; in contempt of the civil authorities, and in defiance of the laws and the constitution.

It has made piratical attacks upon our commerce; by commissioning foreign desperadoes, and authorizing them to seize our vessels, and convey the property of our citizens to far distant ports of confiscation.

It denies us the right of worshipping the Almighty according to the dictates of our own conscience, by the support of a national religion calculated to promote the temporal

interests of its human functionaries rather than the glory of the true and living God.

It has demanded us to deliver up our arms; which are essential to our defense, the rightful property of freemen, and formidable only to tyrannical governments.

It has invaded our country, both by sea and by land, with intent to lay waste our territory and drive us from our homes; and has now a large mercenary army advancing to carry on against us a war of extermination.

It has, through its emissaries, incited the merciless savage, with the tomahawk and scalping knife, to massacre the inhabitants of our defenseless frontiers.

It hath been, during the whole time of our connection with it, the contemptible sport and victim of successive military revolutions and hath continually exhibited every characteristic of a weak, corrupt, and tyrannical government.

These, and other grievances, were patiently borne by the people of Texas until they reached that point at which forbearance ceases to be a virtue. We then took up arms in defense of the national constitution. We appealed to our Mexican brethren for assistance. Our appeal has been made in vain. Though months have elapsed, no sympathetic response has yet been heard from the Interior. We are, therefore, forced to the melancholy conclusion that the Mexican people have acquiesced in the destruction of their liberty, and the substitution therefor of a military government—that they are unfit to be free and incapable of self-government.

The necessity of self-preservation, therefore, now decrees our eternal political separation.

We, therefore, the delegates, with plenary powers, of the people of Texas, in solemn convention assembled, appealing to a candid world for the necessities of our condition, do hereby resolve and declare that our political connection with the Mexican nation has forever ended; and that the people of Texas do now constitute a free, sovereign and independent republic, and are fully invested with all the rights and attributes which properly belong to the independent nations; and, conscious of the rectitude of our intentions, we fearlessly and confidently commit the issue to the decision of the Supreme Arbiter of the destinies of nations.

Richard Ellis, president of the convention and Delegate from Red River. Charles B. Stewart, Thos. Barnet, John S. D. Byrom, Franco. Ruiz, J. Antonio Navarro, Jesse B. Badgett, Wm. D. Lacey, William Menefee, Jno. Fisher, Mathew Caldwell, William Mottley, Lorenzo de Zavala, Stephen H. Everitt, Geo W Smyth, Elijah Stapp, Claiborne West, Wm B Scates, M. B. Menard, A. B. Hardin, J. W. Bunton, Thos. J. Gazley, R M Coleman, Sterling C. Robertson, Jas Collinsworth, Edwin Waller, Asa Brigham, Geo. C. Childress, Bailey Hardeman, Rob. Potter, Thomas Jefferson Rusk.

Chas. S. Taylor, John S. Roberts, Robert Hamilton, Collin McKinney, Albert H Latimer, James Power, Sam Houston, David Thomas, Edwd. Conrad, Martin Farmer, Edwin O. LeGrand, Stephen W. Blount, Jas. Gaines, Wm. Clark, Jr., Sydney O. Penington, Wm. Carrol Crawford, Jno Turner, Benj. Briggs Goodrich, G. M. Barnett, James G. Swisher, Jesse Grimes, S. Rhoads, Fisher, John W. Moore, John W. Bower, Saml. A. Maverick (from Bejar), Sam P Carson, A. Briscoe, JB Woods.

Test: H. S. Kemble, Secretary.

Mr. TOWER. Only 4 days after the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence, the Alamo, which had been under siege for many days fell in San Antonio. The vastly superior forces of

Santa Anna's troops overwhelmed that fort after three assaults.

The battle of the Alamo remains a symbol to Americans to make the ultimate in sacrifice and in defense of liberty. Although vastly outnumbered, these men determined to stay, fight, and die.

I wish to read into the RECORD a letter sent out by the young commandant of the Alamo, William Barret Travis, dated February 24, 1836:

COMMANDER OF THE ALAMO,  
Bejar, February 24, 1836.

To the People of Texas and All Americans in the World.

FELLOW CITIZENS AND COMPATRIOTS: I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna—I have sustained continual bombardment and cannonade for 24 hours and have not lost a man.

The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken—I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, and our flag still waves proudly from the walls.

I shall never surrender or retreat. Then, I call on you in the name of liberty of patriotism and everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid, with all dispatch.

The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily and will no doubt increase to 3,000 or 4,000 in 4 or 5 days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country—victory or death.

WILLIAM BARRET TRAVIS.

P.S.—The Lord is on our side. When the enemy appeared in sight we had not 3 bushels of corn. We have since found in deserted houses 80 or 90 bushels and got into the walls 20 or 30 head of Beeves. TRAVIS.

#### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA REPORT ON ECONOMIC CHANGES IN THE MAJOR HIGH LABOR-USE CROPS IN CALIFORNIA, 1964-65

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, several months ago I asked the Agricultural Sciences Division of the University of California to prepare a study of the effects of recent changes in labor supply on the production of high labor-use crops in California. I am referring, of course, to those crops which have been, until very recently, harvested largely with the aid of foreign labor coming to this country from the Republic of Mexico.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary introduction of the report as sent to me by Maurice L. Peterson, the distinguished dean of agriculture of the University of California, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### ECONOMIC CHANGES IN THE MAJOR HIGH LABOR-USE CROPS IN CALIFORNIA, 1964-65<sup>1</sup>

Many factors affect the production of crops and income to farmers. For crops,

<sup>1</sup> This report was prepared for the California State Board of Agriculture. Presented in Sacramento, Jan. 24, 1966, by Dr. John W. Mamer, extension economist, University of California, Berkeley. The report was prepared by Dr. Trimble R. Hedges, agricultural economist, University of California, Davis, and Dr. Eric Thor, extension economist, Berkeley.

such as fruits, grapes and nuts, production from one year to the next depends primarily on weather and the ability of farmers to perform the cultural tasks and harvest. For annual crops, such as tomatoes, production depends first upon whether or not farmers plant. Farmers' decisions to plant are affected by expected price, availability of capital, cost of production, availability of labor, and equipment to perform the cultural and harvest tasks. Prices received by farmers in the market for such crops as fruits, vegetables and nuts are primarily determined by supply of and demand for the particular crop and its competing crops.

The factors affecting production and prices of individual crops are so many and so varied that it is impracticable to measure the specific effect of any one factor. Therefore, this report has not attempted to measure the effect individual factors had on production and the income to California agriculture in 1965. The report describes general changes in California farm income, production, and employment and records significant developments in six crops: asparagus, strawberries, processing tomatoes, lettuce, lemons, and valencia oranges.

#### FARM VALUE

Data were obtained from the California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service on 1964 and 1965 gross farm value and farm production.

The preliminary estimated total farm value of California's agricultural production indicates that the 1965 gross farm income exceeded that for 1964—\$3.70 billion compared with \$3.65 billion. These totals, however, do not reflect changes that occurred in individual crops and livestock groups.

The total value of fruit and nut crops decreased approximately \$87 million (\$691 million in 1964 to \$604 million in 1965). Total value of vegetable crops increased \$21 million (\$537 million in 1964 to \$558 million in 1965). Total value of field crops increased approximately \$10 million (\$970 million in 1964 to \$980 million in 1965). The total value of all crops decreased roughly \$56 million, while the value of livestock increased approximately \$80 million (\$1.32 billion in 1964 to \$1.4 billion in 1965). Gains in the market price increased the value of livestock and livestock product production enough to offset the net decrease in the value of all crops. Cattle and lamb prices ran sharply above 1964 during 1965, and hogs and turkey prices also were higher. Egg prices were down, and broilers stayed at steady levels.

#### FARM PRODUCTION

The level of production of the State's vegetable, melon, and strawberry crops dropped 8 percent from 1964's level. Total tonnage in 1965 was 6.6 million tons, compared with 7.2 million tons in 1964. The total number of acres, 641,600, was 42,400 acres below 1964. The largest decrease in acreage was in processing tomatoes—27,000 acres. Large acreage decreases were also noted in asparagus and cantaloupes.<sup>2</sup>

A record high production in fruit and nut crops was reported, 8,135,000 tons. This was 1 percent higher than for the previous year. The increase was largely attributed to the 26-percent increase in the production of grapes; this was offset by large declines in production in other tree fruit and tree nut crops.

The combined harvested acreage of California field crops in 1965 was about 1 percent greater than in 1964. The increase in acreage of California field crops was partly caused by a shift from crops which require

considerable seasonal labor to field crops which require relatively little seasonal labor.

The California Department of Agriculture also reported that growers experienced difficulties in recruiting an adequate supply of labor. There were periods when labor shortages caused harvest losses in asparagus, strawberries, Brussels sprouts, and early tomatoes. Local labor shortages for the 1965 deciduous and citrus fruit harvests caused harvest to lag behind the usual harvest pattern, resulting in some individual grower losses. Poor market conditions resulted in excessive cullage and some economic abandonment in the apricot and plum harvest. The largest losses caused by weather occurred in the Clingstone peach industry from brown rot development following the August rains.<sup>3</sup>

#### LABOR

Data were obtained from the California Department of Employment regarding wage rates and changes in employment of farmworkers.

Wage rates for seasonal farmworkers, based on the Secretary of Labor's criteria, increased approximately 35 percent during the 1965 season. The prevailing wage was \$1.05 per hour in most areas in 1964. In January 1965 the prevailing wage was increased to \$1.25 per hour. In March, the wage rate was increased to \$1.40 per hour. Hourly wage rates for seasonal workers tended to follow this pattern in most of the farm areas in the State. Changes in piece rates generally equaled and, in some cases, exceeded the percentage increase in the hourly rate.

The peak farm labor month in California is September. In September 1964, the total number employed in agriculture, as reported by the California State Department of Employment, was 414,100 for the week that includes the 12th day of the month. In September 1965, the employment figure was 364,400—a reduction of 49,700. The total domestic labor force, including hired regular and seasonal domestics, farmers and unpaid families numbered 350,200 in September 1964. This same force numbered 353,000 in 1965, an increase in the domestic force of 2,800 persons. For this same week contract foreign labor decreased from 63,900 persons in 1964 to 11,400 in 1965.

The greatest increase in the domestic farm labor force was in June 1965, when the number of domestic workers exceeded the number in 1964 by 26,100—350,900 compared with 324,800. A large proportion of this increase was composed of youth, both high school and college students.

The change in farm employment can also be seen by comparing the annual monthly averages. The annual average number of farmworkers in 1965, was 305,100, compared with 318,400 in 1964, a decrease of 13,300. The monthly average number of foreign contract workers decreased from 28,000 in 1964 to 2,800 in 1965. The total monthly average of the domestic work force increased from 290,400 in 1964 to 302,300. This is an increase of 11,900, compared with a decrease of 25,200 contract foreign workers.

#### PRODUCTION COSTS

Changes in the total farm value of production do not measure changes in net farm earnings. Statewide averages in production costs for individual crops have not been developed for analysis.

However, the University of California Agricultural Extension Service has developed sample cost data based on the management practices of the more efficient producers in specific counties of the State. These have not been assembled and evaluated to measure the change in total farm production costs.

These have, however, been included in discussion of each of the six crops with high labor requirements that are discussed in detail in this report. The sample cost data do not represent industry averages and are not used to calculate total net income. They do, however, reflect changes in cost of the more efficient commercial farm operations and are used in this report to evaluate the change in farm costs.

#### SUMMARY OF SIX CROPS

##### Asparagus

Total harvested production was 152,700,000 pounds in 1965, compared with 183,100,000 pounds in 1964, a decrease of 30,400,000 pounds. Prices were higher in 1965 than in 1964. Gross farm value of the 1965 crop was \$23.6 million, compared with \$22.4 million, an increase of \$1.2 million.

Total production increased 17.2 percent in 1965, compared with 1964. Growers' total cost of production and harvest was \$3.6 million greater in 1965 than in 1964 conditions had existed. Growers' net in 1965 was roughly \$2.4 million less than in 1964.

##### Strawberries

Farm value of strawberries was down \$8 million from \$26.8 million in 1964; net income dropped \$16.5 million between 1964 and 1965. An estimated \$8.5 million rise in production and harvesting costs partly accounted for the net income decline, and offset the improved prices growers received in both the fresh and processing markets. Harvested production was down 52.5 million pounds from 1964.

##### Tomatoes for processing

The farm value of tomatoes for processing in 1965 was \$86.4 million, an increase of \$10.5 million from 1964 and the second highest in history. The average price received per ton, \$35.30, was an all-time record. Harvesting costs increased, however, some \$8.8 million, so that the net return to growers was about \$1.6 million more in 1965 than it was in 1964. Yields per acre reached a record 21.1 tons, but production was down approximately 500,000 tons because acreage was cut back from 1964's 143,000 acres to 116,000 acres.

##### Lettuce

Total farm value of lettuce increased \$3.6 million, up from \$92.8 in 1964. This increase was offset by an estimated \$11.1 million increase in production and harvesting costs. Net income, therefore, was \$7.5 million less than it was in 1964. There was a slight increase in total harvested acreage (500 acres) and an 800,000-pound increase in total production. Increases in winter acreage were offset by decreases in acreage of spring, summer, and fall lettuce.

##### Lemons

Lemon production during the 1964-65 season was 13,500,000 boxes, a decrease of 3.8 million boxes from the previous season. One result was a decrease in gross income of \$4.8 million from \$46.4 million in 1964. This was accompanied by a \$3.1 million increase in the costs of harvesting and hauling lemons to the packinghouses so that net income to growers was approximately \$7.9 million less than in the 1963-64 season.

##### Valencia oranges

The greatest change in farm income in the six crops discussed here occurred in valencia orange production. The 1964-65 farm value declined \$27.7 million from \$72.6 million for the 1963-64 season. Cost of harvesting increased \$1.9 million. The result was a decrease in net income of \$29.6 million.

Mr. KUCHEL. The report notes that, although there was a slight increase in gross farm income, a number of high-labor-use crops did not share in this

<sup>2</sup> California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service, Annual Summary (Sacramento, Dec. 20, 1965).

<sup>3</sup> California Fruits, 1965 annual summary, USDA, Statistical Reporting Service (Sacramento, Dec. 20, 1965).



bounty. Wage rates for seasonal farmworkers rose 35 percent in California in the last year. There were substantial reductions in earnings from the production of asparagus, strawberries, lettuce, oranges, and lemons. Of the six high-labor-use crops surveyed there was a total decline in net income of \$59.9 million. This loss occurred despite growing conditions that were ideal in nearly every respect. The loss is directly attributable, in my opinion, to the decline in availability of labor. The number of laborers brought into California under contract decreased from 63,900 persons in 1964 to 11,400 in 1965.

I would like to point out that the growers of the State of California have made remarkable efforts, indeed, ingenious efforts to provide machinery to take the place of farmworkers and to find labor on the domestic labor market. On a monthly average basis nearly half of the short-fall resulting from the loss of foreign labor was made up by domestic hiring. At the same time, particularly in the harvesting of tomatoes for canneries, substantial advances were made in mechanization. But, we still do not have all the answers.

Areas remain where the present labor import policies are wholly inadequate. Last year where there was a 16-percent decrease in asparagus production accompanied by a substantial increase in prices, and, for all this, growers lost money. The same pattern was true in the production of strawberries. I would like also to point out a 37-percent decrease in farm income in the production of valencia oranges, long a major product associated with the State of California. There was a decline in net income in this product of \$29.6 million.

I think the growers of the State of California have cooperated well in the Secretary of Labor's agricultural labor program. They have done their part. There are still crops that need special attention. Currently there is a severe problem in harvesting asparagus. I urgently call upon the Secretary to provide adequate standby machinery which would permit immediate importation of foreign workers into areas where they are needed when domestic labor is not available and efforts at mechanization are unavailing. My State has a total agricultural production valued annually at nearly \$3.7 billion. In several of the crops discussed the State produces nearly half of the total U.S. needs. Californians are proud of the fine products that California puts on the tables of America.

Mr. President, my record is clear. I oppose the exploitation of labor of any kind in any way. For my own part, I have supported appropriations for better housing and educational opportunities for farmworkers and their families, and I have supported other measures to assure a full livelihood to farm labor not just in California but in the Nation as a whole. Critics of the agricultural situation in California should note that average hourly earnings in agriculture in my State are now \$1.40 per hour, considerably above, even double, the prevailing rates in other parts of the Nation.

California has produced bountifully. We want to continue that productive life, which is important to the well-being and enrichment of the Nation.

#### JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS IN THE POVERTY WAR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the great Jewish philosopher, Moses Maimonides, wrote some 800 years ago:

The eighth and most meritorious degree of charity is to anticipate charity by preventing poverty; namely, to assist the reduced fellow man, either by a considerable gift, or a loan of money, or by teaching him a trade, or by putting him in the way of business, so that he may earn an honest livelihood and not be forced to the dreadful alternative of holding out his hand for charity. To this Scripture alludes when it says: "And if thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee, then thou shalt relieve him; yea, though he be a stranger or a sojourner; that he may live with thee." This is the highest step and the summit of charity's golden ladder.

This philosophy remains as strong today in the hearts of many as when first uttered in the 12th century. Jewish organizations are participating in the war against poverty with the same concern and fervor as are their Protestant and Catholic brethren. The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds has provided me a detailed report of Jewish activities in the war against poverty.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD.

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

#### COUNCIL OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS, INC., New York, N.Y., February 24, 1966.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: It is a pleasure to respond to your request for further information regarding Jewish activities in the war against poverty.

The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, as the association of 220 central Jewish planning and financing health and welfare bodies serving almost 800 communities, serves as a national clearinghouse and aid in these programs.

The actions of Jewish agencies and their officers and staffs to help prevent and eradicate poverty take many forms. They include programs directly initiated and conducted by Jewish organizations, with voluntary financing as well as with government assistance. They stress citizen leadership and involvement by the officers and staffs of the Jewish agencies to help strengthen the entire antipoverty program, in its many forms and under its varied auspices.

This commitment stresses the importance of leadership to help assure that the communitywide programs will be under the most representative and responsible auspices, that they will concentrate on priority needs, with programs that will make the greatest impact, will be carried out by agencies with the necessary competence, and will avoid harmful diversion and fragmentation. This commitment recognizes too that in programs as new as these, and in some cases as experimental, all will not fully succeed; and rather than be deterred by such experience, the lessons should be applied to strengthen future programs.

The following are examples of the actions by Jewish agencies and their leaders:

In a number of cities, the leaders of our Jewish federations and agencies serve as chairmen or as members of the community antipoverty boards, as in Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Trenton, central Missouri (nine counties), Miami, Utica, New Orleans, Cincinnati, and other cities. The professional staffs of our Jewish-sponsored agencies similarly are chairing or serving as members of technical advisory committees in their communities.

Among the Jewish agencies that have taken responsibility for administering projects are:

In New York City, some 37 Jewish agencies including community centers, the Federation Employment and Guidance Service, hospitals, homes for the aged, family and child care agencies are actively involved in such projects as the neighborhood youth corps by providing work training opportunities, college work study programs, vocational rehabilitation for older persons, manpower training and development programs, Headstart programs—and are participating in other special community action projects. Some are working cooperatively with Mobilization for Youth and Haryou in providing work training.

The Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University has developed a network of community mental health services. These neighborhood storefront centers utilize the services of nonprofessional mental health aids recruited from the areas themselves, working under professional supervision. The university's graduate school of education is researching the educational needs of poor children.

In Boston, the Beth Israel Hospital provides comprehensive medical services to pre-kindergarten children in the Operation Headstart as part of the community's antipoverty program. This project is of such outstanding quality in the entire country that it received our 1965 William J. Shroder Memorial Award for the innovation and all-encompassing nature of its medical care program for children who have no access to pediatricians.

Also in Boston, the Associated Jewish Community Centers administer a program providing for the training of unskilled and semi-skilled unemployed persons in artisan skills—building a summer day campsite for the benefit of children and families in the Greater Boston area. The aim here is to enable people to leave the relief rolls and to prevent others from needing public assistance.

In Chicago, the College of Jewish Studies has established a training corps for volunteers to work with culturally deprived children and parents.

In Cleveland, the Jewish Vocational Service, Jewish Family Service Association, and Mount Sinai Hospital are now involved respectively in developing a job training program, community homemaker services, and a health maintenance program.

In Los Angeles, six of the Jewish health and welfare agencies have formulated a comprehensive project for a self-help action program to serve the needs of the aging who are living at or below poverty standards including employment of older people in the cooperating agencies, loans for small businesses, protective service for older people, "Meals on Wheels," the organization of volunteers to serve older persons in various institutions and the involvement of older persons on committees guiding various health and welfare projects.

In Miami, the Jewish Vocational Service is administering a cooperative demonstration project to provide job training and retraining to in- and out-patients of the South Florida State Hospital.

In New Jersey, the Jewish Vocational Service of Essex County is now developing a project to provide job training opportunities and

experience for 500 disadvantaged youths between the ages of 16 and 21.

In Philadelphia, the Jewish Employment and Vocational Service is working with the Pennsylvania State Employment Service to establish three Youth Opportunity Centers for evaluating and training out-of-school unemployed youths. The most difficult of these young people will be referred to JEVS for intensive psychological and vocational evaluation leading to recommendations for particular kinds of training for employment.

In Pittsburgh, the Jewish Family and Children's Service is administering a community action program in a "poverty pocket" area of 15,000 persons. It provides counseling services and directs individuals and families to other agencies for the specialized services they require.

In St. Louis, the Jewish Employment and Vocational Service is providing work adjustment training and job placement for 16- to 18-year-old youngsters of educationally deprived backgrounds for the purpose of making them employable, and is also arranging for job placement.

In Washington, the Jewish Community Center is sponsoring a teenage social service corps for Jewish boys and girls who have completed the 10th grade. These young people will have the opportunity to put into practice Jewish values learned at home and in religious schools. They will work with 30 other youths recruited by ministers or civic organizations in the areas where poor people live.

Synagogues are recruiting volunteers from the members of their congregations to help teach in the schools of deprived areas, assist in libraries, open employment opportunities in their businesses for the graduates of training programs, assist with vocational guidance, tutor children, and conduct preschool classes.

National Jewish agencies likewise conduct a variety of antipoverty programs. Among them are:

American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith, Hadassah, Jewish Occupational Council, National Community Relations Advisory Council, National Council of Jewish Women, National Jewish Welfare Board.

The National Council of Jewish Women is one of the organizations cooperating with the Women's Job Corps through "WICS—Women in Community Service." Together with the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Council of Negro Women, and the United Church Women, they are screening 16- to 21-year-old girls for the Job Corps and recruiting volunteers to seek out the girls who might best profit from this opportunity. The National Council of Jewish Women also has projects in more than 30 cities, providing classes for underprivileged children at the preschool age and is assisting in Operation Headstart programs.

The American Jewish Congress joined with the Urban League of New York in creating the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity—an effort to help Negro small businessmen. More than 125 businessmen have served as volunteer consultants, with the cooperation of 14 major banks. The project received a grant from the Ford Foundation to extend the program to other cities.

Nationally our Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, together with the Synagogue Council of America and other Jewish bodies, shared in establishing the Inter-Religious Committee Against Poverty, with the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the National Council of Churches of Christ. Jewish organizations and their leaders are likewise active in the citizens' crusade against poverty, a broad coalition of various groups including religious, labor, civic, health, and welfare organizations.

We issue a periodic bulletin, "Progress Versus Poverty," reporting on governmental programs and on the antipoverty projects under way in Jewish health, welfare, and educational agencies.

These illustrations of the antipoverty efforts of Jewish agencies and their leaders are in addition to the programs which have always been part of their work to help overcome poverty, and which continue in full force with the support of voluntary contributions. Many of the Jewish agencies have long served people of all races and creeds—the Jewish hospitals, vocational service, and others.

This commitment has its roots in the Biblical teachings that "there shall be no poor among you," and the religious doctrine that the highest form of assistance is to prevent poverty and to help people achieve self-support.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP BERNSTEIN,  
Executive Director.

### THE APPRENTICE SCHOOL OF THE AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS & RETAIL FOOD STORE EMPLOYEES UNION OF GREATER NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there was published in a recent issue of the Reader's Digest an article describing the success of the apprentice school of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Retail Food Store Employees Union of Greater New York. The story concerns Jim Robinson who, after 30 years of poverty, attended this apprentice school, receiving a subsistence allowance from the Government under the Manpower Development and Training Act, and graduated into a well-paid job where he could look forward to steady employment earning upward to \$7,000 per year.

When Robinson received his graduation certificate from the Meatcutters Union, he said it was "the first piece of writing I ever received that said something good about me."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

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

#### A JOB FOR JIM

(By James Nathan Miller, condensed from the Christian Herald)

Jim Robinson's story holds profound significance for the economic well-being of our country. A year ago, Robinson was little more than a sorry national statistic. ("Jim Robinson" is a composite of three people whose basic stories are almost identical. Only the details of their lives differ.) A 30-year-old Negro, unemployed, father of four children, he was separated from his wife, who was living on welfare payments. In 1951 when Jim was 16 and possessed the reading ability of an eighth-grader, he dropped out of high school. Since then he has held more jobs than he can remember. "Maybe a hundred," he says. They were all bottom-of-the-barrel jobs that led nowhere: horse-handler, chicken-plucker, car-wash man, sanitary maintenance helper. Thus his statistical significance: when I met Jim Robinson he was a "hard-core unemployed."

Today this semiliterate Negro dropout has successfully taken the first difficult steps toward a decent life, a decent job, and a

decent place as head of his family. What changed Jim was a blue mimeographed sheet handed him by a job counselor in the office of the New York State Employment Service. The heading read: Notice of Training Recruitment under Manpower Development and Training Act—New York City. This act, passed by Congress in 1962, offers people like Jim the chance to learn a skill leading to steady work and to self-respect as responsible citizens.

I met Robinson a year ago at the New York State Employment Service, where he had come looking for a job. His clothes were filthy; his face was hidden behind a 2-day beard. As we talked, his eyes shifted constantly, not once meeting mine. How had he got into such shape? A social worker would say that Jim had had a "disadvantaged youth" in a "culturally deprived environment." Three stories Jim told me of his early life give insight into those phrases.

#### JIM REMEMBERS

First, he recalled his introduction to New York City. Jim, who never knew who his father was, had been born on a North Carolina farm. When he was 5, his grandfather sold the farm for \$200 and headed north in an old truck with Jim, his mother, and his four little sisters. Jim remembers gaping at New York's skyline as the truck crossed the Hudson River on a ferry. But it's not the skyline that stands out in his memory. It is the taxi driver of whom his grandfather asked directions. Jim vividly remembers the driver's smiling face—and his answer as he pointed up the avenue: "Just follow your black nose, nigger boy."

Then Jim remembers the time his Aunt Alice briefly held the job in the dress shop. Alice was the educated member of the family. She had finished high school and was a fast typist; she was beautiful and gay and "a kind of dignified dresser." But, like Jim's mother, she worked as a maid. One day, though, she announced that she was starting "a new life." She had been promised a job as salesgirl in a Madison Avenue dress shop that was about to open.

For the next 2 weeks Alice helped scrub the floors and stock the racks of the dress shop, borrowed money to buy three dresses for her new career, then turned up for work on opening day. But the man had changed his mind. "I'd be out of business in a week," he apologized. "There isn't another colored salesgirl on Madison Avenue."

Finally, Jim remembers the day he quit school. His mother had died when he was 11, and he and his sisters had moved into a tiny Harlem flat with Aunt Alice, her husband and their four children. It was impossible for him to do homework; the grown-ups sat and talked around the kitchen table evenings, and the corner of the room with the bed that he shared with his sister was too dark for reading. Besides, Aunt Alice's husband, who couldn't read or write, used to point to Alice's unused typewriter and tell him it was a waste of time for a black man to study. So Jim was in constant trouble with teachers, truant officers, and the police.

One day, Jim had a talk with his friend Artie. A good student and ambitious, Artie had intended to become a plumber after he graduated. But the school guidance counselor had just advised him to try something else: "You won't get into the plumbers' union; they take only white apprentices." Jim and Artie both quit school that day.

#### GETTING SCARED

A few weeks later Jim got a job as a sweeper in a Coney Island penny arcade and married a girl who lived in his building. When I met him in 1965, he had left his wife and was "holed up in a basement in Brooklyn," as he put it, with three friends. And he was getting scared. The unskilled jobs



he had always found were growing scarcer. In the past he had managed to stay out of serious trouble with the law, but now he had his doubts. "You got to eat, man, you know?" he said.

There are, of course, hundreds of thousands of white Americans among the hard-core unemployed in this country, but there are proportionately more Negroes. The reason is obvious: we have (as Jim's Aunt Alice and Artie, the would-be plumber, demonstrated) made it far harder for Negroes than for whites to escape from the poverty and ignorance of the slums. And thus, in President Johnson's words, "the children of the poor grow up and become the parents of the poor." Which is precisely what happened to Jim Robinson—and could have happened to his children. But, thanks to a new national awareness of Jim Robinson's problem, changes are taking place.

#### A WAY OUT

In New York, as in every other State, economists and job analysts of the State labor department are constantly asking employers and unions what skills they need that they find lacking in job applicants. To provide people with these skills, the Government is sponsoring courses to pull the unemployed into the job market and move the underemployed higher within it. In New York, for instance, training is available for such jobs as hospital orderlies, stenographers, office machine servicemen, auto body repairmen, offset pressmen, electronics mechanics, practical nurses, social worker aids.

The blue sheet handed Jim Robinson by the New York State Employment Service counselor described a course in meatcutting. Some of the big supermarket chains on Long Island were short-handed at the behind-the-scenes butcher blocks, where the carcasses from the packinghouses are cut up and packaged.

Requirements for the course were simple: mainly, "the ability to read and write English sufficiently well to absorb instruction," and for this Jim, luckily, could qualify. Some of those wishing to take the course, however, failed even this requirement. Incredibly, even some graduates of our slum high schools cannot read or write well enough to qualify for these job training courses. The so-called functionally illiterate compose somewhere between 20 and 30 percent of the Nation's unemployed. We are only now beginning to mobilize our educational resources in an attempt to reeducate them.

Jim's meatcutting course was to take 17 weeks, during which the Government would pay students subsistence allowances; the Amalgamated Meatcutters would help place graduates in jobs, and the union's starting salary of \$79 weekly would increase over a 3-year period to a base weekly pay of \$129.50. Thus, in a little more than 3 years, Jim Robinson could expect to have a steady job that would pay, with overtime and fringe benefits, approximately \$7,000 a year.

You would think he would have snapped at the offer. But it was an excruciatingly difficult decision for Jim; in fact, he almost turned the course down. In all his life Jim had never succeeded at a single thing he had tried. Through the distorted filter of his past, he saw any kind of effort as adding up to only one thing—failure. Moreover, his worst failure had been in school. Now, at the age of 30, he was being asked to go to school again. As he told me, "I came here for a job, man, not some crazy course."

His reaction was typical, and here is the heart of the problem of our hard-core unemployment today. In the beatup towns of Appalachia, in the city slums, where young and old slouch on street corners staring at you with expressionless eyes, you see it: defeat, hopelessness, lack of motivation. It's

not that men want to stay unemployed or on relief. Offer most of them a job, and they'll take it. But tell them that they must work hard and study to develop a skill before they can get the job, and you've lost them.

#### OPENING DOORS

Jim Robinson, it turned out, was an exception. On the opening day of the class, he was still scared and hesitant—but he was there, in the big refrigerated warehouse in Queens, N.Y. It was the toughest 17 weeks of Jim's life. Five days a week, from 8:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. with a half-hour lunch break, he and the 39 other trainees of every race and color stood at the long butcher tables in the 40-degree icebox of a classroom, each with a knife in hand and a hunk of meat in front of him, while two experienced butchers drilled them in the skills for which an employer was willing to pay: how to break down a 150-pound hindquarter of beef, for example, into its steak and roast sections. The men learned the New York cuts that the supermarkets wanted, the kosher-style cuts for Waldbaum's, the Western style for whoever might ask for it—until they could carve out more than 100 different cuts of meat and poultry. And at night there was homework, memorizing the bewildering anatomical charts so they could identify every bone and hunk of meat in the carcass.

Gradually, the men began to change. Says one of the instructors: "As they acquired a skill, they also gained self-confidence. You could actually see them change from week to week—the way they dressed, the way their hair was cut, the way they held themselves straight. They became different people."

That is precisely what happened to Jim Robinson. When I last saw him, he was a different person. The symbol of his transformation was the graduation certificate given him by the meatcutters' union. It was, he told me, "the first piece of writing I ever received that said something good about me."

By then Jim was working in a supermarket, earning \$80 a week. He had moved in with his wife and children, taken them off relief and was trying to patch together his broken marriage. The new self-respect showed in many ways. "A few days ago," Jim told me, "I went to the bank to look into the possibility of a personal loan. When I handed the guy my application I could see from the way he looked at me that I wasn't going to get it. Then he read the form, and he seemed kind of surprised. 'Oh, you're a butcher,' he said, and I got the dough."

Finally, Jim was going to school three nights a week to take courses in basic education, the three R's mainly, that he flunked as a boy. He now has hope for the future. "Someday maybe I could get to be meat manager of a supermarket at \$10,000 a year," he told me. "Or maybe even a supervisor—they make maybe \$15,000–\$20,000. Who knows? It's not impossible." And as we talked, Jim looked right at me, not around me.

Jim Robinson's experience contains an enormously hopeful message for the millions of hard-core unemployed who still have not broken away from slum-bred defeatism: your country is trying to help you help yourself. Look ahead—to the doors that are opening for you today, that will open wider tomorrow—and realize that if you try, you can make your future very different from your past.

#### THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966 CUTS THE HEART OUT OF THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday, a message on domestic health and education was sent to Congress from the White House. In some ways it was an encouraging promise of things

to come. But as far as the popular efficient, accepted school milk program is concerned it may have sounded a death knell.

In commenting on the program the message states:

Too much of our subsidy, particularly in the special milk program, goes to children who already get a federally supported school lunch, including milk, and whose parents can afford to pay for additional milk.

How does the administration propose to correct this supposed inequity? By increasing funds to provide free milk for the needy? No indeed. The administration proposes to cut the school milk program by 80 percent, to give the milk only to children who either do not receive school lunches or who qualify as needy under some sort of a means test.

How is this means test to be applied? According to the Secretary of Agriculture when he testified yesterday before the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee it is a very simple procedure. The homeroom teacher or the school nurse decides that the child needs free milk or free lunches. Now the Secretary is a fine Secretary and an intelligent man. But he is no expert on schools. According to representatives of the American School Food Service Association no school administrator in his right mind would leave the choice of which child is to receive free food and milk to a homeroom teacher.

Now this association is composed of administrators responsible for conducting the school lunch and milk programs at the State and local level. These administrators, who certainly should know how the lunch and milk programs are run, say the child must qualify under some kind of an objective means test. In some jurisdictions the child automatically qualifies if his parents are on welfare. In others the parents must submit written evidence or testify in a public hearing that they cannot afford to feed their child during school hours. In the cities of St. Louis, Kansas City, and Milwaukee social workers actually visit the parents to see if the child needs free school lunches.

Let there be no mistake, Mr. President, this so-called Child Nutrition Act of 1966, with its odious means test criterion is nothing more nor less than the administration's way of anesthetizing the patient before it cuts the heart out of the school milk program. This is simply an impressive title for a proposal that would cut the milk program by 80 percent and lead to its virtual elimination.

No nutrition program has been as successful over the years as the special milk program for schoolchildren. It has grown and prospered together with the schoolchildren who have benefitted from the cheaper milk the program has made possible.

Parents, teachers, students all attest to the program's unqualified success. To reduce the milk program to welfare status by imposing a means test will kill it and bury it. The Child Nutrition Act will simply be a beautiful but empty epitaph on the tombstone of the school milk program.

## TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, President Johnson's proposed Traffic Safety Act of 1966 marks an historic milestone in the steady struggle to halt the senseless and tragic toll of highway accidents.

The President has more than fulfilled his pledge in the state of the Union message to make a frontal assault on the problem of traffic safety. His proposals constitute a major victory for the American people and the cause of safe highway travel.

I also regard the President's initiatives in this area as a significant tribute to the effectiveness of efforts by the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization to focus attention on what was clearly becoming an important social problem in America. The subcommittee's initial hearings a year ago clearly revealed that Federal efforts in the traffic safety field were disorganized, uncoordinated and woefully inadequate.

The Federal Government was spending only \$5 million a year in largely ineffective attempts to combat a problem that was costing the Nation annually nearly 50,000 deaths, 4 million injuries, and \$8.5 billion in economic losses.

The President has now proposed a broad program which includes \$700 million for the support of State highway safety programs and the creation of a National Highway Research and Test Facility. Last year I introduced legislation which would have done substantially the same and I wholeheartedly endorse the President's proposal.

Authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe nationwide mandatory safety standards for new cars is a solid first step. When we began our traffic safety hearings last year we learned that only the private automobile was exempt from Federal safety regulations in the transportation field.

I would want to examine the details of the President's bill, of course, but in outline the legislative proposals appear strong and purposeful. In one area, the language of the legislation will be particularly important. The President's message to Congress suggested that the Secretary of Commerce be "authorized to prohibit the sale in interstate commerce of new vehicles and their components" which fail to meet certain safety performance criteria. While I would hope to see complete voluntary compliance with these criteria by auto manufacturers, in my view the Secretary of Commerce should be required to halt the sale in interstate commerce of unsafe cars.

I am also somewhat troubled by the suggestion that 2 years be allowed to pass before the Secretary could move to set safety standards. It may take at least a year to pass any traffic safety legislation. If there is a timelag before action by the Secretary, and an additional period in which the auto industry can comply, as much as 5 years could pass before truly safe cars reached the public. In this time, with an annual production of 10 million automobiles, some 50 million cars would roll off the

assembly lines without satisfying safety standards.

I strongly urge that as an interim first step that current safety standards set by the General Services Administration for Government-purchased cars be applied to all automobiles sold to the public and that these existing standards be reviewed, revised, and strengthened.

There is a clear and present need for intensified research in many areas relating to highway safety. In this respect, there is no more promising undertaking than the development and testing of prototype safety cars. I would hope that such undertakings would receive priority consideration in the assignment of support funds for research, along the lines suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] in his bill S. 2162. In addition, States should be encouraged to contribute their talents and know-how in this all-important phase of vehicle safety.

## YOUTH, CRIME, AND THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, James Symington, Executive Secretary of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, is not likely to underestimate the seriousness of juvenile crime, but his article in the February 24 issue of the Reporter illustrates that he also has ideas about how to deal with it.

His emphasis falls on the need for better corrective institutions, and more concern about these institutions from those sentenced young men and women to them; on the need to expand experimental programs, including one at the National Training School for Boys in the District of Columbia, which have proven successful; and on the need for a certain toughness in juvenile court procedures in return for constitutional protection not usually accorded the juvenile offender.

I commend to my colleagues "Youth, Crime, and the Great Society," by James Symington, son of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

YOUTH, CRIME, AND THE GREAT SOCIETY  
(By James Symington)

Those of us working for the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime daily confront the following facts and figures: The largest group of today's unemployed is between 16 and 19 years old. Their unemployment rate is more than 3 times that for the labor force as a whole. One in three of these new young workers—an estimated 26 million of whom are entering the labor force during the 1960's—is a high-school dropout, the last to be hired and the first to be fired. The FBI calculates that in 1964 juveniles were responsible for 37 percent of the Nation's "serious" criminal offenses. All together, some 686,000 of the 1.4 million juvenile arrests were referred to juvenile courts that year, with repeaters accounting for about a third of the cases. Although these referrals represent less than 3

percent of American youngsters between 10 and 17, it is estimated that 17 percent of today's 10-year-old boys will be brought before a juvenile court by their 18th year. That estimate reaches 40 percent in some urban ghetto areas. Add to this the current annual estimate of 200,000 cases of venereal disease among teenagers and 100,000 illegitimate births to adolescent mothers, and the problem looms larger.

The relationship between unemployment and delinquency has not been precisely calibrated, but, like the predicted consequences of racial discrimination, it rests on more than a hunch. Recognition of widespread delinquency and the probability of its increase brought about the establishment in 1961 of the President's Committee consisting of the Attorney General of the United States (chairman) and the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare. President Johnson has reaffirmed its mandate in the strongest terms. A major Federal legislative instrument in this field is the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of September, 1961, which provides the HEW Secretary with authority to make grants to State, local, or nonprofit agencies for the purpose of testing new ways to prevent, treat, and control delinquency, as well as of training social workers, correction officers, police, court officials, and others in the field. The funds available for making these grants have totaled less than \$10 million annually.

Initially, under the 1961 act, 16 major prevention projects were developed in urban areas involving new techniques of job development, job training, education, and neighborhood organization. When it became clear that their objectives could best be fulfilled within the larger framework of the poverty program, most of these projects were brought under the aegis of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

These early efforts had served to show that programs designed to involve large numbers of young people were not necessarily the best means of reaching those who most need help. Thus, in 1965 a special demonstration program was established to support small projects focused on this hard-core group.

Some of these special demonstrations are aimed at the relatively unexplored areas of middle-class and suburban delinquency, including increasing rates of illegitimacy, venereal disease, and the use of drugs. To date 26 grantees—juvenile courts, universities, foundations, and other organizations—have been given roughly \$2 million to deal with the delinquent at various stages of society's encounter with him: as a behavior problem in school, a first or second police contact, a juvenile-court probationer, a correctional-school resident, and a parolee.

Most of these special demonstration projects affect urban youth. The community intervention team in Detroit works with juveniles from 14 to 16 who have been law violators; the YWCA project in Miami tests new methods of dealing with potentially delinquent girls from 13 to 16; the University of California at Berkeley conducts a program for parolees aged 13 to 17; and the Friends Neighborhood Guild runs a foster-family project for Philadelphia boys released from correctional institutions who have no approved home to go to. Programs to reach and involve gangs and gang leaders are under way in El Paso, Brooklyn, Detroit, and San Francisco. In Arizona a center for young Pima Indians is operated on the premise that those who understand and appreciate their tribal heritage do better in school and on the job than those who do not.

Strong family ties seem to offer one of the best assurances against delinquency in the young. I have spoken with directors of



training schools who attribute the rarity of Jewish delinquents to the fact that "they take care of it in the home." This ancient culture, wherein the father is the undisputed head of the family and boys of 13 are reminded in solemn ceremony that they have become men, appears to produce proportionately fewer young lawbreakers than less closely knit family groups. Neither do the sons of oriental families in America which have retained their ancestral traditions—chiefly respect for the father—seem to feel a need to slug a cop in order to prove their manhood.

Since the patrolman is usually the first contact that youngsters in the streets have with the law, the value of any program that attempts to reach them is enhanced by police understanding and, if possible, participation. Police officials maintain that changes in requirements and available manpower limit the opportunity to engage in the kind of day-to-day relationships that characterized some neighborhoods in the "old days." Some question the value of such "nonarrest" contact, claiming it is not a "traditional" police function. I have ridden in squad cars with dedicated young policemen; and if the hostility of their reception in some slum areas is the normal response to this "traditional" function, something "untraditional" may well be warranted in the interest of public safety.

Unsatisfactory relations between some police and their communities and lack of communication between police and welfare officials are prominent obstacles to the effort to reduce delinquency. Even when distrust is broken down, problems of understanding remain. Nor are they confined to relations between the delinquent and those trying to help him. Judges, police, and welfare officials alike could hardly be blamed for failing to get the gist of the following random sampling from a recent treatise on delinquent gangs:

"Osgood, however, has come to the conclusion after years of experience that semantic differential responses have an affective character, apparently coinciding in dimensionality with universal dimensions of affective meaning applicable to all sensory modalities."

The problem of communication between the social scientist and his colleagues in law and law enforcement is very real. But communicate they must, if they are to carry out in a meaningful way the Presidential mandate to identify and combat the causes of crime and delinquency. Of course, the dialog is one that also quite properly engages the spirited participation of parents, teachers, ministers, policemen, editors, scoutmasters, and enthusiasts of all kinds. It should be encouraging, I suppose, to find that many such citizens know exactly what to do about crime, particularly proponents of the "crack-down," "young punk," "jail the parent," and "teach them what it means to be an American" theories. Regrettably, the problem never seems as simple as the solution advanced.

In any event, the overlay of a trained, if not overtrained, social worker's analysis of a given case on top of the simplistic outlines of the precinct-blotter profile adds up to a composite blur of doubtful value to the court. A more coherent total picture might require adjustments in training emphasis, whereby the police rookie loses an hour of traffic training and the budding welfare worker does a little reading on the practical problems of a patrolman.

But policemen, judges, bureaucrats, social workers, and ordinarily reticent professors can find themselves engaged in the liveliest, friendliest exchange in history without making a dent in delinquency if the juvenile himself is not given an active and responsible role to play. We are a young country

and getting younger. Within a few years half of all American citizens will be under 25. The median age is already down to 15 in Latin America. There, teenagers in urban and rural ghettos carry their smaller brothers or sisters on their backs for miles to the doctor or for safe drinking water. The challenge of living to help others and the effort it requires keep many such youngsters on a straight if rocky road. Our own children, rich and poor alike, want to feel involved in causes that transcend themselves, their community, and their time. For many, the chance to help develop and carry out neighborhood programs of education or recreation would provide such a cause.

If it is true that in some American slums up to 60 percent of the children are raised in fatherless homes, who is to play the "acceptable male model" in their lives? Is it wiser to look for such a man from among professional caseworkers who live outside the neighborhood, or from among subprofessionals who could be found within the community itself?

#### THE HARD CORE

And what happens to those adolescents whom programs, however well conceived and executed, fail to sway? What of the "institutions" that receive them and the courts that send them there? James Bennett, former Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, recalls that less than 5 percent of the Federal judges in his time ever visited a Federal prison. How many juvenile court judges have made a thorough investigation of the institutions to which they entrust their charges? But why stop with judges? How many mayors, aldermen, councilmen, or State legislators have really investigated the institutions to which juveniles are committed? And if they are found wanting, what higher priority could there be for the expenditure of public funds?

It is not a question of comforts. One director proudly claimed that his boys could watch television every night and see two movies a week. Undoubtedly they were doing that at home when they should have been working, studying, or listening to music that was written from the head and heart and not the midsection. We must ask what demands are being made of these kids, demands that will stretch their minds and lift their spirits. Rather than pap to dull them into sullen acceptance of their lot, they need classrooms, good teachers, and workshops. And they need protection from the disturbed in their midst, who must be more carefully supervised and, if necessary, separated.

We have some institutions that provide such services, but not nearly enough. Those I have seen which successfully receive, handle, train, and educate delinquent boys include the State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill, Pa., and the annex to the Boys' Training School in New Hampton, N.Y. (here there are 110 staff members for about a hundred boys, a ratio that is clearly relevant to the success of this operation); the National Training School for Boys, located in the District of Columbia, which is embarked on a new education-research program involving flexible rewards (one young man went from a 5th-grade level to 10th in 8 months of schooling); and the Ozanam Home for Boys in Kansas City, where 60 boys attend school in the outside community and enjoy recreation, art, shop, and farm experiences at the home.

Many rewarding techniques for guidance within institutional limits have been developed. But returning the boy to his home community and enabling him to resist the old influences are more difficult challenges. The Labor Department has taken a lead in meeting them. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and its recent amendments, the Department is en-

gaged in experimental programs dealing with the training needs of youthful inmates of correctional institutions and their employment problems when released. In one such project at the New York City institution on Rikers Island, 100 boys learned to operate data-processing equipment while acquiring basic literacy and self-sufficiency. After release, the boys were provided placement, counseling, and family referral services, with a high ratio of success.

A 1965 amendment to the MDTA enables the Department to launch an experimental program to help young ex-prisoners meet the bonding requirements of jobs normally closed to boys with a record. There is hope that the success of these experimental Federal programs will commend them to State and local authorities responsible for the disposition of the vast majority of young offenders, and encourage the passage of enabling laws where necessary.

A reexamination of juvenile court procedures may also be warranted. Some maintain that these courts have become inappropriately soft on the sophisticated young offender and want stiffer procedures for the 16-year-old and up. They would argue that, if juveniles are to have greater opportunities to act responsibly, they can expect less sympathy if they fail to do so. This approach is not inconsistent with the growing realization in legal circles that certain protections not ordinarily provided in juvenile courts may now be due. The admission of hearsay evidence and rejection of the "legalisms" that would block adult prosecution are permitted on the theory that a juvenile hearing is a civil, not a criminal or adversary, proceeding, and that its purpose is treatment, not punishment. As a result, justice may occasionally be sacrificed in the name of a somewhat illusory "mercy" where by youngsters, possibly not even guilty as charged, are hustled off to a detention facility, the "facility" of which is simply to detain. We may be moving toward a more solemn and judicial approach to the older juvenile, whereby his treatment in court would be less avuncular, his sentence more "detering," and his constitutional safeguards more complete.

#### OUR BIGHEARTED APATHY

Last December 23, with Solicitor General Thurgood Marshall and Federal Bureau of Prisons Director Myrl Alexander, I stood in the dining hall of the National Training School for Boys. We were being shown the school's kitchen and dining facilities. The boys—about 200 of them—ate quietly, some glancing in our direction. One motioned us over.

"We just wanted to wish you a merry Christmas," he said, "and to ask who the heck you were."

We wonder who the teenager in trouble is. He wonders who we are and what hypocrites we conceal.

What crimes do we permit to be perpetrated on some families so as to undermine their faith in society and law? They are the quiet crimes of con men who victimize the poor, the new breed of mediocre parasites, the contractor who says he represents urban development and must improve the home to save it from condemnation, the bank that takes the note on such transactions. Delinquents take radios. Loan sharks take houses. Some landlords take all the rent a home-starved market will bear and provide as little as possible in return. This is what makes a job a tough one for the policeman who is seen by the poor more often as the enforcer of laws that take rather than protect.

The journey of a conscience through the world of government can be tortuous. It may seem at times like a tightrope walk between evangelism and bureaucracy. Looking at the problems brings out the evangelist;

doing something about them, the bureaucrat. The balancing pole is patience. What escapes headline attention is the fact that the great majority of government men walk the line without losing their balance.

The headlines on delinquency itself bring many a fist down on many a breakfast table. They stimulate letters to Congressmen and other acts of futile indignation. In fairness, second section reports of slum conditions and recommended community action also stimulate our big-hearted apathy—not only with respect to those elements of society which prey on the less fortunate but also with respect to our own homes and the examples and standards we set for our own children. We talk about excellence and the pursuit of excellence. But how many adult Americans are growing breathless in the pursuit of excellence? Consider the shameful drop that the average adult community accepts as commonplace and be grateful, if incredulous, that the proportion of the young who lose sight of our highest standards to the extent of violating our lowest is under 5 percent.

We permit our children to be spectators of vice and hate every day. To forbid it would be attacked as deprivation of some constitutional right on the part of the purveyors of vice and hate. Worse than that, it would require self-discipline on our part. But in permitting it, we do give our children some hard choices, and ourselves too. For we have the choice of whether or not to ignore the consequences of the double standard we so calmly observe. As long as this is the case, the teenager of our time is tempted to inquire what is "like so great" about our society.

#### A REPORT ON THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in keeping with my previously announced intention to have printed in the RECORD, from time to time, sections of the very excellent recent report on the John Birch Society which was done by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, I would today ask for inclusion of the portion entitled "The Birch Line."

In this section of the report, we find excellent documentation of the paranoid preoccupation of Birch Founder Robert Welch and many of his followers with the preposterous theory that our Government, our State Department and the United Nations are actually controlled by the Communists.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this report be printed in the RECORD.

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

##### THE BIRCH "LINE"

The society's extreme view of the civil rights struggle—that it is directed by an "international Communist conspiracy" or, more mysteriously, by an "international conspiracy of evil"—represents only a portion of the standard Birch line on the origin and nature of the Nation's problems.

Behind this theme stands a whole philosophy—the conspiracy theory of history—based on the belief that there exists an historic, unbroken, secret, and thoroughly committed succession of interrelated human beings dedicated with perverse monomania to evil purposes. "It is clear," to the Birch Society's Revilo P. Oliver (in American Opinion, December 1964), "that there is in the human species some biological strain of

either atavism or degeneracy that manifests itself in a hatred of mankind and a lust for evil for its own sake." The proponents of this hatred and lust are the conspirators.

In the Birch view, the conspiracy involves the very leadership of the U.S. Government for three decades and the present-day thrust of American policy at home and abroad.

##### A COMMUNIST AMERICA?

The Birch Society's latest evaluation of the United States (in the July-August "Scoreboard" issue of Welch's magazine) is that it is 60 to 80 percent under Communist influence and control. And the term "influence" must not be interpreted too softly, for the magazine's explanatory notes are more explicit:

"Americans can expect only defeat so long as they are commanded by their enemies.

In explaining their reasons for announcing an increase in the percentage of Communist control in the United States over 1964, the editors wrote:

"Although some believe that the bracket of 50 to 70 percent could be retained, there is substantial agreement that the percentage of control is now more than 60 percent, and no analysis supported a lower estimate."

And they added a built-in defense:

"It is not too much to say that the conspiracy's greatest single asset in the world today is the fact that our score will seem utterly unbelievable and preposterous to so large a part of the American people.

And yet, from the same article: "Communist domination of many of the departments of the Federal Government is too obvious to require much comment."

##### TARGET: STATE DEPARTMENT

One particular government department was singled out for especially violent attack—the State Department. It was branded as "Communist headquarters in Washington." And the policies of that department were seen as clear signs of conspiracy. The editors recalled "a vigorous action against the Communists in Korea, which traitors in Washington quickly transformed into a very successful device for getting Americans killed, squandering American money, subjecting the United States to a humiliating defeat."

And they apply the conspiracy theory to more recent events, such as those in the Dominican Republic, where "the State Department is now busily installing another Communist base," or in Vietnam where the extent of Vietcong penetration led correspondent Eric Butler (American Opinion, June 1965) to write that "the only reasonable conclusion" was "that the situation was deliberately produced through treachery in Washington. There has been no indication that American policymakers have any other intention."

##### THE ENEMIES IN WASHINGTON

We are, in the eyes of the Birch Society, commanded by our enemies. Hence, say the editors of American Opinion:

"As for Vietnam, one thing is certain: No action really detrimental to the Communists is conceivable, or even possible, so long as Rusk, McNamara, and Katzenbach remain in power."

Robert Welch leveled the same accusation of treason at the top in an interview at Boston in August 1964. "The Communists have absolutely no worry about bombs," he said, because "they control the men on both sides who would give the order to march—not the generals, but the politicians here and abroad."

The hunt for what Welch's magazine has referred to as "these secret forces" can lead, at worst, to the acceptance of awful imaginings as views of reality. Revilo P. Oliver, writing in the December 1964, issue of American Opinion, said:

"In the mid-1930's . . . there were reports that experimental stations in Asiatic

Russia had pens of human women whom the research workers were trying to breed with male apes in the hope of producing a species better adapted to life under socialism than human beings."

The same obsession with conspiracy leads, at best, to a divisive propaganda, creating fear and suspicion that belie claims of patriotism.

The Birch Society's charges of treason levied against America's national leadership, undiminished since Welch's accusation that President Eisenhower was a Communist agent, expanded into a litany of wild indictments against President Johnson after the most recent presidential election. In a melodramatic throwaway headlined "If you are one of the 27 million then read this . . ." the society found not 1, but rather 42 million traitors, brainwashed by the Communist conspiracy:

"In November 1964, 42 million supporters of Lyndon Johnson voted for repeal of our Declaration of Independence.

"Voted for scrapping the U.S. Constitution entirely.

"Voted for encouragement and support by the Federal Government of racial agitators to instigate more riots.

"Voted for governmental steps and policies which will gradually wipe out the value of all of their savings.

"Our 42 million Johnson camp followers voted to condone and accept the gradual destruction of all moral principles.

"Forty-two million Americans voted for communizing our Nation."

The Birch line on such institutions as the United Nations and the Supreme Court of the United States provides ample explanation of why "Get the United States out of the U.N." and "Impeach Earl Warren" have been made important national programs of the society. The 1965 scoreboard in American Opinion spoke of the international organization's peacekeeping machinery as the "Soviet-United Nations forces" and warned of "ruin wrought by the Bolsheviks . . . through their 'United Nations' front."

And it leveled at the Supreme Court an astounding charge:

"The efforts of the Warren gang to produce a tidal wave of violence and crime are accomplishing their purpose."

The editors traced the efforts of the Chief Justice's "gang" throughout our juridical system, speaking of "the criminals whom the conspiracy has slipped into lower courts, wherever they had an opportunity."

##### AND THOSE ELSEWHERE

The Birchers see the hand of the "conspiracy" in areas other than civil rights ("to instigate riots") and foreign policy ("getting Americans killed"). They view local police review boards as part of the secret plot; the income tax as a Marxist means of national suicide; the fluoridation of water as a means to produce a generation of "Mongolian idiots" (Oliver).

"Liberal intellectuals" are, in the view of Jim Lucier, in Welch's magazine, "inherently subversive."

Foreign aid, said the 1965 Scoreboard issue, "was naturally used to finance the Communist takeover of nation after nation [although] the ultimate purpose was to destroy our currency."

Birch Council member, Tom Anderson, one of the most popular speakers before Birch audiences, speaks in the vernacular:

"We've got to take a stand against becoming a dictatorship. It's not the comrade I'm worried about, it's the liberal rat he is nesting with."

"If we have morality and courage we can destroy the diabolical conspiracy of communism. Every Communist and every pro-Communist ought to be arrested, deported, and hung."



Robert Welch, taking a broad look at the national picture in a recent speech, declared: "The United States is an insane asylum run by its worst patients."

And yet, the Birchers offer no hope for the "insane," for they view mental health programs as another Communist plot.

#### SANITY AND REVILLO P. OLIVER

"The Communists," according to the Scoreboard editors, "in a very considerable number of States \* \* \* have induced the legislatures to enact 'mental health' laws to facilitate the incarceration of troublesome Americans." Americans first became aware of this, they added, on October 1, 1962, "when, in obedience to the specific demands of the Communist Party, a gang under the direction of Nicholas Katzenbach (now Attorney General of the United States) kidnapped Gen. Edwin A. Walker in Oxford, Miss."

Oliver took this line in an American Opinion article published in November 1964, claiming that "mental health" prisons are being increasingly used for the kidnapping and mental, if not physical, murder of patriotic Americans."

It is Revillo Oliver of the society's national council who rides at the epigee of the Birch flight of mind. A classics professor at the University of Illinois, Oliver magnifies the terrors seen by the right in triphammer prose, evoking from the members of the Birch Society greater acclaim than any other single spokesman. A tireless speaker on the Birch circuit, Oliver is also an official book reviewer for Welch's magazine—and as such, he recently gave a laudatory review to a blatantly anti-Semitic book, "World Revolution."

The conspiracy becomes satanic in Revillo P. Oliver's eyes. It is he who claimed to see a strain of degeneracy in human beings which prompts them to form conspiracies of hate. And now, he writes, "the power of government is being used, with a consistency and efficiency that must be intentional, to accelerate our deterioration and hasten our disappearance as a people by every means short of mass massacre \* \* \*."

Oliver declared in a 1959 speech that Cuba is "an island largely populated by mongrels," and, in a January 1965 American Opinion article, that Washington, D.C., is populated by "hordes of thieves, perverts, and traitors." He maintained, in November 1964, that it is a lie that the races are equal, and a month later declared that "the United States is now engaged in an insane, but terribly effective, effort to destroy the American people and Western civilization by subsidizing, both at home and abroad, the breeding of the intellectually, physically, and morally unfit \* \* \*."

In the November 1964 American Opinion, Oliver contended that it is a lie that the Nazis killed 6 million Jews. (This, too, was an aspect of the secret plots for which Oliver has a practiced eye.)

In January 1965, he wrote: "More than once, the directors of what calls itself the National Council of Churches have been caught in the very act of importing into the United States and escorting about the country identified agents of the Soviet Secret Police \* \* \*." And in May, he accused the churches of spreading "confusion, fanaticism, and immorality."

#### OLIVER ON KENNEDY

In discussing the work of the old Dies committee (former Congressman Martin Dies, in American Opinion, has pointed with pride to his investigations of Fascists), Oliver wrote in April 1965, that the Dies committee "also investigated a number of small American groups that the Communists called 'Fascist' because they were opposing in various ways Franklin D. Roosevelt's stealthy efforts to squander the lives and the money

of the American people on a great crusade to save the Soviet."

It was Revilo P. Oliver who wrote the notorious "Marxism in Dallas," an American Opinion article charging that President Kennedy had been assassinated by Communist plotters because he was about to turn American.

The man who pours out these fantasies is no mere Birch ally or hanger-on; he is a member of the John Birch Society's National Council and an associate editor of its magazine. Robert Welch has referred to him as "an authentic genius of the first water, and quite possibly the world's greatest living scholar."

And 1965's unsigned notes on the Scoreboard, in assessing the United States to be 60 to 80 percent in Communist control, drew this preliminary comment from Editor Scott Stanley:

"We are especially grateful to Associate Editor Revilo P. Oliver for his hundreds of hours of examination, compilation, and microanalysis, which help to make the central editorial section of this issue one of the finest ever."

The Birch ideology holds that the United States today suffers from a cancerous disease called collectivism which stems in large measure from a huge plot. "Where there is no poverty," says Birch council member, Tom Anderson, "there is no freedom."

Human social progress is found to be degenerate, as well as conspiratorial, in the "microanalysis" of the 1965 American Opinion Scoreboard:

"Only when one looks closely does one see that the progress in every field \* \* \* is progress toward barbarism, designed to weaken and destroy our moral instincts and our capacity for self-respect—designed, in short, to kill loyalty to the United States, respect for the white race, comprehension of Western civilization, and veneration of God. That simultaneous movement in a hundred supposedly unrelated segments of our national life cannot be mere coincidence."

#### THE CONSERVATIVE AWAKENING

After the appearance of the American Opinion 1965 Scoreboard issue, some American conservatives, including William F. Buckley, Jr., editor of National Review—blind for so long, and doggedly so—began to catch glimpses of the fact that many Birchers live in the same fantasy world as does Mr. Welch. Buckley and the others in his circle apparently realized—finally—that there is, indeed, a Radical Right in America, that Birch members agree with the Birch leader, and that they are not merely misled conservatives, following a misguided leader.

Three of Buckley's syndicated columns in August 1965 dealt with the Birch Society. In the first, on August 5, he enumerated the enormities contained in the Scoreboard issue of American Opinion. In the second, on August 17, he reprinted some of the indignant mail he had received from Birch members about his first column. In the third, on August 22, he finally reached the conclusion that there was no great ideological gap between Welch and those who march behind him in the Birch Society and who believe what Buckley called the society's "paranoid and unpatriotic drivel."

Welch himself had already supplied the best answer about his followers years ago, in "The Blue Book," when he declared:

"The men and women who join the John Birch Society during the next few months or few years are going to do so primarily because they believe in me and what I am doing and are willing to accept my leadership anyway."

More recently, Welch declared in a televised interview that "loyalty to an individual leader is harder to break down and tear

to pieces than are a set of policy rules or principles \* \* \*."

#### A MAJOR ATTACK

Nevertheless, toward the end of 1965, the extremism of the Birch movement produced the beginnings of a significant split between the Birch radicals and the ultraconservatives for whom Buckley is the most articulate spokesman.

The split, first signaled by Buckley's three syndicated columns, was then marked by a major attack in the form of a special six-part section in the October 19, 1965, issue of Buckley's National Review, and titled "The John Birch Society and the Conservative Movement."

The essential thrust of the expose by the editors of National Review—Buckley, James Burnham and Frank S. Meyer—was that the Welchian concept of a United States in the grip of an internal Communist conspiracy holding 60 to 80 percent control over U.S. affairs and permeating the Government itself, was a threat to the conservative movement; the more so because most, if not all, Birch members believe the Welchian mythology.

National Review last October quoted at length from Buckley's now-famous 1962 editorial in which he had criticized Welch, but not the society members who follow Welch's leadership. National Review then pointed out:

"In the ensuing 3 years," three things had become clear: First, that Welch's views had not changed but on the contrary, had become "more virulent." Second, that there was no effective movement from within the society "to contain Mr. Welch's utterances, or to remove him as the society's leader." Third, that "Mr. Welch succeeds in influencing his membership to believe those surrealisms which he first ventilated in 'The Politician'; and that as the membership comes to believe the Welch analysis, it ceases to be effectively anti-Communist."

Meyer's article, entitled "Principles and Heresies—The Birch Malady," concluded:

"The false analysis and conspiratorial mania of the John Birch Society has moved beyond diversion and waste of the devotion of its members to the mobilization of that devotion in ways directly anticonservative and dangerous to the interests of the United States. It is no longer possible to consider the society merely as moving toward legitimate objectives in a misguided way. However worthy the original motivations of those who have joined it and who apologize for it, it is time for them to recognize that the John Birch Society is rapidly losing whatever it had in common with patriotism or conservatism—and to do so before their own minds become warped by adherence to its unrolling psychosis of conspiracy."

#### BIRCHERS AND VIETNAM

The article by James Burnham emphasized that on Vietnam, the Birch Society was "lined up with its supposedly diametric opposite, the left, in support of getting out, not standing firm." Burnham said that the Birch stand on Vietnam, which found it on the same side as the radical left, stemmed from the Birch belief that for all intents and purposes today, the United States is a Communist nation and has a Communist government. Burnham concluded:

"Responsible conservatives have long tried to believe that the John Birch Society, though 'misguided,' was 'going in the same direction' and therefore an 'ally.' Certainly this is the case with many, perhaps even most, individual John Birch Society members. But unfortunately, under the years of brainwashing and organizational control by Robert Welch, the Society as a collective body has taken off in directions where no conservative can pru-

dently venture, and has become a suitable ally only for confusion and sterility. Its stand on Vietnam confirms, not for the first time, that any American who seriously wants to contribute to his country's security and well-being and to oppose communism will have to stay clear of the John Birch Society."

In demolishing the oversimplifications of the Welchian and Birchite "conspiratorial" view of history and events, and noting that "human reality is ignored \* \* \* in the outlook of the John Birch Society," Meyer paused to deal with the Birch line that the civil rights movement in America is part of a Communist plot. He wrote:

"The sources of the civil rights movement are manifold. Certain just, if limited, grievances of the Negro people have been magnified, and have been extended to a challenge of our whole constitutional structure, primarily as a result of the operation of liberal ideology. It is true that here (as everywhere it profits them) Communist groups are active, seeking to take advantage of the turmoil, and are sometimes successful in penetrating sections of the leadership of the movement. But the movement is not a Communist movement, as the John Birch Society implies with every device of rhetoric, with pictures, with innuendo, and often with straight forward statement. There is, of course, much in the civil rights movement which conservatives should oppose; but when it is attacked in the Birch manner, on the basis of an obsessed insistence on conspiracy ('it's all a Communist plot'), sober opposition is discredited and great positive harm done the conservative cause."

#### MAUD HASTINGS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 984, Senate Resolution 229.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 229) to pay a gratuity to Maud Hastings.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 229) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

#### S. Res. 229

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Maud Hastings, mother of Howard H. Hastings, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 4 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### DELAWARE AIR NATIONAL GUARD COMPLETES NINTH MISSION TO VIETNAM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, men of the Delaware Air National Guard have again flown a cargo of vital supplies to Vietnam.

The mission recently completed was the ninth by the Delaware Air National Guard. A crew volunteered for the flight. This meant taking leave from their civilian jobs and their families to support the regular Air Force in transporting military cargoes to the Far East.

The effort such men are making is sometimes overlooked, and at this time I would like to call attention to their valuable contribution. I congratulate them and I know their families and friends in Delaware are justifiably proud of them.

On this last flight the crew was made up of: Col. Clarence E. Atkinson, aircraft commander; Capt. Richard Simon, pilot; Lt. Donald Eyre, 2d pilot; Lt. Col. John Caulfield, Air Force adviser; Maj. Harold Morrison, Air Force adviser, navigator; Lt. James Sisson, navigator; Sgt. John Quigley, flight engineer; Sgt. Richard Harada, flight engineer; Sgt. Ben Phillips, loadmaster; and Sgt. Paul Lane, crew chief.

Delaware's Air National Guard will be continuing to make flights to the Far East, Mr. President, and its contribution is one of many being made by similar units in the United States.

I think this valuable assist to the Nation's effort in Vietnam deserves recognition.

#### OMBUDSMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on Monday, March 7, 1966, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure will begin its hearings on a very fascinating concept—the institution of ombudsman. On that date, we will be honored to hear from the distinguished ombudsman of Sweden, Mr. Alfred Bexelius. I urge my colleagues to attend this public hearing if their schedules permit. It will be held in Room 3110, New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m.

Prior to this hearing, however, I would like to share with my colleagues a very interesting article which appeared in New Yorker magazine on February 13, 1965. The article, entitled "Our Far-flung Correspondents," was written from Stockholm by New Yorker Correspondent John Bainbridge. I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the RECORD.

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

#### A CIVILIZED THING (By John Bainbridge)

STOCKHOLM.—In Sweden, if a citizen feels that he has been treated unfairly—or, for that matter, just rudely—by a policeman, a tax collector, a zoning board, a welfare office, or any other civil servant or government agency, he can do something more than simply grouse about the cussedness of bureaucrats. He can take his complaint to a unique public servant called the justitieombudsman, whose sole job is to protect the people from any infringement of their civil rights. If the justitieombudsman—generally abbreviated to "ombudsman" or, more often, to the initials "JO"—finds upon investigation that a complaint was justified, he acts on it, his action ranging from the dispatch of a reprimand to the offender to prosecution in the courts. What the JO decides to do is entirely up to him. He is elected by a special committee of Parliament, but he takes orders neither from that body nor from anybody else. He can, it is true, be relieved of his post if he loses the confi-

dence of Parliament, but that has never happened—and there has been an ombudsman in Sweden, where the institution was created, for more than a century and a half. (Since 1915, there has also been a militeombudsman, or MO, who serves the same purpose for all members of the armed forces.) Until well over 100 years after making his appearance on the scene, Sweden's one-man complaint bureau went about his singular business without attracting much attention from abroad. Recently, however, he has been discovered. Within the last decade, an ombudsman has started to function in Finland, Norway, Denmark, and New Zealand. Last year, a military ombudsman was established in West Germany, and a civil ombudsman was urged upon the British Parliament by a group of jurists led by Lord Shawcross, a former attorney general. (The proposal was rejected, but its sponsors are optimistic about its ultimate adoption, since the Labor Party has also shown interest in the plan.) Popular support for setting up an independent guardian of civil rights based on the Swedish model is growing in a number of other countries, too—notably Canada and India—and the subject has also been discussed in our Congress. All this latter-day interest in the ombudsman rather pleases the Swedes, particularly the present JO, Mr. Alfred Bexelius, with whom I had a talk not long ago. "Oh, yes, it is quite flattering, especially the attention in the United States," he said, smiling. "Just now, I have been reading the 'Federalist Papers,' and I found so many thoughts in there that I supposed America had nothing to learn from any other country. Seriously, I am glad to see the idea spread, because I believe that every country needs the office of ombudsman. It is a useful thing, a civilized thing."

The JO's office occupies half the third floor of a five-story gray stone building that has the aspect of a private mansion and is situated in downtown Stockholm, a few steps from the King's Garden. The building also houses the headquarters of the military ombudsman and of several commercial concerns, each of which is identified by a highly polished brass plaque on its door. In large letters at the bottom of the JO's plaque are the words "Öpen för Allmänheten," which at first sight struck me as saying more than just "open to the public." I had arrived at the JO's office a few minutes early for an appointment I had made by phone, but the attendant who answered the door and took my coat informed Mr. Bexelius at once of my arrival, and he immediately came out to the entrance hall to greet me. He is a tall man, slender, ramrod-straight, and fit-looking, with steady blue eyes and silver-colored hair. He was conservatively turned out in a double-breasted gray suit, a white shirt with starched collar, a gray silk tie, and a handkerchief in his breast pocket. He speaks English easily and talks with animation, and, as I soon discovered, he laughs out loud when something amuses him, which is quite often. When listening to or discussing a serious matter, however, he can transform his expression from amiable to glacial in an instant. Though I found his manner attractive, it came as no surprise; Stockholm lawyers of my acquaintance had told me that whereas the ombudsman has traditionally had a rather cold and distant temperament, Mr. Bexelius, who is one of the most highly regarded men to hold the office in recent times, is also the most personable.

The private office of the ombudsman, to which Mr. Bexelius led the way, is a large, high-ceilinged room copiously furnished with chair, tables, and sofas. At one end of the room, behind Mr. Bexelius' desk, is a solid wall of books, mostly of a legal nature; on



the other walls hang portraits of many of his predecessors, as well as an imposing plaster relief of Baron Lars August Mannerheim, a member of a distinguished Swedish and Finnish family who on March 1, 1810, became the first ombudsman. The post had been created the year before as part of a new Constitution adopted by the Parliament. "Nobody knows exactly how the institution of ombudsman was conceived," Mr. Bexelius said, "but its purpose, plainly enough, was to give Parliament a means of balancing the wide powers exercised by the King. According to article 96 of the Constitution of 1809—which, by the way, is still in effect—it is the responsibility of the ombudsman to institute proceedings before the competent courts against those who, in the execution of their official duties, have, through partiality, favoritism, or other cause, committed any unlawful act or neglected to perform their official duties properly." That is still the ombudsman's job."

The powers given the JO to do the job, Mr. Bexelius continued, have also remained unchanged. In themselves, they are not impressive. The JO has the authority to require all civil servants to furnish whatever information he needs to carry out his investigations; he is entitled to attend all deliberations and decisions of the courts and public agencies, and to have access to their files and minutes; and he may prosecute civil servants who have committed errors or been negligent in their work. He is not allowed to interfere in a case while it is being decided, nor can he change a decision once it has been delivered by a court or public agency; however, if he feels that a decision is wrong he may write to the proper authorities and present his arguments for changing it. Such petitions are not lightly dismissed. The JO's importance, it became clear as Mr. Bexelius described the office, is derived not from his specific powers but from the fact that he is the trustee of Parliament, and from the enormous prestige that his office has accumulated over the years.

"The ombudsman has another thing on his side—his annual report," Mr. Bexelius said, handing me a thick paper-covered book, which I noted, ran to 591 pages. "Each year the ombudsman has to prepare a report for Parliament that covers the activities of his office and provides details of the year's important cases. About 4,000 copies of his report are printed and distributed to all courts and all Government agencies. That is the ombudsman's real weapon, because, you see, nobody wants to have his name in that book. It is a kind of 'Who's Who' in reverse of public officials and civil servants. To keep their names out of it, the people in the courts and agencies are likely to be a little more careful about the way they do their work. There you see an important thing—perhaps the important thing—about the ombudsman's office. Its very existence prevents any number of faults and abuses of power."

Today, as in the beginning, the JO is elected by a committee of 48 members of Parliament—24 from each house—to a 4-year term; he can be reelected, but an unwritten law prevents him from serving more than three terms altogether. To help keep the office free of partisan pressure, the political parties make a point of uniting in their selection of an ombudsman. Almost without exception, the post has been filled by a prominent and widely respected jurist. Mr. Bexelius, who is Sweden's 31st ombudsman, is in the tradition. After passing his bar examination, he went on to complete the extensive additional training given in Swedish university law schools to lawyers who aspire to a career on the bench. Starting as an assistant judge in a district court, Mr. Bexelius rose to become, in 1948, president of a court of appeal. Six years later, he was

named chairman of a nine-man committee appointed by the King to investigate trusts and monopolies. In 1956, he was elected ombudsman, and was reelected in 1960. He is now 61 years old. "For a long time, the person who was appointed ombudsman was a rather young lawyer, and very often he was later appointed to the supreme court," he said. "The ombudsman, by the way receives the same salary as a member of the supreme court—the equivalent of slightly more than \$14,000 a year. Of course, this office should not be filled by a young man. An ombudsman should not be interested in getting a new job, because that might make him careful about criticizing people. So nowadays the Parliament picks an older man to be ombudsman, and after leaving here he is not appointed to a new office."

I asked Mr. Bexelius if he expected to be reelected to a third term.

"Oh, I don't know," he said, and laughed. "It is part of the ombudsman's job to be criticized, and you can never tell if you have the confidence of Parliament. For instance, there is one member of Parliament who was involved in a case that I had to take action on a few months ago. He was wrong, and I had to tell him very plainly that he was wrong. I was compelled to criticize him very hard, and of course, he's very angry with me. What he will be able to do I don't know. You see, one must do the job, and that may mean that one will fail to be reelected. But I would like to serve again. You can't have a more interesting job. Here you see the whole of life."

If a JO's opportunity to see the whole of life depends on the number of complaints that he is obliged to handle, no ombudsman has had a wider vista than Mr. Bexelius. Until the turn of the century, the ombudsman received an average of 70 complaints a year; during the present decade the annual total has been about a 1,000, and this year it will probably exceed 1,200. (Normally, the JO's office, which is opposed in principle to bureaucratic ways, operates with a staff of six lawyers and three secretaries, and keeps well within its annual budget, which is the equivalent of \$120,000. Because of the recent increase in the volume of work, Mr. Bexelius has had to hire three more lawyers; however, by dipping into a \$20,000 discretionary fund that is part of the annual appropriation but that he had previously left almost untouched, he is still managing to stay within the budget.) The major reasons for the mounting number of complaints, Mr. Bexelius believes, are the enormous proliferation of government activities regulating people's lives and a wider public awareness of the JO institution. In recent years, the ombudsman has become a kind of celebrity, whose official doings receive a great deal of attention in the Swedish newspapers. They take advantage of the fact that all the documents that pass through the JO's office—letters of complaint, correspondence relating to investigations, the JO's decisions—are available to the public. Late in the afternoon of every weekday, a reporter from the Swedish news agency that corresponds to the Associated Press visits the ombudsman's office, where a desk is set aside for his use, and goes through all the papers relating to that day's activities, gathering material for stories that will be sent out to all the daily newspapers in the country. In addition to this run-of-the-mill coverage, the newspapers often print stories about conditions that they believe deserve action by the JO; if it isn't forthcoming, they often rap him by publishing subsequent stories on the subject with exasperating headlines like "Is the JO asleep?"

Approximately 9 out of every 10 complaints that come into his office prove to be unfounded or without evidence, Mr. Bexelius

said, but each one (unless anonymous, in which case it is disregarded) is investigated, no matter how absurd or trivial it may seem.

I told Mr. Bexelius that I was surprised at the small percentage of legitimate complaints.

"Yes, that often surprises foreigners," he replied, "but it becomes quite understandable when you look at the actual complaints." He opened a folder on his desk. "These are the complaints that arrived yesterday," he said. "There are five of them. Before they come to me, my secretary, Miss Danius—she has worked in the JO's office for 30 years—makes a record of each one on a separate page of a looseleaf notebook. This shows the number of the complaint, the date it was received, the name of the complainant, the department against which the complaint is made, and the nature of the complaint. Later an entry is made of each step in the handling of the case up to its final disposition. Then the page is stamped, in red, 'avslutat,' meaning 'finished.'"

Mr. Bexelius put on a pair of horn-rimmed glasses and picked up the top letter in the folder. It was written on a sheet of ruled tablet paper. "This is from a man in a mental hospital," he said. "He complains that his letters are being opened by one of the doctors, and asks if the doctor is allowed to do that. The answer is 'Yes,' so there is nothing to do about this except to reply with that information."

The largest single category of complaints comes from patients in mental hospitals, Mr. Bexelius continued, and the second largest from inmates of penal institutions; together, these two groups account for about a fifth of the total. Generally, their complaint is either that they were wrongly committed or are being improperly treated. In such cases, the JO requires the institute where the complainant is being detained to submit a copy of his case history. "We study the record, but usually there's nothing for us to do," Mr. Bexelius said. "Sometimes, of course, there is. For instance, just 2 weeks ago a woman wrote to me that her husband was in a mental hospital, and that when she went to see him, she found him sleeping very deeply. She said that he had been given a tremendous dose of drugs because he had been a little rude to one of the attendants. I wrote for the patient's record, and I saw that an attendant had complained about the patient to the doctor, and that the doctor had given the man so much sedation that he slept for 4 days. So I wrote to the board of health, explained the case, and asked if there is really any medical reason for such treatment. I am now awaiting their reply."

"What will you do if the board of health says there is no medical reason?" I asked.

"Then I will write the doctor who administered the drugs and demand that he explain his action in writing," Mr. Bexelius replied. "There may have been some special circumstances that made him think it necessary. However, if I find his explanation inadequate, I will send him another letter; this time I will criticize him for administering the treatment, give the reasons it was wrong, and instruct him to avoid such practices in the future. If the patient had been harmed in some way by the treatment, I would undoubtedly order that the doctor be prosecuted, and if the court found him guilty, he would be fined. Furthermore, if the patient had been seriously injured, I might petition the government to award him compensation from public funds. Petitions like that are rare, but otherwise that is the general procedure we follow in handling complaints. We never decide a case without allowing the person complained about to explain his action, and we never prosecute a person just because he has acted stupidly. In former times, the JO almost always or-

dered prosecutions for negligence, even if no real harm had been done to private citizens. Gradually, the practice was changed so that in minor cases prosecution was replaced by a letter from the JO admonishing the official at fault. Nowadays, the great majority of cases are concluded with such a letter. This disposition of a case is more effective than might first appear. The letter is written in such a way it serves as information, not only to the person directly involved, but to other officials. They will learn about it, because it will be in the newspapers and also in the annual report. Most officials read that—especially the parts relating to their administration. If they want to stay out of the book, they will avoid making the same mistake."

Turning to the second letter, Mr. Bexelius said that it came from a man in a rural area who complained that the roads in his part of the country were not being maintained properly and asked the JO to get after the local authorities. That complaint was so general, Mr. Bexelius remarked, that all he could do would be to have one of his staff send a reply asking for particulars. "As you see, there is little high drama in these complaints," he said. "A great many of them are about very small matters, but the size of the complaint isn't important. The important thing is that everybody is allowed to come here and complain. The fact that there is such a right—that is what counts."

The writer of the third letter said that the government censor had been negligent in failing to cut certain scenes that the complainant described as pornographic from the movie called "The Silence," written and directed by Ingmar Bergman, which had recently opened in Stockholm. Mr. Bexelius said that he hadn't planned to see the picture but now he would have to.

After scanning the next complaint, Mr. Bexelius shook his head. "Here is a letter from a barrister who is not satisfied with the laws governing the awards for damages made by insurance companies," he said. "He asks that I undertake an investigation of those laws. Well, I shall not be doing that. In my opinion, the present laws in that field are satisfactory, and it is the ombudsman's right to reject any complaint that he feels is unwarranted. I will write this barrister and tell him why I am not acting on his request, though I am not obliged to give an explanation. My predecessors never did. When they refused to act on a complaint, they just wrote on it, 'No action.' But I think that in a democracy people ought to be given the reasons for any decision that goes against them. As a matter of fact, 2 years ago I submitted a rather long report to the government recommending that all administrative agencies be compelled to state the reason for every adverse decision they made. The government sent the report to all the agencies to ask their opinion of the recommendation. Of course, they said it would be impossible to do such a thing. But I think the government will pass such a law eventually."

About how soon? I inquired.

"Probably a few years," he replied. "In these matters, one must not expect action at once. However, several of the agencies have come around to accepting the idea and are already giving reasons. In time, it will become general practice, though someone else will probably be sitting in this chair by then. An ombudsman, you see, must take the long view."

Picking up the last letter, Mr. Bexelius said it was from a young woman in jail in Göteborg, who complained that she was not allowed to have a radio in her cell. "As a matter of fact, when I inspected that prison 2 years ago I noticed that there were no radios in the cells," Mr. Bexelius said. "I

asked why, and they told me that that prison held only people whose cases were to come to trial soon, and also that the building was so constructed that if one prisoner had a radio, it could be heard by all the others. They said that could cause trouble. But this girl, I see, is to be sent to a doctor for mental tests, and that means she could wait in that prison for 3 or 4 months. She says, 'It can't be right that I should be sitting here without a radio for such a long time.' I agree with her. I will first write to the prison and ask why she is denied a radio; they will no doubt repeat the reasons they gave before. Then I will reply and say, 'Yes, but this girl will be staying for a longer time than most. Can't you make an exception for her?' If they say no, then I will write to the Central Board for Prisons and ask, 'Can't you do something for her?'"

"By that time, the girl may very well be out of prison," I said.

"Yes, that is true," Mr. Bexelius said. "But it is not for her alone that I am acting. I am acting for all the prisoners in the country. Prison authorities have a good deal of discretionary power. What we must do is keep watch to see that they do not use that power arbitrarily."

The JO also keeps on the alert for creeping infringements on citizens' rights arising from arbitrary actions by local officials, such as the police chief of a small city who thought that he had the answer to the noise problem created by leather-jacketed youths tearing around town on motorcycles with their exhausts wide open at all hours of the night. The chief simply decreed that motorcycles were not allowed on the streets between 9 in the evening and 6 in the morning except for traveling to and from work and for making other essential trips. The prohibition was hailed by the townspeople, the newspapers praised the chief for his imaginative handling of the situation, and other local chiefs made haste to issue similar regulations. Then the JO spoke up and pointed out that the law already provided a special penalty for excessive traffic noise, and that it was therefore not within the province of police chiefs to regulate the matter by means of a local ordinance. At that, the officials of several municipalities formed a national committee to propose an amendment to the statutes that would give such powers to local chiefs of police. The JO took on the committee and strongly urged the lawmakers not to enact the proposed legislation, on the ground that the noise problem could be dealt with by existing means and that it militated against the protection of citizens' rights to give local administrators the power to restrict the movements of the general public unless such restrictions were absolutely necessary. The danger, the JO pointed out, was the familiar one—that the power thus granted might well be used to introduce other prohibitions for which there was no real cause. This stand did nothing to increase the JO's popularity, and many newspapers criticized him severely, but his view was at length accepted by the Parliament.

Besides investigating the complaints submitted by citizens, the JO initiates some 200 cases a year on his own. Most of these result from an annual inspection trip that he makes of provincial courts and government offices; if there are prisons in the community visited, he also looks them over. In his inspection of the courts, he selects at random the files of 25 civil and 25 criminal cases and examines them in detail for violations of either the spirit or the letter of the laws. He uses a similar method in checking on the administrative agencies. Though the increasing number of citizens' complaints now prevents him from devoting more than about 3 weeks a year to inspection tours, he gen-

erally finds about 175 instances of improper procedures and other faults, including arrogant behavior on the part of officials.

"In Sweden, all officials must be polite and helpful," Mr. Bexelius said. "If they aren't, they have committed a fault and can be prosecuted. As a matter of fact, there were lots of such prosecutions in the 19th century, and I think there is no question that they contributed to the generally correct treatment of the public that is characteristic of Swedish officials today. In Sweden, of course, we have a state church, and when you look back through the old records you see many cases of clergymen being prosecuted by the ombudsman for treating their parishioners badly. That seldom happens any longer, though I did have such a case 2 years ago. Some children called on the rector of their parish and asked him to conduct a funeral service for their father. The arrangements were made, but unfortunately there was a misunderstanding about the time the service was to be held. When the rector arrived at the church, he found neither the children nor any other relatives or friends. This made him angry, and he started the service anyway. Of course, he had no right to do such a thing, so he was prosecuted and fined. I don't remember how much, but the amount is unimportant. Other clergymen all over the country learned about that prosecution, and the effect was to encourage them to be courteous to everyone, regardless of age or position. Nowadays, it is more likely to be judges than churchmen who are guilty of arrogance. Twice in the past 5 years I have had to prosecute judges who I discovered during my inspection tours had been impolite to witnesses appearing before them in court. Each had to pay a fine of 1,500 crowns, or about \$300, which is quite a lot. At least, it is enough to make other judges think twice before losing their tempers in court."

The other cases that the JO undertakes on his own initiative—about 25 a year—are the result of reports he has read in the newspapers. A few months ago, Mr. Bexelius recalled, he happened to see a short newspaper story about a new private dwelling of rather unusual construction that had been designed by an architect employed by a town-planning agency. Since architects on the agency's payroll are not permitted to do outside work, the JO started an investigation, and he found that about 50 of the architects regularly employed by the agency had accepted private commissions. "I had intended to prosecute the chief of the agency, but after I started the investigation, he became sick with ulcers," Mr. Bexelius said. "He told me it was my fault, so I stopped with a reprimand. I was satisfied with that, because I had already brought everything out into the open—how many outside jobs the architects in the agency had had, how much they had earned from those jobs—everything. The people got the whole story."

Of all the cases handled by the JO's office in the course of a year, only five, on the average, are prosecuted in the courts. Last year, there were four. All were actions against administrative officials, including the chairman of a housing council for being generally negligent in the running of his office, the chairman of a child-welfare council for improperly committing a father who had been lax in contributing to the support of his children, and a public prosecutor for failing to inform the court during a criminal trial that a state's witness had committed perjury. The fourth case grew out of an item that Mr. Bexelius saw in a newspaper about a one-day excursion to Paris that a Swedish charter-airline company had staged for promotion purposes. The article said that many prominent people had been aboard but mentioned very few names. His interest piqued, Mr. Bexelius secured a passenger list and found



that among the freeloaders was a high official of the National Board of Civil Aviation. Looking further into the matter, he discovered that the airline's application for a renewal of its license was pending before the board at the time of the trip. He also learned that the official who went on the junket had received permission to do so from the chief of the board. "So I prosecuted both the chief and the official who made the trip, and they were both fined," Mr. Bexelius said. "I know both these men. They are very honorable, of course. Certainly they would not be influenced by a one-day trip to Paris. But they are just not allowed to do such things. They shall not be in a position to be grateful to any person or any company. They shall be independent. Otherwise, people cannot have confidence in them or their agency, or even, to a certain extent, in any authority."

I asked Mr. Bexelius whether, in view of the number of times he is obliged to take action against people of his acquaintance, he finds that being the JO has a limiting effect on his social life.

He laughed. "No, I wouldn't say so," he replied. "Of course, many of my friends have been angry with me. Often, when I have to criticize a judge, he is a man with whom I have worked in court and know very, very well. Naturally, I don't like to criticize him, but I must. The ombudsman cannot be concerned about his popularity. It is no secret that high officials in Sweden—all of them—dislike the ombudsman. They say that he is always interfering in things he doesn't know anything about, and that they could do their jobs better if he would stop meddling, and so on. But all their grumbling doesn't mean a thing. Everybody knows that it is necessary to have an ombudsman."

#### RETIREMENT OF JOHN O'ROURKE, EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, John O'Rourke, longtime editor of the Washington News, has decided to face the hazards which retirement holds for a man still bursting with young ideas.

For 30 years, Washington has had the benefits of his reports and comments. He produced an excellent newspaper. He set a pattern of brevity. He insisted on copy that was lively and interesting. He mirrored the exciting times he lived through and felt with the rest of us. He uncovered the shoddy and dramatized the positive. He made rare contributions to good government and to the newspaper business.

The Washington Post, one of his longtime competitors, paid him tribute in an editorial and I ask unanimous consent for insertion of the editorial into the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1966]

#### AN EDITOR RETIRES

John T. O'Rourke was editor of the Washington Daily News for nearly 30 years and his retirement ends an era in Washington journalism. The three decades in which he served at the top of his profession were exciting decades for Washington, for the country, and for the world. John O'Rourke enjoyed the excitement and participated in the life of his times with zest and enthusiasm.

He was in the best tradition of his craft. He was a good writer. He had a sharp nose for news. He had a heart easily stirred by misfortune and a temper easily roused by injustice or wrongdoing. His mind was alert to developments in many fields—aviation, art, and music were within the range of his most intense interest.

For many years he has been a leading figure in the Inter-American Press Association. He is known and admired by editors throughout Central America and South America. He has labored to lift up the standards of his profession. He has struggled to increase understanding among Americans North and South. He has fought for a free press throughout the hemisphere. His colleagues in Washington cherish him as a friend and respect him as a keen newspaper competitor.

#### VIEWS OF FCC COMMISSIONER LOEVINGER

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Commissioner Lee Loevinger, of the Federal Communications Commission, has recently on separate occasions spoken out in two areas of the Commission's concern. One statement was with regard to the role of the Common Carrier Bureau in the rate inquiry proceedings dealing with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. The Washington Evening Star commented on his views in an editorial of January 29 entitled "An Odd Kind of Court."

The other area of Mr. Loevinger's public concern, voiced in an interview on "The Government Role in Broadcasting," dealt with television programming. The Chicago Tribune of February 1 reported:

Mr. Loevinger finds far more danger in my trying to impose my ideas of quality than in letting people and purveyors of television choose on their own.

In both of these approaches Commissioner Loevinger is showing an approach which tries to preserve rights which can be exercised by industry with a minimum of FCC intervention. I ask unanimous consent that the two items to which I have referred be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 29, 1966]

#### AN ODD KIND OF COURT

A private citizen haled into court might properly feel some uneasiness if he found the prosecutor privately meeting with the judge to suggest how the trial might be run, even to ruling on objections and tinkering with the way evidence could be submitted.

Yet that is roughly the position in which the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. finds itself in the current rate proceedings before the Federal Communications Commission. True enough, a regulatory agency isn't a court, and the affair is being billed as an investigation, not a trial. But the whole business apparently is a close enough parallel to have brought a stinging objection from one of the FCC Commissioners, Lee Loevinger, to the way the agency plans to run the hearings.

What disturbs both Mr. Loevinger and A.T. & T. is the role of the Common Carrier Bureau, an arm of the FCC. The bureau not only has the rights of an investigator and prosecutor but also participates in some commission decisions.

As Mr. Loevinger put it, the FCC in effect "has authorized one of the adversary parties to this proceeding to rule upon objections filed by the other party, to suggest procedure to be followed, and to specify the issues and the order of consideration of evidence, all without notice or opportunity for comment from the other party."

Mr. Loevinger has described all this with such adjectives as unfair, inefficient, unreasonable and impractical. And while he has drawn the fire of one colleague who doesn't think a rate hearing should be run precisely like a court trial, it seems to us the Commissioner has a point.

There can be no quarrel with the FCC's investigation of the telephone company's rates. The agency is well within its rights in ordering such a study. And although A.T. & T. stockholders have been displaying nervousness since the probe began, no damage to the company's reputation is likely to eventuate.

However, it is a matter of legitimate concern that the company should receive fair-play during the hearings to come. The way ground rules are set up now, the match looks pretty one sided.

#### [From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 1, 1966] FCC MEMBER DEFENDS TV'S PROGRAMING: BUT HE AGREES QUALITY IS NOT CONSISTENT

Lee Loevinger, Federal Communications Commissioner, said here yesterday he sees more danger in a commissioner trying to impose ideas of programing quality upon television stations than in letting TV viewers and program purveyors work out for themselves what will be on the air.

Loevinger, an assistant attorney general before he became one of the seven members of the FCC, gave his views in WGN-TV studios while being interviewed on "The Government Role in Broadcasting." The interview, one of WGN-TV's Your Right To Say It series, will be televised at 1:30 p.m., Sunday on channel 9.

#### TELLS OF QUANTITY

"Sure, I'm concerned that a lot of programs I think are good are not being shown, and a lot I don't think are so good are on the air," Loevinger said. "But I see far more danger in my trying to impose my ideas of quality than in letting people and purveyors of television choose on their own."

Loevinger expressed a belief that one reason for poor quality in some television is that the average station now offers 6,000 hours of programing a year, "and you just can't produce 6,000 hours of masterpieces—if you could, no one could stand to look at them."

#### WILL RELY ON NEWS

Asked what he thought American TV may be like in 10 years, Loevinger said: "I'll be surprised if it is radically different from today, really."

"Inevitably, TV will come to rely more and more on news and public affairs programs, for one reason because of the growing public conscience of broadcasters, and for another because we are running out of movies."

#### VIETNAM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, 2 days ago I inserted in the RECORD four articles on Vietnam written by William P. Frank, of the Wilmington, Del., News-Journal papers.

He has completed his series of perceptive articles with two additional installments, and again I would hope to make his comments available to a larger audience. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Feb. 28, 1966]

**THREE GOVERNMENTS RULE SOUTH VIETNAM**  
(NOTE.—This is the fifth of a series in which William P. Frank, who returned earlier this month from Vietnam, reports his impressions of that nation and its people.)

(By William P. Frank)

South Vietnam has an area slightly larger than the State of Washington yet it has, in effect, three governments.

Its population of about 15 million is outwardly governed by the Republic of Vietnam.

But both its economy and its daily life are influenced by the United States. And the National Liberation Front or Vietcong, which claims still to have influence over great sections of the country, is a factor constantly to be reckoned with.

U.S. officials in Washington insist this is a Vietnamese war with American forces helping the South Vietnamese Government. It doesn't take long for an observer to reach the conclusion that, in actuality, the South Vietnamese strip along the South China Sea is being influenced, changed, and affected by the American forces, backed by millions of American dollars and American resources.

The accepted capital of the Republic of Vietnam, with its military congress and military rulers, is Saigon.

The American capital is Washington with the U.S. Embassy and the command post of Gen. William C. Westmoreland in Vietnam as subsidiary capitals.

There is no question that headquarters of the Vietcong forces is Hanoi.

To complicate matters in this complex situation, there are a number of minority groups in South Vietnam which have been problems in the past and may still present problems in the future. Notable among these are the high-spirited individualistic Montagnards of the hill country north of Saigon.

They represent an important group with their own customs, tribal ways, and racial identity. They speak their own language, have their own traditions, and live in an area vulnerable to guerrilla infiltration.

Dealing with the Montagnards has posed a thorny problem. Various methods have been tried. Perhaps the most unusual is the technique of Dr. James Turpin, who operates his own hospital near the city of Dalat. He frequently negotiates with the Montagnards and has found the best approach to them is through cigars.

So, Turpin gathers cigars from friends and hands them out to Montagnard chieftains to gain their attention and friendship.

The extent of the American influence in the South Vietnamese Government is wide and extremely varied. In addition to the armed forces, there are a number of important civilian projects under the umbrella of what was once known as U.S. Operations Mission, now the U.S. Agency for International Development.

This includes a number of social welfare projects and a large corps of advisers. It was interesting to note that while the Americans are supposed to be the "advisers," they quite often "run the show" with the Vietnamese officials playing either a secondary or supporting role.

During an interview with a high-ranking officer in the Vietnam National Police, I asked to interview William Benson, of Montana, the top U.S. adviser for the national police. We drove to the AID building.

It was a little difficult getting past the guards and when we arrived in the lobby, we

were not permitted to walk to Benson's office. He had to come out to greet us.

After a long discussion with Benson, I got the definite idea that he and his staff actually were directing the organization of the National Police of Vietnam.

The effect of the millions of dollars being spent by the United States in Vietnam is apparent to the visitor from the moment he arrives in the Tan Son Nhut Airport. The civilian section of the airport is attractive and small but beyond the gates sprawls one of the largest military air bases in the world, inhabited chiefly by Americans, guarded by Americans, and used mostly by Americans.

Millions of American dollars have been and are being spent not only in military installations but in constructing harbors and harbor buildings—all directed by Americans with Vietnamese employees. Vietnamese now consider it a status symbol to be employed by the American Government or by American contractors.

The United States began its advisory system with the South Vietnamese Government on a small scale in 1955, with the U.S. Military Assistance Advisory Group. It is now one of three dozen alphabetized agencies in the country. Notable is MACV—Military Assistance Command Vietnam.

The entire economy of Vietnam today depends on American support—from the construction of harbors and facilities to the importation of rice into a country that once ranked the grain among its chief products.

American money, engineering, and construction people are the mainstays of the nation. Without them it would collapse overnight.

There is practically no unemployment in South Vietnam, as there was in 1964. In fact, as the United States steps up its construction program, there may be a manpower shortage.

One of the curious features of the country is the role of the Vietcong forces. They not only harass, terrorize, and fight the Americans and South Vietnamese forces but also exact "taxes" or tribute from American and native civilians.

It is common knowledge that U.S. civilian convoys of construction materials are halted at checkpoints by the Vietcong, who get paid for permitting the convoys to move on undamaged. The Vietcongs also intercept food convoys of natives and either exact "taxes" or take food for themselves.

At present, the major differences between U.S. policy and the present government of South Vietnam revolves around the role the Vietcong or Communist National Liberation Front would play at a peace conference.

Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky insists he will have no parts of the Communists. Americans are saying that, if necessary, the NLF should be represented.

Observers in Saigon believe that if the Ky government lasts that long, Washington will have its way in the end since Washington is footing practically the entire bill.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Mar. 1, 1966]

**NEITHER HAWKS NOR DOVES; SOUTH VIETNAM NEWSMEN TREAD MIDDLE PATH**

(NOTE.—This is the last of a series in which William P. Frank, who returned recently from Vietnam, reports his impressions of that nation and its people.)

(By William P. Frank)

Despite their first-hand knowledge of the war, few members of the 350-member press corps in South Vietnam can be classified as either hawks or doves.

Most of the newsmen, representing newspapers, television, and radio in many countries of the free world, would more accurately be described as "railbirds."

Favorable expressions for the Vietcong, Hanoi, or North Vietnam are rare, but the newsmen—most of them Americans—are often critical of the United States and South Vietnam war efforts. The newsmen also take verbal potshots at the social welfare programs undertaken by the United States and its allies in this war.

Because they have been exposed to the vast American installations representing millions of dollars and to the immense array of men and battle equipment, the newsmen are convinced that the Vietnamese economy is completely dependent on the United States.

Occasionally, a newsmen can be heard expressing his opinion that the war should be expanded, but we didn't hear any comments from reporters regarding the United States getting out of Vietnam.

Many newsmen, some of them 2-year veterans of the war, are not impressed with the U.S. effort as it now exists. Some believe the enclave idea will work.

The newsmen have this in common: They are depressed by the number of Americans killed or wounded and they are fearful that these numbers will continue on the increase. They know the ugly side of the war is getting worse.

Newsmen who attend the daily briefings in the small, air-conditioned theater in the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office (JUSPAO) in the heart of Saigon are constantly pestering U.S. officials who persist in giving scanty and sometimes obscurely worded reports.

It is not uncommon at these briefings to hear reporters, just in from the battlefield, tell more about what went on during a specific action than the briefers.

While the reporters appreciate the spot the briefers are in, nonetheless, some newsmen ask them questions like these: "How light are light casualties?" "What's the difference between a Vietcong atrocity and a Vietcong outrage?" or "When is a hut that's been burned not a home for someone but a Vietcong installation?"

When pushed into a corner, the briefers often agree to release more information provided it is regarded as "background data" and should be used only without attribution.

All in all, the news corps has a friendly relationship with the American military officials, principally because the military authorities have not clamped down any broad censorship, and appear to be trying to do their best to accommodate the press in getting stories.

In the field, the newsmen wear fatigues, boots, and always carry canteens. I only saw one carry a revolver—a television man responsible for a lot of camera equipment.

As in all other areas of news reporting, journalists who have been in Vietnam for a long time have established mutual trust with military authorities. This pays off.

However, service to the press varies with the branches of the service.

For example, with the 1st Infantry Division, the "darlings" of the press section, were newsmen from Birmingham, Ala., because Birmingham had recently "adopted" the 1st Infantry Division and the newspaper there were giving the division depth coverage.

With the 1st Cavalry Division, the press section was cooperative all right, but priority went to a battery of writers and photographers from the big television networks.

On the other hand, because Bill Snead and I were to be in Vietnam for only 3 weeks and were always on the go, we didn't have time to develop news contacts with any one group.

This, however, did not count with the U.S. Marines at Da Nang. They treated us as if we were in a position to give them just as much coverage as the Associated Press or the United Press International.



The same went for the press section of the 7th Fleet stationed in Saigon. They put at the disposal of Sneed, a German newspaperman, and myself a two-engine plane that landed atop the aircraft carrier, *Ticonderoga*.

Had we been able to stay in Vietnam longer, we could have gotten out to the other vessels of the fleet on the same basis.

A few American newsmen express some admiration for the Vietnamese but chiefly when a Vietnamese news source will give them valuable tips.

Every newsmen in Saigon has two identification cards. One is the yellow, with red stripes, a Vietnamese press card which he never uses.

The other is the valuable blue press card, issued by the U.S. Defense Department. It is the magic key to many doors. Without his blue card, a newsmen might as well be in limbo.

The blue press card gets him into the PX's, the officers' open messes, and past some of the tightest security guards.

It is also his ticket for military planes when they are available. A newsmen can go into practically any U.S. air terminal in South Vietnam, show his blue press card, and get a ride, if there is room. He can make reservations for planes in advance and not be bumped, regardless of the military waiting list.

The American newsmen will be flown into a combat zone—if he wants to and if a plane or helicopter is available—but getting out is something else. There are priorities, particularly for the wounded, of course.

With very few exceptions, an American news photographer can take pictures anywhere in South Vietnam, except inside the U.S. Embassy and around certain types of planes and in the vicinity of certain kinds of artillery bunkers.

No one censors reporters' stories nor the work of photographers. However, there is security on information that is given on a hold for release basis. A reporter who violates this agreement will get into trouble, but this is true almost anywhere.

Two briefings for the press are held each day. One is at the Vietnam press headquarters in downtown Saigon, usually well attended but not always profitable as far as news is concerned.

Half an hour later, the U.S. briefings are held in the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office Building, always well attended.

It is also in that building where the newsmen make their contacts for going out into the field to contact the various divisions. The building also has a press lounge where some newsmen pick up their mail, and can meet friends and news contacts.

The Americans who run JUSPAO have such trust in the press that the building is never closed. Newsmen can wander in and out any time of the day.

I have seen Vietnamese civilians seeking to enter the building, present their identification cards but they are still searched.

Some of them who carry packages have to open them for scrutiny. I have never seen an American frisked.

Because of the problem of communications, not too many American newsmen associate with Vietnamese officials although the Vietnamese press officials are extremely helpful to newsmen who want to meet Vietnamese personalities in government.

Neither the Vietnamese general police nor military police interfere with the goings and comings of the American newsmen.

While a newsmen has to stop to identify himself before an American MP, at a security checkpoint, I have seen American newsmen whiz past Vietnamese police and yell, "Press."

On the night, however, when the top-ranking Vietnamese officials left the Saigon airport for Honolulu to meet President Johnson, I saw a Vietnamese MP try to push an American photographer back.

The photographer struggled with the soldier and continued taking pictures. This would not have happened had the military policeman been an American.

### OPERATION HELPING HAND

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as residents of the American State closest to Vietnam, Hawaii's people react sensitively—like many Americans elsewhere—to the hardships being endured by the distressed people of Vietnam. They are concerned that they are not doing all that they might to ease the suffering of destitute civilians in Vietnam villages.

Recently, a project called Operation Helping Hand was started in Hawaii. It is being administered by the 25th Infantry Division, whose "Tropic Lightning" soldiers are stationed at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii. The Division's 2d Brigade, recently assigned to Vietnam and already engaged in combat, is distributing truckloads of needed articles collected in Hawaii to Vietnamese families.

The response on the part of Hawaii's people to Operation Helping Hand has been truly gratifying. Government officials, National Guardsmen, Boy Scouts, war veterans, schoolchildren, business firms, and thousands of private citizens joined in the massive drive and donated tons of materials. They included soap, toothbrushes, books, pencils, working tools, children's clothing, health and sanitation goods, foodstuffs, and training aids for vocational schools.

The donated items were assembled at schools, fire stations, supermarkets and other points, then transported to several warehouses. Soon they will be shipped to southeast Asia, to augment smaller collections sent earlier.

In addition, substantial cash contributions were collected.

The close cooperation between the military and the civilian communities in Hawaii made this joint undertaking a splendid success. I am pleased to report that Operation Helping Hand is already bringing aid and comfort to the hard-pressed Vietnamese people. At the same time the project is helping to build closer bonds of understanding with the Vietnamese people.

An informative article on the impact of Operation Helping Hand in Vietnam has been published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of February 25, 1966, under the headline "25th Delivers Gifts."

I also wish to call attention to an editorial in the Honolulu Advertiser which appeared on February 15, 1966, shortly before the drive began. These articles reflect the enthusiasm and support which the newspapers and all other groups and individuals in the community gave Operation Helping Hand.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Feb. 15, 1966]

### HELPING HAND IN VIETNAM

Hawaii gets a chance in a few days to put its help where it will do immediate and potentially far-reaching good in Vietnam.

The 25th Infantry Division's Operation Helping Hand is getting underway next week, and the people of Hawaii are offered a full partnership.

The State and county governments are supporting the drive.

The idea is to collect in Hawaii the many hundreds of daily household goods we take for granted—but which are badly needed in Vietnam—and ship them to the 25th in Vietnam.

The soldiers will use the goods to help the Vietnamese people and to win friends in the villages.

This friendship is a vital weapon for our troops and the South Vietnamese Government in combating the Communists.

Items to be collected February 25, 26, and 27 include such things as soap, saws, nails, hammers, shovels, sewing material, sporting equipment, toothbrushes, and other health-related aids, coloring books and crayons and other toy items.

A list was published in the Sunday paper and will be repeated. Cash donations are also needed.

The recent Honolulu summit talks with President Johnson and the South Vietnamese leaders put a great deal of stress on the "other war," the political war to win the loyalty of the people.

It is just this that Operation Helping Hand is concerned with, and it offers Hawaii a chance to participate in some shirt sleeve diplomacy.

The 25th Division, which began moving from Schofield Barracks the first of the year, calls the items "ammunition for peace" to win the villagers over.

Brig. Gen. Glenn D. Walker, of the 25th, makes the point that while the villagers aren't hostile, they aren't always friendly.

Since getting cooperation is vital to the kind of war we're fighting in Vietnam, Operation Helping Hand is no small matter. It could mean a real difference in the security of many men there.

Hawaii feels especially close to what's going on in Vietnam, as the response to earlier drives of this kind has shown. The 25th is composed of "our boys," as are the Kaneohe Marines who went to Vietnam earlier.

Collection points for the drive will be at fire stations, public schools, and most supermarkets.

Start saving some of the needed items now, and be ready next week to help both our fighting forces and the Vietnamese people caught in a long and bitter war.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Feb. 25, 1966]

### FROM THE ISLANDS TO VIETNAM: 25TH DELIVERS GIFTS

(By Dale Kenery)

CUCHI, VIETNAM.—The hostility of villagers in Haunghia Province, 20 miles northwest of Saigon, melted into smiles today when trucks from the 2d Brigade, 25th Infantry Division, poured into the hamlet of Bacha laden with clothing, reading material, and other supplies from the people of Hawaii.

The shipment is the first in a massive effort throughout the entire Aloha State to help the Vietnamese people in the 25th Infantry Division's Operation Helping Hand.

The soap, school supplies, sewing materials, and clothing were delivered to the children of Minh-tan School, which is in Bacha, a small relocation village for refugees who have fled from North Vietnam.

In accepting the materials for his men from A Troop, 3d Squadron, 4th Cavalry, Col. Lynwood M. Johnson, Jr., 2d Brigade commander, said, "With these items and our medical aid program, we will be able to really convince the people of our sincere desire to assist them."

"The members of the 2d Brigade send sincere thanks and aloha to the residents of Hawaii for furnishing supplies that will greatly benefit the Vietnamese families."

Helping Hand was launched over a month ago under a program conceived by Tropic Lightning Commander Maj. Gen. Fred C. Weyand, who recently informed Hawaii residents that their contributions will be carried along with ammunition and rations and will be personally given to the South Vietnamese people.

To date, the 25th has received the active support of all communities, Gov. John A. Burns, of Hawaii, Honolulu Mayor Neal S. Blaisdell, and the city council, the Hawaii Metropolitan Jaycees, and a number of commercial concerns anxious to give Hawaii's own division support in helping the Vietnamese people.

An estimated 18,000 pounds of materials were shipped from Hawaii last week as a result of the Jaycees' efforts throughout the State.

Weyand recently emphasized, "In our assistance program in Vietnam we have already learned that medical supplies which heal the peasant and his family can be as valuable as artillery shells and a cake of soap for a Vietnamese family more effective than a bullet expended against the enemy."

"In short, Helping Hand will be an extension of our aloha to the people of Vietnam."

"Charity is not our goal. Instead, man lending a helping hand to his fellow man is what the Tropic Lightning soldier will use to secure the friendship so necessary in a country where suspicion and distrust are commonplace."

### THE NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL COMMISSION

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, today the Secretary of Commerce designated the six New England States as an economic development region under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. By so doing the Secretary has formally extended an invitation to these six States to form a New England regional commission. This commission will study both the assets and the deficiencies of the region and determine the steps necessary to insure the future economic growth and stability of the entire area.

What was begun today has been the hope of the New England congressional delegation and interested citizens for a dozen years or more. It also marks a change in our thinking as to how best to bring the reality of national economic growth to every area of the country.

The New England States comprise the oldest regional civilization and economy in the United States. They have been bound together historically and identified as one in their contributions to our Nation's history and development. Unfortunately, they have also been bound

together in suffering the problems of economic decline. At one time New England was the center of our Nation's shipping and fishing industry; at one time this region provided the technology to clothe the Nation; at one time the people of this area were looked upon as the most efficient, productive, and energetic producers in our Nation. They still are. But events have occurred, in most instances totally beyond their control, that lessened the opportunities to use their skills and energies. As a result we have suffered the loss of many talented people—especially the potential of our youth.

No member of the New England congressional delegation has ever made the case that our region was fully debilitated, nor has it ever been suggested that our economic life was in need of a massive Federal program. But it has been recognized that down through the years we have suffered obstacles to growth that have left us with persistent economic weak spots that constantly hamper efforts at revitalization.

The first major recognition of New England's need for Federal assistance in meeting its own problems was stated by Senator Kennedy in the spring of 1953. In 3 days of discussion before the U.S. Senate he detailed those subtle weaknesses in New England's economic structure that constantly held us down, regardless of overall national economic growth. He stressed then as we stress now, that the strengths of New England surpass our weaknesses, and that our people need only to coordinate their economic energies as a region to overcome years of decline.

After more than 3 years of experience with the area redevelopment approach it became apparent that, helpful as ARA was in promoting economic growth in specific communities, long-term growth of the community demanded a broader approach. A change in emphasis was needed from that of complete reliance on programs designed to rescue single areas fully depleted to accelerating entire regions to meet their potential. There was a recognition that only when every region of our country is progressing at a rate similar to our national advance would the benefits of prosperity reach each individual.

I had the opportunity to express the need for a coordinated economic growth program among States in a Senate speech last February. I announced then that in discussions with the President, and members of his administration, I had received assurances that this new approach to regional development was being prepared for presentation to the Congress—and that the New England region would be included in any program eventually developed.

When the Economic Development Act was introduced in March, I was proud to cosponsor the measure and to begin work with my New England senatorial colleagues in preparing the case for our six States.

As a result of a thorough study of the New England economy, in terms of the

guidelines proposed in the administration's bill, by regional experts at Boston University, the New England Senators were fully prepared to present the case for a development commission to the Secretary of Commerce on the date of the bill's passage.

This cooperation at the congressional level is today fully reflected in the actions of the New England Governors in accepting the Secretary's invitation to form a commission.

We now look to the future and the promise of coordination and agreement among several States for the economic benefit of all, regardless of boundaries within the region. For the first time we will be charting a course of economic action from a New England point of view. We will look to our basic resources, find those areas in which we have the advantage, and then move to maximize that advantage. This can be done by integrating the separate plans and programs of State and Federal agencies, and where development gaps remain we can seek new legislative solutions.

Long-range plans can be made to free our rivers from pollution and relieve our cities from the burden of urban blight. We can guarantee the preservation of those things that are considered unique to New England—our beautiful open spaces, our forests, lakes, and coastal areas.

The revitalization of our region will call back the many who have left and attract new manpower. The people of New England, their technical skills and the institutions and enterprises they have created will continue to be considered an enviable resource. Their presence will attract increased private investment and productive capacity to our area so that a broad-based stability will be created.

The problems of New England power, susceptible as we have seen to failure, can be reexamined to determine better ways in which to bring cheaper and more efficient power into our region.

Transportation networks can flourish, especially in rail freight and air travel. Rapid transit systems can be developed to insure the efficient and safe transit of people in and out of major urban areas.

These and other basic resource problems are in desperate need of study and coordination. And the people of New England who have long waited for their use of the opportunities that our region could offer are now assured by today's activities of an economic future that will parallel our Nation's progress.

### THE BIG PICTURE IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a series of articles in recent issues of the Review, the bimonthly publication of the Defense Supply Association, deals with the existing situation in Vietnam, and, I believe, casts a revealing light on the urgency to complete conference action on legislation, passed yesterday by the Senate, to provide fiscal 1966 supplemental authorizations for military procurement.



The author of these articles, Lt. Gen. Andrew T. McNamara, U.S. Army, retired, is presently editor of the *Review* and executive vice president of the Defense Supply Association, an organization headquartered in Washington, D.C., which is composed of officers of the Armed Forces, key civilians in the Federal Government, and leaders of industry. This association disseminates professional information concerning supply and related activities of the Department of Defense.

General McNamara is one of our Nation's foremost experts in the field of logistics, having formerly served as the Quartermaster General, U.S. Army, and as the first Director of the Defense Supply Agency, a combined procurement and supply agency of the armed services. This Agency was created under the directorship of the present Secretary of Defense in the early days of the Kennedy administration as part of the streamlining of the functions of the Department of Defense.

Because of the authoritative background from which General McNamara speaks, I feel his remarks merit the attention of the membership of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the *Record* at this point.

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

[From the *Review*, January-February, 1966]

Many Americans have a mistaken view of how our policy was shaped in Vietnam. "Why force this on us?" they ask.

It is true that a percentage of American people want to know why we are involved in Vietnam. This feeling exists in spite of a wealth of reasons from responsible leaders of our country.

It's visible in many walks of life. The latest and probably most publicized is the youth effort coupled with demonstrations of questionable allegiance. The fact that Vietnam is remote from our shores adds to the fuzziness in their minds.

Contrariwise they cannot reason that failure to stop infringement of rights in other countries will inevitably lead to the challenge of these same democratic ideals but this time it will be in our country.

In addition they reason that we have troubles at home that are not yet solved. Thus they conclude hastily and erroneously that we are wrongfully in Vietnam, and on and on and on.

They run to words. Surely it must be apparent if they are students that the United States of America as a country is now international both in stature as well as commitment. It should be equally clear that communism is not confined to the borders of the Soviet Union.

If they are not students but merely malcontents, then there are several areas of action for them. They can continue their actions and perhaps gain sufficient voice so that law may be passed which would satisfy them. They could join peaceful efforts in other countries where their sensitive natures might fit better perhaps than here. (But they should realize that they could lose their right to express themselves in countries other than this if they prefer to leave us.)

But surely student or malcontent must realize that the United States was founded on the basis of freedom and justice. Since this is so, it is right and also just that of all na-

tions, the United States should defend the principles of democracy, if not advance them.

Who would object to this? Certainly the proponents of communism would. Therefore, where the rights of freemen are being usurped it is proper that our Nation be present to align ourselves with those that seek the same ideals which created this Nation.

This great Nation of ours is not attempting to exploit Vietnam. It seeks to contribute to the stability of Vietnam.

It does not seek to do this by military means. It does seek to help the Vietnamese keep their independence. The presence of our troops and the loss of our men together with their Vietnamese comrades who are also suffering will accomplish this and in addition will serve warning that we want peace and freedom for all men. We Americans want it everywhere.

The three Presidents who have supported our policy have merely called the hand of communism which is steadily attempting to spill into areas not yet under their control. Our Congress has not involved us in an international scene, and this Nation is not being forced to consume such a policy.

We Americans want freedom in Vietnam just as surely as we want our own independence—and we want it for others wherever they live.

A. T. McNAMARA.

#### VIETNAM

(By Lt. Gen. A. T. McNamara, USA, retired, executive vice president, Defense Supply Association)

One of the comments frequently heard relative to South Vietnam and its problems with guerrillas for us pertains to its borders.

Various statements are made that means must exist of closing the international borders of a country. This would simplify the problem and localize the guerrillas to those who are within the troubled country.

But a quick look at the map of Vietnam shows that the suggested action isn't quite as simple a job as the statement. In fact it's a real problem when you look at the length of the border and the type of border which exists in South Vietnam. It's roughly the distance between Washington and Los Angeles and better than half faces the sea. This border is perforated by rivers throughout and with large swampy areas in addition in the south or delta region. The border adjoining the neighboring countries is not well defined and is very woody.

To treat the question we sought an expression from a young captain of infantry, an obvious graduate of the Infantry School at Fort Benning and who had recent exposure to the teachings from the John F. Kennedy Center at Fort Bragg. Incidentally, more expressions from other levels will be developed in future issues.

His answer was short and incisive. There are means to accomplish just such a thing and, of course, it simplifies the problem greatly if borders can be sealed. But it's a tough job, he said.

It seemed almost like attending a school to have him list assumptions, such as when:

(a) neighboring countries are sympathetic to the insurgents;

(b) the bordering nations are capable of supplying mainly by land;

(c) the boundaries are heavily vegetated, mountainous and not clearly defined;

(d) the majority of citizens are loyal to the government body in power;

(e) money, troops and resources are available to the existing government;

(f) the nations supporting and supplying the country do not desire to provoke international incidents with bordering nations;

(g) nuclear weapons won't be employed.

On the top of these assumptions he outlined some facts which bore directly on the problem as he saw it, such as when:

(a) the terrain is difficult and vegetation is dense. This would favor guerrilla movements and the ease of their resupply;

(b) the amount of assistance and resources obtained from any sympathetic bordering nation is substantial.

His discussion on terrain was fascinating. In difficult terrain and dense vegetation two measures popped readily to his tongue; i.e., saturate the difficult terrain with troops and defoliate the heavily vegetated areas. To defoliate would enable friendly forces to check more readily for hiding areas and escape routes. Our Nation, since it's covered with crab grass and broad-leaved weeds, should have a means to defoliate areas with some assurance of success.

A search was made and some pictures were found that show that our modern chemistry had indeed the capability of defoliating dense vegetation.

As a matter of fact about 8,000 acres of mangrove forest which paralleled about 50 miles of rivers, canals and roads were sprayed. The thought was to clear the vegetation from the sides of these arteries and thus give better visibility to our pilots.

About a month after spraying, the areas were checked and it was perfectly obvious that practically all the vegetation in the sprayed areas was dead or dying and almost complete defoliation had resulted.

Our captain was by now thoroughly warmed up to his subject. Terrain, he explained, helps insurgent forces. This is so because it can be rugged and difficult, it can be mountainous or swampy or it can be because of vegetation and therefore the effort must be expended to defoliate.

He talked of the hills of Kiangsi, the mountains of Greece, the Sierra Maestra, the swamps of the Plain of Reeds in Cochinchina, the paddy fields of Tonkin, the jungle of Malaya—all of which give strong advantages to the insurgents.

Turning to another problem, we must understand that to occupy areas such as these requires large forces of men. It is realized, of course, that a country cannot at one time be entirely saturated. It has to be by areas. When this happens the insurgents or guerrillas merely fade elsewhere. It's like squeezing a soft balloon. The air merely pops into the ends. This was true in the Peloponnese which had been a guerrilla stronghold. When the area was saturated with loyal troops, the guerrillas merely moved to the Grammos area. It was simple for the guerrillas but hard for the loyal troops since it required a ratio of 7 to 1 loyal troops to guerrillas.

The picture became really clear as the captain said things can be accomplished but it's hard and costly in effort.

To be able to seal borders would help greatly because it would limit the enemy's freedom of action beyond the borders. This freedom has been one of the main factors which determined the duration of conflict in previous guerrilla wars. Greece was unable to crush their Communist insurgents until Yugoslavia no longer served as a support base to these armed bands who were fighting on Greek soil. It was equally true when the French were fighting the Vietnamese who were able to make use of bases in China. To seal international borders they must be clearly definable. Many obstacles have to be erected. No gaps can be permitted insofar as surveillance is concerned. All means must be utilized to prevent penetration of the border. This of course includes diplomatic intervention.

In conclusion one can reason that dense vegetation can be stripped of its foliage enabling a satisfactory amount of observation, but apparently the only satisfactory way to deny difficult terrain from unwanted encroachment is to physically occupy that terrain. In addition, in order for a nation to

survive strong internal insurgency movement, it must seal itself off from outside intervention sympathetic to the insurgents.

As the captain said: "In Vietnam, that's a tough job. Remember the length of that border."

It might be appropriate now to take a closer look at the land in Vietnam.

#### Vietnam—ITS LAND

Vietnam is an old country, one of several located on the peninsula known as southeast Asia. It was conquered by the Chinese in the year A.D. 200 and dominated by them roughly 800 years before the Vietnamese broke away to rule themselves for some 400 years.

About 100 years ago, several European nations established colonial possessions in that area. Only Thailand remained independent throughout this period of colonial development. The other seven nations have achieved their independence since World War II. During that war, the Japanese Army invaded and occupied the whole area. The allied victory did not bring peace to that part of the world. One by one the colonial powers surrendered their claims either voluntarily or in response to the nationalists' movements.

When the French moved into this area in the late 1800's, the Vietnamese were called Annamites and their kingdom encompassed the area that is now North and South Vietnam, a part of Laos and a part of Cambodia. These were three of the postwar nations that had emerged from the former French Indochina. French rule ended in 1954 and the area was divided by the Geneva accords. Let me write about the Geneva agreements for the moment.

Present at the conference were the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, Communist China, Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, and the Communist Vietnamese regime of North Vietnam.

The U.S. delegation did not take part in drafting the Geneva agreements and did not sign them. The United States was present to show its concern for the future of southeast Asia. In addition, the United States issued a separate declaration that we would abide by the agreements just as if we had signed them and would regard any violation by other parties as a serious threat to international peace and security.

Under these agreements, Vietnam was divided near the 17th parallel into two roughly equal zones. The agreements provided that at a suitable time general elections to establish a united government would be held throughout Vietnam. They have never been held.

The Geneva agreements further provided that everyone in Vietnam would be free to decide in which of the two zones he wished to live. More than 900,000 quickly left their homes in the north and moved to the south below the 17th parallel and the figure has grown to well over a million.

South Vietnam today consists of 44 Provinces roughly comparable to our States and 242 districts which are similar to our counties.

South Vietnam's 66,000 square miles is about 12 percent larger than Georgia's 59,000 square miles. It is a long narrow country shaped somewhat like a banana. It has a land and sea border some 2,200 miles long. Its sea border contains a myriad of inlets and coves and its land border runs through hundreds of miles of dense jungle and mountainous country. The length and nature of this border constitute the more arduous problems we face in our endeavors to choke off the infiltration of enemy forces and supplies.

The country is itself a land of curious mixtures. It has three distinct types of terrain. The coastal plain bordered on the west by

high hills and mountains extends approximately 900 miles south from the 17th parallel along the east coast of South Vietnam. This plain contains small cities and populated areas; there are beautiful sandy beaches backed by rolling dunes, small winding rivers and wastelands of marsh and swamp; and, of course, the rice paddies.

An inland mountainous area, the Annamite Mountain chain, extends from northern Laos, southward along the northwestern border of Vietnam and through South Vietnam to within 100 miles of Saigon. These mountains are steep-sloped and sharp-crested; an occasional narrow pass cuts a reluctant door to desolate, dense jungle. Very few people live in this mountainous area, and roads and trails are few.

Extending north and south between the South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodian borders and the Annamite chain is a high plateau. The northern and northeastern parts of the plateau contain high mountains and dense jungle forests. In the central and southern parts the mountains level to large open plains covered with tropical grasses, the jungle forest becomes less dense and roads and trails are more numerous.

The Mekong Delta area extends south and southwest of Saigon and consists of extensive flatlands. The delta is interlocked with broad, meandering rivers and streams which are connected by a network of canals and ditches. In these marshes and swamps are the rice paddies, for this is the true rice bowl of southeast Asia. Approximately half this area is continuously covered by water during the rainy season. The people generally live along the streams and canals.

Vietnam is tropical. The humidity averages above 80. There are two seasons: a wet season (monsoon) and a dry season—each about 6 months long. These seasons are reversed in the north and south—when it's wet in Saigon, it's dry in Hue.

In the southern delta region, the rains usually begin in late May and continue through September. April and early May are the hottest and most humid months of the year.

Along the central coast, the rainy season begins in October, causes periodic floods through December and continues with drizzles from January to March. July and August are the months when heat and humidity reach their peak. In pleasant contrast the highlands are usually cool at night regardless of the season.

Now let's take a look at the people of Vietnam.

#### Vietnam—ITS PEOPLE

The people of Vietnam are an old people with a long and proud tradition of civilization. Until 1946 they were known as Annamites and fought fiercely for their national freedom. They were first conquered by China in the early second century and for 900 years considered a Province of China. But around the year 1000 a nationwide rebellion drove the Chinese out and the reestablished kingdom stayed independent for the next four centuries. Again China conquered Annam but this time was driven out after only 20 years and from this time, 1428, Annam managed to maintain a status of independence from China. A short period of colonization by the French, which started in 1863, changed Annam's status to a protectorate of France in 1884. The Japanese conquered the entire area in 1940 and this ended with the end of World War II. The Geneva Agreements divided the country in 1954 and thus established North and South Vietnam.

Vietnam's population is estimated at roughly 32 million with about 15 million in South Vietnam.

There are a great many ethnic groups in Vietnam. While the majority of the population are Vietnamese, there are enough dis-

sident groups to create problems for a central government. Many of the small businessmen of the country are Chinese, most of whom were not citizens until 1954 when the Government authorized those Chinese born in Vietnam to take out citizenship papers.

Approximately 80 percent of the population live on farms—not farms as we know them but small parcels of land designed to maintain a family with just a little bit left over. Until just this past year, South Vietnam has continued to be an exporter of rice, one of its basic commodities.

South Vietnam possesses the material and human resources for a good society and the prerequisites for a normal, even prosperous life. So the U.S. assistance program was designed and in 5 years South Vietnam made substantial progress, such as:

One hundred and forty thousand peasants received tracts of farmlands.

Production of rice and rubber rose.

School enrollment tripled, matched by a similar increase in schoolteachers.

Three thousand medical aid stations and maternity clinics were established.

A National Institute of Administration was established to train Vietnamese for public careers.

Several hundred manufacturing plants were built.

Although the partition at the 17th parallel had left the north with a much greater share of Vietnam's industrial facilities, it was the south that achieved the greater economic advances. For example, in 1960 the gross national product of South Vietnam was about \$110 per person compared to about \$70 in North Vietnam. In the same year food production in the north dropped 10 percent; in the south it rose 20 percent.

The Vietnamese are generally considered to be friendly. Like Americans they speak if spoken to in the streets. They appear to be an intelligent people, anxious and quick to learn. They are a brave, courageous people and their soldiers are good fighting men.

They are a proud people. They are Vietnamese and proud of it. They don't want to be Chinese and they have proven they don't want to be French, that they don't want to be Japanese and they certainly don't want to be American. They have their own culture of which they are justifiably proud. It is part of their makeup. This great pride will enable them to win their battle.

[From the Review, March-April 1965]

#### Vietnam

(By Lt. Gen. A. T. McNamara, U.S. Army, retired, executive vice president, Defense Supply Association)

In our January-February issue we touched on the logistics problems at Cam Ranh Bay, a fine natural harbor. Since that writing I've read a very descriptive article in the Military Engineer written by a Capt. Lindbergh Jones which furthers my comments and is, of course, a professional viewpoint. In order to stress the logistics headaches of over-the-beach logistics operations, I have reprinted (with permission) several of the magazine's excellent photos.

Sand is trouble. It is trouble to equipment. It is trouble to road crews. It is trouble to storage efforts. It is trouble to maintenance. It gets in your teeth, in your hair, and in your dreams. It is trouble in many forms.

Sandy areas provide, however, an acceptable alternative to ports and provide a means to empty vessels which, must of course, be unloaded as quickly as possible.

I'm constantly startled to see the lessons of World War II featured as new problems in Vietnam. One would think we had learned little from previous wars.



People who should know better comment bitterly about the backup of ships at ports in Vietnam as though it is something new. It isn't new. We had 200-plus vessels off Antwerp at one time in World War II. They could not be unloaded for months. They faced damage from enemy aircraft, submarines, and the then-new V-2 rockets. There was a reason for their arriving in numbers since they had to cross the Atlantic in the face of killer pack submarine attacks. Therefore they traveled in convoys which were protected as best the Allies could. Consequently many vessels arrived at one time. I might add we were very happy to see these vessels.

Today we have no submarines presently worrying our shipping, nor airplanes, nor rockets. Yet we had a backup. The reason is a simple one. We had off loading problems.

I mentioned to you in earlier articles that port capabilities were limited especially in Cam Ranh Bay and the other smaller ports.

I'm sure you looked at the front cover of our January-February issue, and noted the narrow pier with the two vessels alongside. Their booms can touch. The trucks have to be backed into loading position. Therefore off loading was slow.

At least it was several months ago when this lovely natural deepwater harbor was a quiet port with one pier. Now it bustles with activities. There are four piers of different capacities, one of which was towed from the east coast of the United States. Our engineers are justly proud of their accomplishments and Cam Ranh Bay is one of the outstanding examples for it is now in full support of our troops. There is no backlog of ships at this port as of this writing. Before there were as many as 40 anchored in this 15-mile-long harbor. The timely phasing of logistic troops to far shore military efforts is most important. Military supplies can be moved in great quantity but until means are available to receive these goods problems mount up to great heights. Cam Ranh Bay is over its hump. Qui Nhon is next and will be another chapter similar to the spectacular logistics efforts of Cam Ranh—thanks to our professional logistic troops.

People who comment on military efforts assume many things. For instance the assumption that the vessel has been loaded properly and under good supervision is a common one.

Modern vessels frequently load and discharge at several ports. This causes considerable damage to cargo if carelessness in stowing has occurred. While a staff of carpenters is usually available in the general cargo trade to shore up cargo, sometimes their work is curtailed. Usually the excuse is that the sailing time of the ship will be changed or that overtime would have to be paid.

I don't say that cargoes are in fact improperly stowed, but I do say the assumption we make that all is well is a broad one and could be wrong.

It's the off loading that the military have to worry about. If something has been stowed wrong or heavy weather has shifted the cargo then the off loading operation really encounters additional problems.

Perhaps a flush type pallet has been used because this is the type that is commonly used in normal business operations within the States. Normal business is automating the palletizing efforts which they use. They dislike the wing-type pallet that the military use. As far as I can see the difference to them between the two types of pallets is miniscule.

But it is not so from the point of view of the stevedores or the crews that handle the bridles used in loading or off loading through the ships' hatches. The difficulties of

hooking and unhooking the bridles on flush pallets at our ports and in ships' holds is a far more important consideration to DOD than the perhaps doubtful advantages of the flush pallet.

Think with concern, if you will, of unloading flush pallets into a DUKW or an LCT in choppy water. The boat crews would have to have to manually unscrew the ends of the bridles to release them each time the small craft received a pallet load. The same condition prevailed at the inadequate pier at Cam Ranh Bay where the ships discharged directly into Army trucks. Again the truck crews would have to unscrew each bridle to release the flush type pallet.

Our readers must be constantly aware of the tonnage that comes via airplanes in addition to that of vessels.

The Air Force has a great variety of services to render in a theater such as Vietnam. A cross section of photos will create an image of areas that, when physically covered by actual items and tonnage, reach fantastic figures. The demands on crews and their imaginative response to requests placed on them is an example one should consider.

There are many other areas such as maps, fuel and ammunition. All take skilled personnel to handle. Aircraft are hungry for fuel and when operating aircraft are great distances from home they must be refueled in the modern technique that is now normal.

To an old five-gallon drum man or a simple tank truck supplier such as myself there is a great fascination watching a refueling operation in the air. The contrast between the old and the new methods certainly is marked. It's really breathtaking. Yet part of the old steady pipeline of effort still occurs today as sea tankers plow through the Pacific swells in a steady column to the transfer points where the air tanker can load and perform its part in this great logistic effort.

Ammunition for bombing is a tonnage and distribution problem constantly facing the supply forces. A bomber requires a heavy load to cover its target.

Fighter aircraft carry a variety of weapons for their types of targets. Precision plays a great part of the teamwork of pilot, aircraft and supply man.

Steady effort is the price our Armed Forces must pay to keep up the pressure on an enemy.

#### MAINTENANCE

While I have mentioned problem areas of mud and sand, I haven't really touched on the subject of maintenance.

It's constantly with the company commander in Vietnam. Take a QM direct support company, for example. This is typical of what a commander has to face. One has his shower and bath elements spotted along a road for 60 miles from his base camp. His ration breakdown personnel and laundry personnel are also scattered. He faces a levy for 18 maintenance men and equipment. His Graves Registration personnel are constantly out on search and recovery missions for downed helicopters and their passengers.

In spite of this distribution of his strength, this commander is responsible for class I support of some 26,000 troops in the base area—a problem further enhanced by the fact this strength is composed of joint troops with different eating habits. He must supply class III supplies for the above force plus three hospitals.

He must handle his normal company functions. His day starts early and ends late. Actually were one to go by the book he should have another direct support company plus their equipment.

This stretching of men and equipment quickly brings him into the field of maintenance. He feels the need for new laundry and bakery equipment. Spare parts and repair parts are a real problem to him.

He knows however that he would never trade this experience or job. Maturity has suddenly been thrust upon him. He feels that the basic logistics schools must get to new blood in young officers. The ones he looks at just don't seem to give a damn. His staff sergeants who seemed so good in garrison life where all equipment is installed and maintained for them seem much less than good under field conditions. They should be the ones furnishing the knowledge and experience which a commander could accept and support. He cannot do this and in fact doesn't dare accept, much less support, their acts. The commander is thrown into unexpected details of maintenance.

For instance every washer and dryer he has is deadlined. They are powered by an M38 jeep engine. This is the type that had been sold to Korea and several other countries to include the repair parts. His re-supply of parts fortunately is close by since a Korean division is a neighbor. Consequently, when four Korean jeeps were wrecked, by agreement needed parts were furnished to help his supply.

For power he is using two 30-kilowatt generators found in the command to power his washers and dryers because the 10 kilowatts mounted on the trailers simply won't carry the 18- to 20-hour workday and have long ago been burned out.

Maintenance is constantly with him. He can't stay out of it. He wishes he had spent more time when he was a student learning more about it.

He really knows that his officers and sergeants can produce. However, his team is new and he must get results. The responsibility is his. He is the company commander.

[From the Review, January-February 1966]

#### VIETNAM

(By Lt. Gen. A. T. McNamara, U.S. Army, retired, executive vice president, Defense Supply Association)

In our previous issue I gave as simply as I could a description of some of the problems associated with the insurgents or guerrillas. Then I wrote of the land itself and also something of the people of Vietnam. I have been, of course, establishing the foundation and background on which and against which I propose to describe the logistic effort which our troops have presently established in Vietnam and must increase in order to support our military effort. I will add other items of interest to the younger officer.

We have a major logistic effort which faces our U.S. troops in a distant foreign country. Add to this the ingredients of well-trained enemy guerrillas, terrain which limits the use of modern weaponry, and people who have participated in war for 20 years, and you have a military dish that is difficult to consume.

A great curiosity is inbred in a good logistics officer. Where are we going, what does the area look like, can we use the type of equipment we were trained in, is there an ability to use local facilities, if any?

All are good and sound questions.

Let's assume we seek general knowledge first and then proceed to the specific. Also we will treat airfields later since in this distant country they play such a great role in our logistic support.

Because of limited seaports and severed roads, the U.S. logistic effort is a combination of several methods. Some ships go directly to a port and are completely unloaded. Some go to a port and are partially unloaded and are then diverted to another port. Some cargoes are off-loaded into smaller vessels. All shipments, because of proper marking and sound requisitioning, reach the proper units. The question of course—are they received on time? We will talk of this later.

A brief look at a recent map shows Saigon presently is our main port. Cam Ranh Bay, a magnificent harbor, is a second, and Nha Trang, Qui Nhon, Da Nang, Hue, and Quang Tri follow.

Quang Tri, Hue, and Da Nang are all deltas of small rivers and have limited elevation above sea level—perhaps 20 feet.

Saigon, the largest port, handles over 3 million tons of cargo per year. Nha Trang, Qui Nhon, and Da Nang handle one-half million tons together.

Extensive roadbuilding programs are in process of linking Qui Nhon to Pleiku, Nmh Hoa to Ban Me Thuot, and Pleiku to Ban Me Thuot.

Thirty-two kilometers of four-lane, paved highway link Saigon and Bien Hoa.

The majority of the country's highway bridges are of temporary, wooden structure and accommodate only single-lane, one-way traffic.

There are some 20,000 buses and trucks, plus 50,000 cars in South Vietnam.

All of South Vietnam's large cities have airports capable of handling jet aircraft and most villages have landing strips for short landing-take off type aircraft.

The shoreline of most of South Vietnam is hazardous to navigation because of the many scattered islands, rocks, shoals, and bars that lie off shore especially fringing the headlands except for Cam Ranh Bay.

Hue has the country's highest rainfall average of 116 inches annually. Saigon temperatures stays in the eighties. Dalat has the lowest recorded temperature of 13° F. and the highest is 108° F. at Qui Nhon.

The country's main internal transportation system consists of 1,400 miles of primary and 700 miles of secondary canals where canal barges, small motor junks, and sampans carry freight and passengers.

Two-thirds of South Vietnam's 15,000 miles of roadway are paved and the remainder is in poor condition. The system is bottlenecked by its narrowness, many ferry crossings, fords, sharp curves, steep grades, and low bridge clearances.

The physical conditions of the countries as evidenced above, added to the types of growth of plants, trees, and shrubs have created the necessity for enclaves or base areas from which our military forces can work.

Supplies which must be offloaded into small landing craft for movement into the beach move steadily ashore. They resemble a column of ants carrying small amounts of food to store for harsher times. In this Far East country the supply man has a problem of storage. To offset the rainfall he must store on dunnage, in a well-drained area and cover to protect from torrential rains or burning sun.

He must have roads through his dump in order to quickly reach his items and his location plan must be accurate.

Local labor creates identification head-aches. Security for 360 degrees is needed around each point and you must accurately check your firing lanes so your colleagues are safe from your fire. Ask for and tie in with their fire plan also.

The logistic problems paramount in the mind of officers or logisticians are many and varied.

First let's acknowledge that there are some basic problems that seem to be present in all military areas regardless of countries. Ports present offloading problems especially if a narrow river connects it to the sea. This is the problem at Saigon, the largest port which presently handles the heavy percentage of our cargo. The port itself is part of the city with the piers parallel to the river bank. The river poses some problems. It is narrow and winding. Many ships put their bows into the mudbank and let the tide swing the vessel around.

Saigon has an airport and warfare brings storage problems to airports. Rainfall creates storage problems as the Saigon airport evidences. Some items must be protected from mortar fire.

Cam Ranh Bay is one of the finest natural harbors in the world. Presently it has but one long narrow pier in use. Ships unload on both sides. Trucks have to back up to the pier to get their loads. This creates a bottleneck. Another long pier has been recently constructed. The bay has lovely sand beaches on which LST's disgorge their loads. Vehicles can be quickly offloaded and assembled in defined areas and beach headquarters can be rapidly established.

Quat creates storage problems. It is difficult to move tons. But items must be collected and moved to storage points. Winds move sand rather rapidly and sometimes erode it from under stacks and they tumble. Sometimes the wind piles sand around and in items and they must be dug out. Ferries, homemade type, are of great assistance in quiet water.

While we are laying in this heavy logistics effort, there are other American officers assigned as training teams to various Vietnamese units who must not be forgotten. They have a unique assignment which presents difficult and challenging features to our young officers.

Let's consider a Vietnamese Ranger Battalion. Normally the Americans assign one captain, one first lieutenant, two noncoms who are light weapons infantrymen and one private first class or specialist fourth class radio telephone operator. Generally they carry two radios such as the PRC 25, a member of the new family of radios.

The captain's job consists of offering tactical advice and staff advice. The team generally tries to help in any area where their assistance is needed. Sometimes they dig for these trouble areas since people tend to ignore problem areas in the hope that time, et cetera, will straighten them out. In garrison, as we all know, they make out strength reports, after action reports and monthly summaries plus a unit evaluation. These have to do with materiel, men and overall combat effectiveness.

These reports serve to alert American channels of troubled areas or expected trouble areas. Then the advisers in these areas can confront their counterparts with the facts in an attempt to help them solve the problems.

Operations are normally conducted during daylight because during the night the unit must return to secure the compounds assigned to them to protect.

The American team's job is to accompany the battalion on the march. Usually the lieutenant with one sergeant is placed with one of the leading companies. This gives him a good vantage point where he can observe movement, etc. He checks in with the captain who is accompanied by a sergeant and his radio telephone operator. They stay with the Vietnamese battalion commander. The captain, through his communication media, has contact with the tactical operations center and observer aircraft, usually L-19's. This enables him to call in for medical evacuation, air strikes both direct and indirect, and for armed helicopters for support in ground operations.

In addition to the above, the captain must effect any specific instructions he has received from higher headquarters. His job, therefore, is to advise, communicate with the air, and pass on all timely information to higher headquarters.

Most of the young company commanders like this type of assignment. As one put it: "It's interesting, challenging, tiring, sometimes boring, and damned frustrating. But I'm glad I'm here and not with an American unit. I have full freedom, am trusted and

seeing things from their point of view—a view all too often overlooked."

Practically all officers with Vietnamese Ranger Battalions emphasize the fact that different terrain features, vegetation, etc., create unique problems for each area and that there are few common problems. One officer said " \* \* \* so I wouldn't know about area problems or their tricks of the trade unless I was there. It's funny, isn't it?"

All officers spoke of the mortars as their worst problem. One said: "My worst fear is mortars. I never realized what a weapon that was until they chased us all around one day. The next fear is booby traps and mines. These guys are pros."

## THE ROLE OF THE LAWYER IN THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, William Allen, president of the Boeing Airplane Co., has observed that:

No movement in history for the improvement of man's condition and for the establishment of justice has ever succeeded without the presence, the influence, and the leadership of great and courageous lawyers. No such movement, once established, has been maintained against opposing forces without the aid of great and courageous lawyers. (47 A.B.A.J. 981) (1961).

This observation by Mr. Allen, a lawyer turned businessman, finds ample confirmation in the lawyer's dominant and brilliant role in the political history of our country. In the beginning it was lawyers like Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, James Madison, and John Adams whose eloquence against "the history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States," sparked the drive for independence.

More than half the delegates to the First Continental Congress which met in 1775 were lawyers. Three members of the famous Committee of Five which drafted the Declaration of Independence were lawyers: Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Roger Sherman. Thirty-two of the fifty-five signatories of that document were lawyers. Thirty-five of the fifty-five members of the Constitutional Convention in 1787 were lawyers.

Independence secured, it was lawyers the likes of the great Clay, Calhoun, and Webster who debated in Congress the meaning of the Federal Constitution and the character of the National Government.

At the moment of greatest peril to the Nation, it was the down-to-earth prairie lawyer, Abraham Lincoln, who emerged from the Springfield circuit to save the Union.

It was two other lawyers, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, who led the mighty Allied forces to victory in the gigantic upheavals that have convulsed the 20th century. Both men were outstanding champions in the cause for a great and free society not only for our own people but also for all people. Both, as lawyers, foresaw that the eventual survival of this plant depended upon the establishment of law and order, and both sponsored the development of world



legal and political institutions for the pacific settlement of disputes.

In time of peace and in time of war, in the legislature and in the executive branch, as well as the judiciary, our Nation has drawn its leadership from the ranks of the legal profession. It is not surprising, then, that 24 of our 36 Presidents have been lawyers. The profession can boast among that number: John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

So, also, in the 89th Congress, as with most of its predecessors, lawyers—305 in number—make up a majority of the membership. *Congressional Quarterly*, January 1, 1965, page 25.

The attraction of public service for members of the legal profession has been the subject of comment, usually generous comment, over the years. As one might expect, the reasons advanced to explain this truly American phenomenon are many and diverse. John J. McCloy, lawyer, banker, and public servant extraordinary, has put it this way:

In our society, with a Federal Congress and 48 State legislatures, it is natural that there should be a great demand for lawyers, and I am sure that this aspect of our national life accounts in substantial part for the large number of lawyers who become public figures. We are, moreover, a legalistic country. We have a much wider field of application of statutes and regulations than is the case elsewhere. Our inheritance of governmental traditions and customs is relatively small.

In England, France, and Germany, for example, neither public nor business life requires such a familiarity with the multiplicity of legislation and regulations which we encounter. The ever-increasing volume of this material is a further reason why lawyers in this country are more apt to become interested in public affairs and more conscious of public needs. (2 *Washington and Lee Law Review* 171, 173-174 (1958).)

Others have said that lawyers are attracted to public life because of the challenge which such service presents and the satisfaction of having made a meaningful contribution to one's country and time.

Some commentators have explained the lawyer's call to public service in terms of his traditional roles of advocate and counselor. It is not unusual for those using this approach to begin with Woodrow Wilson's statement that "Politics is the struggle for law, for an institutional expression of the changing life of society."

From this basis, they proceed to draw a number of conclusions, such as, since the lawyer is constantly engaged in the interpretation of the law in the courts and the application of the law in his practice, it is only natural that he should have an interest in the execution of the law as a public executive, or in the change or development of the law to meet "the changing life of society," as a legislator; or, since the lawyer is constantly articulate in the courts in controversies, many of which are of great public interest, he is at home in the public forum pleading public causes which

he deems to be of interest to his larger client, the public interest.

Thus, we are told:

When great occasions arise when a community wishes to express its thought and feeling, or when events are to be fashioned, the lawyer \* \* \* is the most natural spokesman on such significant occasions." (Pepper, *The Lawyer Call to Public Service*, 34 *Penn. Bar Assoc. Quart.* 125, 126 (1962-63).)

While these observations serve to explain in substantial part the demand for lawyers in government and "the lawyers' call to public service," they do not fully explain why men with the training and background peculiar to the legal profession have played and are playing so predominant and successful a role in government. That this training when properly used and developed is most effective in government comes to us on high authority. Thomas Jefferson remarked that:

The study of the law is useful in a variety of points of view. It qualifies a man to be useful to himself, to his neighbors, and to the public. It is the most certain stepping-stone to preferment in the political line.

The attributes which legally trained men can bring to public service were perhaps best described by the late Justice Frankfurter. He put it this way:

The kind of faculties that are needed [for public affairs] are more likely to be trained in men brought up in the law than in any other calling—the ability to see the many sidedness of what appears to be simple problems, the ability to give to those problems the points of view of the interests of all relevant factors, factors with which, though you are not sympathetic or which, on the whole you do not think should prevail, nevertheless have to be taken into account in the final accommodation \* \* \* that is the very special claim of the lawyer; that he is by the nature of his calling, relatively heedful of intellectual disinterestedness in seeing a problem whole, analyzing a problem, taking it apart into its components. (18 *Fed. Bar. Journal* 24, 25 (1958).)

In Justice Frankfurter these attributes—industry, articulation, detachment and objectivity—reached a zenith.

It would be nonsense to think that the characteristics the Justice enumerated are exclusively the possession of the lawyer, or that they are substitutes for breadth of mind, ability, and courage. The attributes of the trained lawyer to which he referred are, for the most part, tools which all wise and capable men employ or strive to employ.

The most that can be said is that, through constant use, these tools are apt to be kept better sharpened by the lawyer, and that when he enters government, or any other endeavor, they are likely to produce more effective results in his hands than in the hands of even very able men whose pursuits have not so continuously demanded their sharpness.

Having examined the extent of lawyers' influence and representation in the history of our country, and the reasons for their preeminent role in government, I would now like to discuss the variety of legal assistance available to Members of Congress. This will bring us into contact with a little known but extremely

valuable Government lawyer—the legislative attorney. There are, of course, two avenues of internal legal assistance to Congress; namely, the Office of the Legislative Counsel and the legal staff of congressional committees. In addition to these familiar sources, Members may seek advice and assistance from lawyers on their own immediate staffs and from the lawyers of the American Law Division, Legislative Reference Service, in the Library of Congress.

Although the ready availability of such legal assistance to Members comes as little surprise to anyone, the role of the legislative attorney is not as well-known as that of his counterpart in the executive branch. The reasons for this relative obscurity are explained partly by the anonymity that cloaks his work, and partly because relatively few lawyers have the same personal contact with Congress as an institution as they do with other branches of Government.

Despite this relative obscurity, the legislative attorney plays an important role in shaping the body of law which affects everyone of us. Both in terms of influence and numbers, lawyers predominate off as well as on the floor of Congress. The predominance of lawyers in the Capitol will, if anything, continue to grow with the increased size and complexity of the congressional workload and the demand for persons with legal training.

The makeup and activities of the modern Congress are a far cry from those of the First Congress in 1789. The 26 Senators and 65 Representatives who met in 1789 had only a very tiny staff to assist them with their legislative activities. These activities consisted chiefly of action on little more than 100 pieces of legislation involving a total expenditure of \$4.5 million for the entire Federal establishment.

The present Congress, composed of 535 Members, will have before it some 18,000 bills and will pass on two annual budgets exceeding \$100 billion each. In contrast to the First Congress which had only a handful of committees and conducted no investigations whatsoever, contemporary Congresses devote a great deal of time to legislative oversight and investigation. Unlike their 18th century predecessors, today Members have a full-time, year-round occupation the scope and breadth of which requires the help of more than 2,500 nonclerical staff aids, including more than 500 persons with legal training.

Of the four kinds of legislative attorneys who assist Members in the performance of their legislative duties, doubtless those on the Member's personal staff have the broadest range of activities. Commonly referred to as legislative assistants, the staff lawyer is responsible for such things as analyzing legislation before the Member's committee or before the entire House, briefing the Member on all the relevant factors involved, and sometimes recommending a position for the Member to take. Some portion of his time will also be taken up by the preparation of bills and amendments for the Member himself to in-

introduce, and assisting the Member in working toward favorable action.

In addition, the legislative assistant, as a member of the staff, is frequently called upon to shoulder many of the other activities of the office. Thus, it is not unusual for him to draft answers to constituent correspondence and assist visiting constituents in their business dealings with the Federal Government. On occasions he may be called upon to stand in for the Member at a speaking engagement or to testify on his behalf.

Because of the farflung nature of his responsibilities, the legally trained staffman learns early the importance of cultivating contacts with various sources of "expertise" which will save him a great deal of time and effort. These contacts number among them his brother attorneys on the committee staffs, the Legislative Counsel, the Library of Congress, and in the executive branch of the Federal Government. Frequently, he will call on, and seek advice on specific matters from, nongovernmental sources, such as bar and trade associations, colleges and universities, and lobbyists.

Hence, the legislative assistant frequently is, in a very real sense, the Member's alter ego. The price paid for this close association with the Member is a high degree of anonymity outside the confines of the congressional office.

Whether the Member himself is a lawyer and/or has a lawyer on his staff, both eventually call upon the legal experts employed by the 16 Senate and 20 House standing committees that handle legislation, and some 15 or more special, select, and joint committees which are primarily concerned with conducting investigations. As might be expected, the narrow range of subjects over which each committee has jurisdiction, virtually assures that the lawyer on the staff is a qualified expert.

Although appointments of committee staff personnel are generally made by the chairman alone or in consultation with the ranking minority Member, committee aids have a responsibility to all the members of the committee. They are expected to furnish factual information about matters of committee business to any Member who requests it, including those not on his committee.

In addition to assisting Members, committee counsel are responsible for virtually all aspects of the functional operations of the committee. He prepares for hearings by calling for and arranging the appearance of witnesses, establishing lines of inquiry, and getting all the relevant legal and factual source materials. He briefs Members on all matters which arise in connection with the hearings, and upon their conclusion, assists in the committee's final deliberations, including the markup of the bill and the preparation of committee reports.

The submission of a report does not signal the end of committee counsel's involvement with a particular bill. When a bill is being considered by the entire body, he may be asked to assist in the preparation of statements or otherwise familiarize noncommittee members with

the salient details of the legislation. Finally, he must be available to assist conference members who are appointed to reconcile any differences in the Senate- and House-passed versions.

Perhaps the most specialized work in the legislative branch is performed in the Office of the Legislative Counsel. Both the Senate and the House have their own office to which members and committees turn for bill drafting services. These services are available at every stage of the legislative process—from initial preparation of a bill, to drafting amendments, to harmonizing the compromised version with the original text. The personnel of the office may also be consulted with respect to a draft prepared from any of the innumerable and diverse sources of legislation.

The art of drafting legislation is a highly specialized skill. It is an art which calls for competence of as careful an order as that required for other legal documents of the highest importance. Not only the words to be used, but also the organization and framework of the draft, as well as the sanctions, if any, by which it is to be carried into effect, must be considered and chosen with care. It requires, above all, a thorough knowledge of the subject matter of a particular measure—statutory and decisional law, administrative interpretation, as well as the entire frame of reference in which it is to operate. This formidable task is the responsibility of the legislative counsel and the 20 or so men that staff each of the offices.

Somewhere within the structure of Government there is, of necessity, a place to which legislators turn in some numbers for information. This is the function of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress. Both Members and committees are continually confronted with complex problems upon which they are supplied with reports, opinions, and recommendations of departmental experts. To assist Members, the Legislative Reference Service will report on those problems by its own team of trained specialists. In this way, Members will obtain an impartial presentation of the facts by experts who have no axe to grind. The result is that Members of Congress and congressional committees, have available on the one hand, reports of the executive departments, and on the other hand, the reports of impartial experts.

In particular, the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, consisting of some 18 lawyers, services members, and committees with a broad range of legal reports. These include such things as surveys of Federal and State legislation on a subject, legislative histories of a given measure, arguments on the constitutionality of a bill, and analysis of court decisions.

In addition, on particular request of a Member, statements will be prepared for specific use in connection with remarks on the floor or elsewhere.

Finally, the lawyers on the Legislative Reference Service staff are available for consultation on any subject within their special competence.

Lawyers in the legislative branch perform a variety of important roles in the effective operation of the Congress. By virtue of their legal training, they provide analytical skills indispensable to intelligent and judicious lawmaking. In these varied undertakings they perform what Justice Frankfurter described as "work of the greatest possible value to an ordered society."

In all the diversity of our great functions—

He went on to say—

I deem them great who belong to the great symphony that makes the legal music of the world and particularly our world, our country. (18 Fed. Bar Journal 24, 32 (1958).)

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE APPALACHIAN STATES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in the past few months, there have been a number of comments on the dispatch and efficiency with which the Appalachian Regional Commission has gone to work. I was proud to sponsor and help manage this legislation in the Senate and I have been pleased with the far-reaching action which has been undertaken and is going forward under the act.

During the adjournment of the Congress, an article in the Washington Post of Sunday, December 5, 1965, called attention to the effective work of the Commission, and particularly its Federal Cochairman, Mr. John L. Sweeney. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD today.

I would like to note also that the January 1966 issue of Fortune magazine has given a very thorough appraisal of the creative Federal concept which the Congress embodied in the Appalachian Regional Development Act. In particular, Fortune says that:

The new criterion of public spending leads the men in the Appalachian program to talk in businesslike terms about market analysis and plant-location strategy rather than in terms of social work.

The article gives credit to Mr. Sweeney for his direction of the program, and it notes that he regularly calls attention to the fact that the Appalachian region, lying between the two great markets of the United States—the eastern seaboard and the Great Lakes complex—can have a glittering economic future. It says:

The key power center is not Sweeney's office but a commission made up of the Governors of the 12 Appalachian States.

In keeping with the desire of the Congress, Fortune notes that:

States, counties, towns, colleges, and private businesses have already been stimulated to compete in presenting to the Commission proposals based upon the test of greatest potential.

The closing remarks of the Appalachian section of this article give the key to the program, both in terms of the Federal programs and the local response:

If this local initiative continues to wax, Federal coordinating functions will be a small part of the total activity. If the local initiative subsides, there won't be anything worth coordinating \* \* \*. In neither case



will Washington have increased its control of Appalachia.

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

**APPALACHIA HELPED**  
(By Julius Duschka)

When President Johnson signed the bill setting up the Appalachia Regional Commission last March, he declared: "The dole is dead. The pork barrel is gone."

Nine months later relief checks and surplus food are still helping to hold Appalachia together, but the unique Appalachian Commission appears to have convinced Members of Congress as well as Governors that it is not in the business of dispensing pork.

The Commission's real test will come in another 9 months, however, when the Nation is in the midst of the 1966 congressional campaign and the Johnson administration will be searching throughout the Government, as all administrations do at election time, for goodies for deserving Senators and Representatives.

From quiet offices staffed by only 60 persons the 14-man Commission is overseeing the spending of \$350 million in Federal funds this year in the mountainous areas of 12 States stretching from New York to Alabama.

The Commission's offices at Connecticut and R Streets NW., are a world removed from eastern Kentucky or southern West Virginia where poverty is still a depressing and degrading way of life.

But the Commission may offer the best hope, the much-studied and surveyed-to-death people of the Appalachian Mountains have yet had.

**PREVIOUS EFFORTS**

Previous efforts to help the mountain people, whose land and coal mines are no longer competitive, have concentrated most State and Federal aid in the hills and hollows where the poorest people exist.

"We're not trying to alleviate the need where it is the greatest," John L. Sweeney, Federal Cochairman of the Commission said in an interview, "but rather we're trying to get money where there is the greatest growth potential."

An assistant to G. Mennen Williams when he was Governor of Michigan during the 1950's and former aid to Senator PATRICK V. McNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, Sweeney has been intimately involved in Federal studies of Appalachia for the last 2 years.

As Federal cochairman of the Appalachian Commission, Sweeney can veto any project even though it is approved by all 12 of the Governors on the Commission. Republican Gov. William W. Scranton of Pennsylvania is State cochairman of the Commission. Also representing the States is Harry A. Boswell, a former aid to Gov. J. Millard Tawes of Maryland.

**PROJECTS REJECTED**

Under the unique Commission setup, projects must originate with the States but must have the approval of a majority of the Governors on the Commission and Sweeney.

Sweeney and other members of the Commission staff have sent back to States projects seeking money for three airports where one would do, for sewage-treatment plants unrelated to industrial development, and for roads ostensibly opening up areas for timber development but actually doing favors for county political leaders.

Nearly \$200 million—or almost two-thirds—of the \$350 million at the Commission's disposal this year is for construction of modern highways, the key to the industrial development of Appalachia.

The other \$150 million is being used for such projects as sewage plants, health facilities, vocational education, reclaiming land all but destroyed by strip mining, and developing Appalachia's abundant hardwood timber resources.

The Federal funds, all of which must be supplemented with State money, are being channeled into cities and towns that have been growing or where growth is expected.

With good roads leading to towns and cities having adequate public facilities, the Commission hopes to move people out of the countryside to jobs no more than a half-hour's drive away.

The Commission's staff works closely with officials of the antipoverty program and the new economic development program—a combination of the old depressed areas and accelerated public works programs—to coordinate all Federal efforts in the Appalachia area—West Virginia and parts of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Ohio.

**THE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on two occasions, specifically, the 27th of January and the 18th of February of this year, I have addressed the Senate concerning the small business crisis which stems from the lack of financial assistance under the direct loan program of the Small Business Administration. Since that time, my office has received many telephone calls and letters from small businessmen, whose backs are virtually to the wall. Most of these have come from Rhode Island, but I have received pleas from small businessmen from as far away as Florida and Minnesota. In order to demonstrate the seriousness of this problem, I should like to read excerpts from some of the letters that I have received. I do not wish to identify these businesses, as I do not want to jeopardize their financial condition any further by advertising the precarious circumstances with which they are confronted.

One Rhode Island businessman states that although he presently has an SBA loan, he now needs additional financing. The reason for this is that his firm has been approached by a major aircraft company which needs their services on a high priority military aircraft. This Rhode Island firm is one of the few in the country that performs the type of critical services that are needed. However, in order to perform this contract he needs additional capital. His communication to me of February 24, 1966, states, as follows:

We required an addition to our building and additional new equipment, but we are in a bind because the SBA has no funds to increase our loan and the majority of banks won't touch the SBA loan, or their terms are short payment periods that could not be met by us. We are talking about vital military equipment that we can supply and the order could total as much as \$150,000. Quite a sum for a three-man operation. Again, we hope your efforts generate enough interest to quickly allow the SBA to continue the small loan program.

Mr. President, this is an example of the type of communications that I have been receiving from small business firms who are desirous of doing subcontract,

priority, defense work but find themselves in a position where they are unable to do so because of the complete lack of direct loan assistance from SBA.

Mr. President, Senator J. Joseph Garrahy, of Providence, R.I., a distinguished member of the Rhode Island State Senate, who is associated with a small business firm in Providence, also wrote to me concerning the effect of the lack of SBA financial assistance on Rhode Island industry. I should like to ask at this time unanimous consent to insert his communication to me of February 22 into the RECORD.

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

**STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND  
PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,  
February 22, 1966.**

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: I just want to let you know how pleased I was with your statement in the Senate regarding the refunding of the SBA.

As you know, I am involved with a new company in Rhode Island started with the assistance of SBA. We have employed as many as 70 people within the last 10 months when we started here in Providence. We have the business (some of which is defense) to hire additional people if we could secure additional direct financing from SBA. It is indeed unfortunate that the very program which has encouraged new business and provided employment opportunities now forces many of these companies to curtail their business. This, of course, means reducing payrolls and less productivity.

At a time when our country is enjoying record prosperity and our defense commitments are urgent, we should be pumping new life and energy into SBA.

I am certainly happy that you have placed yourself in the forefront of this problem.

Best regards,

J. JOSEPH GARRAHY.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I could go on and on and recite to you case after case of small businesses who are literally hanging on the ropes or who have had to seriously curtail any possible thought of expansion because there is no avenue open to them to receive loan assistance at reasonable interest rates. The average small businessman has no place to turn, because SBA has been traditionally the lender of last resort. This is why the Small Business Administration was set up—to be of substantial assistance to them. It is becoming extremely difficult to tell a small businessman who has to meet a weekly payroll, who has to go out and sell his product or services, who has to work day and night to scrape along, that "assistance will be forthcoming in the near future." The Small Business Administration, when queried, indicates that their direct loan assistance program will resume some time in the near future, but to a small businessman, this is like trying to reach the horizon—we see it—we know it is there, but one could never quite put his finger on it.

Since my last statement on the floor of the Senate, on February 18, I received two communications from national organizations which represent literally hundreds of thousands of small businesses throughout the United States.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a telegram I received from Ernest H. Osgood, Jr., president of the Small Business Association of New England, in which he states, and I quote:

Our members from all corners of New England are frankly very worried and alarmed at the obvious lack of attention that this vital agency has received from the administration.

I also received a communication from C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, and ask that it, too, be included in the RECORD.

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

BOSTON, MASS.,  
February 24, 1966.

Senator CLAIBORNE PELL,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the Smaller Business Association of New England, I would like to express our appreciation and support for the excellent address you presented on the floor of the Senate last Friday, February 18. I cannot overemphasize how much we agree with your statement concerning the serious conditions existing within the Small Business Administration that have drained it of its abilities to meet crucial problems faced by smaller businesses everywhere. Our members from all corners of New England are frankly very worried and alarmed at the obvious lack of attention that this vital agency has received from the administration. There is no question that an agency the size of the SBA with no appointed administrator since August is not functioning as intended by Congress. You will agree the sudden stoppage of the direct loan program every time there is a natural disaster only results in economic hardship for businessmen throughout the country. Our members also believe that any move to place this vital agency within the Department of Commerce will result in the eventual demise of the SBA's ability to meet the problems of small business. We believe that a mistaken impression has developed from the highly publicized fact that corporate earnings after taxes increased by 20 percent during 1965. These figures represent big business profits and small business has unfortunately not had such pleasant returns. The annual rate of business failures of 14,000 will be greatly increased unless something is done soon to assist small business to compete effectively in the American marketplace.

Thank you again, and we strongly urge your continued support.

ERNEST H. OSGOOD, JR.,  
President of the Smaller Business Association of New England.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,  
San Mateo, Calif., February 23, 1966.

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: We know the Nation's entire small business community is deeply grateful for your consistent support of their cause. The speeches delivered by you on the Senate floor on January 27 and February 18 protesting the current curtailment of the Small Business Administration's most important function—loans to small businesses, are shining examples. We also know of your great concern and opposition to the transfer of the Small Business Administration to the Department of Commerce.

As you are well aware, the National Federation of Independent Business, like you, is greatly disturbed over the virtual halt in the

SBA business loan programs and over well founded rumors that this independent agency may be subordinated to the Department of Commerce.

In addition to policysetting polls, we conduct yearly factfinding surveys and, at the request of Members of Congress or committees, special surveys. In one section of our recent year-long factfinding survey ("Small Business—The Nation's Largest Employer") our members were asked if they expanded during the previous 12 months, and how many (if any) new job openings resulted. Over 70,000 responses were received. We all know small business is an essential vibrant part of our economy and that one of our prime national goals is the production of new job openings for our growing population and to reduce unemployment. In this connection, studies of our survey show that during the past year, projecting our representative expansion rates to the entire American small business community, as many as 1.5 million smaller businesses expanded creating in the process over 3 million new job openings. Obviously, small business expansion and increased employment are dependent upon availability of capital. With the present general tightening of the availability of capital, it is incomprehensible that the Small Business Administration should further hinder job creativity by being forced to curtail its loan functions.

Speaking for our more than 208,000 individual members, we emphatically oppose any effort to merge the Small Business Administration into any Government department. Members of the National Federation of Independent Business took a strong position in support of an independent agency when it was created. Since the problems affecting small businesses are even greater today, the importance of the independence of the Agency is proportionately greater.

Small Business is no small interest group, it is the largest segment of our economy, numbering 4.7 million units and employing more than 30 million of our people. It requires and deserves services and recognition on the same basis as other important segments of the economy. Congress recognized this need in establishing an independent agency in 1953 and making it permanent in 1958. When the President was senior Senator from his State he stood up for an independent agency. He gave further recognition to this principle only last year in his Executive order freeing SBA from loan policy controls by the Treasury and Commerce Departments.

We are convinced that the Small Business Administration must remain independent and not be subordinated to a Department which is considered to be "big business" oriented. We strongly recommend that you and your colleagues, who have long championed the small business cause, insist that the intent of the Congress, as written into the Small Business Act, shall not be aborted. The act reads in part:

"Small Business Administration \* \* \* shall be under the general direction and supervision of the President and shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government."

Sincerely yours,  
C. WILSON HARDER,  
President.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the national federation speaks for more than 208,000 individual members, and states:

With the present general tightening of the availability of capital, it is incomprehensible that the Small Business Administration should further hinder job creativity by being forced to curtail its loan functions.

I think it is high time that the administration and particularly the Bureau of the Budget, took a hard look at this sit-

uation in order that these abuses can be corrected and so that SBA can resume doing a job that the Congress set it up to do. It seems to me that SBA is foundering and stumbling. Since August of last year there has been no appointed Administrator. And now there have been many indications that the administration is exploring the possibility of a merger of SBA into the Department of Commerce. I think that first things should come first and that SBA should be put back on its feet financially before any premature moves are made in the direction of a possible disastrous merger.

There has been one delay after another in the establishment of a small business development center in the city of Providence. And in the past few days I received a communication from Anthony J. Agostinelli, economic opportunity director of the State of Rhode Island, which emphasizes the situation that I have been discussing here in the Senate. I should like to ask unanimous consent to insert this letter into the RECORD, along with several articles which have appeared in the press on this SBA funding problem.

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

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND & PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,

Providence, R.I., February 23, 1966.

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL,  
New Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: On behalf of the community action program chairmen and directors who recently signed a telegram to you about the extension of small business development center services, thank you for your prompt reply. A majority of those chairmen and directors decided to postpone the meeting based on words received from you and Senator JOHN O. PASTORE promising action on their concerns.

Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY has responded to us similarly.

I have followed the discussions about the small business revolving fund in Congress and am aware of your published remarks, those of Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Representatives JAMES C. CORMAN, and RODNEY M. LOVE, and others. I understand that the Senate and House Committees on Banking and Currency are discussing these issues in the form of bills—among them, S. 2729 and H.R. 12037, which pertain to our interests.

We look forward to a lifting of the moratorium which is in effect on disbursement of SBA loans because of the many demands on the revolving fund.

We hope that soon the Providence Small Business Development Center or other centers will be able to extend to all Rhode Islanders the services of the Small Business Administration.

We appreciate your efforts on our behalf.

Sincerely,  
ANTHONY J. AGOSTINELLI,  
Economic Opportunity Director.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News,  
Feb. 3, 1966]

DEMANDS FOR SMALL LOANS IS HEAVY  
(By Rice Odell)

District of Columbia firms have recently been receiving financial sustenance from the Small Business Administration at the rate of some \$232,000 a month.

That was the average figure for business and Economic Opportunity Act loans approved in the District for last July, August



and September. Then in October, the total jumped to \$275,700, reflecting a demand for such loans which has grown steadily greater in the last few months.

Speaking nationally, an SBA spokesman said that "last fall, the demand got much heavier than anticipated, and heavier than ever before."

A major factor, he said, is the tightening of credit, and the tendency of banks to turn down small firms' applications in preference for their more solid customers. The small firms then turn to the SBA for help.

#### TIGHT

The trouble is, the SBA, although it isn't out of money, has run up against its authorized ceiling, and has asked Congress to raise it. In fact, last October 11 a moratorium on direct loans (but not Economic Opportunity loans) was established.

At that time there was still \$100 million in loan applications in the pipeline, and these are being processed. So the monthly totals will not decline too much until about the end of February, when the spokesman says SBA will be in tight straits.

With such a demand for loans, SBA will probably have to work out an order of preference since it won't be able to approve all the applications it normally would.

Last July thru September, for instance, there were 51 applications in the District for \$1.9 million in loans. Of these, 18 applications for \$434,000 were declined, and 21 for \$696,000 were approved.

#### EXAMPLES

A listing of October loans in the District of Columbia shows the type of firms which are getting approval. The largest dollar share went to restaurants.

Business loans were to Dotnic, Inc., restaurant firm, for \$75,000; Dupont Specialty Shop, a retail notion and novelty store, \$2,500; Fashion Mart, \$2,000; Office Cleaners, Inc., \$15,000; and Paul Coopers, Inc., restaurant, \$42,500.

Economic Opportunity loans were to Aero Maintenance & Renovation Co., \$10,000; After Hours Delicatessen, \$15,000; AMP Dental Lab, \$25,000; Electrical Appliance Repair Shop, \$6,000; Gene Charles Hairstylist, \$8,000; Govans Printing & Duplicating, \$8,000; Lindsey & Sons, landscaping services, \$6,700; McCall's Furniture & Carpet Center, \$16,000; North Capitol Barber Shop, \$15,000; Olde Brookland Carry Out, \$9,000; Peoples Surplus, \$6,000; Professional Carpentry Service, \$4,000; and Young's Radio & TV Lab, \$10,000.

In October, another \$152,700 in loans were approved for firms in the suburbs:

In Virginia: Aquinas School, Alexandria, Montessori school, \$15,000; Halem Studios, Alexandria, ceramic workshop and gallery, \$3,500; Typhoon Fence Co., Arlington, \$12,000; Victor's Hair Fashion, Arlington, \$11,000; Old Coach Inn, Fairfax, \$1,700; Juvenile Fashions, McLean, \$15,000; Paul D. Scanlon, Reston, attorney, \$7,500; and New Light Laundry, Alexandria, \$25,000.

In Maryland: Princess Shoes, Inc., Hyattsville, \$4,000; RCA Plumbing Inc., \$15,000; Adrian Gerard Van Leen, Silver Spring, jewelry manufacturing, \$5,000; De Carlo Jewelers, Inc., Silver Spring, \$20,000; Globe Associates, Inc., Silver Spring, wholesale electronic tubes, Inc., \$12,000; and Capitol Contract Carpet Co., Upper Marlboro, \$6,000.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Feb. 22, 1966]

#### TO BE EFFECTIVE, THE SBA NEEDS REALISTIC FINANCING

Senator PELL deplored the fact the other day that the Government's Small Business Administration has cut back operations with some painful results. It is time that other Senators speak out against the completely

unsatisfactory situation into which the agency has been allowed to slip.

Since last fall, the agency has refused applications for direct loans to small business. The agency also has withdrawn partially from its commitment to make small loans under title 4 of the Antipoverty Act. The reason for both cutbacks is a lack of funds, a fact which explains the action, but doesn't settle some of the basic ironies in it.

One irony was underscored by a Rhode Island businessman who complained to Senator PELL that he couldn't get the capital he needed from the SBA to fill orders from corporations working on high priority defense contracts. When the agency was set up in 1953, Congress said that the Government should help as much as possible to see that a fair share of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government would be placed with small business firms. This policy is basic to the strength of the economy, and for that reason, it is puzzling that the policy hasn't been applied more realistically in organizing the agency's budget.

The present shortage of funds for conventional loans springs from the impact of Hurricane Betsy which tore through Louisiana and Mississippi last September, and which placed a heavy drain on agency funds to get many storm-damaged businesses back in operation. But in so doing, the agency created a virtual crisis, as Senator PELL says, in small business financing elsewhere.

Coping with hurricane damage should not be a new task for the agency. Its resources were heavily tapped after the hurricanes that swept up the Eastern coast in 1955. It was clear then—and the law makers should have grasped the lesson and acted—that SBA funds for emergencies must be something apart from those funds for conventional loans. If these conventional funds are kept separate, then the basic function of the agency, and its great importance to the economic community, could be preserved in spite of emergencies. Reforms to the agency's funding operations have been put off long enough.

[From the New Republic, Jan. 1, 1966]

#### SMALL BUSINESS IN SEARCH OF LOANS

(By David Sanford)

The Small Business Administration, which used to give loans to small businesses, has run out of money for the sixth time in its 10-year history, is accepting no new business loan applications, and has cut back other programs. The reasons given for the moratorium are unprecedented demand for business loans, and Hurricane Betsy. The hurricane has cost \$90 million in disaster loans, but a \$160 million supplemental appropriation by Congress was still not enough to avert stoppage of SBA programs. When Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, called Ross D. Davis, the Executive Administrator of the SBA, before his Senate Select Committee on Small Business to find why the agency is having so many problems, he learned very little. Didn't you get the appropriation you asked for from Congress last year? asked SPARKMAN. Yes, thank you, we got everything we wanted, replied Davis. Did you come to Congress to request a supplemental appropriation to enable you to continue your loan programs? No. Are you going to ask for a larger appropriation next year so this doesn't happen again? I don't know.

SBA's poverty will also have its effect on Negro businessmen. It has always been difficult for a Negro to get a loan to improve or expand an existing business. For a Negro to get money to start a new business in most cases has been completely out of the ques-

tion. "Minority-group people are just not bankable," said a Small Business Administration official. "They have nothing to talk to a bank about. They greet questions about collateral with 'What's collateral?' and the banker immediately loses interest."

When Eugene Foley was appointed Administrator of the SBA in 1963, the agency discovered the Negro. Foley inaugurated the so-called 6x6 program, a scheme to make loans of up to \$6,000 available for periods of up to 6 years. Character rather than collateral became the principal criterion in evaluating loan applications. Prospects of repayment replaced traditional hard banking judgments. Small business development centers were set up, first in Philadelphia, and later in New York, Washington and Camden, N.J., to help applicants fill out necessary forms and give them management training and counseling. The centers weeded out the frivolous and gave tips on advertising, display of merchandise and bookkeeping which in some cases obviated the need for a loan. Under 6x6 SBA approved 286 loans totaling more than \$1.2 million in 1964. The program was considered so successful that it was incorporated in the poverty war (in title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act) with provision for still larger loans and longer pay-back periods. The Office of Economic Opportunity earmarked \$3 million to set up small business development centers and SBA set aside \$25 million from its revolving loan fund for the first year's operations.

Hundreds of proposals have been submitted for small business development centers but officials have had to discourage most of them for lack of funds. For example, Senator SPARKMAN mentioned at the recent Small Business Committee hearing that at least six communities in his own State had requested small business development centers but had been turned down. (By last week only 35 of the centers had been set up in 19 States and the District of Columbia.) Since there is a policy of "no small business development center, no loan," potential applicants in the remaining States are out in the cold.

The Washington, D.C., center set up two branch offices when it discovered that those who came to inquire about loans and other services all lived within a mile radius of the development center. This either shows a lack in publicizing and soliciting for the program or the need for a vastly expanded network of centers. Ghetto small business development centers are not equipped to reach out to an entire city and not permitted to extend services to outlying rural areas and small towns, where nearly all business is small business and where poverty is prevalent. Rural areas, Senator SPARKMAN noted, have been neglected by the program.

More alarming still is evidence that in the South, however many poor people are benefiting from the program, not many of them are Negroes. The national rate of participation by Negroes is about 40 percent. In Corinth, Miss., the only small business development center in the State has dispensed 33 loans amounting to \$645,000, and not one of them has gone to a Negro.

Negro business has never been terribly prosperous. A preponderance of Negro business is ghetto business established originally to provide services (haircuts, restaurant meals, funerals, real estate) which were not available to Negroes from the white community. (Last summer Howard University made a count of Negro-owned and operated businesses in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Of approximately 12,300 businesses 1,534 were owned by Negroes. Of these a large majority were service operations—beauty salons, barbershops, service stations, restaurants, cleaners, real estate and funeral

homes. Service businesses also cost less to start and less to operate on a day-to-day basis since they do not depend on expensive inventories of merchandise. Now many Negroes shop outside the ghetto and marginal ghetto operations have a hard time competing with more prosperous white merchants. Some businesses were established simply to provide employment for their owners. But few have made a killing in business. Yet for many Negroes business continues to be the only alternative to unemployment or the underground. And without help it will probably never become a truly viable alternative.

Eugene Foley, who has left the SBA to become an Assistant Secretary of Commerce and director of economic development, predicts that if anything, there are likely to be fewer Negro businesses in 10 years than there are now, but not because the ghetto and the distinction between white and Negro enterprise will disappear. Rather, he feels that as the walls of segregation are lowered and the incomes of Negroes improves, there will be great business opportunities awaiting exploitation that will be snapped up by profit-smelling white businessmen.

The poverty of the SBA is having an unfortunate effect on the poverty loan program. Title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act, approved in August 1964, provides for long-term, low-interest business loans for poor people or for persons who agree to hire the poor. In November, SBA quietly decided to curtail the program by restricting loans solely to the poor and by reducing the amounts of the loans. The change in policy will have the effect of eliminating from eligibility for any Federal or private loan program a class of very small businessmen, many of them Negroes, who cannot meet SBA's strict income definition of poverty but who are, like virtually all Negro businessmen, in some sense impoverished. Take the case of Reginald Hart.

#### VERY SMALL BUSINESSMEN

Reginald Hart was a salesman and ultimately the manager of a chain shoe store in Cleveland. After 5 years with the firm the 26-year-old Negro decided to go into business for himself in Washington, D.C. He tried to interest investors or get a partner who could put up the necessary initial capital but found no takers. He tried to get a bank loan but was told that he had to be worth \$45,000 to borrow \$15,000, and he had only about a thousand dollars in the bank. So he went to the Small Business Administration, which grants loans only to persons who have been unable to secure loans from other sources. Hart had very little collateral and therefore could not qualify for SBA's regular business loan program. And he was not, at least by SBA definition, poor. But he said he would hire two bona fide poor people to work in his store if SBA would give him the \$20,000 he needed to get the business started. Hart had to wait nearly a year for the bureaucratic wheels to turn (the first Economic Opportunity loans were approved last April), but he got his money. And he got his shoe store. If Hart were to apply today for the same loan he would be turned down, because SBA will no longer approve a loan unless the applicant (in the case of a single man) makes less than \$2,310 a year. Even if Hart were to qualify he could not get so large a loan; the maximum loan now is \$15,000.

SBA officials say that under the new policy the agency will be able to give out more loans with the modest \$25 million allocated for the poverty loan program for this fiscal year, and it will be able to give them directly to the people who need the help. But this is not the only interpretation that can be given to the action. Critics contend that very few applicants for the Title IV

assistance will now be able to qualify at all. (Seventy percent of the loans approved by SBA prior to the policy change went to persons agreeing to hire the poor, not to the poor themselves.) Add to this the fact that the program has never been more than a token effort (744 loans approved by December 14 totaling \$9 million) and there doesn't seem to be much of a program left.

SBA was created a decade ago for the purpose of closing what was referred to as the credit gap—the difficulty small businessmen had in securing long-term loans from banks. But, according to Berkeley Burrell, president of the (Negro) National Business League, prior to 1963 “we were hard pressed to find the names of five Negroes who had gotten SBA loans in the entire history of the agency.”

To SBA a small business is one grossing less than a million dollars a year. There are about 4.7 million such businesses in the United States. SBA pretty much ignored the “small small business,” the one whose only contribution to the national economy is the support it gives to its owner and his family. SBA's primary interest before 1963, and in some of its programs now, was in loans to companies which show promise of growing to serve a regional market, which produce a new product or process. Most Negro businesses are not in this category. There are relatively few Negro businesses and the majority of the shops, even in ghetto areas, are owned by whites. (The Harlem and Watts riots have been attributed in part to Negroes' feeling that nothing belongs to them. Some of the businesses that escaped looting and burning in Watts had signs in their windows identifying them as “soul brothers” or “Negro owned.”) Those Negro businesses that there are, traditionally have barely supported their owners. The change in SBA policy to exclude those who don't meet rigid income criteria means that there will continue to be a credit gap.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 4, 1966]

#### NEGRO AID MUDDLE—FEDERAL PROGRAMS TO HELP BUSINESSMEN AT CROSS PURPOSES

(By Monroe W. Karmin)

WASHINGTON.—It's all so embarrassing. Just as upper-echelon Johnson administration thinkers are beginning to talk up new ideas to help the Negro businessman, lower level bureaucrats have come up with a stunning innovation of their own. They have cut off the Negro businessman's main supply of existing aid from Uncle Sam.

This turn of events will shock Eugene P. Foley, now an Assistant Secretary of Commerce and previously top man at the Small Business Administration (SBA). Mr. Foley has been, and still is, the driving force behind the Federal effort to get more Negroes into a broader range of businesses. Right now he's pushing a variety of new Government programs to meet the complaints of Negroes that most ghetto businesses are owned by whites.

But before Mr. Foley proceeds much further with his new thoughts, he'd better talk to Benjamin Goldstein about what has happened to an old Foley idea. Mr. Goldstein is in charge of the SBA program that lends money to Negro entrepreneurs—or used to, anyway. He has just returned from a painful gall bladder operation to the discomfiture of a spreading political controversy.

“We've had a tremendous amount of complaints, from small business development centers, from Negro businessmen, from Congressmen, from everybody,” Mr. Goldstein sighs.

#### THE CAUSE OF DISTRESS

The cause of Mr. Goldstein's distress is a bureaucratic equation worthy of the most adept mathematical mind.

It begins with an experimental program, launched by Mr. Foley a year ago, to funnel SBA loans, at easy rates and under relaxed credit standards, to Negroes with business ambitions. Terms: Up to \$6,000 repayable over 6 years, or “6 x 6.” The experiment worked so well, so quickly, that the President's war on poverty not only incorporated the Foley idea but substituted an expanded version. Current terms: Up to \$15,000 repayable over 15 years, or “15x15.”

The antipoverty program is supposed to benefit the poor in general, not just the Negro. So, “15x15” managers initially established two categories of those eligible for loans: One, the poor themselves, as defined by the poverty-fighting Office of Economic Opportunity; two, expansion-minded entrepreneurs—mostly Negro businessmen as it turned out—who pledged to hire the poor in return for easy credit. But because the demand for “15x15” came largely from those already in business, policymakers decided they had missed their mark—financing the entry of poor people into the business world—so they eliminated the second category of eligibility.

Thus, as far as the Negro businessman who might seek SBA money via category 2 is concerned, the result of bureaucratic calculations becomes: “6x6” plus “15x15” equals 0.

Berkeley G. Burrell, president of an organization of Negro businessmen called the National Business League, has figured out the answer. “The effect of the change is that the Negro businessman who has had some experience is cut out altogether.” Alfred Stites, director of the District of Columbia Small Business Development Center (a poverty-fighting creation that's supposed to help poor folks get into business by giving them counsel along with money), agrees: “The result is to eliminate the Negro businessman.”

But that is not the worst of the matter. In order to qualify for an antipoverty SBA loan, a businessman had to be ineligible, as too great a risk, for SBA's regular loan program, which requires that an applicant first be turned down by local banks. Thus, the experienced Negro businessman, by being removed from the antipoverty program, is left with no place to go for financing.

Instead, SBA's antipoverty loan program now seeks the really poor person who has had little or no business experience and can prove his impoverishment under OEO standards. This means a single man must show income of no more than \$2,310 a year; a man and wife, no more than \$2,985; and on up to a family of seven which must show income of no more than \$6,590.

To Mr. Burrell, this is an impossible quest. “You really have to beat the bushes for these people,” he declares. “They are totally unsophisticated; they cannot even read the newspapers. You will have to go down to the unemployment compensation boards to find entrepreneurs standing in line. These people are the least likely to have business experience and the most likely to fail.”

Which is precisely the predicament that faces Mr. Stites in his search for District of Columbia loan applicants. Now he is supposed to send SBA candidates who are poor by OEO standards, which means they have failed to earn more than minimal incomes for several years, yet who can offer SBA sufficient assurance of success in their new business propositions to satisfy the agency's requirement that loans be repaid.

“You cannot do both,” Mr. Stites declares, throwing up his hands. Since SBA eliminated category 2 eligibility on November 15, the District of Columbia Small Business Development Center has been unable to develop a single new loan application. “Nobody has met the screening test yet,” Mr.



Stites reports. There are 35 SBDC's throughout the country facing the same dilemma.

SBA headquarters claims to have no national statistics available yet on the program's experience since the November 15 change. Until then, \$7.4 million of a \$25 million kitty had been put out in loans. Messrs. Burrell and Stites still hope to lend the entire amount by the end of the fiscal year next June 30, but are sure the program has come to a complete halt, unless revisions are made.

Eric Beshers, an assistant to Mr. Goldstein, defends the crisis-causing November 15 change as being designed "to refocus the program more sharply toward creating opportunity for the disadvantaged, especially in the light of the not large amount of money we have available."

The second category of applicants, businessmen promising to hire the poor, tends to stimulate employment, not business opportunity, he contends. And, he notes, "the administration as a whole has a great many more programs to stimulate employment."

Mr. Goldstein, himself, is more concerned with reexamination than defense. "There's no question about it," he admits, "the whole program has been slowed tremendously." Prescribing a remedy is not easy, however. While SBA lends the money, OEO seems to control policy. "This position of focusing on the poor was taken mainly by OEO," Mr. Goldstein says. Right now he's trying to convince the poverty fighters otherwise.

While Mr. Goldstein tells Sargent Shriver's aids of the crisis at SBA, Mr. Foley over at the Commerce Department is promoting the promise held by SBA and other Federal programs to improve the lot of the Negro businessman and life in the Negro ghetto.

One of these is SBA's local development company program, which lends up to 80 percent of the funds, repayable at 5.5 percent over 25 years, needed by a nonprofit corporation that finances businesses considered promising to the economic development of a community. Mr. Foley says the program has been "virtually unused" and holds "great promise" of uplifting life in the ghetto if worked in with broader urban renewal efforts.

#### GUARANTEEING LEASES

Another is SBA's new authority to guarantee the leases of small businessmen up to 10 years. "The great significance in this authority," says Mr. Foley, "lies in the fact that private mortgage money which has heretofore not invested in slum areas can be fully protected."

But Howard Rogerson, who now is devising standards for the lease guarantees, is having problems like Mr. Goldstein's. Mr. Rogerson's present inclination is to shy away from the OEO-classified poor who want lease guarantees so they can go into business. He leans instead toward aid for already operating businessmen who are displaced by urban renewal. And his reasoning can only add to Mr. Goldstein's distress: "We feel," Mr. Rogerson says, "that there is more potential under the relocation programs, because in most cases these are sound businesses."

Mr. Foley sees potential aid to the Negro in a variety of other Federal activities, but the program closest to his heart is SBA's anti-poverty lending. Discussing it, he waxes enthusiastic. "The management training and individual management counseling should make it possible for enterprising Negroes to begin in business, modernize, and expand. This has to be done if any start is to be made in creating a respectable Negro business tradition."

What's been accomplished up to now is a "promising beginning" but "still not enough," he declares. "Its most important aspects are that the successes will be more immediate and more visible than successes

to be achieved under the other programs of the anti-poverty campaign. \* \* \*

Mr. Foley, talk to Mr. Goldstein.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this report of a merger or, as it has sometimes been referred to, a shuffle of the Small Business Administration to the Department of Commerce, is somewhat appalling. To my mind, the real shuffle is the one that the small businessmen are receiving. If our country is to remain strong in these days of national crisis, then we must look to our people for strength. The strength of America has been the small businessman, the corner drugstore, the small manufacturer, the local clothing outlet. If these are to survive and flourish, then we in the Federal Government must assist them in this direction and not attempt to pull the rug on them.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12563) to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I rise to explain and support the provisions of H.R. 12563, the Asian Development Bank Act.

The bill before us today authorizes the President to accept membership on behalf of the United States in the Bank, authorizes the appropriation of the full amount of the U.S. subscription of \$200 million and contains several provisions of law necessary to make the membership of the United States effective. The bill requires the approval of the Congress for certain future actions which the United States might take with respect to the Bank.

Members have available to them the favorable report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on H.R. 12563, and the hearing conducted by the Committee on February 16 to which is appended the charter of the Bank and a U.S. Treasury Department special report on the Bank. I shall not take the time of Members to review the provisions of the Bank's charter in detail, but I should like to stress a few points before a vote is taken.

The Bank is the result of an initiative on the part of Asian countries in the United Nations Commission for Asia and the Far East, or ECAFE as it is popularly known. The Bank will be located in

Asia, 19 of the 31 countries that have signed the Bank's charter are Asian countries, the President will be Asian, and Asian countries are contributing 65 percent of the \$1 billion capitalization.

The purpose of the Bank is stated succinctly in article I of the Bank's charter. It is:

To foster economic growth and cooperation in the region of Asia and the Far East \* \* \* and to contribute to the acceleration of the process of economic development of the developing member countries in the region, collectively and individually.

Membership in the Bank is open to the members or associate members of ECAFE and to other regional countries and non-regional developed countries which are members of the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies. There are two methods by which countries eligible for membership can join the Bank. Those that have signed the agreement and deposit instruments of ratification by September 30, 1966, become charter members. Other countries which are eligible to join the Bank but do not do so as charter members may be admitted by a vote of two-thirds of the Governors representing three-fourths of the total voting power.

Communist China, North Vietnam, and North Korea are, therefore, not now eligible to join the Bank because they are not members of the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies. The Soviet Union, and the other European Communist countries which belong to the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies, are eligible to join if they are developed countries. The Soviet Union was the only Communist country represented in Bangkok last October when the draft charter was negotiated. However, the Soviet Union did not subsequently express an interest in joining the Bank and did not sign the charter. Therefore, neither the Soviet Union nor the other developed European Communist countries which are members of the United Nations may join the Bank as charter members. They may be admitted, after the Bank comes into operation, by a vote of two-thirds of the Governors of the Bank.

I have already remarked that Asian countries are contributing 65 percent of the capitalization of this Bank. Of the remaining 35 percent being contributed by non-Asian countries, the United States is contributing 20 percent or \$200 million. Our subscription is, therefore, smaller in amount and in terms of the percentage of the total capitalization, than is the case in any of the other multilateral international financial institutions to which the United States belongs.

Of the U.S. subscription of \$200 million, \$100 million must be paid in; the remaining \$100 million is callable. The first installment of the \$100 million to be paid in is \$20 million and it is due 30 days after the charter enters into force. Four future installments of \$20 million each will be due in each of the 4 succeeding years. Of these \$20 million installments, \$10 million is to be paid

in cash and the remainder in demand obligations. The subscription, without payment, of the entire \$100 million of callable capital is due at the same time as the first installment of paid-in capital.

Hence, the only portion of the U.S. subscription which enters the balance-of-payments accounts at the time of payment is \$10 million in the first year and \$10 million each of the 4 succeeding years. According to the Treasury Department, there is reason to believe that some, or even all, of the minimal short-term balance-of-payments effects will be offset. Under Secretary of the Treasury Barr told the Committee on Foreign Relations on February 16 that, over a somewhat longer term, there would be no net balance-of-payments cost resulting from our participation in the Bank. He noted that procurement by the Bank will be limited to member countries and that the Bank will finance mainly the purchase of capital goods of which the United States is a major international supplier. Furthermore, the group of countries in which the bulk of the Bank financing is likely to take place includes many in which the United States enjoys a strong competitive position.

In the hearing held by the committee there was considerable discussion of the special funds for which the Bank's charter provides. By a vote of the Board of Governors, the Bank may set aside not more than 10 percent of the paid-in capital to establish one or more special funds. These special funds may be used to guarantee or make loans with longer maturities, a longer deferred commencement of repayment, and lower interest rates than those that apply in the Bank's ordinary operations. The Bank may also accept special funds from contributing countries providing they serve the Bank's purposes and come within the Bank's functions. Any contribution by the United States to such a special fund which the Bank may agree to administer, as distinguished from the special funds the Bank may itself establish, would require prior congressional authorization.

I know that several Members are concerned about the role of the private sector. I hope that they will be reassured by the statement made to the committee on February 16 by David E. Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development. He said:

The Bank will also play a major role in carrying forward another basic policy of our own assistance program—strengthening the role of the private sector. The Bank will do this in several ways—by identifying particular projects which can attract private capital; by helping to draw up development plans and stimulate policies which will encourage private initiative; by insisting, as have similar institutions, on strict economic and banking standards which will encourage initiative and efficiency on the part of borrowers; and by drawing private capital to the region through its regular operations and by helping to tap other sources and put them to work in the region.

Eugene Black, the eminent former President of the World Bank who has been instrumental in the formulation of the Bank's charter, told the committee

during its hearing on the bill before us that the Bank "can become not simply a product of cooperation but one of the important generators of cooperation." In this sense, I regard the Bank as a particularly hopeful and welcome development. If it can succeed not only in helping Asian countries to help themselves in promoting investment and expanding the economic growth of the region but also in stimulating cooperative spirit among Asian countries, its contribution will be significant indeed. The fact that the charter of the Asian Development Bank has been modeled closely after the charters of the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank and the further fact that the Bank has the strong endorsement of Eugene Black are promising signs that the Bank will prove to be a successful institution.

While the Asian Development Bank will not replace the bilateral economic assistance programs of the United States in Asia, it should provide an effective complement to these programs in many ways. And as the Bank prospers and its capital is increased, it may be possible for the United States to reduce some of its bilateral assistance programs. Furthermore, the Bank will spread the burden of economic assistance to the developing countries of Asia by bringing funds into the region from developed countries which have not contributed before and by increasing the assistance being provided by other developed countries outside the region.

The Bank will come into existence when 15 countries, 10 of which must be regional countries, ratify the agreement establishing the Bank. It is obviously important for the United States to be represented when the Bank is organized and the initial decisions are made regarding its future operations.

I, therefore, urge the Senate to vote favorably and promptly on this bill. There was no opposition at all to the measure in committee. The measure was unanimously reported.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I speak today in lieu of offering an amendment which I had intended to offer to the bill. The amendment I had intended to offer deals with the matter of private enterprise process in the development of Asia.

Mr. President, my credentials in this matter are sound. I believe that every private enterprise amendment to foreign aid bills of the United States—certainly since I have been a Senator, and going back to my service in the other body—has in some way been related to the work that I have done.

I have been instrumental in bringing about the organization of an international private investment company which is multilaterally designed by the private enterprise of Europe, North America—that is, Canada and the United States—and Japan to aid the flourishing of the private enterprise system in Latin America.

We have very carefully analyzed the charter of the Asian Development Bank and the hearings on H.R. 12563. I state

at the inception that I support the measure. I do not want to do anything to impede the passage of the measure. I have decided against the introduction of an amendment because I think that what I have in mind can be accomplished without an amendment.

I am always aware of the fact that if one seeks to amend a measure on which there is approval, he runs the danger of encountering opposition to the bill and some possibility of delay.

The amendment which I had in mind to offer, Mr. President, would have been to insert on page 2, after line 15, a new subsection to read as follows:

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that the resources of the Bank should be utilized to the maximum extent possible to support development by private enterprise, and that the Director of the Bank who is appointed by the President should, in the exercise of his functions, work for the implementation of this policy.

Mr. President, the reason why I do not believe that sufficient emphasis on the development of private enterprise is indicated—and I emphasize that word "indicated"—in the operations of the Bank, is attributable to the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and to some of the answers to questions which I posed to the administration witnesses through the very kind offices of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Those answers, Mr. President, are contained in the record of the hearings, pages 44 through 47, and I ask unanimous consent that I may include in my remarks such questions and parts of the answers as may be pertinent.

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

#### RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS POSED BY SENATOR JAVITS

1. How much of the Asian Development Bank's funds would be devoted to public infrastructure projects and how much to develop private enterprise directly?

The articles of agreement of the Asian Development Bank, in specifying the Bank's functions, state that it shall "promote investment in the region of public and private capital for development purposes." The articles do not prescribe that any minimum proportion of its financing must be devoted either to public or private projects. The relative emphasis given to private sector as against public sector projects will be a matter of policy to be worked out by the Bank's Board of Directors once it is established.

In view of the realities of the Asian situation, however, including the fact that many of the Asian economies have only a minimum infrastructure in being, it is possible that a large portion of the Bank's early lending will be for such basic projects as roads, ports, irrigation, transportation, power, and the like.

Nevertheless, the Bank's articles give it ample authority to take full advantage of what are expected to be substantial opportunities for private sector lending. The fact that the Bank's Asian sponsors took care, in negotiating the articles, to include broad authority for private lending is good assurance that the Bank will be properly oriented to the desirability of such lending.



2. How does the Bank propose to promote the inflow of private capital into Asia?

Among the ways the Bank may promote the inflow of private capital into Asia are the following:

By making loans to enterprises along with funds from private sources, where it is not feasible to finance the project entirely from private sources.

By offering guarantees to private investors on their loans for projects in the region.

By selling its own securities in world capital markets and channeling the proceeds into development projects in the region.

By selling to private investors portions of loans it has made, thereby replenishing its lendable funds.

By contributing, through the effects of its financing operations as well as through its technical assistance activities, to a healthy private investment climate in its member countries.

3. What authority is given to the Bank under the articles of agreement setting up the Bank to make loans or equity investments in private enterprise projects?

The Bank's general authority to make loan financing available includes full authority to lend to private enterprise projects. There are no provisions of the articles specially applicable to private enterprise projects, except the provision that the Bank may, when it deems it advisable, require a government guarantee of a loan for a private project. Regarding equity investment, the Bank is authorized (after a majority vote of its Governors determining that the Bank is in a position to commence such operations) to invest in the equity capital of an institution or enterprise. The articles limit such investment at any one time to a maximum of 10 percent of its paid-in capital, reserves, and surplus.

4. How do the provisions of the Bank's articles differ from, or are similar to the articles of the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank regarding financing of private enterprise projects? (Please cite from both articles; indicate operations of the two Banks in this field.)

As indicated above, the only distinction drawn in the Asian Bank's articles between financing of a private enterprise project and other projects is with regard to the possibility of a guarantee being required for the former. The same is true with respect to the Articles of Agreement of the World Bank and the Inter-American Bank. For both of these institutions, loans to private enterprise projects are subject to the same terms and conditions as loans to other projects, with the exception of the guarantee provisions.

The World Bank's provision on guarantees for private enterprise loans is a mandatory one, as follows (art. III, sec. 4, IBRD Articles of Agreement):

"The Bank may guarantee, participate in, or make loans to any member or any political subdivision thereof and any business, industrial, and agricultural enterprise in the territories of a member, subject to the following conditions:

"(i) When the member in whose territories the project is located is not itself the borrower, the member or the central bank, or some comparable agency of the member which is acceptable to the Bank, fully guarantees the repayment of the principal and the payment of interest and other charges on the loan \* \* \*"

On the other hand, the Inter-American Bank, like the Asian Development Bank, has an optional provision regarding guarantees (art. III, sec. 8, IDB Articles of Agreement):

"In the case of loans or guarantees of loans to nongovernmental entities, the Bank may, when it deems it advisable, require that the member in whose territory the project is to be carried out, or a public institution or a similar agency of the member ac-

ceptable to the Bank, guarantee the repayment of the principal and the payment of interest and other charges on the loan \* \* \*"

Differing from the Asian Bank, neither the World Bank nor the Inter-American Bank are authorized by their respective articles to engage in equity financing.

The World Bank provided through fiscal year 1965 a total of \$1.4 billion of financing for private industrial projects. Through the end of calendar 1965 IDB provided a total of \$396 million for such projects.

5. Would you supply for the record a table indicating the amount and country of origin of private capital invested in the area to be serviced by the Asian Development Bank and the annual net flow of private capital in the past 5 years?

No systematic data are available showing private capital flows into the Asian regional countries by country of origin. Such figures as are available on capital flows to the region are not up to date. The attached table is a compilation from individual country balance-of-payments tables, of estimated private capital inflows during the 5 years 1959-63.

Private investment flows to Asian Development Bank recipient countries, 1959-63

	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
Cambodia	16	-13	-6	10	-4
Ceylon	-1	-1	-1	-1	1
China	5	17	16	9	18
India	-17	58	-10	-3	21
Iran	3	21	6	-76	-50
Korea	1	3	-	9	42
Malaysia	18	82	92	108	124
Pakistan	8	29	28	24	74
Philippines	63	56	13	-3	-30
Thailand	20	18	32	72	79
Vietnam	1	3	1	12	2

Source: International Monetary Fund balance-of-payments yearbooks.

6(a). What is the U.S. Government doing at the present to promote the flow of U.S. private capital to developing countries in Asia through AID, etc.?

The U.S. Government stimulates the flow of U.S. private capital to the less-developed countries of Asia by (1) working with the governments of these countries to create conditions which facilitate private economic activity, and (2) by promoting American private investment in these countries.

AID's efforts to improve the climate and conditions for private sector development take several forms. Through its country assistance programs AID is helping to identify and provide the resources to carry out needed reforms in governmental policies, regulations, and plans affecting the private sector. The needed reforms range from improved tax structures and new investment laws to exchange rate changes. For example, an AID loan to Pakistan in 1964 was a key element in that country's successful import liberalization program. AID is working closely with the Indian Government and with American firms to remove roadblocks to private investment in India, particularly in the fertilizer industry. In Thailand and Korea, AID is conducting detailed studies of the climate for both local and foreign investment. These studies were stimulated by the President's Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid (the Watson Committee).

AID is continuing its program of assistance to institutions, such as the Industrial Development Corporation in Nepal and India's Industrial Finance Corporation, to open more sources of credit for private borrowers. AID is assisting the Philippines Economic Development Foundation, the Board of Investment in Thailand, the Investment Advisory Center of Pakistan, and similar institutions in other Asian countries which play an important investment promotion

role. Through its assistance to technical and vocational training schools, AID is also continuing its efforts to develop the skilled manpower essential to private sector development.

The U.S. Government has a broad spectrum of information, risk sharing, and financial programs specifically designed to encourage U.S. private investment in the developing countries of Asia and elsewhere. AID, the Department of Commerce, and the Export-Import Bank work closely together to make these programs effective. The U.S. Government emphasizes the importance of U.S. private investment and publicizes its incentive programs through sustained liaison with business organizations, publications, speeches, and personal contacts. AID's Catalog of Investment Information and Opportunities provides a single reference source for basic data and specific feasibility studies. A special southeast Asia supplement to the catalog will be published shortly and will include a large amount of new material on specific investment situations.

During 1965 AID and the Department of Commerce helped to arrange a visit of American businessmen to Vietnam to explore investment opportunities and brought a group of Korean businessmen to the United States to discuss possible joint ventures with American firms.

Through its investment survey program, AID shares 50 percent of the cost of examining new investment opportunities, should the businessmen decide not to invest. To date, 72 investment surveys have been completed or are underway in Asian countries.

Potential investors in the developing countries of Asia can obtain insurance against convertibility, expropriation and war, revolution, and insurrection through AID's specific risk guarantee program. In fiscal year 1965, contracts for specific risk guarantees totaling \$150 million were issued for an estimated \$50 million of U.S. investment in the Near East, south Asia, and the Far East. Extended risk coverage is also available to U.S. investors. One of the four extended risk contracts authorized to date is for a U.S. investment in a private fertilizer plant in Korea. During the past year, the coverages available under the investment guarantee program was extended in Korea, Singapore, and Thailand. The United States now has investment guarantee agreements with 17 Asian countries.

The U.S. Government provides both local currency and dollar financing for U.S. private investors. AID and the Export-Import Bank make dollar loans to private borrowers. In fiscal year 1965, AID authorized three dollar loans for private projects in Korea and Pakistan totaling \$51.5 million. AID administers the local currency "Cooley" loan program. Cooley loans are now available in the Republic of China, Korea, Ceylon, Cyprus, Greece, India, Iran, Israel, Pakistan, Turkey, and the United Arab Republic. In fiscal year 1965, AID authorized in these countries Cooley loans totaling \$51 million.

New U.S. investment in the developing countries such as those in Asia is also encouraged by a preferred position in the program of voluntary restraints on investment undertaken to strengthen the U.S. balance of payments.

6(b). Are we doing anything through DAC to encourage industrialized countries to do the same?

The U.S. Government sponsored and is actively supporting DAC's ad hoc working party on private enterprise. The working party held its first meeting in October 1965, and is preparing a work program for DAC consideration. Primary stress will be placed on (1) improvement of statistics on the nature and extent of private capital flows to the developing countries, (2) pilot surveys of training programs and technical assistance sponsored by private sectors of developed

countries in the developing countries, (3) private investment conferences in selected developing countries, (4) exchange of information and experience on investment incentives.

The availability of AID's Catalog of Investment Information and Opportunities has been publicized in DAC. Other industrialized countries have been encouraged to provide studies for inclusion in the catalog.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there are two questions involved here. One is the adequacy of the paid-in capital of a bank, and the other is the likelihood that a real effort will be made on the part of a bank to assist in a substantial way the broadening of the flow of private funds which are so urgently required in Asia.

I base my conclusions on the following facts:

The Bank's resources are limited—during the first 5 years paid-in capital will total \$100 million per year, only 20 percent in nonconvertible currencies. Eugene Black, to whom we are all very deeply indebted, has been instrumental in bringing about the organization of this Bank, with which, I repeat, I thoroughly agree. He and the Treasury Department admit readily in their testimony that during the initial years at least the Bank's loans will be directed largely toward infrastructure projects. This would require such enormous funds as to take up all the Bank's capital, without much question.

Even though the articles of the Bank authorize it to make loans to private enterprise, to guarantee loans to private enterprise, invest in development banks and eventually to make equity investments, funds for such purpose will therefore be limited, if nonexistent, in the first few years.

Indeed, the articles of agreement do not prescribe that any minimum proportion of its financing must be devoted either to public or private projects. This will be left to the discretion of the Bank's Board of Directors.

I wish to point out, in this respect, that though the record of the other international lending agencies is a better one than is now indicated by what we are going to find here, it is a fact that even the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank are not doing enough with respect to backing private enterprise, in order to accelerate and broaden the flow of private funds into the areas with which they are concerned. For example, of World Bank's total financing through fiscal year 1965, 16 percent was set aside for financing private industrial projects—\$1.4 billion out of total of \$8.78 billion; of Inter-American Bank's total financing through calendar year 1965, 26 percent was provided for such projects—\$396 million out of total \$1.5 billion. If Asian Bank follows similar pattern, its loans and investments to private sector will be insignificant indeed.

Now, it is to be said at once that the International Finance Corporation, which is an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, has provided already \$1.5 billion in loans and investments to the private sector since its inception, but the Asian Bank, that is, the Asian Development Bank we are authorizing United States

membership in now, has no such counterpart.

The Inter-American Development Bank also does not have an investment affiliate, but I think it is fair to say that the Adela Investment Co., to which I referred awhile ago, somewhat stands in a similar relationship to the Inter-American Development Bank, as does the International Finance Corporation to the World Bank.

Mr. President, I hope very much that the U.S. Director to the Bank will direct his attention to the organization either of a private enterprise company like Adela, or to the development of an investment affiliate like the International Finance Corporation for the Asian Development Bank.

Mr. President, it should also be pointed out that there are no provisions in the articles especially applicable to private enterprise projects, except the provision that the Bank may, when it deems it advisable, require a Government guarantee of a loan for a private project.

The articles in fact limit equity investment by the Bank at any one time to a maximum of 10 percent of its paid in capital, reserves, and surplus. The Bank is authorized to make equity investment in a private institution or enterprise only after a majority of its Governors determine that the Bank is in a position to commence such operations.

Mr. President, there is a great deficiency of private capital flow into Asia. Neither the Bank nor other U.S. Government programs in existence have generated adequate private investment flows to the developing countries of Asia. This is also true of the efforts of other industrialized countries. With the population of developing countries in the area totaling 718 million in 1963, the total flows of private investment—from all countries, including the United States—totaled less than \$200 million annually in 1959, 1961, 1962 and less than \$300 million annually in 1960 and 1963.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that the private enterprise system of the Western industrialized nations, as is shown by its great interest in the Adela Investment Co., which is a fabulous success, shows every indication of being ready to undertake a much greater role in what will contribute to the objective of foreign aid than ever before in the whole history of foreign aid since the end of World War II.

The Asian Development Bank does not have nearly the size which is required for its job. We all know the manifold troubles of Asia; we went through them in agonizing detail in the last couple of weeks in the Vietnam debate.

Mr. President, the Asian Development Bank has no investment affiliate; therefore, as opportunities are opened for private investment in many parts of Asia, which will be under the concern of the Asian Development Bank, there is a possibility that the industrialized entities which are operating in Asia now, notably Japan, in partnership with the countries of Western Europe, the United States and Canada, establish perhaps ultimately another Adela investment company or prototype of it in Asia.

I now ask the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who I know has very considered views on this subject, if he would be good enough to express his general views on directing the attention of the Director of the Bank, who will represent the United States, on the Bank on a day-to-day basis to the urgent need for exploring in every way possible the capabilities of the Bank to stimulate private enterprise investment in Asia, so as it were, to give our Director the feeling that this should be one of his big cares and concerns in respect of his representing the United States in the affairs of the Asian Development Bank.

I should be deeply indebted to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee if he would give us some comfort on that score.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say, first, before I reply directly on the question of private enterprise, that I agree with the Senator about the size of the Bank, that this was the largest amount of capital they could muster at this time and it was thought wise to proceed, even though this is not a large bank. I agree with the Senator that the amount is not large enough for Asia, but it is a beginning. We have to do what we can. With regard to private enterprise, questions were submitted by the Senator from New York and I would be glad to read the official answers of Mr. Bell, or does the Senator wish only my own?

Mr. JAVITS. If I may be frank, I would appreciate the Senator's answers more than anything. I have read the answers supplied by the Treasury and AID. I believe that what we ought to do is to give some coloration to Senate approval which would give an inducement to our representative on the Bank to keep his eyes peeled and his efforts active for this kind of additional development in this totally new foundation of the Asian Development Bank.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sure that he will. We inquired of Mr. Black, Mr. Bell, and Mr. Barr, and they have all commented on the subject. The provisions in the charter on this subject are the same, I believe, as in the Charter of the World Bank. We know that the World Bank has given great assistance to private enterprise. These men are private enterprisers. They are not Socialists and never have been. It is fair to say that the same interest would be shown here, although not as a matter of policy because the needs of the particular country must be considered. Most of the Asian countries have a greater need for what is called infrastructure, things which are normally within public responsibility or governmental responsibility, such as roads and transportation. So infrastructure projects will have priority in many countries. There is no point in building a factory if there are no roads.

Mr. Bell made this point. In most other areas of the world—for example, in Africa—there would be the same problem; but, as a matter of policy, I am sure that our representative is fully in accord with the Senator's views as to the importance of private enterprise, just as I am.



Once we complete the infrastructure, which would enable private enterprise to operate, private enterprise should be encouraged. This is the most efficient way to carry on business, and I know that it will be the policy of our representative and, I believe, of the Bank itself.

Most bankers, even those in other countries not noted for being private enterprise countries, tend to favor private enterprise in their outlook. I have no doubt that this will be true in this Bank. I know it has been the case in the operations of other international banks.

The formal answers to the Senator's questions which I have before me confirm this point, and I would be glad to read the answers into the Record if the Senator so wishes.

Mr. JAVITS. I have already done that. Let me now appeal to the Senator on a little bit more businesslike basis; I have no doctrinal feelings. The Senator knows me and my philosophy well enough to know that I am not trying to get an assurance that these fellows are not going to be Socialists or are going to be favorable to a private enterprise system, but as a practical matter, there are many ways in which the bank, even while it is devoted to its own main resources on infrastructure problems—and I understand that perfectly—may be encouraging private enterprise efforts which would not materially involve its capital but it will make sure that it will be the dominating entity in the area.

What I would hope the Senator might say—and, of course, I am not trying to dictate to him, unless he feels that that is his view—is that certainly we would expect our Director on the Bank to be alert and on the ball when he comes to finding ways and means, and looking for ways and means, to expand the usefulness of the Bank through what it can stimulate and develop in the private enterprise system.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sure that will be the attitude of our representative on the Bank. I believe that this is the attitude of our AID people. They have a planning operation in which they seek out operations for private investment, and they have been of great assistance to the private sector. The Senator knows that this is the general policy of all branches of our Government in this field. There is no doubt in my mind that our representative, who will come from the Treasury Department—as he usually does, as the Senator knows—will be alert to any opportunity for private enterprise.

I believe that there is not as much opportunity here as in many parts of the developed world, because of the need for such basic things as roads. Roads are normally built by the government, just as they are in the United States, and they will have to come first. There is so little money available, at least initially, that the activities of the Bank will necessarily be limited. But as a matter of attitude, I am quite sure that the representative of this country will be alert to any possibilities for private enterprise.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope the Senator will forgive me for pressing the point, but it is one thing to say that we are sure the representative of this country will do it, and it is another thing to say that the Senator feels that he would like to have the U.S. representative to do it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot give the Senator any guarantee. I do not know who is going to be the representative but I have not yet found that any Socialist has come out of the Treasury Department to represent us in any of these other international organizations. So I am quite sure that our representative will be alert. I believe that all of us consider that this is the most efficient way to carry on, as far as industrial enterprises are concerned.

It is the policy of the World Bank that it will not make loans for industrial operations owned by the state. This is a long-established policy. It is not required by the charter. The World Bank makes loans, guaranteed by a government, for all kinds of purposes, but it does not make loans as a matter of policy to an industrial enterprise that is publicly owned.

I believe that Mr. Black said that while this policy is not required under the Asian Bank charter, he is quite confident that the same policy will be followed.

Mr. JAVITS. One other question. Would the Senator be receptive to any presentation of facts in pursuance of the general authority of the committee for legislative oversight, which may bear on this question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Most certainly. We would welcome it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Any time we can give advice to the Bank, in order to influence it in this direction, we will be glad to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. That is very satisfactory to me and I am grateful to the Senator from Arkansas for his comments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from New York for raising the question of encouraging investment in the private sector of our economy and the private sectors of other economies in the areas which will be served by the Bank. Let me assure him that this point was discussed during the hearings. The legislative record of the hearings is good, but I believe it is important that it be equally good on the floor of the Senate as we adopt this measure today.

With the permission of the Senator from New York, I invite his attention to page 19 of the hearings, wherein I raised the matter of investments, as follows:

Senator MORSE. Mr. Black, will the Bank's expenditures result in an increase or decrease in the flow of private capital from the United States and other developed countries to the developing countries of Asia?

Mr. BLACK. If you are talking about a balance-of-payments effect, I don't think it would be serious at all, because as I said before, all the United States puts up in the first year is \$10 million, and certainly when the

Bank starts, through procurement we certainly ought to get business of more than the equivalent to this \$10 million that we put up. It may have a favorable balance-of-payments effect.

Senator MORSE. The purpose of my question is to elicit from you what the value of a successful bank, if we have to gamble on its success, but I think it is a good gamble, what the effect of a successful bank would be from the standpoint of bringing back to the United States a considerable amount of trade that will be to our benefit.

Mr. President, I was pressing for this investment so that we could build up these trade relationships. The Senator from New York and I have worked closely on this problem in connection with Latin America, and we must do so also in connection with Asia, or anywhere else in the world where we are trying to develop the underdeveloped countries.

There is no question of the fact that Mr. Black has made a legislative record in the hearings in support of the idea that the Bank should give encouragement to private investment, and to the private sector of the economy concerned.

I invite the attention of the Senate to page 33 of the hearings, wherein there is a discussion of policy toward loans to State enterprises, in contrast to loans in connection with private enterprise. The matter was raised by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHEL].

As shown toward the bottom of the page, Mr. Black said:

The policy—I don't work there any more but when I was there—

Speaking of the World Bank—

the policy was against lending money to any government-owned, government-managed industrial enterprise. This is different from a power company or railroad, but for any industrial plants, such as a fertilizer plant, it was against the policy of the World Bank to make a loan to any government-owned industrial enterprise. This is not in the charter of the World Bank, it is not in the charter of this Bank.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHEL] said that he subscribed to that statement.

We sought in this part of the hearing to make it clear that what we are trying to do is to encourage the Bank to help strengthen the private sector of the economy.

After all, this Bank, as I see it, is but one manner of exporting economic freedom to Asia, and our whole concept of economic freedom is based upon the notion of the part that the private economy plays.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in the hearings, made a most significant contribution, which we find on page 44, when the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] filed in the hearings a series of questions that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] had proposed, dealing with the whole problem of investment in the private sector.

I am satisfied from the hearings that it is well understood that the Bank is to sponsor and encourage investments in the private sector of the economy, and the American representative on the Bank

will go to his job with this understanding clearly in mind. If that is not the case, we would not have reacted in committee as enthusiastically as we have with respect to this Bank. I am a supporter of the Bank, as I said in the hearings, as I am of the Inter-American Bank and as I am of the World Bank. These are the vehicles for strengthening the participation of our private-enterprise system in exporting and developing economic freedom in those areas of the world where this is going to be necessary if there is to be any hope of developing political freedom.

I commend the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for the contribution he has made these past years in regard to the very point he is raising today.

I do not think that the amendment of the Senator from New York is needed. I think that the Senator's reasons for not offering it are sound. I think that it might result in confusion.

I think that the legislative history being made on the floor will be helpful, for future reference, to the United States representative in the Bank.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to my colleague, the Senator from Oregon, for his statement and for his expertise and for his pointing out the thesis which I have sought to bring before the Senate today. I am grateful for his understanding and support.

One of the reasons that gave rise to my presenting the matter to the Senate in the way I have is the testimony which was given by the principal officials of the Government, Mr. Barr, Mr. Black, and Mr. Bell, and also the very answers to the questions, which did not seem to me to be as clear and effective and unequivocal as they could have been, to this approach of activity in the area of encouraging investment and development on the part of the private sector in Asia.

I am satisfied the point has been made very effectively by the chairman of the committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], both of whom are leading members of the committee on the majority side, and I have made clear on the record how I feel about it.

I am very grateful to my colleagues and for the assurance by the chairman of the committee that any actual complaint will be followed through carefully, in line with the responsibility of the committee which has legislative oversight over the Bank and its U.S. Governor and Director, and that there will be called to our attention any instances where we are "losing any bets" on the subject.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I read with interest the report of the Committee on the Asian Development Bank. One question that came to mind was with respect to the voting rights of the Bank. That has always been important in these international banks, like the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and so on. If I understand correctly, we did not get what we really wanted to get in the way of voting rights.

We wanted to get between 90 and 95 percent. That figure was knocked down

to 80 percent. When we compare that to the amount we will have in the bank, the voting right amounts to a little under 17 percent. Therefore, if, for example, it took three-quarters of the votes on the question of voting to amend the charter or suspending a member, and so forth, we would have to have the support of Japan, principally, or a number of other countries, to prevent what we felt was detrimental to our interests.

Am I correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct, though this is not too different from the situation in the World Bank. Alone, we do not have a veto power in that Bank. We do not even have one-third of the total voting power. As a matter of fact, our voting strength is a little less than 30 percent. I think that it is about 28 percent. So it is not too different. In this case, it is 16.69 percent. There were negotiations on this question. We originally asked for 90 percent, but I am informed that in the final negotiations we were not able to obtain that. We finally compromised. As the Senator has suggested, in order to have a veto on enlargement, for example, we would have to be in combination with other members.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And this situation is not much different than occurs in other international banks?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not. Alone, we do not have what we might call a veto power in international banks.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I realize that. Mr. FULBRIGHT. I might point out that any additional subscription beyond what is authorized in this bill would have to come back to Congress for approval. In other words, the bill does not automatically impose a legal obligation on us to contribute more until authorized by the Congress.

Does the Senator understand the point I am making?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think I do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Bank cannot unilaterally impose upon us the obligation to contribute more capital without the approval of Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not realize that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I refer the Senator to section 5 of the bill, which reads:

Unless the Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall, on behalf of the United States, (a) subscribe to additional shares of stock of the Bank; (b) vote for or agree to any amendment of the agreement which increases the obligations of the United States, or which would change the purpose or functions of the Bank; (c) make a loan or provide other financing to the Bank, except that funds for technical assistance not to exceed \$1,000,000 in any one year may be provided to the Bank by a United States agency created pursuant to an Act of Congress which is authorized by law to provide funds to international organizations.

In other words, even though the Bank may admit a new member by a two-thirds vote, the Bank cannot by a two-thirds vote, or by any vote, make us contribute more money.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Without coming back to Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. Without our approval.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I had the honor and the opportunity to attend the meeting in Manila as an observer and adviser at the time the charter of the Asian Development Bank was considered and signed.

As has been said, the leaders of the American delegation were the Honorable Eugene R. Black, former president of the World Bank, and Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr.

I think that it was a notable occasion. At that meeting there were views given and decisions made in accord with many positions taken in the Senate and in the Congress in past years. It was an enthusiastic meeting attended by representatives of 27 of the charter nations, and this enthusiasm was obvious among the Asian members who were embarking, with the help of nonregional members, upon the establishment of a Development Bank to serve their own mutual needs.

Yet, I think there was an appreciation, shown through their actions that this was a businesslike proposal that was not being undertaken only for reasons of regional sentiment. In fact, in an address to the delegates, Mr. Black stated that he was happy to note that an Asian representative had said it was his firm conviction that the establishment of a regional bank should be accomplished on its merits rather than dictated by sentimental reasons.

I believe it is important to note that 3 years were spent in the preparation of the charter. I know that our distinguished colleague, Senator FULBRIGHT, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has given the background of the planning for the Bank, but I would call attention to the initiative, in 1963, of ECAFE, an institution of the United Nations that has been concerned with economic problems in Asia since 1947.

As a result of the 1963 meeting, a working group of experts made a report in 1964 to the Ministers of the Asian governments which are represented on ECAFE, the United Nations Economic Commission on Asia and Far East. In 1965, these Asian nations unanimously agreed to work toward establishment of a bank, and a Consultative Committee, made up of nine Asian nations, was appointed to meet to consider the preparation of a charter.

The Honorable Eugene Black brought to this Consultative Committee the wealth of his experience and inspired the trust of the interested Asian nations. Then after President Johnson said that the United States was prepared to consider membership in such a bank, a charter was negotiated by representatives of the nations who have now promised to subscribe funds and to participate in the organization of the Bank.

Finally, the charter was presented at the meeting of delegates in Manila. After careful consideration it was adopted and signed by the delegates there. It is now being submitted to those who signed, to be ratified in accordance with their constitutional processes.



I believe it is quite interesting to note that the regional members, some 19 of them, have subscribed almost \$650 million of the \$1 billion capital stock, and they have already oversubscribed the original quota set for the Asian members. So far, also, 12 nonregional members have subscribed funds as charter members, resulting in the full capital of \$1 billion being pledged.

It is also notable that this is one institution being formed where the United States is not bearing the usual large burden. Two hundred million dollars is a large item to subscribe, but representing 20 percent of the capital stock thus far established in the charter, it is not as large a share as we have undertaken to provide in other institutions of this type.

I have listened to the valuable questions of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who have been concerned with the development of institutions of this type, and I think it would be helpful to quote from a section of the House report which is directed more specifically to the points about attention to private enterprise that they have raised:

In its lending activities out of ordinary capital, the Bank will make loans and guarantees to developing member countries of Asia, individually or collectively, or to agencies of political subdivisions thereof. The Bank may make loans for special projects in any developing member country or for joint projects in which two or more countries are involved.

The Bank also gives substantial promise of assisting private enterprise development in Asia as well as development of public facilities. Its charter enables it to lend directly or to guarantee loans by others to private enterprises, agricultural, marketing and urban cooperatives, and other similar organizations, in developing member countries, lend to development banks in member countries for relending to smaller enterprises, invest in equity capital of private enterprises, and underwrite issues in local capital markets and thereby mobilize local capital in support of development.

That is a statement made by the House committee. It probably could be optimistic, but it reflects the statements made at the Manila meeting about the provisions of the charter, and it attests to the basic purposes of this Bank.

At this point, I believe I should say that the interest and intention of our Government were fully and clearly expressed in the sessions at Manila. Under Secretary Barr brought to the meeting the support of the Department of the Treasury and the Secretary, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler. He also brought his own experience and ability in meeting specific points and issues.

The Honorable Eugene R. Black, held in the highest respect by the delegates of every country, gave to the conference the leadership and wisdom which he had provided in developing the charter itself. It is difficult to describe adequately the contribution which Eugene Black has made to similar development programs throughout the world, and thus to peaceful relations among the nations. These contributions have been numerous, and

I am sure they will continue, following this most recent effort that was concluded at Manila.

Because of this leadership and because of the esteem in which he is held, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at the close of my remarks, Mr. Black's address to the delegates at the Manila Conference. It is a very fine speech, and one in which he draws attention to some of the problems this Bank must face.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COOPER. In one section Mr. Black calls the Bank the beginning of opportunity. Then he goes on to point out that the hard decision will have to be made by the Board of Directors, and he cautions them in a very correct way with regard to what he thinks their duties will be. I believe that it is an accurate appraisal of the Bank at this time.

I believe this is the first institution which has been established in Asia in which the Asian countries themselves have initiated this kind of movement in economic cooperation, in which they promise to provide over 60 percent of the capital. In a larger sense it is a beginning of the kind of economic cooperation which could have its effects in political and peaceful ways.

The enthusiasm of the meeting in Manila was accompanied by a recognition that the member countries are embarking on a movement of cooperation which they hope, and which our country hopes, will lead to other, larger types of cooperation in economic growth and for the peaceful development of Asia. I believe approval of this Bank, and our membership in it, can help speed this development and fulfill the objectives we have set.

#### EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS OF HON. EUGENE R. BLACK, CHIEF OF THE U.S. DELEGATION TO THE MANILA CONFERENCE ON THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

It is a great privilege to be asked to sign, on behalf of the United States, the charter of the Asian Development Bank.

I want to congratulate the Asian delegations represented here for the initiative they have taken—for the way in which they have translated their common resolve of just 2 years ago this week into a common decision to act.

I want to honor U Nuyn and the staff of ECAFE, who for years have toiled tirelessly for this new day in Asian cooperation. I want to salute the members of the experts group who first laid the plans and of the Consultative Committee of Experts who fashioned out of those plans the pioneering charter before us.

And let me express my sincere appreciation to the Government of the Philippines for extending their gracious hospitality on this historic occasion. I also wish to congratulate the Philippines for having been selected as the site of the Bank.

It was just 2 years ago in this very city that U Nuyn sounded the note which has moved us all to join our energies with his. On that occasion he said:

"By slowly and steadily building up habits and institutions of regional economic cooperation, and by reaping the benefits of much cooperation, countries of the ECAFE region may be assisted to reduce and resolve their political difficulties."

That quiet hope, expressed 2 years ago, is now embodied in the charter before us.

And on that occasion 2 years ago, another distinguished Asian delegate sounded another note, which is also reflected in the spirit of this charter, when he said that it was his "firm conviction that the establishment of (a regional bank) should be based on its own merit rather than dictated by any sentimental reason."

But this charter is even more than these things. It is a bold and challenging document. It challenges Asia to make common cause in economic cooperation—whatever the heritage, whatever the legacy of history which divides one nation from its neighbor. Article II of the charter commends the Bank to use its resources, giving priority to those regional, subregional and national projects and programs which will contribute most effectively to the harmonious economic growth of the region as a whole. This charter dares to envision Asia as a community of nations, working together.

This is a charter in league with the future. It looks at Asia, not as it is today, but as it can be tomorrow. It makes a virtue out of the vast diversity of this region, and in this spirit embodies a broad membership policy—inviting Asian nations and others to sign up in a new adventure in partnership.

As an interested—or rather fascinated—witness at the birth of this charter, let me offer again my respect and congratulations to all of those whose work and wisdom brought it into being—and with such dispatch.

Asia is here today in force, ready to sign, ready to begin, ready to invest in the cause of regional cooperation. Your subscriptions, combined with many millions more from non-Asian subscribers, including, subject to the approval of our Congress, \$200 million from my government, guarantee that the Asian Development Bank will begin with a wealth of confidence already expressed in it. In a very brief period you have reached almost 100 percent of the billion dollar goal you set for yourselves. The oversubscription by the Asian countries of the 600 million goal was a spectacular and magnificent achievement. This is clear evidence of the deep commitment by the countries of this region to the idea of regional cooperation for development.

Speaking personally, I have to say that I am a little disappointed that the non-regional members of the Bank are still some millions short of their allotment. But I am sure it is clear that in this case the books aren't closed—that more subscriptions will be coming in. For I know that you have aroused the interest of other countries around the world, not all of which have yet expressed their support.

You have made the charter. You have gathered the subscriptions. You have begun. But I do not have to tell you that charters and subscriptions do not make a bank. The men who decide how the subscriptions will be invested and how the charter will be interpreted will make the reputation of this Bank. And the number of people who benefit from the work which this Bank sets in motion will measure its worth.

As you might guess, I am an enthusiast when the subject for discussion is development finance. I do not think there is any more important business in which nations can invest and with which men can occupy themselves in these times. When U Nuyn speaks of "reducing and resolving" political difficulties through economic development, he strikes a sympathetic chord in me.

Development finance is concerned simply with getting people together around the problems of their economic growth. Its relation to political difficulties stems from the

fact that you can't get on with the job until all the interested parties have been heard from and until some measure of agreement has been reached. And if there is any ground for agreement among nations, in this ideologically torn world of ours, surely that ground is our common desire to improve the lot of people who no longer believe that their poverty and suffering is a punishment or that they were predetermined by forces beyond human control.

Yours, I say, is an exciting adventure because its object is to communicate with those people—to show them that they do have some say over their own destiny.

But development finance is a complicated business. It is forever in danger of succumbing to unrealistic expectations—of yielding to the temptation to plant gold in the ground in the vain hope that it will yield a harvest. So far as development finance is concerned, all we can honestly say about the Asian Development Bank today is that the nations of Asia, with help from other regions, are establishing a fund of opportunity. What happens from here on depends on the ideas and plans which Asians fashion to employ that fund effectively.

Here again U Nyun struck a responsive chord within me when he talked of "slowly and steadily building up habits and institutions of regional economic cooperation." Development is too often a slow—a maddeningly slow business. What we all must try to do is to make it a steady preoccupation—an alternative occupation to the strife and suffering which have plagued Asia for far too long.

Because development finance can be a maddeningly slow business, I strongly urge that you let the management of this new Bank get on with the job. During the negotiations which led to this charter, I was impressed with the resolve, expressed on all sides, that the Asian Development Bank should be known for its professional competence—for its hardhead, if you will, insofar as that expression means letting the weight of economic evidence be decisive. This is a difficult standard to stick to, as I know from my own experience as President of the World Bank. It is not always easy to gather the economic evidence necessary to provide the basis for investment decisions.

For this reason I hope you will call on all the help you need in establishing the operational procedures of this new Bank. In this connection I have been pleased to learn that my good friend, George Woods, who is so imaginatively charting the course of the World Bank, has said that he is fully ready to work as closely with you as possible in these early days. It is not that I think that the Asian Development Bank should necessarily follow my particular precedent in setting up its operations. It is simply to save precious time and talent that I urge you to borrow from the experience of others. I make this suggestion because you want the Asian Development Bank to arrive, as quickly as possible, at the point where it will make its voice heard and will be in a position to interpret for others the special problems of Asia in ways that will permit them to increase their contribution as you increase yours.

If regional cooperation in Asia becomes a habit, as we all hope and pray it will, the Asian Development Bank has, built into its charter, provisions for quickly increasing its resources. In particular, the charter permits the Bank to administer various kinds of special funds. In doing so it recognizes that much of development today cannot be financed any longer with conventional loan instruments.

This in keeping with the practice in other development banks—the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank for two. There is, in fact, a whole orchestra of finan-

cial instruments employed in the development finance business these days. These new instruments are needed, of course, because some countries simply do not have foreign exchange resources with which to service any additional appreciable amount of debt on conventional terms.

I think these provisions of the charter are eminently prudent. As a banker, I have been concerned for some time with the effect in some countries of the steady increase in conventional loans which each year syphon off greater amounts of scarce foreign exchange to service outstanding debt. I have been concerned because in other countries there are worthwhile projects which need finance but for which finance may be denied simply for lack of a capacity to earn foreign exchange. I have been concerned because the structure of international credit is not infinitely strong; it may not be a perfect structure, but it does represent one island of order in this world which it would be folly not to protect.

As most of you know, President Johnson entertains a particular hope that one of the first special funds set up under the Asian Development Bank will be a fund to help with the special development problems of southeast Asia. He authorized me to say in Bangkok last summer that if other members of the Bank agree and will contribute to such a fund, the United States, subject to the approval of Congress, will advance \$100 million of its own. It is his hope that through the special funds of the Asian Development Bank it will be possible to direct more aid to southeast Asia through a multilateral channel; which will pool the resources of many nations.

This is just one example of the form such special funds might take, although as you will appreciate, it is an example to which my Government attaches great importance. No doubt there will be other funds. As such proposals are made, my Government will wish to consider them carefully. It is our purpose to help you in every way we can to make a reality out of the promise of regional cooperation.

Before I left Washington, President Johnson handed me a personal message for you which expresses more eloquently than I can how our hopes ride with you in this new adventure. Let me, in closing, read that message to you.

"Mr. Chairman," the message says, "please convey to every delegation in Manila my respect and admiration for the decision they have made. Please express to all, my profound hope that this cooperative undertaking you are now to begin will signal a new turn in Asia's fortunes."

"Throughout my lifetime the peoples of Asia have been asked again and again to make heroic sacrifices, only to have their freedoms threatened anew. Again and again foolish men have attempted to deny the rich diversity of your continent and to impose rigid conformity instead. And as each one in turn falls, as he inevitably must, he leaves behind a new wave of suffering and pain. The plight of the people of Asia lies heavily on the conscience of the world."

"You know that peace in Asia can only be preserved by championing diversity, not fighting it. As you know that to preserve the vigor and distinction of your nationalities, there must be some forms of regional cooperation. As you set out to make a reality out of the promise of such cooperation, we Americans are eager to extend you every assistance we can. Your initiative has captured the imagination of us all."

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in this hour of strife, the Asian Development Bank is a symbol of hope. It emerges as a constructive Asian response to the troubled economic and political

situation on that massive continent. It looks to the future, offering hope and opportunities for economic advancement and cooperation in an area riven by turmoil and conquest for countless centuries. And its charter is soundly based upon the experience of other successful international financial institutions, principally the World Bank.

The agreement to establish the Asian Development Bank is an example of the best in creative cooperation between advanced and developing nations. It is the product of hard work by experts from more than a score of nations. It is a solid, imaginative response to President Johnson's call, in his great Johns Hopkins statement, for affirmative multilateral efforts to assist economic development in Asia.

Following that statement, the President asked his trusted adviser, and former President of the World Bank, Eugene R. Black, to contribute his great wisdom and long experience to the task of founding a development bank of and for Asia. By early November of last year, after months of unremitting effort, the draft agreement was hammered out by representatives of interested countries in Bangkok. A month later, in Manila, representatives of governments signed the agreement and readied them for ratification by their legislatures. By the end of January 1966, more than 99 percent of the authorized capital had been pledged for subscription to the new Bank, almost \$650 million by Asian countries and \$350 million by countries outside the Asian region.

Thus, less than a year after the President's Baltimore address there is an agreement before legislative bodies all over the world which will authorize membership in an Asian Development Bank—and no less than 31 countries have indicated their interest in becoming charter members. A more heartening sequence of events could not be imagined.

These rapid strides in the formation of the Asian Bank are a great tribute to Asian initiative. They are also clear evidence of the willingness of many nations—Asian and non-Asian—to join in any cooperative venture which gives promise of peaceful progress in the world's most populous area. They are a measure of the widespread confidence in the soundness of the financial arrangements underlying the Bank. We will do honor to our country, and serve its interests well, by our adoption of H.R. 12563 to authorize U.S. membership in the Asian Development Bank.

I wish to give unqualified support for H.R. 12563, which authorizes American participation in the Asian Development Bank. It is an act of opportunity, which will enable the United States, together with 30 other nations, to join as charter members in a new venture of cooperation to promote economic growth in the poor countries of Asia. It is an act of promise, offering economic and political cooperation between countries which share a determination to raise the living standards of the impoverished peoples of Asia.

While offering opportunity and promise, the agreement to establish the Asian



Development Bank, to which H.R. 12563 relates, will provide the foundation for a sound financial institution. It is clearly the product of careful and able work of representatives of different countries joined by a high common purpose, and the United States can be justly proud of its participation.

The Asian Development Bank is modeled in many important respects on the highly successful World Bank. Its constitution reflects also the devoted attention and wise counsel provided by Eugene Black, an eminent international economic statesman whose stewardship of the World Bank for a decade and a half contributed so much to its success.

Those who formulated this agreement can take pride in a well-wrought charter for an effective financial institution which will serve great purposes. They can also find pride in the remarkable response by subscribing countries to the authorized capital of \$1 billion. The countries of Asia have pledged very nearly \$650 million and 12 countries outside the Asian region are contributing \$350 million including the \$200 million pledged by the United States.

Under the leadership of the President, and following his great speech in Baltimore, the United States has played a distinguished role in helping to build this new institution. It is our task here today to follow through.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, at this moment the nations of Asia stand at a turning point in the course of their affairs. They are about to embark on a new enterprise that may, over time, mean the difference between starvation and plenty; between misery and well-being for many millions in that vast region.

This new enterprise is the Asian Development Bank, to which the United States and other advanced countries have been asked to give support. H.R. 12563 responds to this appeal by authorizing U.S. membership in the Asian Development Bank with a subscription of \$200 million. I rise to give my full support to this legislation.

We will not be alone in our response. Of total authorized Bank capital of \$1 billion, \$650 million will come from 19 Asian nations themselves, including \$200 million from Japan, and more than \$100 million from Australia and New Zealand. The remaining \$350 million is being subscribed by 12 countries outside Asia, \$150 million of which will come from countries other than the United States. Germany, for example, is subscribing \$34 million, the United Kingdom \$30 million, Canada \$25 million, and Italy \$20 million. Overall, our contribution represents only 25 percent of the Bank's hard-currency subscriptions. Our role is essential to the Bank's success, but we are not being called on to bear the major burden.

The facts of war and economic backwardness in Asia today speak plainly of the need for a regional institution to further economic development. I am deeply impressed with the extent to which these facts have been taken to heart in this country and by the degree

and depth of support for H.R. 12563. This bill was reported unanimously by committees in both houses, and passed the other body by a margin of 3 to 1. Public expressions of support have reflected a broad range of opinion, and include the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor, the National Foreign Trade Council, the American Bankers Association, the Investment Bankers Association, the Cooperative League, and the League of Women Voters.

I particularly wish to point out that the articles of agreement of the Asian Bank by no means confine its operations to support of projects in the public sector. This new Bank will have full powers to make loans, or guarantee loans by others, to productive private enterprises in member countries, and, after it has been determined that the Bank is in a position to do so, to make equity investments in private enterprises. The Bank will also be able to assist in underwriting security issues of private firms in member countries, thereby contributing to the development of local capital markets and the mobilization of domestic capital. And, since it will in future years float bond issues and make portfolio sales in private capital markets, the Bank will further facilitate the international flow of private funds.

Very careful consideration has been given to the possible effect of the subscription obligations authorized in H.R. 12563 upon our balance of payments. The Secretary of the Treasury has stated that the balance-of-payments effect of our subscription will be minimal, amounting to not more than \$10 million in the first year. Over a longer period, procurement in the United States financed by Bank loans can be expected very largely to offset our subscription payments. Nor need we be fearful of large drains on our capital market by the Bank. The Bank's articles specify that no securities may be issued except with the consent of the country where the issue is to take place, and that the Bank must follow the principle of diversifying its borrowing sources. The assurances of the administration and the safeguards built into the articles provide an ample basis on which to give this legislation a clean bill of health on balance-of-payments grounds.

Mr. President, much has been said in this Chamber about the role of the United States in Asia, and the importance of our making it known that we seek neither territorial gain nor military domination of the nations of that area. If we are serious about associating ourselves with the works of peace in Asia; if we are truly committed to efforts to grapple with the economic and human problems that beset that area; if we wish to help Asians to find their way through their current trials; then H.R. 12563 provides us with the vehicle to achieve these ends.

I intend to heed the President's call in his great speech at Baltimore. I will vote for this bill and for the cause of peace it represents. I urge each of you to join me.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like the RECORD to show my opposition to Senate approval of this proposal. The Asian Development Bank is but one additional method by which the United States funnels foreign aid to virtually all the countries of the world. As is the case with banks of this type, the United States cannot exercise control over which countries are eligible to receive loans and other forms of financial and technical assistance. Eligible countries, such as Mongolia, have forms of government and political philosophies completely alien to those of our own people, and I consider it inconsistent with the best interest of our country to support, financially or otherwise, governments of this type.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 12563) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### REPORT BY SENATOR TYDINGS ON VISIT TO VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in his news bulletin to his constituents of February 1966, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] reports on his visit to Vietnam during the last congressional adjournment. The Senator supplies a most informative personal account of his experiences and observations. One does not have to agree with every detail in order to recognize this report to be a very useful contribution to public understanding of the Vietnamese problem.

I would address the Senate's attention particularly to the final section of the report, which is entitled "The Uncertain Future." It is a well-reasoned and temperate appraisal of the situation and the Senator's position with respect thereto. In setting it forth, Senator TYDINGS makes a significant contribution to public and Senate understanding of the Vietnamese problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bulletin "On the Record," for February 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### ON THE RECORD

(By U.S. Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS)

(NOTE.—During the past congressional recess, I spent a week in South Vietnam as a member of a four-man delegation. Traveling almost constantly from 6 in the morning until late at night, we met with our frontline troops in every major area—the 3d Marine Division in Da Nang, the 1st Cavalry in An Khê, a special forces A team in Cai Cai. We crisscrossed the country several times, visiting refugee camps, Vietnamese villages, and a variety of installations. In addition to meetings in Saigon with Gen-

eral Westmoreland, Ambassador Lodge, and AID Administrator Mann, we talked with Premier Ky and other South Vietnamese officials, students, and villagers.

(Our soldiers are fighting in a land whose terrain, people, and traditions were almost unknown to us 10 years ago. Even today Vietnam is strange and little understood. The diplomatic terrain is equally uncertain. We must guess the intentions of Peiping; we are unsure of the policy of those in control in Hanoi; we do not know what influence Moscow exerts, nor how independent the Vietcong is from Hanoi. The political and military situations change so rapidly that we must continually reexamine our assumptions and refine our views.—JOE TYDINGS.)

#### THE TROUBLED PAST

South Vietnam is about the size of California with a population of approximately 14 million. For centuries these sturdy, handsome people have fought off Chinese efforts to conquer them. They still regard the Chinese as traditional enemies. In the 19th century, the French colonized Indochina and began nearly 100 years of unenlightened rule. In 1942, Japan invaded and occupied the country.

After World War II, the French wished to return to Vietnam, but Ho Chi Minh, a popular resistance fighter against the Japanese, was in control. Orderly transition from colonial rule to self-government was unsuccessful, and war broke out between the French and Ho's Vietminh forces. The war dragged on for 8 years, until the French were decisively defeated at Dienbienphu.

At the conference table in Geneva in 1954, an accord was reached whereby firing ceased and a line was drawn between the Communist north and the non-Communist south. Free elections under international supervision were to be held throughout Vietnam in 1956 to select a government for a unified Vietnam. The United States did not sign the Geneva accords, but endorsed it in principle. After the country was partitioned, almost 1 million citizens fled from the north to the south. Only 100,000 chose to move north.

A relatively free election was held in the South in 1955. Ngo Dinh Diem overwhelmingly defeated Bao Dai, the former French puppet Emperor. Diem refused to permit the unification elections unless Ho Chi Minh agreed to effective international supervision in North Vietnam. The elections were not held. Diem soon terminated the practice of electing local officials and appointed his own men. He persecuted the Buddhists, the Cao Dai, and other religious sects. He permitted corruption to flourish, jailed his political opponents, and failed to make even token economic and social reforms.

Considerable opposition to Diem had developed by the late 1950's. Guerrilla fighters set up shadow governments in the provinces and began to kill village officials. These guerrillas were aided by North Vietnam. At the Third Lao Dong Party Conference in Hanoi in December 1960, the National Liberation Front was proclaimed, and Communist assistance became official.

Since Diem's demise in 1963, there have been five governments. The present Premier, Nguyen Cao Ky, inherited a difficult situation, but during his few months in office, he has displayed greater understanding of the political, economic and social problems of his country than his predecessors. He has permitted free elections in the Provinces and has devoted increasing attention to desperately needed programs of education and rural development. While our officials believe Ky to be personally honest, corruption and graft exist at lower echelons of government.

We began to aid South Vietnam in 1954. Predicated on the assumption that "needed reforms" would be undertaken, this aid was to be entirely economic. When the situation

deteriorated, however, President Eisenhower sent military assistance. President Kennedy continued this assistance and gradually increased the number of advisers.

In February 1965, the Vietcong threatened to cut South Vietnam in half, roughly along Highway 19 from Pleiku to the coast. Our military force in Vietnam then numbered about 20,000—mostly advisers and technical personnel. President Johnson was confronted by the alternatives of complete collapse or dramatic increase in our military commitment. He chose the latter.

#### THE PRESENT SITUATION

To secure the entire nation will be a long and difficult task and will require a massive military commitment. Two-thirds of the highways are controlled by the Vietcong. Passage of troops and supplies is difficult by day and impossible at night. Saigon and many of our military bases are vulnerable to sabotage and harassment.

The Vietcong infrastructure is effective in approximately two-thirds of the villages. Although the Vietcong do not always occupy the villages, a few sympathizers maintain close communication with jungle fighting units and are able to bring down an attack on a village that refuses to pay taxes to the Vietcong or which cooperates with the Saigon government. Thousands of village schoolteachers and officials have been kidnapped and assassinated. In this fashion, the Vietcong exercises control over two-thirds of the land area of South Vietnam, though less than one-third of the people.

In addition to guerrillas, at least seven hard-core regiments have come down from North Vietnam. Almost all heavy fighting in recent months has been against these North Vietnamese regulars. The struggle is no longer a revolt or an insurgency; troops are trained, equipped, and shipped from the north.

War has left thousands of Vietnamese homeless. I visited six refugee camps and met with the minister of social welfare and our AID officials to discuss the staggering problems of feeding, clothing, educating, employing, and ultimately relocating these refugees. Though some progress has been made in this area, more often than not it has been a case of too little, too late. We must help these people not only for humanitarian reasons, but also because their political support is essential. I am encouraged by the President's recent clear commitment to the welfare of the Vietnamese refugees. The need is great and the problem grave.

The morale of our troops is extremely high. I spoke with many Maryland boys in every unit I visited. Despite some inevitable bottlenecks, our men are better trained and equipped than any soldiers in history. They have displayed incredible bravery and resourcefulness under extreme conditions.

Special Forces units have set up camps throughout the toughest Vietcong territory in South Vietnam. These isolated camps, built much like stockades of our frontier days, are manned by 2 U.S. officers and 10 enlisted men. Together with local villagers, they have repeatedly defended these small forts against powerful Vietcong sieges.

While the war goes on, our troops and AID officials are rebuilding this war-ravaged country. Our civic action program has been one of the most important—though least reported—activities in South Vietnam. It was a great inspiration to see our troops helping the villagers to build schools and sanitation facilities, dispensing medicine to sick children, and instructing families in the use of soap. Medical companies attached to our line units are providing badly needed medical assistance to thousands of Vietnamese villagers and farmers. These activities are almost unprecedented in the history of modern warfare.

#### THE UNCERTAIN FUTURE

Politics is the art of choosing among available alternatives. We are confronted by three basic possibilities: escalation, withdrawal, or continuing to defend the territory we now occupy. War is hell, but the alternative of unilateral withdrawal is less acceptable. My visit convinced me that our fundamental commitment to help defend South Vietnam is a necessary one. I found that our help is generally wanted. A precipitous withdrawal now would mean the end of an independent South Vietnamese Government and the ultimate murder of tens of thousands who have fought Communist aggression. Withdrawal would bring incalculable pressure upon Thailand and the other small countries of southeast Asia. Eventually, India could lose her independence and thus her strength as a great democratic counterweight to China.

Our objectives are limited. We do not want territory or a military garrison in southeast Asia. We are not there to wage an aggressive war. We do not want to destroy North Vietnam, merely persuade it to stop making war against its neighbor. Our aim is simply to give the people of South Vietnam an opportunity freely to choose their own form of government.

I had hoped that we could achieve our objectives by negotiation. The response to President Johnson's peace offensive has been disappointing, but we must intensify the search for an acceptable solution. I support turning this matter over to the United Nations and would welcome a renewal of the Geneva Conference. I think we should be willing to negotiate with the National Liberation Front as well as the government of North Vietnam, and to accept free elections in South Vietnam as an ultimate political solution.

While the search for peace continues, we must devise an appropriate military and political strategy. I was doubtful that our bombings of North Vietnam were sufficiently useful from a military standpoint to justify the political risk of their resumption. I had hoped that the President would have been able to continue the bombing pause. But now that he has made his decision, we must support him insofar as conscience permits. He has far greater access to the relevant information. I hope and pray that this decision is correct.

We can best achieve our goals by continuing to help the South Vietnamese build their nation with some degree of peace and security. We must place greater emphasis upon economic development and social reform. Seventy percent of the people of South Vietnam live in territory defended by United States and South Vietnamese troops. If we can protect the people in these areas from harassment and terror, and, at the same time, help them to rebuild their economy, institute governmental reforms, and embark on a program of social justice, we will have achieved many of our objectives. Even this will not be easy. Barring the unexpected, American soldiers will be in South Vietnam for many years to come. Our AID mission faces untold problems in trying to build a modern nation in a backward, war-torn country.

But whatever the difficulties, I am gratified that we finally appear to be recognizing the importance of civic reform. In the long run, the most important phase of this struggle will be fought in the schools, the hospitals, the rice fields of South Vietnam, rather than on the battlefields.

#### TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966,



is reported by the Committee on Finance, it be made the pending business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

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

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. President, I wish to speak on a subject of considerable interest to a number of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor, and that I may be recognized to continue my remarks following the quorum call.

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

Mr. **CURTIS**. 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. **CURTIS**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### DISTRIBUTION AMONG THE STATES OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. President, I am today introducing a resolution, the object of which is a better geographical distribution of the research and development funds that are granted, loaned, or otherwise made available by the agencies of the Federal Government to our institutions of higher learning.

This is a sizable program. So far these funds have been overly concentrated in two or three areas. Many fine colleges and universities have been left out. Many States have been left out.

For many years, various groups and individuals have urged a decentralization of these Government expenditures. No one has come up with a sound formula to accomplish that objective. The resolution which I am introducing proposes that such a formula be developed and fixes the responsibility for writing such a formula.

The pace of change is the constant factor in our changing lives, and the days ahead will each be filled with new wonderment. The technological explosion of World War II started this pace which accelerates each year. The mind of the man of science seems to know no bounds as we add today's achievements to tomorrow's routine. With all these blessings of great material progress, we in the Congress must assume the stewardship of its burdens.

Today we must work to keep this pace of progress. Today we must work diligently to give a better direction to this pace of progress lest our population explosion be coupled with a population erosion. We can erode away the academic excellence of many areas of this great Nation. We can erode away a balance in our national productivity which is now dwindling. We can concentrate in a few centers those talents which are basic to education, to continuing development, and to future productivity.

For 20 years the Congress has given sincere expression, but unfortunately a general expression, to the need for a balanced development of our basic sciences. For years we have wrestled with this burden, and we have found it a tough one to pin down. I hope today to set in motion a pursuit of the specifics which can begin to bring equity into an imbalance which worsens each year.

The imbalance which must be righted is not only the increasing maldistribution of \$15 to \$20 billions of Federal research and development funds but the reversal of trends which this maldistribution has set in motion. Mind you, were we to delay this reversal for another decade, the Members of this body might be faced, in a score of years, with the fact that wide areas of this great Nation may then fail to possess the skills and the talents to perform useful research in the basic sciences. Our great institutions of higher learning, in vast areas, may be reduced in scope to schools of narrower pursuits. Our laboratories and kindred facilities will move away, and will not then our industries follow that pattern?

The power of the Federal Government to generate scientific and technological achievement must be harnessed in the absolute of feasibility to render a balanced achievement.

An expression of my concern is well exemplified by the recent formation of the Midwest Resources Association, a 12-State effort seeking fair and equitable distribution of our resources and our skills. Twenty-four Members of this body form a bipartisan committee to aid its work. My distinguished senior colleague from Nebraska serves on its executive committee.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **CURTIS**. I yield.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, I commend my colleague for his sponsorship of this resolution.

His reference to the Midwest Resources Association is most appropriate. This young organization represents the heartland of America—Nebraska, the Dakotas, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, Ohio, Kansas, Missouri, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

A completely bipartisan group, its whole dedication is to the economic welfare of our region. It is directed by a steering committee made up of 12 Governors, 6 Senators, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives. Together with the senior Senator from Ohio, it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the association's executive com-

mittee and to participate in the organization's development.

This association was conceived out of a realization that only by uniting the Midwest would we be able to compete with the more populous and better financed States. Recently, the association employed a full-time executive secretary and opened an office in Washington.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have long been concerned about our ability to manage the research and development activities of the Federal Government. These programs have grown in the past two decades out of all proportion to any other segment of the national budget.

Just before World War II, the Government spent a mere \$75 million on science and technology annually. Today the figure is between \$15 and \$20 billion.

No one argues with the need for intensive programs of science, research, and technology. We still have vast frontiers to conquer. No one wants to put a price tag on the cure for cancer, the common cold, or heart disease. No one fails to recognize the literal life-and-death seriousness of maintaining our military strength.

That is not the point. The point is whether the Congress is intelligently providing ample funds for all these efforts and whether the Nation's scientific and technological resources are being properly utilized.

Many of these programs—and the justification for their funding—have not been based on any particular logic or rationale. They have, like Topsy, "just grown."

We had a striking example of this last year in the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. Our distinguished chairman, Senator **HOLLAND**, insisted on a thoroughgoing analysis of research carried on by the Department of Agriculture.

While some progress was made and we have a better view of the Department's research effort than before, much remains to be done. What is indicated is a thorough overhaul which will provide the tools, the background, and the know-how to treat the entire research field and not just a narrow segment.

I commend the Senator for his concern with this problem and for his effort to bring something concrete out of the often expressed desire to make progress in this field.

May I say, Mr. President, that I think it would be difficult to find anyone more qualified and experienced to pursue this resolution than the Senator from Nebraska, because of his long tenure in Congress, his membership on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and on the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and his activity, through the years, on the Government Operations Committee. It is with pleasure that I join him in this resolution as one of its cosponsors, and it is my hope that many other Senators will see fit to do the same.

Mr. **CURTIS**. I thank the distinguished Senator. I am fully aware that a proper distribution of these funds is a difficult task.

I have a very high regard for the National Science Foundation. It is Government oriented. I believe it is qualified to make a study, take a little time, and bring in a formula that will do justice to the programs undertaken and will, at the same time, help decentralize those activities from a geographical standpoint.

The industries of tomorrow will be located where the scientific complexes are now being located, and Congress has an obligation to do equity and justice in determining where this money is being spent, loaned, or given.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is not the situation sometimes aggravated by this type of occurrence: The necessity for some crash program will make its appearance. In the area of that project, there are certain well-known, outstanding institutions for example, educational institutions, which exist and have been active in the field. Without an organization like the National Science Foundation to make a complete appraisal of the available talent and facilities the nation over, there is always a tendency to say, "Well, college X or university X having done this in the past, let us give them this project, too."

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Not being aware of many facilities which would be equally good and perhaps even better, because of not having an overall schedule and for other reasons; and yet the National Science Foundation would have knowledge that would enable a decision to be made, which would take into consideration not only decentralization, but also other factors which would attach to other potential places for location.

Mr. CURTIS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator.

In addition, I should like to point out that when they pass over a well-qualified institution of higher learning, oftentimes that institution is unable to hold its scientific talent; it loses some of its talent to the areas that do get the grants, and the cycle picks up more and more, with the result of having Government funds injure one area to the advantage of another.

Mr. HRUSKA. The trend feeds on itself and keeps going.

Mr. CURTIS. Exactly. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, not only for yielding, but also for bringing up this very important resolution he has before us now.

I remember some years ago talking to the National Cryogenics Association in Boulder, Colo., about some of the problems involved in Government support of research.

I believe at that time approximately 80 to 85 percent of the total funds being spent on scientific research were being generated out of the Federal Government, and I pointed out to them that in

the process of continuing on this type of emphasis, unless something were done, it was bound to feed into certain well-defined areas, which would then deplete the scientific knowledge and brains of other areas as they flowed into the areas where the money was going.

I gather from what the Senator is saying that he thinks this is one of the problems we are now facing; in other words, that a university has received a grant because they are supposed to be particularly capable in a certain field, and then, when a new program comes along and more money is to be spent, because this university has had a large program, that the second one is liable to flow into it automatically; because they have demonstrated capacity in the first one, they are assumed to have capacity in the second.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the Senator has stated the problem correctly.

I am not critical of the Government administrators who make the grants. I believe they need the guidance of a formula that might be developed by the National Science Foundation, in order that they might have an appraisal of the competence of a university, the competence of its instructor personnel and the heads of the departments. I think such a formula would be of great help to the Government administrators who are charged with distributing these billions of dollars.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wonder if the Senator could answer this for me, because I unfortunately have not had the opportunity to read his bill: In the resolution, are we referring to all types of research, or are we referring only to scientific research dealing with scientific subjects?

Mr. CURTIS. The resolution refers to the laws under which research and development funds are granted, loaned, or otherwise made available by industry or agencies of the Government to institutions of higher learning for scientific or educational purposes.

Mr. DOMINICK. That could, then, take in research, for example, under the Disarmament Agency. As the Senator knows, the Disarmament Agency has in the past given out a research program to some professor somewhere, on the thesis that he is to come back with a new method of overcoming problems of a disarmament nature. It could, I presume, take in educational research as well; is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. It seems to me this becomes even more important as the scope of research is developed, because obviously brains in all these different fields, by the sheer nature of it, cannot be concentrated in any two or three or half dozen universities; they must be spread throughout the country; otherwise, we would not have the good universities that we do.

I know that we have a very large series of programs in Colorado, but I have often wondered why some of the others do not go there as well, in view of the capacity that we have. It is possible that the formula that the Senator is suggesting the National Science Foundation de-

velop would at least show the need for redistributing certain types of research which are now going into the southern area or the western area or the northern area; they might be focused in there deliberately under this type of formula, is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. At least, we would have the guidance of a qualified scientific group which could appraise all the talent in the country. Without a doubt, many of these grants and loans are well placed. On the other hand, there is no doubt that many of them could have been successfully handled elsewhere. There should be some guidance on it, some equity and justice injected into the disbursement of these funds.

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe that the Senator has brought up a subject which is, really, of great significance. I would be happy if the Senator would allow me to join him as a cosponsor of his resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. I would be very glad to have the Senator as a cosponsor, and I thank him.

Mr. DOMINICK. Even though eventually none of us may agree with the formula proposed, and I would wish to reserve my final decision.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator. The National Science Foundation might disappoint all of us, but, as of now, I believe it is the proper agency to which to turn to start this project.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to join the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and the Senator from Nebraska, in expressing approval of the approach which he has made to this very sizable problem. I am happy to serve as a cosponsor of the bill. It comes at a most timely occasion, because the Government Operations Committee, of which the Senator from Nebraska is a member, has recently created a new subcommittee to conduct what I would not like to call an investigation, but it is a study in depth of the whole research program of Government headed by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS]. I serve on the committee as a regular Republican member. Just this morning, we met and agreed on a well qualified step with the Government scientific background, to proceed in an orderly fashion to put the whole problem before Congress, first of all, by identifying all research grants which have been made.

As members of the Finance Committee and of the Committee on Appropriations, we have difficulty, sometimes, in this whole field, because of the problem of overlapping and duplicating research projects, in not being able to find where they are.

Thus, we are going to create an inventory and find out just how far the Government has gone into the research contract and grant business, find out where the contracts have been made, where contracts have been granted, or where the work is being done and then move



into the direction of trying to get a more equitable distribution of projects into the educational areas where we have talent.

I therefore congratulate the Senator from Nebraska on the fact that while this has been discussed a great many times, and while it has grown into a seriousness which has caused us to create the special subcommittee to study the problem in depth, the Senator from Nebraska has come up with the one practical suggestion which can serve as a guideline by providing that the National Science Foundation assume the responsibility of working up some formula to propose to Congress. I believe that this is a step in the right direction and with the background of information which will come out of the study being made by this newly created subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, the testimony in the hearings, and the field investigations, I am sure that Representatives and Senators will be able better to evaluate this formula which will, I hope, eventuate from the very constructive suggestion which the Senator from Nebraska has made.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYRINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that he has selected an agency with some experience in this matter. As the Senator from Nebraska will remember, the Senator from South Dakota and I were the authors of a bill to create the National Science Foundation, followed with a request on handling appropriations after it was created. The Senator from South Dakota and I found, in the early days of the National Science Foundation, that they did not have quite as much money as they have now, but we found that about 70 percent of all their grants was going to one area of the country—I need not mention the area.

Mr. MUNDT. Near the growing of beautiful ivy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, the ivy area. We did not do this deliberately.

Mr. CURTIS. No.

Mr. MUNDT. Right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We felt that we should keep it from spreading. They did. They went about it. Mr. Waterman finally went about creating a broader spread. He has not created it, or done as well as we would probably have liked, but they have done pretty well.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator suggested that what they have done was to create a "low-priced spread," and we are over in the "high-priced spread."

Mr. MAGNUSON. They created the "low-priced spread," that is true, but there is a spin-off to this thing that we are always talking about; namely, the shortage of personnel in the field who, when they are trained, whether it be by

Government grants, privately, or both, go off in another direction, and we consequently suffer from a severe lack of teachers who stay.

We have found from experience, and so has the National Science Foundation, that where we give some of these grants to the smaller colleges—we have them in our State, but in the Middle West there are great numbers of them—there is something about the smaller college atmosphere when they receive this grant—rather than the hustle-bustle of a large technical school in which students are given interviews for jobs by big corporations, and so forth—that the smaller college student is more inclined to wish to go into the teaching field. But it proves something, too, in these grants. So that I suggest that the National Science Foundation has learned, through hard experience, to try at least to do what the Senator is suggesting. The Senator has picked an agency which has had a great deal of background in this field.

Mr. CURTIS. I am well aware of that, and I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for having pioneered in this field in the creation of the National Science Foundation. I am sure that it enjoys a fine reputation throughout the academic world. They are qualified, if any agency is, to reduce to a formula some way to distribute these funds so that it will not just be happenstance, or rest entirely upon the competence of particular individuals who happen to be making the decision at the time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to commend the able and distinguished Senator from Nebraska for offering this resolution. If he has no objection, I should be pleased to join as a cosponsor.

Mr. CURTIS. I would be most happy to have the Senator from South Carolina added as a cosponsor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to join as a cosponsor to the resolution.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a great many people have felt for a long time that something along this line needed to be done. It is my hope that the resolution will be passed and that action will be taken on it soon.

There is no question, as was mentioned by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] a few moments ago, that a large percentage of contracts for research have gone to a very small geographical area of the United States.

It seems to me that funds for these research projects come from all the people in all the States of the Nation. Therefore, as much as possible, there should be a more equitable distribution of these projects. I am convinced that we have able scientists, that we have many able educators, and many able people in the various States of the Nation. Practically every State in this Na-

tion has one or more outstanding educational institutions. It seems to me they might be considered for some kind of project under this program, rather than concentrating the projects in one area of the Nation.

Again I wish to commend the able Senator from Nebraska for his work on this problem. It is my hope that it will bear fruit.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina very much for his comments.

Mr. President, in a recent presentation illustrating the desirability of locating an important Federal structure in the Middle West the association noted:

Fourteen percent of Health, Education, and Welfare research and development expenditures at universities in 1964 were committed to universities located in New York, nearly 12 percent to universities located in California, and nearly 8 percent to universities located in Massachusetts.

Thirty-nine percent of Atomic Energy Commission research and development expenditures at universities in 1964 were committed to universities in California and nearly 20.5 percent to universities in New Mexico.

Sixty-nine percent of National Aeronautics and Space Administration research and development expenditures at universities in 1964 were committed to universities in California. This is the impact of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

Fifteen percent of all National Science Foundation grants to universities in 1964 went to universities in California, nearly 12 percent to universities in New York and nearly 10 percent to universities in Massachusetts.

The total expenditures for research and development at universities by these five major groupings of Federal agencies—Defense, HEW, AEC, NASA, and NSF—amounted to \$1.6 of the \$1.7 billion of Federal expenditures for research and development activities at universities in 1964.

At the conclusion of this notation these three questions are asked:

First. Is the current geographical distribution of Federal research and development grants and contracts at American universities meeting the major program objectives of Federal agencies, especially as these program objectives may involve a strengthening and diffusion of higher education capacity for research activity over the long run?

Second. Is the current general support of American universities enabling additional universities to advance their capacity for research activity?

Third. What are the social and economic effects of this concentration of research and development programs?

These are questions of the greatest importance to the Nation—to generations ahead. They are by no means limited to those people who now reside in these 12 States. They are by no means limited to an area of 12 States which today produces 35 percent of the Nation's manufactured goods with 28.6 percent of its population.

They are by no means limited to an area of 12 States which today produces 34.4 percent of the Nation's doctoral degrees from 28.6 percent of the Nation's population.

These questions must be answered to give shape, and form, and balance to this Nation's future for all the years ahead.

I am sending to the desk a resolution asking that an agency of Government given the responsibility for appraising our scientific resources make a study and report to the Congress a feasible plan for equitable direction of Federal research and development funds. This agency, the National Science Foundation, was charged from inception to "appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and upon the general welfare." It was further charged to "strengthen basic research and education in the sciences and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education."

The 15th annual report of the National Science Foundation gives further and full recognition to this original mandate in accepting the burden of science resources planning and in the commendable statement prefacing that report by its director, Leland J. Haworth.

I know so well, as a Member of this body during all the postwar years of the explosion of science, as a member of this body's Committee on Space, and as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that the solution does not rest in simple arithmetic nor in per capita distribution of research dollars. Yet I know that, unless we find a formula for a feasible and responsible distribution of a significant portion of those 15 to 20 billions spent annually in research, we are victims of a trend which soon will escape reversal.

We will accept a population erosion which will concentrate our talents, our industries, and our people in narrow and hopelessly confined areas of this broad and beautiful land.

I ask that the resolution which I now send to the desk remain there for 10 calendar days for cosponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will remain at the desk as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 231) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

#### S. RES. 231

*Resolved*, That the National Science Foundation is requested to formulate and transmit to the Congress at the earliest practicable date its recommendations for such changes in—

(1) the laws under which research and development funds are granted, loaned, or otherwise made available by departments or agencies of the Government to institutions of higher learning for scientific or educational purposes; or

(2) the administration of such laws; as may be necessary and desirable to provide for a more equitable distribution of such funds to all qualified institutions of higher learning to avoid the concentration of such activities in any geographical area and to ensure a continuing reservoir of scientific and teaching skills and capacities throughout the several States.

#### VIETNAM AND RHODESIA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Vietnam and Rhodesia are half a world apart. But there is a reason why we should think of them together, in one particular connection.

This is what I want to discuss for a short time today.

In South Vietnam we are fighting a war to preserve the independence of that little country.

Britain is waging an economic war against Rhodesia to force that little country, which only recently declared its independence, to come back under British domination.

We are helping Britain in her Rhodesian struggle; but Britain is not helping us in South Vietnam. This epitomizes our relationships, today, with many of our allies. But since time is limited, I shall confine my discussion today to the United States and Vietnam, and Britain and Rhodesia.

It has been said, and rightly said, that this country has a commitment in South Vietnam. But so does Britain have a commitment.

The United Kingdom is one of the eight signatories to the SEATO pact, and has exactly the same obligations under that pact that the United States has. England's interest in preserving South Vietnam from engulfment by the Communists should be as great as our own.

We should be able to count upon substantial help from England, in our efforts to preserve the independence of South Vietnam, but we have not been getting it and there is no prospect that we will get it.

Yet Britain is getting our help in her efforts to destroy the independence of Rhodesia.

Just for background, let me portray the Rhodesian situation briefly.

Rhodesia declared its independence from Great Britain on November 11, 1965. Prime Minister Harold Wilson immediately characterized the action as "illegal" and "treasonable."

The declaration followed by slightly more than a month the rejection by Prime Minister Wilson of a demand by Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian D. Smith—in London discussions October 4 to 8, 1965—for immediate independence for the self-governing British possession.

Rhodesia's area is 153,330 square miles. Her population is slightly over 4 million, of which about 250,000 are white; about 1 white to each 15 blacks. The whites presently control the Rhodesian Government. Prime Minister Wilson declared independence would not be granted unless Rhodesia expanded African representation—now limited to 15 in the 65-member legislature—to pave the way for what he called true majority rule.

Economic sanctions by Britain promptly followed the Rhodesian declaration of independence. Rhodesian Prime Minister Smith was suspended November 12 by Sir Humphrey Gibbs, the Queen's representative. Then on November 17, Smith announced he had suspended Gibbs.

Britain also announced it would suspend all aid to Rhodesia, ban exports to

Rhodesia, expel Rhodesia from the Sterling area, ban purchases of tobacco and sugar, and deny Rhodesia access to the London money market.

On November 12, 1965, the Security Council of the United Nations by a vote of 10 to 0, with France abstaining, called on all nations to refrain from rendering aid or recognition to what was termed "this illegal racist minority regime in Southern Rhodesia."

The United States thereupon declared an arms embargo on Rhodesia, announced it would discourage investment or travel in the country, and canceled Rhodesia's sugar quota.

On December 18, 1965, the U.S. Government advised all its citizens to comply with the British embargo on oil shipments to Rhodesia.

On December 28 the U.S. Department of Commerce prohibited the export of gasoline, kerosene, and other petroleum products to Rhodesia, without a validated export license, and announced that its general policy would be to deny such licenses.

The U.S. Government put pressure on American manufacturers who purchase raw materials from Rhodesia, and as a result various imports from Rhodesia have been discontinued. Imports of asbestos and lithium were discontinued on January 10. The State Department has been attempting to persuade American users of chrome to stop buying Rhodesian chrome or chrome ore, and it was recently reported that such purchases had been suspended. This seems a particularly shortsighted move, because in recent years nearly one-third of all chrome used in the United States has come from Rhodesia. Chromium is a material in short supply here, as well as being a strategic material; and the State Department's position in seeking a voluntary cutoff of Rhodesian chrome imports into this country seems hard to justify in the light of our own national interest.

The United States has not been a completely innocent bystander during the development, in recent years, of increased racial tensions in Rhodesia. Lest it be forgotten, let me recall an incident of about 4 years ago.

John K. Emmerson, U.S. consul general at Salisbury, Rhodesia, was recalled in March 1962, after 17 months in that post, as a result of charges by Roy Welensky, then Rhodesian Prime Minister, that after appointment of G. Menen Williams as the U.S. State Department's African expert, U.S. representatives in Rhodesia had abandoned their "traditional line of noninvolvement in Rhodesian internal affairs" and had "pursued a line of not oversubtle alignment with African Nationalists."

Specific charges included these:

First. That the U.S. Information Agency had issued films and literature which "appeared to incite Africans to greater efforts to combat or boycott the federal and Southern Rhodesian systems of government."

Second. That certain films offered by USIA contained "scenes and episodes from past wars of liberation" coupled



with "reminders that Africans, too, are struggling for their independence."

Third. That in Nyasaland, "American consular cars frequently have gotten mixed up in car processions of the Malawi Congress Party, making it appear as if U.S. officials and Malawi partisans are riding toward independence together."

Fourth. That in Southern Rhodesia, American consular men "have also been in close touch with Mr. Joshua Nkomo's Zambia movement." This liaison with Nkomo, it was charged, had been carried on "by both Americans and locally recruited African consular staff of U.S. diplomatic missions."

Sir Roy Welensky in June of 1962 ascribed what he called the present truculence of African leaders partly at least to American and United Nations encouragement.

Dissatisfaction was also expressed by the Rhodesians over the size of the U.S. diplomatic mission, which had a staff of nearly 200 persons, most of them locally employed Africans, and which was larger than any other diplomatic mission in the Federation, and even larger than the British High Commission in Rhodesia. These figures covered the two U.S. consulates in Lusaka and Zomba, as well as the Consulate General in Salisbury.

Throughout Africa, new countries have proliferated as the rising tide of black nationalism has spread across that continent. Every time a group of partially educated, half-savage tribes has constituted an alleged government and declared its country free and independent, we have been pressured by an unreasoning fear of world opinion into immediate recognition of that government. These new, unstable, little so-called countries are immediately admitted to the United Nations where each is given a voting strength the same as our own in that international body. We are told that under no circumstances must force be used to retain or recapture any of these newly declared independencies as territories or dominions of one of the civilized nations of the world.

But when Rhodesia declared its independence, there was a vast cry that force must be used to restore British control; and representatives of the United Kingdom at the United Nations were snubbed and insulted because Britain had not used immediate force to destroy Rhodesian independence.

Does that sound like a double standard? In reality it is not. It is a single standard. The basic principle is increased power for the blacks; but no increased power for the whites.

The first white settlements in central Africa were made only 75 years ago. If we want to understand how the white Rhodesians feel, it may help to imagine how the early settlers in any State of our Union would have felt at being told, 75 years after settlement of the State began, that they should turn over their government to the Indian because they were the true majority.

As I have pointed out, the United States is aiding the British embargo on

shipments to Rhodesia, and our State Department has even gone so far as to put pressure upon American users of chrome to halt purchases from Rhodesia, in spite of the fact that chrome is a critical metal in short supply in this country. But in agreeing to do all this, the United States has not obtained any agreement from Britain to assist us in an embargo or blockade against North Vietnam.

In fact, it does not even appear that our State Department sought such an agreement from Britain when we agreed to help Britain against Rhodesia.

This country has the necessary naval and air strength to enforce a sea blockade against North Vietnam. Those who argue against such a blockade make it a main point of their argument that Britain would not recognize the blockade, and, therefore, that we would be in trouble with our greatest ally if we should attempt to set up such a blockade. Sometimes, more euphemistically, those who argue along this line say that our allies would not recognize the blockade.

It is not at all certain that this is true. Perhaps the announcement of a blockade would give Britain a basis for cutting off trade which she now feels she must maintain in order to avoid offense to the Red Chinese, by whose sufferance alone Hong Kong is permitted to remain British territory.

Only 2 days ago the Commerce Department clamped controls on all exports from this country to Rhodesia. Perhaps there would be resistance by certain interests in the United Kingdom to similar action by that nation with respect to North Vietnam.

But since the United States is cutting off our shipments to and purchases from Rhodesia, in order to help Britain bring that turbulent dominion back under its control, why should we not ask Britain to help us cut off shipments of goods and supplies into North Vietnam, in aid of a defense against Communist aggression which is important to the whole free world?

One thing seems perfectly clear: we should not be asked to hold off on blockading North Vietnam because of any consideration for the British or their feelings about the matter.

If a blockade will help us in our struggle against Communist forces in South Vietnam, if it will help us to shorten the months and the years during which American fighting men must be kept in South Vietnam, if it will reduce in any degree the grisly total which eventually will represent our total casualties in South Vietnam, then a blockade must be undertaken, and the sooner the better.

The weight of the evidence so far adduced supports the conclusion that a blockade will help accomplish these objectives.

The conclusion seems inescapable that, unless there are important facts concealed from us, this country is not doing all it can to win in South Vietnam, and will not be doing so until a blockade of North Vietnam has been set up and made effective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able editorial entitled "On the U.S. Policy Toward Rhodesia," which appeared in the Vicksburg Evening Post, of Vicksburg, Miss., on Monday, February 28, 1966.

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

#### ON THE U.S. POLICY TOWARD RHODESIA

The Commerce Department announced Saturday it is putting controls on all U.S. exports to Southern Rhodesia, and said this action would have the effect of cutting off virtually all exports of importance to the economy of that African country. Previously the United States had put an embargo on arms, military equipment and all petroleum into Rhodesia. Exports to Rhodesia in 1964 were reported at about \$21 million, with the principal export items being construction machinery, transport equipment, textiles, paper and wheat. Now, practically everything we exported into Rhodesia comes under the controls.

It just doesn't follow correct reasoning to adopt such a course against Rhodesia. First of all, it injects our country into the internal affairs of another nation; second, the quarrel between Britain and Rhodesia is none of our business, and we should not take sides in what should be a family affair; third, we, too, broke away from Britain, and proclaimed our independence, and we might, at least, have some sympathy with Rhodesia; fourth, this is the modern day, when all ties with colonialism must be broken, and so Rhodesia should be as entirely free and independent, and should have the same right to freedom and independence as the other African nations which have blossomed out in recent years; but finally, and most important, there is absolutely no basis for us to accede to Britain's wishes for economic sanctions against Rhodesia, when that same Britain insists on doing business with Cuba and North Vietnam and Red China, all of which are our mortal enemies. If, indeed, Britain had any claim whatever on our friendship, then she should be an ally in fact, by refraining from helping out those who are arrayed against our Nation.

If the Members of the Senate of the United States want something to really argue about, they should turn their attention away from Vietnam, and turn their oratorical guns against our administration policy in Rhodesia. There is fertile ground for sound and serious protest, whereas no such ground now exists in Vietnam. We are being played for the proverbial sucker in Rhodesia, while we do nothing to make our supposed allies desist from trade with our enemies. There is justification for an all-out protest against our Rhodesian policy.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Department of Transportation. Introduction of the bill is at the request of the President and the executive department of the Government.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill would establish a 12th Cabinet Department. This is not a new proposal. The Commerce Committee of the Senate considered a

similar proposal for a Department of Transportation in hearings held as far back as 1948. The matter of a Department of Transportation had been before many Congresses prior to that time. I have personal knowledge of the hearings in 1948.

Since 1948, the proposal to establish a Transportation Cabinet Department has been brought up on many occasions, and many study groups have been appointed by the executive department, and by Congress itself, which have recommended such an establishment.

The Commerce Committee's Special Study Group on Transportation Policies in 1961 suggested that a Transportation Department be established.

As I recall, the opening part of the so-called Hoover Commission proposals on reorganization of the Government suggested a Department of Transportation.

Over 5 years ago President Eisenhower recommended to the Congress that such a Department be created. Of course, the need for such a Department has been growing since that time.

President Johnson in his state of the Union message pointed out that such a Department of Transportation is needed to bring together our transportation activities. He stated that the present structure—35 Government agencies, spending \$5 billion yearly—makes it impossible to serve either the growing demands of the Nation, the needs of the industry, or the right of the taxpayer to full efficiency and frugality.

The Congress in the exercise of its power to regulate commerce is vitally interested in insuring that the needs of commerce—communities, shippers, users, and carriers—for a safe, efficient, equitable, and balanced transportation network are served.

The geography of this country makes transportation more important to the economic scheme of this country than to any other country in the world, because of the land mass of the United States and the nature of our economy.

Expedient and effective decision on this bill would be facilitated if the administration would transmit to Congress the factual studies and underlying data on which this recommendation is based.

That, I understand, will be done quickly.

It has been a perennial problem in the field of transportation legislation to subject value judgments and opinions to factual analysis because the facts have not been readily available. Prompt receipt of this information will enable Congress not only to make a prompt decision, but also a better one.

Today the President has sent to Congress a message on transportation. Accompanying this organizational reform of one of the most vital aspects of governmental activities is the President's Transportation Message.

We have, of course, the best transportation system in the world. It has its flaws. But it is the only completely private enterprise transportation system in the world. Most countries have either government-owned transportation, or

the government completely controls transportation and finances it wholly or in major part.

Although we have many flaws, we have a good system. Sometimes it is a marvel to me that it survives as a private enterprise. But it has flourished as a result of private initiative and endeavor. It has also grown with the encouragement and support of various governmental programs. I do not think that we should forget these aspects.

These programs of the government are widely dispersed and uncoordinated. Lately we have begun to aid our transportation system by research.

The bill which I have just introduced on automotive safety carries out that trend in order that we might have greater safety on our highways.

The President has alluded to 35 different departments and agencies involved in transportation, and stated that these programs involve vast sums of Federal money.

Transportation is so much an integral part of our economy, and so important to our economy, that few people realize that transportation activities comprise about one-fourth of the gross national product of this country. It is big business.

We hope that by this bill, the Federal role in transportation will be given a truly national and meaningful effect. If we are ever to achieve a coordinated national transportation system we must reorient and redirect these many programs. The exploding population and economic growth of the Nation demand that we bring some order to the structure of the Federal Government as it is presently organized to deal with transportation.

If we fail to do so now it is obvious the task will become immeasurably more difficult in the future, for transportation needs and problems were multiply.

The importance of transportation as an element of the complex interrelationships of our economic system is increasing daily. Yet there is no one in the present Government organization, other than the President himself, who has authority to coordinate many aspects of Federal transportation policies and programs. The independent regulatory agencies, such as the CAB, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and others, are not able under present law to take such action efficiently and effectively. For our part, we can legislate, but we do not administer.

It is a fact of governmental life that transportation functions have not kept abreast of current or future requirements. Any projection into the future will confirm that conclusion.

If congressional transportation mandates are to meet the needs of the public, we must exercise foresight. This Nation must be assured of strong leadership in promoting advances in transportation technology for fast, efficient, economical service.

The bill attempts, and its objective is, to resolve these matters.

Departmental status would be conferred on those activities which repre-

sent the preponderance of government money and personnel concerned with transportation.

The key modes are the Bureau of Public Roads, which today is next to the Department of Defense as the second largest business in the world.

The Federal Aviation Agency which deals with the sensitive problem of airplane safety is another. It now costs us almost three-quarters of a billion dollars to operate this agency in order to keep the safety features of our airplanes intact and up to date. The FAA would be included in the proposed Department of Transportation.

The Maritime Administration—that is, the Maritime Administrator in the Department of Commerce which now has a single head as distinguished from the Maritime Commission, which has other functions—will also be transferred. There are provisions for integrating our merchant marine into this new department. It will bring the merchant marine into proper relationship with other forms of transportation, rather than operating by itself.

My friend from Oregon and I are interested in the proposed transfer of the Coast Guard into the new department.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, would the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. The Coast Guard renders invaluable service in Alaska, as it does in other parts of the Union. But there is no State in which the service of the Coast Guard is more valued and highly regarded than it is in Alaska. Our people are so glad to see them going out saving lives. It is one of the most cherished things that we have.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As an aid to water operations.

Mr. GRUENING. And I hope that nothing is done to impair its usefulness.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Also transferred is the Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation and its existing responsibilities.

This is a complex and major piece of legislation. It is probably the most important in many years in this field. Because of all of the activities that it covers no one will suggest, not even the chairman, that the bill should not be modified. There will be some portions that need to be corrected and some that may be opposed by Members of Congress. The administration has no particular pride of authorship. They are sending it up to make a start toward a Department of Transportation.

The bill would transfer to the new department Federal safety functions pertaining to all modes of transportation. From the Interstate Commerce Commission, would come rail, motor, and pipeline safety functions.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has a Locomotive Inspection Section in the Bureau of Railroad Safety and Service which is supposed to be responsible for the safety of trains. We give them a niggardly amount every year to inspect locomotives and cars. I believe there have been too many railroad accidents lately. Much of it goes back to



the fact that locomotives and cars have not been inspected as they should be. That function would be transferred.

Then there is the motor carrier safety functions. I do not know how we are going to reach what some of us in the transportation field call the "gypsy" operator. Mainly, they are vehicles in agricultural hauling. They are never inspected. Few farmers today use trucks to haul goods except for short distances. The bulk is carried by "gypsy" operators. Fifty States have 50 different varieties of motor carrier inspection, and the result is that some of these trucks are not in very good condition. There are many accidents occurring in this field. Federal motor carrier safety functions would be transferred to this new department and consolidated with other features of transportation.

Pipeline safety might sound unimportant, but there are extensive pipeline systems in this country.

The bill would transfer Federal safety functions pertaining to all modes of transportation—rail, motor, and pipeline—from the Interstate Commerce Commission; aviation from the Civil Aeronautics Board; and water from the Coast Guard.

Pipelines are constantly blowing up and causing trouble and stoppages because the lines extend for hundreds of miles. Pipelines now under the ICC would be included. Every sensitive field of transportation safety would be included in the new department.

The safety provisions and safety responsibilities with respect to aviation now in the Civil Aeronautics Board would be transferred to the new department, as would those of the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Coast Guard.

The bill also requires that accident causation be determined by an independent National Transportation Safety Board. A five-member board is proposed in the bill. They would be appointed by the President, and their nominations confirmed by the Senate. They would have independent responsibility to examine causes of accidents in all fields. No one is suggesting that the safety board would be an organization whose personnel would go out to investigate each individual automobile accident. Its purpose would be to consider patterns of accident causation.

The President's message endorses the tire safety bill, which I sponsored and which the Committee on Commerce, at its next meeting, is ready to report to the Senate. The Transportation Safety Board might consider all phases of tire safety, from the manufacture of new tires to tire retreading. Such a board would be an independent safety board. I hope it will be possible to secure members that will be as objective as possible, because such a board would correlate safety in all fields.

The bill which I have just introduced will be followed by another bill dealing with safety at sea. The regulations for safety at sea need to be revised. However, we are waiting until the Coast Guard finishes its inquiry into the *Yarmouth Castle* tragedy, to ascertain what

should be done in that respect, and what might be done to improve the safety of foreign ships coming into this country. Such ships obviously do not have the same minimum safety standards that are required for U.S.-flag ships.

Also, operational units and functions of certain agencies relating to other aspects of transportation would be transferred to the new department.

One feature of the bill will have to be considered very carefully. I do not know whether it would be helpful, but we shall explore it and listen to everyone who has ideas. Certain functions of the Corps of Engineers pertaining to anchorages, bridges, and tolls would be transferred. The Alaska Railroad and the St. Lawrence Waterway Development Corporation would be transferred. This can be done by executive order, to fit those agencies into the proposed new Department. It will be necessary to define precisely where the dividing line will be with respect to the functions of the Corps of Engineers as they pertain to many operations that might have some transportation benefits, but as to which the main purpose of the project or the program would not be transportation.

The transfers I have mentioned contemplate an essential nucleus around which sound national transportation policy can be developed, implemented, and coordinated.

The bill also provides that the Secretary of Transportation shall develop economic criteria and data for use by departments and agencies of the Federal Government in the investment of Federal funds in transportation of facilities and equipment. Defense, foreign assistance, and interoceanic canal matters would be exempted from this feature. Perhaps, high speed transit systems also would be excepted, at least for the time being.

In a somewhat similar vein, in connection with the subsidy element of rate-making for the transportation of mail, the bill provides for the Civil Aeronautics Board to take into consideration principles and criteria prescribed by the Secretary of Transportation for determining the character and quality of transportation required for the commerce of the United States and the national defense.

Another subject is of interest to about 80 percent of the membership of the Senate. At one time it was of interest only to Senators west of the Mississippi River. Now, however, about 80 to 85 percent of the Members of the Senate are interested. We out West are highly conscious of this matter, but other areas of the country are also becoming quite conscious of it. It is a serious obstacle to the achievement of a decent transportation system in this country. I refer to a condition that has plagued us out West for many years—the boxcar shortages. Our lumber mills and plywood mills cannot obtain cars to move cargo even a few miles to the docks at a time when we are trying to encourage export trade.

At one time a bill would be reported at every session of Congress from the Committee on Commerce, and we would count noses. Every Senator from east of the

Mississippi would vote against the bill, and every Senator from west of the Mississippi would vote for the bill. At that time more Senators opposed such a bill than favored it, so it was not possible to have such a bill passed. Now the boxcar shortage is national; it affects every area; and it is growing worse. Last year the peak car shortages, on the average, ran about 7,000 cars a day. Now, the Interstate Commerce Commission reports, the shortage is more than 15,000 cars a day.

The Senate has passed a bill to end freight car shortages. It has not yet been reported from the House Committee on Rules. I am hoping that the Members of the House will find it possible to expedite action on the bill. The provisions of that bill to end these shortages, I hope will be transferred to the Department of Transportation, because the new Department could correlate the problem of boxcar shortages with the problems of other modes of transportation to the end of expeditiously moving our products.

The bill does not assume military or government traffic management functions; rather, its purpose is to confer needed responsibility where none has existed; to bring coordination into areas lacking it; to bring consistency of policy in place of fragmentation; and to recognize the concern with the public interest by Congress, the President, the States, labor, management, shippers, and travelers. All in all, this bill is a great step in the right direction.

Lastly, the message calls for—and this has long been an idea of many members of the Committee on Commerce—a permanent Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That Commission is the only independent agency that does not have what is called a permanent Chairman; all the other agencies do. By that statement, I do not mean that his service would be permanent, but that he would serve his term as Chairman by the appointment of the President. The Interstate Commerce Commission has had what is called a revolving chairmanship. Every year it has a new Chairman. Some times that causes problems. I think the bill will be helpful in that field.

The bill is broad. It ties in with the proposed automobile safety legislation, which was introduced today, and with other fields, including tire safety, which is a necessary requirement in the field of automobile safety.

There is one more problem. I am sure the Committee on Government Operations will hold hearings on this bill as it affects the executive department. In the field of automobile research, the suggestion was first made that trust fund monies be used for such research. A contrary suggestion was then made that perhaps that should not be done because, primarily, it was trust fund income. It was pointed out that such research should stand on its own feet. It may be that a percentage of the revived automobile excise tax could be used for research in the field of automobile safety.

This bill is all-encompassing in its field. It is probably the most important bill introduced with respect to trans-

portation since the origin of the Interstate Commerce Act.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I express my gratitude that the senior Senator from Washington, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, will be in charge of the far-reaching proposed legislation on transportation. No one knows better than he how dependent Alaska is on transportation. For Alaska, though physiographically part of the continent, is economically an island. Its very life is dependent upon transportation. No Senator has contributed more usefully, effectively, and devotedly to this activity than has the senior Senator from Washington who is now in charge of the bill.

The Senator from Washington knows that the greatest part of American transportation to Alaska originates in his home city of Seattle, whether by sea, air, or highway.

It was none other than the senior Senator from Washington who embraced the idea, and carried it to execution, of the Alaska Highway. He was the Chairman of the Alaska International Highway Commission, the legislation to create which he sponsored, and I was a member. The Senator will recall that in consequence he and I together made a trip by air over the then nonexistent and proposed routes of the highway in 1939.

The Senator will recall that he was so eager to get going that he neglected to change to heavier clothing and wore his palm beach suit and straw hat. He was willing to travel into those northern latitudes without changing his garments. He wanted action and we got it. Alaska owes a great deal to Senator WARREN MAGNUSON. I am very happy that this new, comprehensive approach will be considered under his guidance.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am a little pressed for time. I do not have time to reminisce with my good friend, the senior Senator from Alaska, who was then the Governor of Alaska. That was quite a trip. I do not believe that I could make that trip now in a lightweight suit. However, we did it then, and the result is that we do have an Alaska Highway today. It should be paved.

Mr. GRUENING. Certainly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The highway is serving a great purpose. I think that this new Department should take a look at this whole matter as it relates to sea and highway transportation, highway paving, and the Alaskan Railroad.

I expect that the new Department will do this and that such problems can be correlated. There is a problem as to the role of common carriage to Alaska as against chartered trucks. There is remarkable progress in some fields. Copper ore is now being hauled along that highway from the Kennecott mine for refining in Vancouver and Tacoma. That is one use to which the highway can be put.

I think that water transportation is improving because there is a little competition.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I hope that the committee plans to hold hearings at various communities in Alaska, all of which points are so vitally concerned—along the steamship route, such as Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Sitka, Juneau, Haines, and Skagway; and points along the Alaska Railroad such as Seward, Anchorage, and Fairbanks, and also at Kodiak and Nome. These cities are all vitally concerned.

It is very important that representatives of these cities be afforded a chance to be heard before any legislation is enacted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Lengthy hearings will be held. The Committee on Government Operations is responsible for executive reorganization. The distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] told me that the committee would immediately start to work on this matter.

We would like to pass this bill in this session. Whatever version of the bill Congress decides to pass should be placed on the books as soon as possible because transportation is a very explosive thing in our country. Transportation is vitally needed to keep our economy alive and strong, not that it has not been doing a good job. However, we can better meet the problems of the future if we have more adequate transportation.

I do not know how many people realize it, but many matters which appear to be urgent at this time will be very urgent 10 years from now.

Thirty-five years from now, in terms of population and facilities, America will be placed on top of the America which presently exists. There will have to be two schools rather than one, two or more hospitals beds rather than one, and perhaps six or more highways rather than the one highway of today. There will be 140 million automobiles on the highways.

Many things must be done to lay the foundation and establish guidelines, such as has been done by the fine work of the senior Senator from Oregon in establishing guidelines in the field of education.

We will thank the Lord 10 years from now that something was done about this matter. Perhaps we are late in acting even at this date.

There will be a completely new America 35 years from now. It took over 175 years to develop the America that exists today. Thirty-five years from now there will be an additional 162 million people.

We hope that we can establish some guidelines, not only for now, but also for the future, so as to create efficient, safe, and economical transportation in the field of transportation which is so important to our economy.

Mr. President, I understand that the President's message on transportation was printed in the RECORD earlier.

I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section summary, together with

a technical addendum thereto, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary and addendum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3010) to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The section-by-section summary and the technical addendum thereto, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Section 1 provides that the act would be cited as the Department of Transportation Act.

#### DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Section 2 sets forth the basic purposes for the establishment of the Department. Congress would declare that the Nation requires development and implementation of national transportation policies and programs conducive to the provision of fast, safe, efficient, and convenient transportation at the lowest cost consistent therewith and with other national objectives, including the efficient utilization and conservation of the Nation's resources.

Congress would find that a Department of Transportation is necessary in the public interest and to assure the coordinated, effective administration of the transportation programs of the Federal Government; to facilitate the development and improvement of coordinated transportation service to be provided by private enterprise to the maximum extent feasible; to encourage the cooperation of government, industry, labor, and other interested parties toward the achievement of national transportation objectives; to stimulate technological advances in transportation, to provide leadership in the identification and solution of transportation problems and to develop and recommend national transportation policies and programs with full consideration of the needs of the public, users, carriers, labor, and the national defense.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT

Section 3(a) would establish a Department of Transportation and provide for a Secretary of Transportation to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Sections 3(b) and (c) provide for an Under Secretary of Transportation, four Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel. These officials would be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Section 3(d) provides for an Assistant Secretary for Administration to be appointed by the Secretary under the classified civil service, with the approval of the President.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 4(a) provides that the Secretary shall exercise leadership under the direction of the President in transportation matters and develop national transportation policies and programs. The Secretary would carry them out or make recommendations for their implementation to the President, the Congress, or the transportation regulatory agencies, as appropriate. This would include participation by the Secretary as a party in proceedings before the regulatory agencies. The subsection also provides for



the Secretary to promote and develop transportation information and research and development in transportation. Transportation would, of course, include all modes of transportation, as well as all types of transportation facilities (e.g., airports) and services (e.g., freight forwarding).

Section 4(b) provides that the Secretary shall give full consideration to the need for operational continuity of the functions transferred by the act, to the need for effectiveness and safety in transportation systems and to the needs of the national defense. This section is intended to prevent undue disruption within the new Department of the functions now being performed by the various operating units which would be the foundation of the Department in order to help assure that the Department will accomplish the stated purposes of the bill.

Section 4(c) would permit the Secretary to provide for emergency medical services, food, quarters, and other specified services generally on a reimbursable basis, to employees and dependents stationed at remote localities, when such services are not otherwise available. The section is not intended to detract from existing authority in agencies transferred.

Sections 4(d), (e), and (f) would authorize the Secretary to accept gifts and bequests of property to aid the work of the Department. Money gifts and bequests would be deposited in the Treasury in a separate fund to be disbursed on order of the Secretary of Transportation. Such gifts and bequests would be considered as gifts to the United States for tax purposes. The Secretary of the Treasury, upon request of the Secretary of Transportation, would be authorized to invest money gifts in U.S. or U.S.-guaranteed securities.

Sections 4(g) and (h) would authorize the Secretary to make special statistical studies in transportation, upon request of any person, firm, or corporation, on a cost reimbursable basis.

Section 4(i) would authorize the Secretary to appoint advisory committees. Members would be authorized per diem and travel expense in accordance with existing law.

Section 4(j) would make orders and actions of the Secretary in the exercise of the functions transferred to him under the act, subject to judicial review to the same extent and in the same manner as if such orders and actions were issued and taken by the agency from which the function was transferred.

Section 4(k) provides that the Secretary, in the exercise of the functions transferred to him under this act, shall have the same powers that are vested in the agency originally exercising such functions. These powers include the authority to hold hearings, issue subpoenas, administer oaths, examine witnesses, take depositions, and compel testimony. The section would, for example, provide the Secretary the same authority as the Civil Aeronautics Board has in section 1004 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 for use in the exercise of the functions transferred to him from the CAB.

Section 4(l) provides that officers and enlisted men on active duty in the Coast Guard are not precluded from appointment to any position in the Department other than Secretary, Under Secretary, and Assistant Secretary for Administration. Retired officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard could be appointed to any position in the Department. The military status of persons appointed under this section would not be affected by the appointment. This section is included so that the military status of personnel of one of the major components of the new Department will not preclude their use in positions within the Department requiring expertise and experience in

the fields of transportation, management and administration gained through service in the Coast Guard. The section would not otherwise change the general law applicable to service in a department by members of the armed services.

#### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Section 5(a) would establish within the Department a National Transportation Safety Board which would exercise the functions transferred to the Secretary by this act with regard to the determination of cause or probable cause of transportation accidents, and with regard to the review on appeal of the suspension, alteration, modification, revocation, or denial of any certificate or license issued by the Secretary. It is anticipated that the Board would establish criteria specifying the type of cases it will consider or review so as to exclude cases of limited impact on the transportation industry, personnel employed therein, and the public.

The Board would be independent of the Secretary and of the operating units of the Department.

Sections 5(b), (c), (d), and (e) generally provide that members of the Board would be appointed with regard to their fitness to perform the functions of the Board, by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; that Board members would serve 5-year terms and be removable only for cause; and that the President would appoint a Chairman whose duties are prescribed. The Chairman would be compensated at level V of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 and members would be compensated at grade 18 level. Other details are set forth in the bill.

Sections 5(f), (g), (h), (i), (j), and (k) generally provide that the Board could issue appropriate rules and regulations to carry out its functions; that the Board, its members, and hearing examiners could issue subpoenas, and perform other acts necessary to carry out the functions of the Board; that the Board could delegate its functions subject to the proviso in section 701(g) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which would prohibit the Secretary from participating in determinations of probable cause in air accidents; that the Board could make recommendations concerning transportation safety and rules and procedures for the conduct of accident investigations to the Secretary; that the Board could employ persons under the civil service; and that the Secretary shall provide financial and administrative services to the Board, on a reimbursable basis. Other details are set forth in the bill.

#### TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT

Section 6(a) would transfer to the Secretary of Transportation all of the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Commerce and other officers and offices of the Department of Commerce under various specified statutes. These transfers are the functions of the Secretary administered by the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, including the high-speed ground transportation program, the aviation loan guarantee program, the aviation war risk insurance program, the Great Lakes Pilotage Administration, the Maritime Administration and the Bureau of Public Roads. The Maritime Administration, among many other maritime activities, has responsibility for operating differential subsidy and construction-differential subsidy for the U.S. merchant marine and shipping industry. The Bureau of Public Roads, among its many highway activities, is responsible for the apportioning and expending of moneys from the highway trust fund for the Federal-aid highway systems.

Section 6(b) would transfer the Coast Guard to the Secretary of Transportation, as

well as functions of the Secretary of the Treasury which relate to the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard would be transferred and would operate in the new department as a complete organizational unit. In time of war or when the President directs, the Coast Guard, together with its functions, would be transferred to the Secretary of the Navy, as provided in existing law. Section 6(b)(3) would transfer the functions of the General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury under the Uniform Code of Military Justice to the General Counsel of the new department. This would preserve the plan embodied in existing law wherein the Judge Advocates General of the Armed Forces exercise judicial functions with respect to review and final action concerning courts martial under the code and the Secretaries of the various departments exercise final approval authority together with such clemency action as they deem appropriate.

Section 6(c) would transfer to the Secretary of Transportation all of the functions, powers, and duties of the Federal Aviation Agency and of the other officers and offices thereof. The Federal Aviation Agency, among its many responsibilities in the field of air commerce, promulgates and enforces safety regulations concerning airmen and aircraft, certifies airmen, aircraft, and aviation schools, and conducts other air safety activities; develops, establishes, maintains, and operates a common system of air navigation and traffic control for civil and military aircraft; provides leadership and direction through the national Government industry program for the design and development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft; and administers the Federal airport program.

Section 6(d) would transfer to the Secretary certain functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board which relate to safety. In general, these functions are to provide for independent review of actions denying or adversely affecting licenses issued under regulations governing air safety and to investigate the facts and circumstances relating to accidents involving civil aircraft and to determine the probable cause of such accidents; and to make recommendations to prevent such accidents in the future.

Section 6(e) would transfer to the Secretary the functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) relating to the administration and enforcement of the various railroad, motor carrier, and pipeline safety laws, and those parts of part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act which relate to car service. The car service functions transferred by this act would permit the Secretary to allocate, for optimum utilization and distribution, railroad freight equipment. Also transferred would be ICC functions with regard to safe transportation of explosives and other dangerous articles. In addition, the Secretary would be given the ICC's functions of setting geographical limits of standard time zones in the United States.

Section 6(f) would transfer to the Secretary certain specific functions of the Secretary of the Army. These are the authority to prescribe drawbridge regulations, to regulate rates on toll bridges, to control the location and clearances of bridges over navigable waters, to detect and enforce measures to prevent oil pollution, and to regulate the location for ships to anchor.

#### TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT STANDARDS

Section 7(a) requires the Secretary of Transportation to develop standards and criteria, subject to Presidential approval, for the formulation and economic evaluation of all proposals for the investment of Federal funds in transportation facilities or equipment, with certain listed exceptions. Provision is made for consultation by the Secretary with the Water Resources Council in preparing compatible economic standards

applicable to transportation features of multipurpose water resource projects. Examples of investment excluded from coverage in the section are those of the Military Sea Transport Service (MSTS), the Military Airlift Command (MAC), the Panama Canal, and AID. Civil transportation investment proposals by the Department of Transportation itself, by the Army Corps of Engineers, and by other Federal agencies would be included.

Section 7(b) requires every survey, plan, or report formulated by a Federal agency which includes a proposal as to which the Secretary has issued standards and criteria pursuant to subsection (a) to be prepared in accord with those standards and criteria and on the basis of transportation data furnished by the Secretary of Transportation and coordinated by the proposing agency with the Secretary and other Government agencies before transmission to the President for appropriate disposition.

#### AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

Section 8(a) amends the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (section 406(b)) by providing that, with respect to subsidy for air carriers, the Civil Aeronautics Board shall take into consideration standards and criteria prescribed by the Secretary of Transportation for determining the character and quality of transportation required for commerce of the United States and the national defense.

Section 8(b) would amend section 201 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act so as to provide that the Secretary of Transportation, rather than the Secretary of Commerce, would be authorized to assist in the construction of an Appalachian development highway system, and make the determination as to which provisions, if any, of the Federal highways laws are inconsistent with the Appalachian Act. The Appalachian Regional Development Commission would continue to submit for approval its recommendations to one Federal official, the Secretary of Commerce, who would transmit such recommendations as he approves to the Secretary of Transportation for approval. The Secretary of Transportation would be authorized to require participating States to use coal derivatives in the construction of roads. Federal assistance to any construction project could not exceed 50 percent of the cost, unless both the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Transportation determine that additional Federal funds are required. Appropriations would be made to the Secretary of Commerce who would transfer funds to the Secretary of Transportation for administration of approved projects.

Section 8(c) would include the Secretary of Transportation in the list of those with whom the Appalachian Regional Development Commission shall consult.

Sections 8(d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) would amend various sections of the Interstate Commerce Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and the Federal Explosives Act to make the necessary changes to implement the transfers in section 6(e). The Secretary would receive the same authority as the ICC to administer, execute, and enforce the functions transferred to him.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Sections 9(a), (b), and (c) would authorize the Secretary to appoint personnel under the civil service laws and to hire experts and consultants. The number of GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions available within the Federal Government would be increased from 2,400 to 2,445. It is noted that the additional 45 would be in the addition to the increases proposed in S. 2393 and H.R. 10498.

Sections 9(d) and (e) would authorize the Secretary to arrange for participation of military personnel in carrying out his functions. Members of the Armed Forces could be as-

signed to the Secretary pursuant to cooperative agreements between the Secretary of Transportation and the military departments. These provisions are similar to existing provisions applicable to the Federal Aviation Agency. Members of the Armed Forces so detailed would not be charged against statutory limitations on grades or strengths applicable to the military departments, and appointment would in no way affect the status of the military personnel so assigned. Persons so assigned would not be subject to the direction or control of the Armed Forces with respect to the responsibilities exercised by such persons in the Department of Transportation. The Secretary would be required to report annually to the Congress on personnel appointed under subsection (d).

Section 9(f) would authorize the Secretary to delegate his functions and to issue appropriate rules and regulations.

Sections 9(g), (h), and (i) would transfer to the Secretary all personnel, assets, liabilities, and appropriations which relate to the functions transferred by the act. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget would have the authority to implement these transfers. Personnel transferred would be protected against reduction in classification and compensation for a period of 1 year. It is expected that most of the personnel would be assigned responsibilities in the new department comparable to those they presently perform, thus minimizing the likelihood of grade reduction. Personnel transferred, of course, would retain whatever rights and benefits to which they are presently entitled under applicable laws.

Section 9(j) would lapse the Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, the Maritime Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Great Lakes Pilotage Administration, and the Federal Aviation Agency. The Coast Guard would not be lapsed. Any person holding a position in any such agency compensated under the Federal Executive Salary Schedule who, without a break in service, is appointed to a position having duties comparable to those he presently performs, would continue to be compensated at not less than the rate of his present position for the duration of his service in such position.

Section 9(k) would authorize the Secretary to establish a working capital fund, similar to those in other departments, for operating various common administrative services in the Department such as supply, messenger, mail, telephone, space, library, and reproduction services. Details are set forth in the bill.

Section 9(l) directs the Secretary to adopt a Department seal and provides for judicial notice of the seal.

#### CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

Section 10(a) would place the Secretary of Transportation in the line of succession to the Office of the President of the United States.

Sections 10(b) and (c) are technical provisions which would extend to the new department the provisions of title IV of the Revised Statutes, except to the extent inconsistent with the bill. These provisions deal with such matters as departmental vacancies, regulations, duties of clerks, details, and employment of personnel, oaths, subpoenas, and witness fees.

Section 10(d) amends section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 by placing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Transportation in level I of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule; by deleting the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation and inserting the Under Secretary of Transportation at level III; by adding four Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Transpor-

tation and a General Counsel of the Department of Transportation at level IV; and by adding an Assistant Secretary for Administration of the Department of Transportation and the chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board at level V. The section also authorizes the President to place one position in level III and a total of nine additional positions in level IV and level V of the executive salary schedule.

Section 10(e) removes from the Federal executive salary schedule, subject to the provisions of section 9 of the Department of Transportation Act, reference to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; Deputy Administrator, FAA; the Associate Administrator for Administration, FAA; the Associate Administrator for Development, FAA; the Associate Administrator for Programs, FAA; the General Counsel, FAA; the Federal Highway Administrator; and the Maritime Administrator.

Section 10(f) amends the act which makes the vessel operation revolving fund available to pay activation and deactivation cost of ships chartered out by the Secretary of Commerce so as to make it applicable to ships chartered out by the Secretary of Transportation.

Section 10(g) amends the act which prescribes a criminal penalty for false representations relating to highway projects submitted to the Secretary of Commerce so as to make it applicable to such projects submitted to the Secretary of Transportation.

Section 10(h) implements the provision of section 6(b)(3) of this act.

#### ANNUAL REPORT

Section 11 provides for an annual report.

#### SAVINGS PROVISIONS

Sections 12(a), (b), (c) and (d) provide that orders, regulations and the like, issued and in effect on the effective date of this section, by any department or agency, functions of which are transferred by this act, shall continue in effect until modified or changed by the Secretary or other legal authority; that proceedings before agencies at the effective date of the section shall continue before the new department; that court proceedings shall not be affected by this and including provision for appropriate substitution of successor parties; and that references in Federal laws, with respect to functions transferred by this act, would be deemed to mean the Secretary of Transportation.

#### SEPARABILITY

Section 13 provides a standard separability clause.

#### CODIFICATION

Section 14 would direct the Secretary to submit to the Congress within 2 years from the effective date of the act, a codification of all laws transferred to the Secretary by this act.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 15 would authorize the President to nominate and appoint the presidentially appointed officers provided for in sections 3 and 5 of the bill, as provided in those sections, at any time after the date of enactment of this bill. All other provisions of the bill would take effect 90 days after the Secretary first takes office, or on such prior date after enactment as the President prescribes in the Federal Register. Provision is made for compensation of appointed officers and related expenses of their offices, from funds available for the functions to be transferred to the Department under the bill.

#### TECHNICAL ADDENDUM TO SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

1. All citations in the bill, of course, are intended to refer to the most recent version of the law cited, including all amendments.



2. Language identifying the subject matter being transferred is included in section 6 of the bill. Such language is intended merely for identification and, unless otherwise clear in the bill, is not intended to limit the transfer of the entire act or section of an act which is the subject of the transfer.

3. All citations in the bill are to the original Statutes at Large citation, except where the United States Code is positive law. The following cross reference to citations in the United States Code is supplied for convenience:

Section 4(i):  
The Administrative Expense Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 808) (5 U.S.C. 73b-2).

Section 5(e):  
The Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 416) (5 U.S.C. 2211);

The Classification Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 954) (5 U.S.C. 1071).

Section 5(h):  
Section 701(g) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 782) (49 U.S.C. 1441(g)).

Section 6(a):  
The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1145) (no applicable code citation).

The act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 526) as amended by the act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 779) (no applicable code citation).

The Federal-Air Highway Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 70) as amended by the Act of October 13, 1964 (78 Stat. 1092) (no applicable code citation).

The Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 387) as amended by the Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 897) (no applicable code citation).

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1028) (no code citation as to sections 302-305 and 401-403 of the act).

The Alaska Omnibus Act (73 Stat. 141) (no applicable code citation).

Senate Joint Resolution 81 (79 Stat. 578) (no applicable code citation).

Section 525(c) of the General Bridge Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 847) (33 U.S.C. 525(c)).

The act of July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 669) (no applicable code citation).

The act of December 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 846) (no applicable code citation).

The act of April 12, 1941 (55 Stat. 140) (no applicable code citation).

The act of April 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 59) (no applicable code citation).

The act of September 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 893) (49 U.S.C. 1631 et seq.).

The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 302) (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

The act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 629) (49 U.S.C. 1429 note).

Section 410 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 769) (49 U.S.C. 1380).

Title XIII, War Risk Insurance, of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 800) (49 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Great Lakes Pilotage Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 259) (46 U.S.C. 216 et seq.).

The Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (41 Stat. 988), (46 U.S.C. 861 et seq.).

The Merchant Marine Act, 1928 (45 Stat. 689), (46 U.S.C. 891 et seq.).

The Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (49 Stat. 1985), (46 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

The Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728) (46 U.S.C. 801 et seq.).

The Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 41) (50 App. U.S.C. 1735 et seq.).

The Maritime Academy Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 622) (46 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.).

The act of June 12, 1940 (54 Stat. 346) (46 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.).

The act of August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 614) (46 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.).

The act of September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 514) (46 U.S.C. 1126b-1).

The act of June 13, 1957 (71 Stat. 73) (46 U.S.C. 1177a).

The act of June 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 59) (46 U.S.C. 1241a).

The act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 605) (46 U.S.C. 249 et seq.).

The act of August 9, 1954 (68 Stat. 675) (50 U.S.C. 196, et seq.).

Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1273) (5 U.S.C. 133z-15 nt and 46 U.S.C. 1111 nt).

Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1949 (63 Stat. 1070) (5 U.S.C. 133z-15 nt).

The act of August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 715) (5 U.S.C. 1161).

Section 6(d): Titles VI (72 Stat. 776) (49 U.S.C. 602(b)) and VII (72 Stat. 781) (49 U.S.C. 1441, et seq.) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

Section 6(e):  
The act of March 2, 1893 (27 Stat. 531) (45 U.S.C. 1, et seq.) as amended by the act of August 14, 1957 (71 Stat. 352) (45 U.S.C. 6, 13).

The act of March 2, 1903 (32 Stat. 943) (45 U.S.C. 8-10) as amended by the act of April 11, 1958 (72 Stat. 86) (45 U.S.C. 9), and the act of April 14, 1910 (36 Stat. 298) (45 U.S.C. 11-16), as amended by the act of August 14, 1957 (71 Stat. 352) (45 U.S.C. 6, 13).

The act of May 30, 1908 (35 Stat. 476) (45 U.S.C. 17-21).

The act of February 17, 1911 (36 Stat. 913) (45 U.S.C. 22-29).

The act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1192) (45 U.S.C. 30).

The act of June 26, 1918 (40 Stat. 616) (45 U.S.C. 24-26).

The act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 659) (45 U.S.C. 22-27).

The act of June 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 822) (45 U.S.C. 24).

The act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148) (45 U.S.C. 24-34).

The act of May 27, 1947 (61 Stat. 120) (45 U.S.C. 24-nt, 26).

The act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 909) (45 U.S.C. 34).

The act of October 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 972) (45 U.S.C. 24).

The act of August 14, 1957 (71 Stat. 352) (45 U.S.C. 34).

Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1965 (79 Stat. 1320) (5 U.S.C. 133z-15 nt and 45 U.S.C. 22 nt).

The resolution of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 838) (45 U.S.C. 35).

The act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 325) (45 U.S.C. 36-37).

The act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 965) (45 U.S.C. 37).

The act of May 6, 1910 (36 Stat. 350) (45 U.S.C. 38-43).

The act of September 13, 1960 (74 Stat. 903) (45 U.S.C. 38).

The act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1415) (45 U.S.C. 61-64).

The act of May 4, 1916 (39 Stat. 61) (45 U.S.C. 63).

The act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 909) (45 U.S.C. 34).

The act of August 14, 1957 (71 Stat. 352) (45 U.S.C. 63).

The act of February 23, 1905 (33 Stat. 743) (49 U.S.C. 1201-1203).

The act of June 13, 1957 (71 Stat. 69) (49 U.S.C. 1201-1203).

The act of March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 450) (15 U.S.C. 261-265).

The act of March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1446) (15 U.S.C. 265).

The act of March 3, 1923 (42 Stat. 1434) (15 U.S.C. 264).

The act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 646) (15 U.S.C. 264).

The following sections of the Interstate Commerce Act: 1(10) (49 U.S.C. 1(10)), 1(11) (49 U.S.C. 1(11)), 1(12) (49 U.S.C. 1(12)), 1(13) (49 U.S.C. 1(13)), 1(14)(a) (49 U.S.C. 1(14)(a)), 1(15) (49 U.S.C. 1(15)), 1(16) (49 U.S.C. 1(16)), 1(17) (49 U.S.C. 1(17)), 6(8) (49 U.S.C. 6(8)), 15(4) (49

U.S.C. 15(4)), 15(10) (49 U.S.C. 15(10)), 420 (49 U.S.C. 1020), 25 (49 U.S.C. 26), 222 (49 U.S.C. 325), 1(21) (49 U.S.C. 1(21)), 204(a)(1) and (2) (49 U.S.C. 304(a)(1) and (2)), 204(a)(3), (3a), and (5) (49 U.S.C. 304a)(3), (3a), and (5)), 1(6) (49 U.S.C. 1(6)), 206 (49 U.S.C. 306), 207 (49 U.S.C. 307), 209 (49 U.S.C. 309), 210a (49 U.S.C. 310a), 212 (49 U.S.C. 312), and 216 (49 U.S.C. 316).

Section 6(f):

Section 7 of the River and Harbor Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1053) (33 U.S.C. 471).

The act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 150) (33 U.S.C. 180, 258).

Section 5 of the act of August 18, 1894 (28 Stat. 362) (33 U.S.C. 499).

The act of June 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 497) (33 U.S.C. 511-524).

Section 4 of the act of March 23, 1906 (34 Stat. 85) (33 U.S.C. 494).

Section 503 of the General Bridge Act (60 Stat. 847) (33 U.S.C. 526).

Section 17 of the act of June 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 552) (33 U.S.C. 498a).

The act of June 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 821) (33 U.S.C. 498b).

The act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 670) (33 U.S.C. 503-507).

The Oil Pollution Act, 1961 (75 Stat. 402) (33 U.S.C. 1001, et seq.).

Section 9 of the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151) (33 U.S.C. 401).

The act of March 23, 1906 (34 Stat. 84) (33 U.S.C. 491-498).

The General Bridge Act (60 Stat. 847) (33 U.S.C. 525-539).

Section 8(a): Section 406(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 763) (49 U.S.C. 1376(b)).

Section 8(b): Section 201 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act (79 Stat. 10) (40 App. U.S.C. 201).

Section 8(c): Section 206(c) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act (79 Stat. 15) (40 App. U.S.C. 206(c)).

Section 8(d): Sections 12 (49 U.S.C. 12), 13(1) (49 U.S.C. 13(1)), 13(2) (49 U.S.C. 13(2)), 20 (49 U.S.C. 20), 204(a) (49 U.S.C. 304(a)), 204(c) (49 U.S.C. 304(c)), 205(d) (49 U.S.C. 305(d)), 205(f) (49 U.S.C. 305(f)), 220 (49 U.S.C. 320), 222 (49 U.S.C. 322) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Section 8(e): Section 212(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 Stat. 555) (49 U.S.C. 312(a)).

Section 8(f): Section 13(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1067) (29 U.S.C. 213(b)).

Section 8(g): Section 18(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act (27 Stat. 386) (49 U.S.C. 18(1)).

Section 8(h): Section 3 of the Federal Explosives Act (40 Stat. 385) (50 U.S.C. 123).

Section 9(b): Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 959) (5 U.S.C. 1105(b)).

Section 9(c): Section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810) (5 U.S.C. 55a).

Section 10(c): Section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 416) (5 U.S.C. 2211).

Section 10(e): Subsections (b)(7), (d)(2), and (e) (12), (13), (14), (76), (82), and (89) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 416) (5 U.S.C. 2211).

Section 10(f): The Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 897) (46 U.S.C. 1241c).

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Americans are justly proud of the fact that we have the greatest transportation system in the world. But this happy situation results more from good luck than from careful and deliberate planning. It may not be so in the years ahead.

Railroads, canals, roads, river systems, ocean shipping, and aviation were de-

veloped to meet the needs of a growing country.

During this process each form of transportation has received help and encouragement from the Government in one form or another. And each has experienced governmental regulation to restrain monopoly, on one hand, and to avoid destructive competition on the other.

Naturally, this evolutionary process has not resulted in a real system, in the real sense of the word. I think it would be more accurate to say that we have today a conglomeration of transport networks which, fortunately, have so far served us well.

However, it would indeed be foolhardy to assume that our transportation resources will automatically keep pace with the requirements of our burgeoning economy in the decades just ahead. The world has become far too complicated to allow us that luxury.

And so I welcome the initiative of President Johnson in sending to the Congress his proposals to create a Department of Transportation. These proposals indicate a knowledge of the fact that action will be necessary soon to provide for a vital and versatile transportation network to serve a rapidly growing economy and the national defense.

I am sure there will be no easy answers in this search for rational, coordinated, and clearly defined national policies, but the President's plan provides us with a concrete starting point. Just as the problems are complex so will the solutions be complex and will require a great deal of study and investigation before this concept can be put in final form. I am in complete support of the President's determination to begin this process at once.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I congratulate President Johnson on his call for a new Department of Transportation. It is a bold and much needed step and one in which I strongly support him.

We are a nation on the move. Indeed, we have become great largely because of a great transportation system.

There are, however, as the Washington Star noted recently, "too many cooks" in the system.

Transportation regulation and policy formulation is divided among 35 Government agencies, and as President Johnson has said, this makes it difficult to serve the Nation, the needs of the industry, or the right of the taxpayer.

I have been made acutely aware of the problems which this diversity of Federal responsibility can create, through my own concern with transportation matters in the Northeast States, particularly with regard to the New Haven Railroad.

The New Haven is, in fact, a classic example of the frustrations and confusion which can result from uncoordinated public policies. The railroad is, in the first place, under the general supervision of a Federal court because it is in receivership. Next, because of its precarious position, it has petitioned an independent Federal agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission, to allow discontin-

tinuance of all its passenger service, on the one hand, and to require inclusion of the line in the Penn-Central merger, on the other.

Concurrently, however, two other Federal agencies are participating in programs of either temporary assistance or experimentation which could lead to future rejuvenation. The Housing and Home Finance Agency has made a substantial demonstration grant to assist the New York commuter service, and more recently the Commerce Department has launched an experimental program, with which I am happy to be associated, to test new high-speed equipment on the northern end of the line to determine if the railroad can recapture some of its intercity passenger traffic.

Meanwhile, the parallel competing transportation services—by highway, air, and water—which contributed so notably to the New Haven's decline, continue to be heavily supported by the programs of the Bureau of Public Roads, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Maritime Administration.

It is high time, I believe, that these diverse and often competing agencies be brought together under one roof and under one coherent and unified framework of responsible policy formulation which will have as its paramount objective the provision of a rational and balanced transportation system to serve the public interest.

We have an excellent example, I believe, of the kind of coherent policy formulation we need in the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965, with which I am proud to claim a paternal relationship. Under this program we are attempting to determine first if the public will respond to rejuvenated rail service and thus relieve overburdened air and highway facilities and, secondly, to determine over the long range if even more efficient modes of ground transportation can be devised for short and intermediate distances and thereby alleviate the almost inevitable congestion which will occur without such developments.

It will take coordinated policy formulation to make effective use of the findings of this excellent program, however, and such coordination can only come from the structural amalgamation of Federal agencies along the lines the President proposes.

Finally, Mr. President, I think it is noteworthy that the press has responded favorably to the President's proposal as first set forth in his state of the Union message. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this time editorials from the Providence Evening Bulletin, Christian Science Monitor, Washington Evening Star, and the Washington Post.

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

[From the Providence (R.I.) Evening Bulletin, Jan. 18, 1966]

MR. JOHNSON HAS A SOUND IDEA

There is merit in President Johnson's proposal to establish a Department of Transportation at the Cabinet level.

As the President pointed out in his state of the Union message, transportation activities of the Federal Government presently are scattered among 35 separate agencies. This scattering, the President declared, "makes it impossible to serve either the demands of the Nation, the needs of industry, or the right of the taxpayer to full efficiency and frugality."

Senator PELL warmly endorsing the President's suggestion, has cited a specific example of the existing confusion in which various Federal agencies appear to be tripping over one another's feet.

"While the (New Haven) railroad is petitioning the ICC to drop all passenger service," Senator PELL observed, "two other Federal agencies, the Department of Commerce and the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, are trying to devise ways through two separate experiments to keep the service alive. Meanwhile, highway development and air service, which weigh so strongly in any plans for railroad rejuvenation continue their separate courses under the Bureau of Public Roads and the Federal Aviation Agency."

The example cited by Senator PELL is not at all unusual. Innumerable similar examples could be cited in which the lack of coordination among the various Federal agencies often makes for confusion and wasted effort. It simply doesn't make sense any more to have one agency establishing policy for the airlines, another for the railroads, still another for the merchant marine, and yet another for the road network that is used by buses and trucks.

The only sensible approach is to consider our transportation network as an integrated whole. Our railroads, airlines, buses, trucks, ships and private cars all fit into our national transportation picture. Each element has a role to play, but each of the elements must be integrated smoothly with all the others.

One way to achieve that integration would be by placing all the Federal agencies that deal with transportation into a single department.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 18, 1966]

TO UNCLUT THE JAMS

Even before the New York transit strike, we had seen a piquantly amusing and prophetic short cartoon at the movies. It was either British or Canadian. But that is not the point. It showed what might eventually happen to our cities if automobiles continued to pile up in our streets just as the lava and the pumice piled up nearly two millennia ago in the streets of Pompeii and Herculaneum. The fact is that just such a throttling and choking threaten already all the industrialized societies of the Western world.

We may not like centralized planning, but there seems little alternative to a coordinated handling of all transport facilities and services, if our modern societies are not to be brought to a standstill by a surfeit of cars and a dearth of nearly everything else. When Nikita Khrushchev was in Washington several years ago, he saw from a helicopter some of that city's rush-hour traffic jams. Reportedly he said he would never allow that kind of nonsense in the Soviet Union. He simply would not let everybody buy a car. But amusingly now, it seems that all the doctrinaire direction of the Soviet system has not been able to prevent parking becoming a major problem in Moscow.

In a word, transportation has become one of the social problems of our time.

President Johnson referred to it in his state of the Union message. "A new Department of Transportation is needed," he said,



"to bring together our transportation activities. The present structure—35 Government agencies spending \$5 billion yearly—makes it impossible to serve either the demands of the Nation—the needs of industry—or the right of the taxpayer to full efficiency and frugality."

Britain, where transport problems are less gigantic but more concentrated than in the industrialized parts of the United States, has long had a Ministry of Transport. The British public have tended to identify it with roads—and Prime Minister Harold Wilson's recent appointment as Minister of Transport of a woman who does not have a driving license has produced snorts and guffaws from some Britons (particularly male drivers). But the putting of Mrs. Barbara Castle—for she is the lady in question—in the top job at the Ministry of Transport bespeaks recognition of the need for drive and reorganization and, above all, the British Government's determination to draw up an integrated transport plan for the United Kingdom.

Mrs. Castle was an undoubted success in the apparently not very glamorous or exciting Ministry of Overseas Development where Prime Minister Wilson appointed her after the 1964 general election. His decision to put her in charge of transport is—as the Economist said—imaginative. It stems from the same basic need as prompted President Johnson's announcement of a new Department of Transportation in the United States. All of us have a vested interest in the success of both moves, for all of us have a greater urge and opportunity than ever to get about—whether it be simply getting to work from the suburbs or more ambitiously getting away on vacation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 26, 1966]

#### TOO MANY COOKS

President Johnson in his state of the Union message put his finger on one of the major flaws in American transportation policy. Regulation is now divided among no less than 35 Government agencies, spending a total of \$5 billion yearly.

Such a fragmented approach, in the President's words, "makes it almost impossible to serve either the growing demands of this great Nation, or the needs of the industry, or the right of the taxpayer to full efficiency and real frugality."

Mr. Johnson's remedy would be to centralize all this supervision of airlines, railroads, trucking, and shipping in a new Department of Transportation. While Congress must await details of how this would be accomplished, the basic idea seems so logical and simple that the puzzle is why it was not done long ago.

Actually, the notion of such a Cabinet-level department has been kicking around Washington for years, but mutual suspicion and hostility among the powerful lobbies representing the various carriers and the struggles by bureaucrats to keep control over their little fiefdoms have successfully stalled action.

The result is a patchwork approach to the industry. Some modes of transportation must build their own depots while others use buildings erected at taxpayers' expense. Some carriers pay tax on fuel, others do not. Uncle Sam contributes to the cost of safety devices for one industry, while another receives no such benefit. And so it goes.

Putting all the regulators in one department will not automatically produce a rational, fair, and harmonious policy toward each segment of the industry. But it is the first step that must be taken to achieve such a reform. The public interest requires no less.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 19, 1966]

#### TRANSPORTATION AND MORE

The President's proposal to establish a Department of Transportation, a single agency that would coordinate the diverse programs and functions of the Federal Government, deserves the widest support. In fact, a good case can be made for broadening the scope of the new department to include communications and power.

There are obvious and compelling reasons for placing the Federal transportation agencies under one roof. The Federal Government is now spending some \$6 billion a year for motor highway construction, the subsidization of the merchant marine, inland waterway and harbor improvement and the regulation of railroads, airlines, and common motor carriers. But those dollars cannot be spent effectively, they cannot confer maximum benefits upon the taxpayers unless national goals are clearly specified and pursued through coordinated efforts. Neither logic nor necessity has decreed that the Federal highway and waterways programs must work to the detriment of the Nation's railroads as they do now.

But a perfunctory coordination of transportation activities, one that merely results in shifting autonomous agencies under one big, bureaucratic tent will accomplish nothing more than an increase in Federal employment. To cite a specific example, the new department is not going to be effective so long as the Interstate Commerce Commission, that sclerotic archetype of the independent regulatory agency, continues to establish minimum, not maximum rates and approve rail mergers without sufficient attention to the balance and efficiency of the total transportation system. The effective coordination of Federal transportation programs, to say the very least, will involve a political struggle.

But that struggle, which will be centered largely around the conflicting interest of different modes of transportation, is not likely to be protracted if the new department were to encompass communications and the transmission of power. The inclusion of the Federal Communications and Federal Power Commissions in a new Department of Transportation, Communications, and Power would make it possible for the Government to regulate virtually all the interstate public utilities in a uniform and equitable manner. The inability of both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to make headway in the effort to alter railroad rate regulation is but a foretaste of the opposition to the formation of a new department.

#### TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate H.R. 12752, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12752) 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.

#### THE VICE PRESIDENT'S INFORMAL MEETING WITH THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have before me a most interesting article that

appeared in this morning's Washington Post. The headline is "HUMPHREY Agrees To See FULBRIGHT Panel Privately."

The article states:

Vice President HUMPHREY agreed yesterday to a compromise plan to meet with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in private, informal session.

For the past 2 weeks HUMPHREY has rejected Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's request that he meet with the committee in a more formal public session.

Under the compromise plan, HUMPHREY will meet with the committee this afternoon on the neutral ground of Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD's Capitol office.

FULBRIGHT's disagreement with another high administration official—President Johnson—continued to simmer yesterday.

The President refused to make public the testimony he gave to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 25, 1961, after he returned from an Asian tour which he made as Vice President. On Monday FULBRIGHT suggested that the President make the testimony public.

At a press conference yesterday, Presidential Press Secretary Bill Moyers said that Mr. Johnson had appeared before the 1961 committee meeting with the understanding that it "would be informal and private." Moyers said that the President "doesn't regard it as appropriate to change the rules 5 years later" by making public his testimony.

In another development, FULBRIGHT disclosed that the committee would resume public hearings on U.S. Asian policy next Tuesday.

The new hearings will center on Communist China. The first witnesses will be two university experts on China—A. Doak Barnett of Columbia University on Tuesday and Harvard's John K. Fairbank on Thursday.

My reaction to the story is: How absurd can we be?

I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and this morning I protested any informal meeting with the Vice President on neutral grounds in the majority leader's office this afternoon.

I do not care how many Senators, be they members of the Committee on Foreign Relations or not, want to meet with the Vice President any time they want to meet with him. However, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I do object and said so this morning, to this kind of fol-de-rol, to this kind of nonsense.

Mr. President, no one has defended more than I have—and I shall continue to do so—the matter of separation of powers and the right of executive privilege.

The Vice President of the United States does not have to come to any committee meeting that he does not wish to attend. He is completely protected by executive privilege. He can volunteer to come. It has happened in the past.

But, Mr. President, I am at a loss to understand this parliamentary nonsense. I should have thought that the Vice President, on his own initiative, would have asked for the opportunity to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee in open session, to discuss with the committee the trip into Asia that he took at the request of the President of the United States. That would have been a most appropriate forum in which to discuss it.

There are other forums, and the Vice President is using them, as he has a perfect right to do, and I am glad he is using

them. He used the forum of the East Room of the White House the other morning. In fact, I think he used it on a couple of mornings, to meet with various Members of Congress. That is fine; I heartily approve of it.

He has announced that he is going to use forums across the country to discuss his trip with the American people. I highly approve of that. He has used the forum of nationwide television and I approve of that.

The Foreign Relations Committee has certain special responsibilities in the field of foreign policy. It has certain special prerogatives in that field, and has a responsibility to officially seek to take testimony from those who, in the opinion of the committee, are particularly qualified and competent to be of assistance to the committee by giving them their testimony.

The committee chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] was seeking to carry out that responsibility when he most respectfully suggested, the other day, that the Vice President meet with the Foreign Relations Committee in open, public session and discuss with the committee the trip that he had taken, and the many foreign relations problems that were raised by that trip.

When it became clear that the Vice President would not wish to meet with the Foreign Relations Committee in open session, the chairman of the committee most respectfully and properly suggested that he meet in executive session with the committee. When that was first suggested in our committee, I made it clear that it should be at the voluntary discretion of the Vice President, that we could not insist that he meet with us, but that we had the right to invite him to an executive meeting.

When the Vice President indicated, as I understand he did, that he did not care to meet the committee in public session or executive session, the matter should have been dropped. I do not think that it is fair, either to the committee or to the Vice President, to become involved in this hybrid arrangement, which is neither fish nor fowl.

Therefore, Mr. President, I made clear at the meeting this morning that I would not attend the session this afternoon, because I do not think that that session is in keeping with the separation of powers doctrine as far as a Senate committee is concerned, unless they were simply meeting as individual Senators, without any representation that it is a committee meeting. As far as I am concerned, there is no official Foreign Relations Committee meeting with the Vice President, and there cannot be, under the terms set forth in this press report.

There are some questions that the American people are entitled to have answered by the Vice President, but they are entitled to have them answered, in open session, where he can be asked on the record questions about problems that are raised, for example, by a story that appeared in the Washington Daily News of February 25, by Walt Friedenberg, entitled "South Korea Drove a Bargain With H.H.H."—meaning the Vice President.

The article reads:

SEOUL, February 24.—Vice President HUMPHREY ended his 2-week, 9-nation tour here with a bargaining session on terms for sending more South Korean troops to help fight in Vietnam.

The terms were not made public. It is agreed, however, that this country will send one more regiment to South Vietnam by the end of April and a full infantry division by mid-July.

The present ROK troop total of 23,000 would thus rise to about 40,000.

Seoul argued that its present contingent in Vietnam was a reasonable contribution. But if more troops were to be sent, South Korea must look to its national interests, that is, be compensated.

So far as can be learned now, South Korea has been promised:

The gradual, selected reequipping (chiefly in heavy weapons) of its 500,000-man army.

Assurance that \$150 million in earmarked economic aid promptly will be forthcoming.

A stipend of about \$2 a day paid for each Korean soldier in Vietnam for better living conditions.

The continued flow of Korean civilian technicians to good-paying construction jobs in South Vietnam.

A greater share for Korea in the procurement of cement, of military uniforms, and other goods needed by South Vietnam.

An interesting story. I do not know what the facts are. But I do know, Mr. President, the American people are entitled to know what the facts are.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles from which I have quoted, the one from today's issue of the Washington Post entitled "HUMPHREY AGREES TO SEE Fulbright Panel Privately," and the one from yesterday's Washington Daily News entitled "South Korea Drove a Bargain With H.H.H.," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 1, 1966]

#### HUMPHREY AGREES TO SEE FULBRIGHT PANEL PRIVATELY

Vice President HUMPHREY agreed yesterday to a compromise plan to meet with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in private, informal session.

For the past 2 weeks HUMPHREY has rejected Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's request that he meet with the committee in a more formal public session.

Under the compromise plan, HUMPHREY will meet with the committee this afternoon on the neutral ground of Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD's Capitol office.

FULBRIGHT's disagreement with another high administration official—President Johnson—continued to simmer yesterday.

The President refused to make public the testimony he gave to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 25, 1961, after he returned from an Asian tour which he made as Vice President. On Monday FULBRIGHT suggested that the President make the testimony public.

At a press conference yesterday, Presidential Press Secretary Bill Moyers said that Mr. Johnson had appeared before the 1961 committee meeting with the understanding that it "would be informal and private." Moyers said that the President "doesn't regard it as appropriate to change the rules 5 years later" by making public his testimony.

In another development, FULBRIGHT disclosed that the committee would resume public hearings on U.S. Asian policy next Tuesday.

The new hearings will center on Communist China. The first witnesses will be two university experts on China—A. Doak Barnett of Columbia University on Tuesday and Harvard's John K. Fairbank on Thursday.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 24, 1966]

#### MORE AID IN VIETNAM FOR MORE AID: SOUTH KOREA DROVE A BARGAIN WITH H.H.H.

(By Walt Friedenberg)

SEOUL, February 24.—Vice President HUMPHREY ended his 2-week, nine-nation tour here with a bargaining session on terms for sending more South Korean troops to help fight in Vietnam.

The terms were not made public. It is agreed, however, that this country will send one more regiment to South Vietnam by the end of April and a full infantry division by mid-July.

The present ROK troop total of 23,000 would thus rise to about 40,000.

Seoul argued that its present contingent in Vietnam was a reasonable contribution. But if more troops were to be sent, South Korea must look to its "national interests," that is, be compensated.

So far as can be learned now, South Korea has been promised:

The gradual, selected reequipping (chiefly in heavy weapons) of its 500,000-man army.

Assurance that \$150 million in earmarked economic aid promptly will be forthcoming.

A stipend of about \$2 a day paid for each Korean soldier in Vietnam for "better living conditions."

The continued flow of Korean civilian technicians to good-paying construction jobs in South Vietnam.

A greater share for Korea in the procurement of cement, of military uniforms, and other goods needed by South Vietnam.

Mr. MORSE. I do know, Mr. President, that in a democracy, if it is to be preserved, the executive branch of Government must be stopped, whether it involves the President or the Vice President or both, from engaging in government by executive supremacy. If the Daily News story I have read is true, this is dangerous stuff.

If it is true, it is important that we proceed without delay to check the increasing exercise of arbitrary, capricious power on the part of the President and the Vice President of the United States in the field of foreign policy.

By our failure to demand a public accounting, we will entrench government not by law but by a man. I know of no man, including the President of the United States, who should be given such unchecked arbitrary power.

Thus, Mr. President, I do not intend to participate in any conference—which is going on as I speak now—in the name of the Committee on Foreign Relations. In my judgment, if members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as individual Senators, wish to meet with the Vice President of the United States, then they should do it in their individual capacities as Senators. They should not go into any such off-the-record informal meeting in the name of the Foreign Relations Committee, because when a Foreign Relations Committee meeting is held, it should be held as an official meeting, in accordance with the rules and policies of the committee.

Mr. President, it saddens me to make these comments about the Vice President, but I mean every word.



In my judgment, anyone who advocates, as the Vice President is advocating, the bombing of people to a so-called peace table, has lost his right to claim to be a liberal. Anyone who is advocating the kind of an escalating war, which the Vice President is advocating in his public statements, has lost the right to claim to be a liberal.

Mr. President, I have said before on the floor of the Senate, and repeat today, that the issue is now before the American people.

I say to the American people that they and they alone have the authority to check this escalating war in Vietnam, that they will have to do it at the ballot box, beginning in the primaries just ahead, and then voting in the November elections in 1966, continuing in the primaries in 1968 and voting in the general election in 1968. Unless the American people are willing to defeat those who are seeking to lead this country—by its present foreign policy—into a major war in Asia, which will be the inevitable end result, then the American people have only themselves to blame as increasing thousands and thousands of Americans, both military and civilian, will be slaughtered in that holocaust.

Mr. President, that is the issue.

I am going to urge—short of a formal declaration of war, which this President should have recommended before he sent a single boy into Asia to be slaughtered—that the American people defeat the policy which now characterizes the warmaking policy of the administration.

I am perfectly willing to face the ballot box. I am perfectly willing to be judged by my people. I have served for 20 years in the Senate, always on the basis of the principle that each term is my last, for that is the only basis upon which anyone, in my judgment, has any right to serve in the Senate. For if we are not willing to serve in this body on the assumption that we are going to be either reelected or defeated on the basis of the record we make, as we utilize our independence of judgment on the facts as we find them, then we have no right to serve here at all.

I am perfectly willing to be judged on the record that I make, and to be judged on my record for peace—a peace on terms which honors my country and carries out the long-held professions of my country that we believe in following the rule of law in the settlement of international disputes, and not in the rule of the jungle by the use of military force which we are following today in southeast Asia.

#### COMMUNICATIONS ON VIETNAM WAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that certain communications, editorials, and articles dealing with my views on foreign policy be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Feb. 8, 1966]

#### MORSE ON THE VIETNAM WAR

Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on

January 28 that the administration had tried to "expose fully to the public" the elements of the Vietnam problem but that it was hard to get the people to listen.

Critics of the administration's policy do not agree that an effort has been made to expose the public to all elements of the problem. They think the administration has withheld information and deceived the public in statements and speeches. The critics might agree that it has been hard to get the people to listen.

But this situation has changed, we believe, as a result of the big buildup of U.S. forces in Vietnam, the bombing pause and its resumption and the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. People are in a mood to listen. They want to obtain a better understanding of the problem.

Des Moines had evidence of this new mood Sunday when about a thousand persons turned out to hear Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, talk at a meeting sponsored by Iowans for Peace in Vietnam. Judging by the applause and the questioning of Senator Morse, the audience was largely sympathetic to the views of the Oregon Senator, a harsh critic of administration policies.

Senator Morse made a strong, reasonable and unemotional presentation of his case. He made clear that he respects and admires President Johnson and that he believes the President wants peace. MORSE has no sympathy for communism. He does not favor an immediate pullout of troops from Vietnam and he does not support those who violate laws in peace demonstrations.

Senator Morse challenged the legal basis for the actions the United States has taken in Vietnam, without a declaration of war. He sees a drift to government by Executive decisions. He believes secrecy policies and deceptive propaganda make it difficult for people to get the facts on Vietnam—and to generate a change in our foreign policy.

MORSE listed what he believes are the failures of the United States to live up to provisions of the Geneva treaty of 1954 and the United Nations Charter. He told of the lack of support for U.S. views among other countries. He praised the belated decision to ask the United Nations to consider the problem. He expressed his fears about the dangers of escalation that could lead to war with Red China and the Soviet Union.

We hope the great debate goes on, not only through speeches throughout the country by men like Senator Morse and those who disagree with him, but also in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor of the Senate.

The search for an alternative policy to one of indefinite expansion and intensification of the war must continue—and that search will be helped by bringing everything, except security matters, into the open. Democratic and constitutional processes must be preserved in handling even such a difficult problem as the war in Vietnam.

[From the Oregon Journal, Feb. 18, 1966]  
WORLD WAR I VETERAN VOICES DOUBTS ON VIETNAM

To the EDITOR:

May I in the name of Christianity and democracy express my deep concern in regard to the road of destruction along which our President and the hawks of the Pentagon are leading us?

I volunteered 11 days after war was declared in 1917. I furnished three boys and a girl in World War II and one boy in the Korean war.

While they were gone I ran a 250-acre farm alone to make sure they had the food with which to fight. I gave a gallon of blood

that they and their comrades might have blood to meet their needs. I sold Government bonds and never once did I miss my quota, even if I had to buy enough myself to fill it.

Now, some of those "super patriots" insist that I send my grandsons to fight and die in that hellhole of Vietnam in order to force a people to accept our brand of democracy merely because it has proved a success here where conditions are in no way the same except that each deals with human beings. What is wrong with America's faith in democracy when we will say that we must send these boys to fight and die 7,000 miles away because this big deal of communism is liable to take us over?

Nowhere in the world can you show me where communism has ever been able to give its people the things that we have accomplished for ourselves. Nowhere can you show me a country that has accepted communism but what was driven there by economic and social breakdown in its ability to serve its people. Communism cannot gain a foothold unless there is poverty, injustice, and economic chaos. This is the ground in which it survives. Can napalm bombs and destruction kill communism or solve these problems? It cannot.

I will admit that America with all of the destructive weapons can scorch the whole of North and South Vietnam, but you will never kill the cause for which they fight regardless of what we choose to call it, and you will leave behind a hatred all over Asia that will live on forever. Why doesn't our Government tell the people that 87,000 Vietnamese regulars deserted in 1964 and 90,000 in the first 10 months of 1965? These are men whom we have equipped and trained, and yet Mr. Johnson leads us to believe that they have come from the North. Most of the arms that we capture are not Chinese made, but Russian and United States made.

If we would have spent just a fraction of our cost of war today in medical, educational, social, and economic advancements, we would not be called on 20 years after our real commitment was made by Vinegar Joe Stilwell, who was head of the Chinese Nationalist Forces during World War II. We would not be called on to make this staggering decision facing us.

I helped to elect Mr. Johnson because of my faith in him to resolve this crucial problem. But now I am thinking that perhaps I have made a terrible mistake for he seems completely under the spell of the hawks of the Pentagon.

General Eisenhower warned us of this military-industrial complex lest they would take over; so did Gen. Matthew B. Ridgeway in his book "Soldier." "I challenge any thesis that destroying the military might of China would be in our long-range interest." We could create there a great vacuum which would compel us to drain our own resources of men and money to fill, and it would bring us face to face with Russia along a 7,000-mile frontier. This is not my appraisal, but the appraisal by a man whom I cannot bring myself to call a "pinkie" or dove.

If such an emergency exists in Asia, why are we to be called on to solve it alone? Is our stake so much greater than the members of SEATO and NATO? I know no better way of sucking us dry than the way we are going.

I say what I have said because I fear it needs to be said. I have spent my 71 years in full support of my country's ideals, but I'm sure this is not one of them. My eyesight is good and I can still handle a gun. Let me go if there is no other way, even if I do not believe or agree with it. But for God and country's sake exhaust every avenue before we commit these boys against their will to fight and die in Vietnam for

what may be a lost cause. But if this be necessary then let every laborer, every farmer, every industrialist operate on a non-profit basis. In closing let me remind us all—"What profit a man if he gaineth the whole world and yet loseth his own soul."

SIDNEY M. LOVRIEN.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

February 6, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your strong, dissenting voice on our Vietnam policy is a major contribution to the restoration of sanity in our foreign policy. We are grateful for your courage and lucid portrayal of the ominous, mistaken course we are following.

We hope your committee will continue its valiant effort to get the facts before the American people, define our goals and turn our policy toward realistic peace efforts.

Sincerely yours,

JACQUELINE KIENZLE.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,

February 7, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You should know, directly, that your position and your intentions in the questions of the war in Vietnam have our full support and are very much appreciated.

We have joined the protests and we have written to President Johnson. We are unable to understand his objectives except in terms of economical and political expansion and domination, which probably, is what "imperialism" means.

Yours truly,

HUGO RIBEIRO.

OREGON TRUCKING ASSOCIATION, INC.,

Portland, Oreg., February 1, 1966.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Old Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: I can't help but believe that you had a great influence on the President when he referred the Vietnam situation to the United Nations. I had the privilege of viewing last Sunday's TV program and felt at the time that you were right, that from this time on the American public would demand United Nations consideration.

I appreciate your forthright and positive position, though I am sure that at times it has been difficult, but then I also believe that you are happier when you have a tough job to do.

My best wishes to you and Mrs. Morse for this session of Congress.

Best personal regards.

ROBERT R. KNIPE,  
Managing Director.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,

February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please continue your efforts in pressing for stronger investigation of the facts in our administration's policy and participation in the Vietnam war.

I feel very strongly that the majority of the American people do not favor further involvement in this war.

We must seek negotiation and help from the United Nations if we are to survive as a world leader.

Sincerely,

VICTORIA F. JENSEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 7, 1966.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Let me be one of the first to congratulate you on your sincere remarks at Des Moines last night.

I am writing many letters to various parties relative to the Vietnam war and many of us are so grateful to you for your effort in getting the President to not be so stubborn and listen to someone besides the two Secretaries.

I only hope you can get these two men into the Senate for questioning.

Many of us are attempting to try and help to stop this horrible carnage.

We are behind you in your efforts.

Sincerely,

ROY A. GAGE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When the record shows how shamefully most great nations and the United States have treated China, no wonder that country resents us.

McNamara's declaration that we can defeat both Russia and China only provokes war.

There is a paperback on "China" by Felix Green (95 cents). Perhaps Mr. Berg can procure a copy. I recommend you read pages 264 to 293 wherein many strong points are presented why our present policy regarding China is unjust.

A wise acquaintance said to me, "I think all the wise men are dead and I am feeling bad myself."

With great respect and best wishes.

Sincerely,

WALLACE A. PRATT.

ONTARIO, OREG.,

February 7, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Sorry you have to suffer all this, trying to help us the people, trying to save our loved ones. People everywhere are with you but are afraid of causing trouble for their loved ones. I can't understand why mothers and fathers of this country can't put a stop to sending our men to protect everyone else in the world. All we want is to have our men to protect our own country right here.

We all know you are right and always have been. We have sent many letters protesting this war but we are just the people not the Great Society. The servicemen are hooked. This is not a free country, we are full of fear of our own President. That is the way they want it. We would all feel different if it was a declared war. We all know how rotten all this is. This is the worst.

Many of the other people in the Congress are against the President but are also afraid of him. I am afraid to sign my name.

Keep well and keep trying to help us. It makes us feel good to know someone like you is still allowed in the Senate. We keep hoping they won't shut you up, but expect it any time. They shut up everyone else. We are sorry you are the only one having to fight all this. The people are with you so keep it up.

Everything you have said a year ago is turning out exactly like you said it would. The Big Three still hasn't been able to tell us a true answer. Our dear loved ones getting killed for someone else. Oh dear God. How can three men have such power?

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 4, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I agree with you on the concern of saving young American lives over in Vietnam. We should save the "flower of our youth" from getting killed over in Vietnam. Those orientals should fight for themselves. I speak as a Korean war veteran.

Sincerely,

MR. THOMAS DOWD.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,

January 31, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your stand on the Vietnam war. My support is with you and I feel that you are gaining more support all the time.

Let us hope that this move of the President's today to take the issue to the United Nations succeeds.

Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

KATHERINE CORTRIGHT.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,

January 27, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to say that I agree with you about Vietnam. I told you so last April, but I would like to remind you.

My Dad and I voted for you when you were a Republican even though we were Democrats.

Would you tell Senators HARTKE, McCARTHY, MOSS, BURDICK, METCALF, McGOVERN, MANSFIELD, GRUENING, and FULBRIGHT that they have support for their opposition. Thank you.

Yours truly,

BARBARA J. LUCAS.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,

January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to applaud your public stand against the Administration's Vietnam foreign policy. As a graduate student in political science at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, but an absentee voter in the State of Oregon, I am much concerned about the fearsome implications of the present war in terms of escalation, the potential involvement of the Chinese, and the impact the war atmosphere has upon the democratic process within our country. I wish to encourage your effort in seeking to alter our Nation's foreign policy generally, and specifically in terms of seeking our withdrawal from Vietnam. As far as the techniques of withdrawal are concerned your expertise in this matter goes beyond my knowledge. However, I can see that our involvement in Vietnam will solve no problems confronting that nation, nor add to our Nation's statute throughout the world, nor be of any material "self interest" to the United States. Morally and from a "realist" point of view, I see no rational reason why we must continue our policy in Vietnam.

As an aside, I have noticed a shift of attitude within the academic circles of students, teaching assistants, and professors within the last year which increasingly questions and has doubts about our present policy in Vietnam. At home in Roseburg during Christmas I also talked with friends, admittedly from a select socioeconomic level and high educational level, who were in support of your position and very concerned about the Vietnam policy of our Government and its implications upon our Nation's general foreign policy.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL A. DONDERO.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

January 26, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I and my family should like to commend you for voicing your opinions regarding the so-called peaceful expedition in Vietnam. Yours is as "a voice crying in the wilderness" and you deserve praise for taking the right, but unpopular stand, on this controversial situation.



I have followed your stand on this matter for the past several years and have used material as expressed by you in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the whole sorry record of this situation.

Respectfully,

HOWARD WATERBURY, Jr.

ASHLAND, OREG.,  
January 25, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Chambers,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your efforts are sincere to familiarize the American people of the facts of Vietnam. It is hoped that you will continue to demand that the Vietnam situation come to a halt, and be referred to the United Nations for settlement in accord with the Geneva agreement.

Respectfully,

CLAUDE J. MILLER.

OREGON CITY, OREG.,  
January 27, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Realizing that you, no doubt, have had much criticism regarding your stand on the Vietnam situation and that those of us who are in agreement with you are often lax at letting you know that we are 100 percent for you I feel that I have, thus far, been remiss by not writing you in commendation. I want you to know that many rather quiet people are behind you in the stand you have taken. Despite all the people with whom I talk daily I have yet to hear one person express support of what we are doing in Vietnam.

While many people, thinking it unpatriotic not to support policies of the President, have rather begrudgingly given assent to his escalation of the war because they feel he ought to know what he is doing, they do not support our role in Vietnam, and they are hoping and praying for peace. Republicans and Democrats alike, however, support you in your role of opposition and I'm glad to see that now some others are joining you vocally in the Senate and House.

Again, congratulations on your faithfulness to conscience and to the upholding of the constitutional freedoms of our democracy.

Respectfully yours,

Rev. HORACE L. BACHELDER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
January 27, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: \* \* \* We would like to know, why we are in Vietnam. To whom are we committed? There are so many questions that have no answers in this regard. We parents have sons that are going to be involved in this mess, should certainly have the right to know why our boys are being sent there.

Many people in Oregon appreciate your stand on the Vietnam situation, and hope you will continue your work to end this war.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN D. BOONE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
January 26, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington 25, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Tonight's Oregon Journal carries a short note that you oppose the sending of draftees to Vietnam against their will without congressional approval.

I earnestly concur and I applaud your stand. I detest the administration's bypassing of Congress with the Vietnam mess; such action is usurpation of power.

I very sincerely pray your legislation is fruitful.

Yours,

MACLYN GEROLD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
January 26, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my support for the views you have so courageously expounded concerning Vietnam and the draft.

I suspect you will go down in history—if certain people in the Pentagon do not prevent us from having a history—as the most sane and thoughtful person in the U.S. Senate at present.

Sincerely,

ARLENE BLUM.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am proud to be a resident of a State which is represented by a man whose political vision is as fearless, sane, and farsighted as yours. May your sanity prevail.

Please: Vote "no" in more U.N. war funds.

Sincerely,

RUTH HAN.

WOODBURN, OREG.,  
February 25, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our warm and sincere congratulations go forth to you today for the brilliant courage you have demonstrated, particularly during the recent TV Vietnam hearings. We are proud of you, Senator MORSE, and of Chairman FULBRIGHT, that you are taking this stand and fighting for what you believe in. In these days many are too chickenhearted even though they may talk big in some circles.

We have thought of you so often; if we had written every time we thought of you; and when we had opinions and suggestions on some of these present-day affairs that are so critical, your office staff would be swamped with letters.

There is great interest shown in our community, as all over the Nation, but it seems there are so many who are talking and surely do not have full information. Some do not understand your motives and have taken your remark about the rise of Hitlerism as a shocking condemnation of our administration and not as we feel, a warning as to what could happen here if we don't all take an interest and some action at the polls.

Because we have supported you openly in our small area we have received some criticism too, and one day a party called me on the telephone following the General Taylor inquiry, very much alarmed about our friend, Senator MORSE, and that communism was everywhere (possibly under every bush) and she was afraid.

In February, to learn more about the Vietnam affair, we attended several great decisions meetings. The group was very, very small, an ex-colonel as discussion leader, apparently with the view that fight was necessary and war should be escalated. We were not inclined to go along, and our representation from Oregon in the matter of the Taylor-Gavin-Rusk was relegated to the lowest depths following a complimentary remark we had made about our Senator on the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Chairman FULBRIGHT.

If you should have any occasion to consider the groups interested in great decisions it would seem proper that the discussion leader refrain from attempted influence of deci-

sions in these matters and that discussions be given to the public attending, rather than to listen to lengthy arguments in favor of the military as in this case here.

Thank you, and keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. HARRY G. THORN.

SALEM, OREG.,  
February 26, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I admire your stand on Vietnam and wait with great interest each progressive step you make toward your goal.

Sincerely,

MARY EDITH GILKERTSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue to voice your opposition to President Johnson's war in Vietnam since I agree with most of your policies and ideas in this regard.

From my listening and reading, I feel we are aiding an evil government against the only people who seem to care for the Vietnam country and majority.

At any rate our being there is intervention and wrong. It has none of my moral support.

Sincerely,

Mrs. RICHARD E. TRACY.

SALEM, OREG.,  
February 21, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Last night we held a surprisingly well-attended meeting on Vietnam in my legislative district. Of those present I was surprised by what I feel is a change of mood following the public hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings.

I feel it is most important that further hearings be held to solidify the changing mood.

I was surprised when the audience was involved in expressing their opinions. I asked for a show of hands and approximately 70 percent favored deescalation; 20 percent favored continuance of present policy; 10 percent increase war effort; 90 percent favored calling for internationally conducted elections and for abiding by such election even though this meant the election of a Communist South Vietnam Government.

I remain your loyal supporter.

Sincerely,

WALLY PRIESTLEY,  
State Representative.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

President L. B. JOHNSON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: What price commitment if your country is ravaged, your people dead, or any who survive reduced to a cave-man era.

Financial cost in the black market, misused funds, and aid to the world, plus plans for a better life here at home are too expensive for your tax weary people to pay.

There can be honor in retreat—in the realization that we have made a mistake and admitting it. France still lives with dignity.

Allies? Who are they? Where are they except on paper? Their numbers do not support us by financial or military aid to any great degree. I beg you, Mr. President, to listen to your learned educators, your fellow

Senators, who have made a life study of these problems, and to your religious leaders. Seek a peaceful settlement—not a peaceful talk of settlement—while on the other hand you prepare for a larger war. Another Korea may not be the best answer, but it is a better solution than land or nuclear warfare.

You, as President of the United States, have a debt to the world. It is far greater than any commitment in Asia—it is life and the right to live. Please, Mr. President, give us peace.

Sincerely yours,

MARY A. GALVIN.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This family again cannot find the proper words to commend you enough on your stand against the President's Vietnam policy. It is our constant prayer that you can continue to find the strength to do so.

The Senate hearings were watched with great interest and much was learned. It is our belief that without you to lead the way many other Members of the Senate would have remained silent and just blindly followed the President's wishes.

Sincerely yours,

MARY A. GALVIN.

TILLAMOOK, OREG.,  
February 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I think you are on the right track with your "no draftees to Vietnam" bill—or any other undeclared war. If those countries cannot furnish their own manpower to win then they cannot preserve their freedom, and we certainly cannot police the whole world.

The American people are not willing to make this terrible human sacrifice to "save face" for some few policymakers. Ridiculous, if it weren't so tragic.

Yours truly,

VERNA ROSENBERG.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 22, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again I want to take this opportunity to support you in your stand on the Vietnam question. It must be a source of some satisfaction to you to have such a broad swing over to what has been the rational point of view on this matter, and to be able to move out of an almost completely isolated position into one of rather broad support.

I have just finished reading David Halberstam's Pulitzer Prize winning book "The Making of a Quagmire," which I thought the most impressive documentation of the history of our involvement in that area, and the best presentation of the persistent misinformation and misadvice and misestimates of the situation, which came first from our military people, secondly to our Embassy people, and finally to Washington. I think the question might be raised as to legally treasonable activity on the part of some of our people in the past 6 or 8 years. These are strong words, but since that kind of activity has now gotten us into a situation in which we may ask a great many young Americans to give their lives for the wrong cause—at the wrong place and the wrong time—I think it is a question fair to raise and I think you are the man to raise it.

The description of events from the military headquarters and from the Embassy

in Saigon sounded so much to me like the thing I previously described to you from Taipei that I think it is worth again noting that our people are largely talking to themselves in our foreign offices.

For perspective I am sending you a copy of a small bit by Arnold Toynbee which I think might interest you, which first appeared in the London Observer, and then was reprinted by the Witness—an Episcopalian weekly—in 1965.

With kindest regards I am,

Very sincerely,

JOSEPH B. TRAINER, M.D.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your continuing efforts to stop the escalation of the war in Vietnam. Please keep up the good work.

This Oregonian is very proud to have you representing her in Congress.

Sincerely,

SOPHIA LOVING.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for speaking so clearly about Vietnam. I am willing to stop this destruction on any terms and get on with the reconstruction. Why, after all of our years of foreign aid, don't we have less costly, more effective aid? I can't afford to spend so much for so little.

Sincerely yours,

MARGRET B. BAILEY.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your continued efforts to bring the Vietnam question to national focus. As a registered voter in Oregon I am proud to know that at least one of Oregon's representatives to Congress is willing to challenge the administration's present policy in Vietnam.

Your continued efforts to clarify the alternatives available in the present "executive war" are deeply appreciated, as are your efforts to stop U.S. unilateral offensives in Vietnam. I also am in favor of the recent bill initiated by you and Senator GRUENING of Alaska which asks that recent draftees not be sent to Vietnam unless they volunteer to do so. I think this is definitely a step in the right direction.

My personal feeling is that the war in Vietnam is a very unfortunate mistake on the part of U.S. foreign policy. I do not believe we can "win" militarily in Vietnam without the commitment of 2½ million troops which would be unthinkable. Our best recourse is to cease the bombing of North Vietnam (the bombing only results in solidifying the opposition and determination of the North Vietnamese people), recognize the NLF at the negotiation table, encourage and support the direct involvement of the United Nations and then abide by its decisions, and most of all be willing to accept a compromise settlement rather than push for a military victory which would mean the annihilation of the Vietnamese people and a very likely chance of involving the Red Chinese directly in a land war.

Best wishes for the success of your continued efforts with regard to the Vietnam question.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JEAN H. EHRHORN.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just a note to indicate again my 200 percent support of your stand in regard to the war in Vietnam. I shall be everlastingly grateful for your courage and perseverance.

The recent unanimous statement by the American Bar Association alleging the legality of our involvement in Vietnam is to me absolutely incomprehensible. As a result, I am enclosing a few quotations that I have run across in the judgment of the military tribunal of the Nuremberg war crimes trial, which you might find useful if you have not already noted them. Since the U.S. representatives were on the tribunal, we stand condemned in Vietnam by the same words we used in condemning the Nazis.

Sincerely,

CARL J. NELSON.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,  
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have watched at least a part of the proceedings of the Senate inquiry concerning Vietnam. We appreciate something of the complexity of the situation, but which for most of us must be at some distance from the more intimate facts of the situation. In your position you must be in possession of facts not available to us here. We have appreciated your sincerity in trying to impress all and sundry with the hazards being faced and of the deep desire of our people for honorable peace, seeking a peaceful solution reflecting a people of honor.

I have been rather increasing disturbed at the assurances we have been receiving that our Government is ready to sit down unconditionally at any time or place to negotiate this matter, then to discover that we seem to have established certain adamant preconditions. Among these is the matter that we will not sit with any representative of the Vietcong, but only those from North Vietnam. Other preconditions also seem to lie in the background.

It is to be hoped that here, too, we may be honorable and do as we say we are ready to do—talk peace with anyone anywhere and at any time. The situation being such as it is, it would be difficult to summarily withdraw from this business, and such would possibly leave a disastrous aftermath. But ways must be found. If negotiations must be carried on deviously and at arms length to avoid the Chinese pressures upon Hanoi, requiring a slow-paced patience, then let us do so. This might require processes not open to public view, and the public could only ask for reassurances of some kind that every avenue is being pursued and no doors being shut.

Whatever you can do to further such a cause will be in the interest of all people. It will require the kind of courage you have shown in the past as you have sought to serve the cause of what is best for America. Our prayers and best wishes attend you in these difficult areas of service.

Sincerely,

W. H. MONROE.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,  
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: There is always the time to write a letter to your elected representative and this is mine. I want to congratulate you on your courage in questioning



our actions in this Vietnam affair. I'm proud you are Oregon's Senator, too. History is going to prove you correct but I'm not sure you are going to have much influence. It is discouraging to see how readily we are putting so much power in the hands of the executive branch. If this continues what is going to happen to the power of the Senate and House of Representatives? Even the best of Presidents can be misinformed or influenced by the wrong advisers. The article in this weeks National Observer, which reported the Senate hearing, is priceless. I didn't see the TV report. Anyway, I'm proud of you.

I don't think many of the Government officials realize how unhappy most of us are about this "engagement" in southeast Asia. I belong to a "great decision" group and all of them agreed it was foolish and senseless. Of course, we couldn't solve the problem of how to get out there. I hope you can. Someone needs to solve this huge problem.

Good luck.

Mrs. GLENN STEWART.

LANGLOIS, OREG.,  
February 10, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Many of my friends, no doubt, will not take the time to write to you, but I can assure you that they will have the same views as I do on your stand on the war in Vietnam. I agree as you do, that investigation should not stop at the Senate level, and not behind closed doors, only unless for security reasons.

In all, Senator, I think that you are doing a good job where you are. I like you because you have guts to stand up and let the world know what you think.

Sincerely yours,

AL and LOUISE BROWN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 11, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: God bless you for your fearless approach to all problems concerning the welfare of the Nation and our freedom heritage. We watched with interest and appreciation the Senate hearings as televised across the country yesterday, with renewed confidence that we have many able minds and courageous hearts devoted to our country's best interests. May your voices continue to be heard on this problem of Vietnam as well as on every occasion where you are the champion of our individual rights and the national security.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. KENNETH C. SMITH.

EDDYVILLE, OREG.,  
February 10, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write to praise the work of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in holding such effective hearings on U.S. foreign policy.

I hope that a full transcript of the hearings will be made easily available to the public since coverage by the communications media is inadequate with a few honorable exceptions. Voters should know the truth.

I write also to thank you for trying to block the appointment of Jack H. Vaughn as new head of the Peace Corps.

It is high time that we completely overhauled our thinking in foreign policy to make it conform with the realities of the atomic age. The time lag has been dangerously great.

Yours respectfully,

H. R. GLASCOCK, Sr.

GRANTS PASS, OREG.,

February 8, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While visiting in Grants Pass I listened to many of your broadcasts which I enjoyed very much. I agree heartily with all that you believe in. I certainly admire your courage and your stand in defense of the people's rights and the United States' position in Vietnam.

If there are ways we citizens might help in support of your program please let us know. We are behind you 100 percent.

Very sincerely yours,

HELEN E. ELLIOTT.  
RUTH E. MAYERS.  
GLADYS CLEGG.

FLORENCE, OREG.,  
February 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The televised hearings on Vietnam are very informative. I think it is getting through to a lot of people the futility of escalating the war.

Very truly yours,

MARIAN HUNT.

PORTLAND, OREG.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I got to watch a good deal of the Foreign Relations Committee hearings, plus the evening news regarding these hearings, plus special programs on these hearings. I have also read many newspaper articles in this regard. I still do not feel well informed on the subject, but I do have some thoughts.

None of the witnesses seemed in favor of escalating the war, all seemed excruciatingly sincere in their testimony and all seemed in favor of getting to the conference table with the enemy. Mostly in trying to get them to come to the conference table. One of the main problems seemed to be in predicting the future—perhaps you should call a fortune teller with a crystal ball in as a witness; pose hypothetical solutions and ask her to peer into the future to see what the result would be if such a course should be taken.

Based on the hearings, whether or not to contain the spread of communism by aggression seems to be the issue, with China's immediate intent the big question mark.

I do not believe we can or should be the policemen of the world. Aggression should be halted and our mutual protection treaties should be honored.

It does seem that the U.N. should be the instrument through which peace is manipulated. If that doesn't work no avenue toward peace should be unexplored. This also seems to be being done, or tried.

These hearings have been the best thing to happen in this country in a long time. The public should know what is going on as well as just how difficult it is to wrestle with this problem.

Sincerely,

Mrs. WALTER STAHLER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue to fight, in every way possible, the escalation of the Vietnam "situation." I am in Portland with my husband who attends Reed College, and am unfamiliar with politics and procedures in this area. I would appreciate any advice regarding my efforts to help in any way I can to bring about a peaceful settlement of this nightmare.

Most sincerely,

MARLENA LANGSTON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have owed you this letter since your brave, and almost solitary

stand against the Presidential takeover of congressional duties, in regard to Vietnam.

For a while, I thought that the constitutional point you were making was of lesser importance than the moral and humanitarian issues, but I have come to see that for this country, at any rate, the two are one. An undeclared war is a wrong that was guarded against by our basic law. An infringement there may lead to further infringements on issues more immediate to our personal rights. You were right, and I was wrong. Thank you.

Thank you for your courage, intrepidity, your continuing stand for the right as you see it.

Most sincerely,

FANNIE SCARL.

MEDFORD, OREG.,  
February 17, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I will not take your time by writing a long, involved letter concerning our policy in Vietnam.

I do, however, want to say that I applaud your stand on this important issue and am confident that you have contributed in large measure to a gradual change in public opinion concerning the administration's conduct of this war.

You are, as usual, performing a great public service and it is encouraging to see more and more of our responsible congressional leaders joining you in public criticism of this immoral war.

Thank you for saying what so badly needs to be said.

Yours very sincerely,

Mrs. MARJORY E. MADDEN.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,  
February 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you to commend you on your academic and brilliant performance at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on February 10.

You have much support, more perhaps than you realize. I fear people are afraid of being anti-Vietnam because they will be labeled as Communists. We must stop this war in southeast Asia. We will become so weak, spreading ourselves so thin, our image throughout the world will be nil. Perhaps this is the very strategy of the Communists.

Please continue your fight for nonescalation of the war and for approaching this whole thing from a different viewpoint.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. W. A. SLABAUGH.

SPRINGFIELD, OREG.,  
February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: Please count me as one of the 17 to 1 against the war in Vietnam.

Fortunately, Americans are not quite as they were a few short years ago. Not all of them will give up reason and commonsense because it might be labeled communistic.

I am at a loss to understand the people who maintain that what we are doing throughout the world has anything to do with democracy, peace, or even anticommunism.

The countries we have helped most have developed the strongest communistic leanings and small wonder has a way of reverting to American interest.

One wonders how long Americans will continue to tax themselves to support their own destruction.

God bless you for having the courage of your convictions.

Sincerely,

H. M. CUMMINS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: These televised hearings have certainly been enlightening to those of us who are so deeply concerned. Believe me, I am praying that wisdom will be given to you who are forming our policy in this mess.

Few Americans would object to the giving of our resources, money, and knowledge as a contribution toward a solution. But I can't see drafting youngsters in their teens and shipping them off to Vietnam after just 6 months training.

It isn't always easy to do what you think is right, is it? Let me commend you for having moral courage, a most admirable attribute.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY M. WATERBURY.

BROOKS, OREG.,  
February 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We agree with your position on Vietnam and admire your courage in stating your views.

We wish you continued success in the future.

Respectfully yours,

LILLI and FRANK HENRY.

P.S.—Thank you for the excerpt of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your speech.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
February 25, 1966.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please permit me to suggest that you advocate that the United States and other nations (optional) designate specific periods for peace prayer vigils. Prayer is the omnipotent force in the universe.

You have my 100 percent support of your steadfast position on the entire Vietnam issue.

May God bless you abundantly for your most excellent achievements for Oregon and the world.

A loyal and staunch Oregon friend,  
MRS. VIRGINIA F. SMITH.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
February 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am in agreement on your stand on the Vietnam issue, and have been following the televised hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee. I am so thankful for your outspoken concern, and that of Senator FULBRIGHT, over our dangerous and hypocritical policies in Vietnam.

Yours truly,

MARGARET S. SPOERRI.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 22, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: After considerable reading and listening, and a fair understanding now of the history of the Indochina area leading up to the 1954 Geneva agreements, and after a reading of these latter agreements, and factual accounts of what has happened since that time (aided very little by the statements made by our administration), I must conclude that I concur with you in your courageous and determined opposition to our Government's present policy toward Vietnam.

May I say that I am very proud to have you as the senior Senator from Oregon. In retrospect, I believe that most of my disagreements with your stated views in the past—and this has not been too many times—have centered around my own incomplete grasp of pertinent facts. At any rate, I feel quite sure that time and history, perhaps most

CXII—297—Part 4

particularly in reference to our conduct in southeast Asia, will honor your record in the U.S. Senate as that of a genuine patriot.

Would you please add my name to your mailing list and also that of my brother. His name and address are: Stanley O. Stewart, 2312 SE. 156th Avenue, Portland, Oreg., 97233.

Thank you, and my best wishes to you and your family.

Sincerely,

ELTON L. STEWART.

P.S.—If not too late, we would both appreciate copies of your January 1966 newsletter with your speech of January 19, 1966, as entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Thanks again.

E.L.S.

SALEM, OREG.,  
February 25, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For several years we have followed your work concerning the problem of Vietnam, and have appreciated your consistent, understanding, and unhypocritical approach to it. We have been even more proud, as your constituents, and grateful for your recent efforts. It is good at this time to see men such as yourself and Senator FULBRIGHT doing what needs to be done, and doing it so well.

If we could be of assistance to you in this work, we would appreciate your suggestions as to what we might do. We will, of course, consider these issues in voting this November.

Sincerely yours,

PHYLIS BERGER, PH. D.

THE DALLES, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Though this is written on a church letterhead, it is strictly personal.

We received and read in its entirety your very interesting newsletter and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1966. Mrs. Morrow and I are more than ever impressed by your courageous and competent handling of the case in re Vietnam. We simply want you to be assured of the enthusiastic support of this family. You stand in this matter with some of the keenest and most honored of the country's advisors.

Even the Oregonian had to print Governor Hatfield's stand and the rather surprising result of "Great Decisions" discussions in which Oregon participants were divided 50-50 on Vietnam. We are not sanguine about the outcome at this time, but we are grateful for your efforts on behalf of sanity and what is right.

Very sincerely yours,

FRED R. MORROW.

NEWBERG, OREG.,  
February 20, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Please use all your power as a Senator against this undeclared war in Vietnam. It is not legal to draft men under the age of 21 without parents' consent. These men must pay taxes when they are employed, but yet they have no say as to how this country should be governed as they do not have the right to vote.

The war in Vietnam should be put to a vote for or against.

Are the American people unable to stop sending troops to Vietnam?

Use your vote to stop this. More power to you; you are correct in your fight against wars undeclared.

ROBERT R. KAMPH,  
Veteran, World War II,  
91st Infantry Division.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
February 20, 1966.

DEAR HON. SENATOR MORSE: I would like to thank you for your courageous stand on Vietnam, and your faith in democracy.

I believe that the U.S. policy in Vietnam is illegal and immoral, and that our foreign policy is too narrowminded to deal with the complex problems of the world today. Our Government is acting on a cold-war foreign policy of containment, and it sees internal revolutions and nationalist movements as Communist aggression. We cannot bully or blackmail countries into a democratic form of government. I urge our immediate withdrawal from Vietnam, and I suggest that the United States reconsider its foreign policy.

Please place me on your mailing list, for I would like to follow your actions in the Senate.

Respectfully yours,

MARTIN I. DURST.  
MARY JOYCE DURST.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been watching the hearings on the Vietnam question, and I wish to compliment you and Senator FULBRIGHT on the courage you have shown on these issues. I know most of the people are behind you. I, in my business of serving the public, go into many homes and in asking about the Vietnam war find that the majority of people feel as you do on the issues. We are very fortunate in having men such as you in our Government. God bless you, and keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

SAMUEL MARRONE.

WINSTON, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the information you sent me in relation to South Vietnam, and let me say I am very proud of you for your stand opposite to that of the present administration, but Senator MORSE, I do not see how a formal declaration of war by the Congress changes the situation in relation to the danger of a war with China, and in the end a nuclear war from which no nation can emerge victor.

It seems to me our great military power was created not to attack but to repel an attack.

Are the American people to furnish the men and arms to police the world?

If we follow the advice of Mr. Rusk, Mr. McNamara, and President Johnson we are sure to end up in a war with China, and a declaration of war would be the go sign they now lack.

Thank you for your efforts in behalf of peace and justice but I am very much afraid the future looks very black.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. HUKER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a resident of Oregon, and the mother of a son who could be called into the service at any time, it is a consolation to know we have a man representing us, with the courage of his own convictions.

I only hope and pray this terrible slaughter of our boys may soon end.

After listening to the hearings—I felt like you and your committee—there is so much more we could have done, and still could do, to improve this horrible situation without all of this heartbreak for everyone involved.

It is indeed a sad and empty feeling to realize we raise our beloved sons only to be snatched away in the prime of their young



lives, to fight a war that seems so unnecessary.

I pray that God will give our leaders the proper guidance to end this brutal war.

Keep up the good work. That is what America is all about. The freedom to speak out and be heard and the wisdom to make the right decisions by free and open discussions.

Sincerely,

Mrs. W. G. ROVANG.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,

February 27, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks greatly, sir, for your stand on the Vietnam war and current proposals.

Your stand on this issue is as great to witness as your display of skill in riding your horse seen some years ago at a horse show.

May God give you added strength to bring proposals of war to the stage of negotiation and debate, that peace may reign in our land.

Sincerely,

DONALD COLLIER.

SWEET HOME, OREG.,

February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are doing splendid job. We want to thank you very deeply.

Have wanted to write you many times because we feel you are taking the right course on the war situation.

I find it hard to express all the "gratitude" in writing you.

You and the men such as MANSFIELD and FULBRIGHT are giving us new hope, good luck.

Yours truly,

RAYMOND EWING.

February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hurray for you. I'm with you all the way—and have been since I've been in Oregon.

I hope you keep up the good work, I'm so sick of secrecy—and some of the lies that come out of this administration. I'm tired of being treated as though I'm not good enough, or wise enough to have a voice in the policy of this great land.

I'm an Independent—but a registered Democrat since 1932—because I believed in the Democratic Party principles, more than I've been able to believe in the Republicans.

We receive your congressional report and do appreciate getting it, for it gives us a chance to at least know what is going on in Washington.

Thank you again for the TV Senate hearings. I listened to every one—and appreciate what all of you are trying to do.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LEO A. KILGES.

LEBANON, OREG.,

February 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You must get many letters scolding you for your stand on Vietnam. Critics always write the most letters. I hope those who agree with you also let you know that they do. I am one of them.

I listened attentively to all the Senate Foreign Relations Committee broadcasts with special attention to the opinions of Mr. Rusk and General Taylor. I wanted to find through them an area of agreement with my President. I could not.

Early in January 1964, Slim and I stopped awhile in Tuxtla Gutierrez on our way north from Panama. A compatriot staying at our hotel, a Californian, showed us a newspaper published in Mexico City and asked us to read a certain editorial and give him our opinion. With some difficulty and his help, I translated. This is the gist of it:

"Tourists from Estados Unidos mean much to our economy. Treat them well. Be courteous. Above all do not make argument politico. Because they are obsessed with the fear of Communists. It is a national sickness and they cannot help it. It has been their foreign policy for over 40 years and one day it will lead them into bad trouble. But they cannot help it. We will ignore it. We are thankful for their friendship and the prosperity their tourists bring to us. But we will not make argument politico."

My reaction was anger and humiliation. The Californian laughed and said, "Think about it."

Senator MORSE, I have thought about it. Thought about it a great deal since the Vietnam situation assumed such a frightening aspect. I am not now angry but I do feel humiliated. Have we indeed carried fear and hatred and national arrogance to the predicted "bad trouble"?

I am grateful for the mailings that come to us from your office. I am deeply thankful that you sit in the Senate and on its Foreign Relations Committee. Your fearless stand on our foreign policy gives me some measure of hope.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. KATHERINE HARRIS.

MILWAUKIE, OREG.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Thank you for the way you are fighting for the common man. The people of Oregon are lucky to have someone like you to fight for us; the majority of people are with you.

Keep up the good work. We are doing all we can to help.

Thank you again.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN PHILLIPS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just heard President Johnson's speech to the Freedom House Award, in which he implores us to support the war. With just as much zeal and emotion, I implore you as my Senator, not to desist in your efforts to find another way.

We have three young daughters, not sons, but my point of view in no way reflects anything but the utmost respect for our servicemen in Vietnam. Somewhere in all the avenues open to us and all the intelligence of our diplomats there must be some way, some idea that can point toward a new solution to our world strife.

I will not go on at length as to why we support your position but wish to indicate our support.

Sincerely,

CORINNE and DUANE PAULSON.

OAK PARK, MICH.,

February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,  
Washington, D.C.

MOST HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to tell you that me, my family and very many of my friends want to say thank God for you.

We are all American citizens and are very much concerned and upset with our President's policy, and the whole war in Vietnam.

We do not feel that we should be responsible for the unjust slaughter of our boys, and the Vietnamese people, but so far there seems very little that we can do to stop it. Please continue to do your part and the investigations into the whole affair. Let more people know what the true situation is, and we hope and pray that we can come to some settlement in a hurry.

Please tell me if there is anything that I can do to help stop this war, before it is too late.

Sincerely,

THELMA MILLER.

PORTLAND, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senator from Oregon,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is to inform you that our entire family is deeply concerned over the situation in Vietnam.

We strongly urge you to continue to pursue activities that would bring this matter to a peaceful solution. We are very much opposed to the present policies of President Johnson and his advisers.

We are thankful that there are still brave men at home who are not afraid to voice their opinions.

Respectfully,

Mrs. N. RASSEKH.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,

February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your efforts to save humanity from a nuclear war are greatly appreciated. History will have to record your good works.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. SUMMERS, M.D.

TACOMA, WASH.,

February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Oregon State can be proud of their Senator. God bless you on your stand on Vietnam. We pray the American people will get behind you and support you all the way on this important matter. There has to be a better way than wars and its bloody killings.

Sincerely yours,

MYRTLE ROBISON.

BERT ROBISON.

SHELLEY ROBISON.

PACIFIC GROVE, CALIF.,

February 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are certainly a man Americans can be proud to claim as their own. Throughout the hearings you have conducted yourself in a cool, intelligent manner as befitting your position.

Thank you so very much for striving to bring peace to the world and an end to the killings. I'm certain you will be long remembered and honored when the militarists are long forgotten.

"Blessed are the peacemakers." You are among them.

Sincerely yours,

STEVE A. POLKABLA.

LOS ALTOS, CALIF.,

February 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is difficult to find a way to express our gratitude to you for your courageous and lonely fight on the Vietnam issue. If we get out of this thing alive you above anyone in public life deserve the credit. You and Senator FULBRIGHT were very effective at the hearings. Perhaps it will prove to be the beginning of the end.

Very sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. JOHN FRYMIRE.

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.,

February 20, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Grateful thanks must be expressed by my wife and myself to you for your marvelous display of intelligence and integrity—your unswerving devo-

tion to truth, to peace, to humanity—in which lie all mankind's hopes for an end to the foul conflict in Vietnam and for an end to all wars.

Your voice is America singing.

Sincerely,

EDMUND STONE.

STUYVESANT, N.Y.,  
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your criticism of our war in Vietnam, and for your efforts at clarifying our policy there.

Although this engagement is confusing and confused, it does seem that where there is fighting there is a war. If it is war does it not have to be declared by Congress? It seems to be Presidential wars that are not controlled.

I hope that you will continue to criticize everything with which you disagree. If citizens cannot disagree with any policy involving our Armed Forces and have no say in where our forces shall be sent what voice do we have?

Very truly yours,

MURIEL T. ASBORNSEN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
July 19, 1966.

Senator MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: More power to you. I'm behind you in your efforts to get Vietnam war negotiated—put in U.N. hands—and stop U.S. aggression.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE JUVINALL.

CARMEL, N.Y.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our thanks and admiration to you Senator MORSE for your courage to stand up, almost alone, for what you consider right, moral, and the good of your country.

Very truly yours,

IDA RUTH BERRY.  
NICHOLAS BERRY.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,  
February 22, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Thank you for your wonderful and brave stand you are taking to try to bring about an end to the terrible undeclared war in Vietnam.

May I respectfully request that you support the realistic proposal of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY to admit the Vietcong to peace negotiations and to the formation of a new government for South Vietnam, as they represent more than 75 percent of the population of South Vietnam?

Please continue your brave fight to bring an early end to the terrible sufferings and enormous waste of our country's money in a war we should have not entered into.

Our country is being condemned all over the world for our intrusion into the civil war of an oriental country. Thank God we have a man like you who will fight for justice no matter how the warmongers try to smear you. God bless you.

Yours truly,

CLARA SHOECAFT.

STUDIO CITY, CALIF.,  
February 22, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was so deeply impressed with your statements and position during the hearings which were on television that it has

taken me these number of days to collect my thoughts in order to write to you.

Your statesmanship in the midst of confusion and darkness is a beacon of light and we are proud of you and wish you Godspeed and good health in order to remain the voice of sanity and reason.

I know dozens and dozens of people who share my views about your great patriotism but as you well know human nature is such that people are quick to criticize and rarely exert effort when they agree \* \* \* so please be assured that you have tremendous support all over the country.

It is appropriate that I should have written this letter on George Washington's birthday—a day of reflection.

Sincerely,

LILLIAN SHADRON.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,  
February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For years my parents have been telling me what a dreadful man you are, but after thinking it over, I think you're great. My husband and I appreciate your determined questioning of Rusk, Taylor, etc.; and hope you can prevent President Johnson's abuse of the Tonkin Gulf resolution. We are concerned by the administration's confusion and apparent willingness to escalate indefinitely at the behest of Hanoi.

We'll be back in Oregon in a couple of years and hope to be able to vote for you then.

Sincerely,

JUDITH W. ALLEN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I must apologize for not writing to you long before this to say how much I appreciate your persistent and welcome voice of sanity all these months. At last it seems that some other Members of Congress are joining with you, thank goodness. But your courage and patience in advocating a course of reason with respect to the Vietnam policy will long be remembered.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH REED, M.D.

WEST COPAKE, N.Y.,  
February 23, 1966.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senator From the State of Oregon,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is with respect, admiration, and gratitude that we write to you to offer our unqualified support for your honest and courageous stand on the Vietnam policy of the United States.

We have followed your outstanding career for many years and are very pleased to have this opportunity to extend our respects and appreciation to you for being a voice of conscience to the American people and the world. You have moved us to join you in fighting for the redemption of our foreign policy. We have written to everyone we can think of to either thank them for supporting you or ask them to join you. We hope it will, in some small way, help.

As the parents of three small children, we look toward the future with many uncertainties, as have all parents for all time, but our outlook includes the fear that no matter what sacrifices we may make to insure our children's health, a good education and the rest, a nuclear war may make all our efforts meaningless.

We thank you for your efforts to make the world a safer place for all children to find fulfillment and the joys of life.

With respect and deep affection, we remain,

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT D. TASSLER.

ISLAND CITY, OREG.,  
February 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I wish to thank you for your stand on the Vietnam situation. It is nice to know that there are people like you that have the courage to speak up. We as ordinary citizens cannot speak up against the war without being classed as being unfair to our soldiers in Vietnam or being Communist appeasers.

I am a member of the Masonic Order as I know you are, and I have never known any Mason to be a Communist appeaser or sympathizer.

This war is a nasty mess and I am glad to know that through your efforts it is being brought before the United Nations for possible settlement. Also I like your stand on withdrawal of the broad authorization of the President to conduct the war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

AXEL DAHLSTROM.

BAKER, OREG.,  
February 11, 1966.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For many years I have been more or less opposed to this business of writing letters to elected representatives on the theory that you people probably have more important things to do than to read and answer them. Your appearance on a recent Sunday television program, however, prompts me to write this to let you know that my wife and I, while we have not been your most ardent supporters in the past, do feel that your opposition to our so-called foreign policy is justified, particularly as it pertains to Vietnam. Our position there is untenable to say the least, but it appears that we are caught between the devil and the deep blue sea.

It is our thinking that it is high time that this Nation takes a long, hard look at its foreign policy. It doesn't quite make sense to me that the United States should take it upon itself to make a utopia out of the entire world without some help from our so-called allies. It is inconceivable that we can justify helping with our hard-earned dollars those foreign countries, including Great Britain and France, if you please, and many others, only to have them use this aid to help the other side, perhaps not directly but most certainly indirectly.

Perhaps with advancing age we become more selfish, but with a son approaching military age (now 16), it is going to be particularly difficult for me to see the reason for sacrificing him in an Asian conflict, perhaps, to force democracy on a bunch of people, 99 percent of whom don't know or care of the difference between democracy and communism.

We feel that it is about time for Congress to start acting like a Congress and stop rubber stamping everything that the present occupant of the White House requests or demands. For all the good it did, the last Congress could have stayed home and the buildings could have been rented to the labor unions. At least this would have saved the salaries and netted a tidy sum for the Treasury.

We know that it is not easy for you to take your present stand, and we are not sure in our own minds that you are entirely right. To pull out of Vietnam now, I am afraid, would be disastrous, but maybe it is time for us to admit that we cannot save the entire world all by ourselves and return to some kind of sanity in this foreign policy field.

Keep up the good work. If we can be of any assistance, let us know.

Yours very truly,

W. L. JACKSON.



March 2, 1966

NORTH POWDER, OREG.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I have watched with great interest the hearings on television concerning Vietnam. I can say the information the public has been given in this situation has been, until this time, completely inadequate. I feel that not only this issue, but others equally important, should be made public to the population.

I understand from what I read that you were responsible, along with a few other men on the committee, in making this possible to our TV industry. You are to be commended.

I would also like to say I agree in most part with you on Vietnam. However, I look on it in a slightly different manner. I feel, as many other people who have discussed this, feel that this war is kept going not in Hanoi, but in Washington. Don't misunderstand me. I am not pink or Red. I am deadily opposed to communism. I feel it has little, if any, merit. But I do feel we have thwarted almost every effort to reach a peaceful settlement so far. I am of the opinion that our President, in order to save his neck at home on the economic field, is sending our young men to give their necks on the battlefield. From what little information I can glean from the press, I have reached the conclusion that our economy is strong, not because of our national product, but because of the millions and billions of dollars pouring into our defense spending and the circulation of money for the Great Society programs which have been started.

I think the bombing lull served two purposes. It gave Hanoi time to rebuild installations, thus giving her the capability to continue the war at a heavier tempo. It also served our purposes in the worldwide flight of doves on a so-called peace mission, which I feel was never meant to accomplish peace. It was a neat job any con artist would admire.

Then our President made his big play at the United Nations and while that body was still deliberating, took off for Hawaii and stated his intent of giving all it took to defeat the enemy. I cannot possibly imagine how the world could seriously think we have really exhausted every avenue of peace when we have yet to make a sincere step in this direction.

I am opposed to this war which some have said (including the Secretary of Defense) could last 10 years. I have four sons who could be spilling their blood over there, and what a tragic waste it would be.

I don't want communism anymore than the next but I feel we have set ourselves up as the protector of all mankind. It is impossible.

Maybe this isn't from scripture, but as a child I heard it many times: "The Lord helps those who help themselves." I do not feel, that aside from economic aid to these weak countries, we owe them the lifeblood of our young men. Teach them how to help themselves and give them aid. Let them choose their own paths. We cannot.

I want to say that anything I can do in my small way to see you back as our senior Senator from Oregon, I will do. Maybe this doesn't agree with your politics, but on the other hand, I'm going to do everything I can to convince everyone I know that Lyndon B. Johnson should not be our next President. I am sickened by many of the Members of our Congress who mouth everything he says as if it were the gospel and I do admire your courage in speaking out against some of his policies. More than your ideas, I admire your integrity and courage.

I am a housewife. I have seven children and perhaps I have little business even saying anything. But I feel so strongly that we are on the wrong road that I had to write

you and say I just wish there were a few more who see things as you do.

Most sincerely,

JANICE METZ.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,

January 3, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senator for Oregon,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We send our best wishes for a healthy, happy, and prosperous New Year.

We receive your reports regularly and appreciate having them.

Again we wish to commend you for your stand on foreign aid to countries that do not deserve it. How can we be so stupid to send aid to people like Nasser and many others that we know are our enemies.

We are enclosing a clipping cut from the Albany paper. We go along with this and hope that you will also.

We assure you of our continued support in your efforts.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES E. WILLIAMS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

January 31, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When we moved to Portland 11 years ago from New Orleans, I brought along my French drip coffee pot and we ordered our coffee from Baton Rouge. As usual, I was up at 6:30 dripping coffee and saw the early TV report.

It must be highly gratifying to you to know that your aim in part (U.N. Security Council) has been accomplished. Congratulations. We are very proud and I believe you'll go down in history as the greatest statesman and Senator who ever served his country. The brilliance of your thinking has again been demonstrated. We'll all keep praying for peace, for you and for our President's strength. He certainly has my sincere sympathy. The times ahead will be trying. So let's keep trying!

Sincerely,

Mrs. PAUL F. MIELLY.

P.S.—I just looked up the words "statesman." "A man versed in the principles and art of government; especially, one who shows wisdom in treating or directing public matters; also a man occupied with the affairs of government and influential in shaping its policy." You surely have been a tremendous influence in shaping our policy so it fits and I can put the letter back in the envelope.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

SIR: My faith in the democratic process has been invigorated anew by the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, so recently televised. As one of your Oregon constituents, I owe a special debt of gratitude to you, Senator MORSE, for your persistent and courageous efforts to put your convictions first, and to keep our Vietnam policy in perspective. At times you, Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator CHURCH seemed to have been waging a lone battle against heavy odds. It now seems you have been rewarded, at least in the efforts of all the committee members to make a thorough and searching inquiry into our policy in Vietnam. I hope nothing will stop or hinder the committee from further challenging the premises on which our present policy is based, and then recommending a more sane and realistic approach to our future there. General Gavin has contributed much in that

direction. "Profiles in Courage" would now have you, Senator MORSE, to add to its pages.

Very truly yours,

VIRGINIA COEN.

ONTARIO, OREG.

DEAR SIR: We are all very happy we still have someone left like you that doesn't want our loved ones getting killed for every other country.

Mothers and fathers of this country want to know how to stop sending our boys to death. We are full of fear wondering why this country thinks it's so powerful it can lick the world. Our loved ones are so afraid and sick of going to Vietnam just to die.

How can mothers and fathers put a stop to this? Our boys are getting killed. How can I be a member of the "Women Strike for Peace"? Ask the people what they think about this—not the President.

Mrs. HARRIS.

WILDERVILLE, OREG.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We want to congratulate you for the stand you are taking. Every American should know and understand that Congress can only declare war. It seems as though the American people should be awakened. Seems though the American people are just in a trance; they have to be told, and you are the man that can do it. A few more letters like you had in the Courier and also in the Oregonian should wake most of them. Hope to hear more of you.

Your truly,

ANNA RUMBOLZOMY,  
E. C. RUMBOLZ.

MEDFORD, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Am writing you today commending you on your stand on the Vietnam controversy. From visits around my territory which includes northern California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, I find most of my contacts are entirely in agreement with your reasoning and firm stand. You have taken a most courageous stand against forces who are in my opinion acting quite contrary to the wishes of the people, especially those in this area.

I, personally, am a firm believer in the Monroe Doctrine and would gladly do anything possible to look after our interests and protection in this hemisphere. Beyond that and those boundaries, we are delving too much into affairs and responsibilities of Europe and the Far East.

Our resources are limited and the mounting Government debt is awesome, contrary to the claims of our so-called leaders. I and others believe and agree with you that our (the public) interests should be protected and that the public should have the facts about our involvements around the world and our fabulous giveaways.

Our Vice President traveling through the Far East is demonstrating his generosity which has been true to his past record. With that you are no doubt quite familiar. If we have danger from the extreme right, then we have the same from the extreme left of which he has been a member for some time.

Many of your constituents are highly pleased with your bold and forthright position. We are proud of you and our Governor for the sensible stand you have taken.

Ours is a free country and we want to keep it that way. This cannot be done by constantly piddling away our resources in men and money. We are depending upon you to look after our welfare in your honorable capacity.

Sincerely yours,

LES W. BAILEY.

BAKER, OREG.

FOREST GROVE, OREG.,  
January 30, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I congratulate you on your clear, concise, and very pertinent remarks made on the CBS "Congress and the War" program, Sunday.

Like most Americans, I have been very disturbed by the get-out-of-Vietnam demonstrations around the country, but even more disturbed by the fact that the average citizen of this Republic literally cannot get any information upon which to make any kind of sensible judgment about the war. The equivocal statements of the President and his defenders do nothing but increase my anxiety and, if conversations with friends are any indication, the uneasiness of Americans is general.

As though gross national product has anything to do with ethics or international law. I was especially pleased that you pointed out the moral and practical issues involved. We have already been judged (and found wanting) by our fellow nations, and we must face our penalty from an international court. And we must realize that this war is not likely to stop with Vietnam.

I don't think I'm alone in feeling this way. My husband, a history professor at Pacific University, doesn't seem to have any inside information I don't have. The politicians and political scientists or whatever we talk to seem as much in the dark as we average citizens about President Johnson's intentions. If this is a democracy, I think we have a right to know—at least more than we know now.

Pain in the neck you may be to your colleagues in the Senate, but I'm awfully glad I voted for you.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. FRANK CHIPPS.

P.S.—Is it possible to get a copy of the Mansfield report?

SALEM, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR MR. MORSE: As an Oregonian and a constituent of yours I wish to take this opportunity to express my affirmation of your stand on the Vietnam issues, now being debated before the Armed Services Committee of the Congress.

Your intelligent and courageous effort to end this futile conflict should be applauded by all who are really interested in peace.

Please keep up your efforts. I am sure that eventually the American people will get behind you and others like you to bring pressure on those determining our course of action, to stop this undeclared war.

Sincerely,

W. J. GENTZHOW.

PORTLAND, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been so thankful for your attitude toward the war in Vietnam. Whenever I have heard you speak or have read your views in print they have always cheered my heart. I'm surely very glad that our Oregon Senator is against this war.

Very sincerely,

CLARA IRWIN.

ASTORIA, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been more than sympathetic to your stand on the Vietnam issue, and this final stand which you and Senator GRUENING assume on the relationship of the draft to the situation is inspirational. You have been willing to stand and be counted for a long time and you are beginning to rally solid support from others such as Senator GRUENING.

With the change in attitude as evidenced by the Catholic ecumenical announcement which intimated that it would be possible to live in the same world with Communists and that it is not necessary to eliminate them—I see some crack in the superpatriotic front which I view somewhat like that of an alcoholic personality—it survives on the euphoria supplied by opportunities of patriotic demonstration which make it feel greater and more secure than it really is.

I pledge myself to work in your behalf as hard as I am able.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. FRYBACK, Ph. D.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
February 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: I know how busy you must be these days but as a citizen and a Korean veteran I hope that you will have the time to read my short letter to you. I'm not a very good letterwriter but I felt that I wanted to write this one.

All these months I've been reading about your views and watching you on television concerning the war in Vietnam and I wanted you to know that I agree with you 100 percent. I want you to know I am very proud to have a person such as yourself to represent my thoughts in the Senate. Without people like you the average citizens such as myself would never be heard of.

In closing may I say that I hope you will continue to stick to whatever your beliefs may be for the good of our country, and may God give you the strength and energy to continue your views concerning Vietnam. Someday perhaps I will have the good fortune of being able to meet you personally and to shake the hand of a real man and an American. Whatever I may be able to do for you please do not hesitate to ask.

Respectfully yours,

BING L. CHINN.

FLORENCE, OREG.,  
February 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The televised hearings on Vietnam are very enlightening. They bolster my opinion on the subject, which is:

The United States should admit Vietnam was and is a mistake, and we should get out now.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. HUNT, D.M.D.

PORTLAND, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR: Be assured that many more than those who write you support your courageous attempt to save this country from its disastrous and immoral course.

I am proud to be an Oregonian at this time.

Sincerely yours,

RUDI H. NUSSBAUM.

SALEM, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our family urges immediate and open debate on the Vietnam war as you have suggested.

Yours truly,

L. P. MITCHELL.

SALEM, OREG.

DEAR HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for the letters I am receiving from you. I agree with everything you do in regards to the war in Vietnam. I hope our officials will come to know too that they are in a very critical war and should withdraw, the sooner the better. Thank you again for the letters you sent me. Please note my address has changed from 285 McNary Avenue NW., to 1375 Ruge Street NW., Salem, Oreg.

Yours respectfully,

GERHARD GIRSBRECHT.

PHOENIX, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We support your views and we wish there were more like you and Senator FULBRIGHT.

It disturbed us to hear Secretary of State Rusk's answers to why we didn't fight communism in Cuba in 1960 just 90 miles from us. Yet we are asked to make the supreme sacrifice now in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. OTTO MCGINLEY.

PORTLAND, OREG.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: You are doing good work there in Washington and we hope that we can have peace with honor in the near future so the boys can come marching home once again.

Your great efforts are much appreciated in this great State of Oregon, I feel.

Yours truly,

Mrs. LINNIS WENTWORTH.

EUGENE, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The continuing hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee of which you, Senator, are a member and which is so ably chaired by Senator FULBRIGHT, are of deep and abiding interest to me.

In no other way can the people of the Nation learn the aims and objectives of the lawmakers of their country as well as possible by listening to discussions of this nature. I heartily endorse these hearings and consider them to be extremely important in helping the citizen to an informed and more enlightened state of mind.

We regularly receive the newsletter and the excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from your office, both of which we appreciate and read with interest. We commend your able presentation of the facts regarding our entry into the Vietnam situation and hope for a speedy settlement of this war which is so tremendously costly in money and in blood spilled.

Very truly yours,

DOROTHY E. FELTUS.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guard,  
Feb. 13, 1966]

WHY NOT WITHDRAW FROM VIETNAM?

(By Robert M. Hutchins)

The picture we get from Washington portrays our Government earnestly, even frantically pursuing all avenues to peace and finding them blocked by sullen and derisive Orientals.

How can we make peace, we say, if we can find nobody to make it with? Since we can't make peace, we must make war.

The first question is, how much war do we have to make? A leading diplomatic expert, George Kennan, has joined a military authority, Gen. James Gavin, in suggesting that we stay where we are and "simmer down." Their theory is that if we hang on without doing anybody very much damage somebody will eventually come forward from the other side and offer to settle.

This proposal is better than burning up Vietnam, North and South, in the name of the freedom and independence of the south. But it leads to the second question: Why hang on?

"Surrender" is a dreadful word. Both Gavin and Gen. Maxwell Taylor are revolted by it. What is the matter with "withdrawal"?

If we have made a mistake, if we have no right to be where we are, if we are doing enormous harm to ourselves as well as others, why should we not admit the mistake and correct it? This is something we could do all by ourselves.

It is now officially admitted that we have made a mistake. No other interpretation can



March 2, 1966

be placed on the peace campaign of the administration. To put the matter on a higher ground, we have decided we can't win.

Nobody has ever succeeded in discovering any basis for our presence in Vietnam except our own decision to go there. No treaty or international convention of any sort authorizes the United States to blow up some of the South Vietnamese in order to maintain in power those who could not have achieved power without us. In attacking North Vietnam, we violated our solemn obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

The Geneva accords of 1954 did not contemplate two independent countries, South and North Vietnam. On the contrary, they explicitly stated that the whole territory would be united after elections to be held in 1956. We prevented those elections. We created the fiction that South Vietnam is an independent state that has called on us to protect it against aggression.

So why not withdraw? The North Vietnamese know as well as we do that we can't win. They are equally aware that there is no moral or legal excuse for our presence. Why should they talk to us?

The reason we do not withdraw from a hopeless and guilt-ridden adventure is that we have been persuaded by almost half a century of propaganda that wherever communism raises its ugly head it is our duty to chop it off. We cannot allow Ho Chi Minh to triumph because he is a Communist. We cannot leave southeast Asia open to Communist China.

The example of Yugoslavia suggests that we should be building up Ho Chi Minh against China. "Pacem in Terris," the last encyclical of Pope John XXIII, warns us not to let our hatred of an ideology lead us into a mistaken estimate of the intentions of those who profess it. The hypothetical possibility of a distant danger does not justify a present crime.

FEBRUARY 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As one of your constituents temporarily residing in the South, I am pleased to be able to tell you that many of the students here have expressed to me their admiration for your stand on Vietnam. Many of us believe that conscription of students (or anyone else) to fight in an undeclared war which they regard as immoral and contrary to the national interest, is a usurpation of their basic political rights and their right to oppose the administration's insane policies. We hope that you will push your proposal to allow draftees to defer service in Vietnam and will continue to vigorously and vocally oppose this war.

Sincerely,

JIM DRISCOLL.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 20, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for sticking by your guns. The American people need you Senator, more than they will ever know. Thank you.

W. J. PALMER.

LYONS, OREG.,

February 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been most interested in the public hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the comments of the witnesses. In fact, I stayed home from work yesterday to hear them.

I am sure there has never been a more informative series of programs ever presented. I must admit, Senator MORSE, that I have never voted for you but it seems that the questions that came to my mind as the witnesses gave their opening statements are the

very questions that you asked when your turn of questioning began. So I guess your thinking must be more agreeable than I had realized.

I felt that the testimony of Mr. Bell was interesting in regard to the economical phases of the Vietnamese front. Although this information may be available to all of us—how many private citizens know where or how to ask for tariff and import costs in Vietnam or how government projects are handled?

Many, many other pieces of information in regard to our problems in the world have been brought to mind and gives me much food for thought.

I would like to see the line of questioning pursued in regard to Ky's statement in Honolulu in the livid statement about refusal to sit down at the conference table or anywhere else with the enemy leaders. What chance is there for settlement when the primary participants refuse to sit down to talk? I was shocked to hear this news broadcast and until it was mentioned in today's hearing have heard nothing more of it. It seems most important to me.

I am very sorry that more people cannot view these hearings in their entirety—working people, professional people, and students find it impossible to see it all and much is lost in the concise comments of the 11 p.m. newscaster.

Am looking forward to the testimony of General Taylor next week. Would like to see Mr. McNamara there too, so keep trying. I am sure that he could give the people a testimony that would not harm our Nation's position, although am not so sure about this.

I felt it was a privilege indeed, to hear Mr. Kennan's testimony. His ideas on the effects of our foreign policies on the common people of these lands was most interesting and realistic. It is hard for the American people to comprehend the thinking and problems of such people. We have to be jarred up once in a while.

Again let me say that I feel these televised hearings are most informative and I hope they continue, not only on the Vietnam crisis but on many other subjects on which we stand to gain or lose much.

Sincerely,

NADINE DUGGAN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
The Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Keep up the good work on Vietnam and everything else. I only hope your unusually forthright language will not jeopardize your Senate seat in your next election.

Keep it up.

Sincerely,

PETER LOMHOFF.

EUGENE, OREG.,

February 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Need I reiterate that you "scored" again when Ambassador Kennan was questioned by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Thursday.

When you read the President's Honolulu statement, it put all the careful pussyfooting in proper perspective. I'm sure the thoughtful people in the country appreciate this. Thank you for having the courage.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY LEEPER.

P.S.—I'm sure these hearings will offer President Johnson some constructive alternatives to our present collision course.

IMBLER, OREG.,

February 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Knowing that you are fearless and uncompromising when a principle is at stake we are sending you this newspaper clipping for your attention. If its thesis is true what hope is there in the United States trying to influence world affairs anywhere, anyplace? Are the American people too far gone on the road to personal gain without regard to the rights of others? Can the administration claim that they are activated by altruistic and noble purposes in Vietnam when they can do nothing to stop such grafting? And as a leading member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee we are hopeful that you—if no one else—might be able to do something about it.

We take both the Oregon Journal and the Oregonian and try to read all sides and all the commentators have to say about Vietnam. Never before in history it seems to us has such an issue been so cloudy and mixed up and yet of so vital importance to us and the world at large. We do not see how people can attack you so bitterly over your courageous stand in what you think to be right unless they have studied only one side of the issue. There is no doubt that you are sincere. However the same seems to be true of Johnson, Rusk and McNamara. They are no less sincere than you although taking a very opposite stand to you. If the top statesmen and political leaders of the day differ so what right has the ordinary person not nearly so well versed on the subject to take such violent positions either pro or con. But whichever side is right this grafting should be handled and it appears to us that it is up to Johnson and the administration to see that something is done about it and we are hoping that you can be the "gadfly" (the term meant in no disparaging way, believe us) to sting them into action.

Hoping to hear from you as soon as it is possible for you to do so in your busy life for we really get anxious about such things as mentioned above, we are,

Sincerely,

A. K. LARSEN.

Mrs. A. K. LARSEN.

P.S.—Since writing this letter we have read your speech given before the Senate and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated January 19, 1966, which we received this morning. It is very illuminating and instructive as to the historical background of the present dispute. Your arguments seem to be irrefutable.

COOS BAY, OREG.,

February 22, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I think it most appropriate my first letter to a Congressman be on Washington's Birthday. The role you are playing in Congress is equally as important as that of our First President.

I had the extreme pleasure of attending your lecture on the campus of Southwestern Oregon Community College a couple weeks ago, and while it has been impossible for me to watch the Senate hearings on television during the daytime, I have certainly heard many favorable repercussions from them.

The position you have taken on our involvement in the Vietnamese war is most commendable, and the fact that you are standing almost entirely alone, in my esti-

mation, warrants all the moral support we in Oregon can give you. I am most proud to be a citizen of Oregon, and to be represented in Washington, D.C., by a man of your caliber.

Please accept my congratulations on your courage in the face of such powerful opposition.

Very truly yours,

RHEA M. GRAY.

SCAPPOOSE, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I admire the courage with which you state your position on the Vietnam situation. Our Nation needs men who will stand for what is right, even though it means standing alone.

May God grant you many more years of honorable service to our country.

Sincerely,

EUGENE A. OSTER.

MCMINNVILLE, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to support you in your untiring efforts to oppose the present policy of the administration in Vietnam.

It is sad indeed that so many persons in high positions are so insensitive to the worldwide distrust and hatred of the United States which is being generated by this country's unilateral policy in Vietnam.

Hopefully the voices of reason such as yours will soon be heeded.

Sincerely,

ELLYN J. PAULUS.

BANDON, OREG.,  
February 21, 1966.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your stand on our position in Vietnam is well taken in my book.

It is by the courage and wisdom of men of your thinking that our Nation will survive the peril we face.

Keep up your good work. You have, I'm sure more solid support than you know.

Sincerely,

R. W. STRONG.

CORNELIUS, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are in full accord with the stand you have taken in regard to the Vietnam situation.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. DIETRICH.  
Mrs. JOHN H. DIETRICH.  
Mrs. P. J. DIETRICH.

TROUTDALE, OREG.,  
February 13, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Courthouse,  
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is written to inform you that we admire your courage in speaking out against the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. We heard your statements over a recent TV broadcast. We believe you and hope you are successful in any attempts you undertake to correct this confusing war.

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR GUDGE.

EUGENE, OREG.

SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE,  
Washington, D.C.:

I want to say congratulations on the "seminars" on television. I heard both General Gavin and George Kennan the full 10 hours and I am glad to know that millions of people had a lesson in history and sanity.

Sincerely,

ANN KLEINSASSER.

FEBRUARY 21, 1966.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is to indicate my strong support of your fight for peace, and particularly your emphasis on the need for placing responsibility on the United Nations or some other international body.

I also would favor a bill to prevent sending draftees to Vietnam for actions which would run counter to their own consciences.

Thank you for your vigorous and steadfast interest in the cause of peace and of government by the people.

Respectfully,

VIRGINIA CORNING.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,  
February 24, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Words cannot express how grateful I am for your clear and sensible stand against the President's Vietnam policy. In my travels to eastern Oregon, I find more and more people talking about the war. They wouldn't talk about it a few months ago. Usually they say something fairly neutral until they find how the other person feels about it. Many people over there feel unsure about our involvement in that country. As you know, eastern Oregonians tend to be more conservative than in the cities of the western area. There is a group of professional workers in Medford who oppose the war. They are too cautious to come out openly in the papers because of the reactionary opinions of the "wheels" in that town. Antiadministration policy feeling here in Corvallis seems to be spreading. We had no trouble in getting 50 persons, mostly professors, to participate in a peace vigil at Christmastime. Still more have joined our ranks since then. There is going to be a large international protest of the war on March 25 and 26. Rumor has it that there will be more than 10 nations participating in some form of protest on those days.

Some of us have written Mr. Howard Morgan to ask him to run for the Senate. We don't want to have to choose between Robert Duncan and Mark Hatfield.

I know you will keep up the good work. I will support you at every opportunity.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. STEBBINS.

THE DALLES, OREG.,  
February 25, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Our family agrees with you 100 percent about everything you say concerning our operations in Vietnam.

I am enclosing some pages from the Oregonian in which I thought you might be interested. It would seem that the mass communications media in this country, even on the news pages, are being used as giant propaganda weapons by this administration.

Letters are beginning to appear in our local paper pro and con the Vietnam war, but the writers' names are omitted by request to the editor. They are afraid. For families with draft-age sons, freedom of speech is no longer a reality.

The U.S. Senate seems to be our last hope between the American people and a real dictatorship. The House of Representatives has apparently given up doing its own thinking.

God bless you and keep up the good work.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. WILLIAM E. MAY.

FEBRUARY 25, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your January "Senator Morse Reports" and especially for the copy of your speech in the U.S. Senate on January 16 concerning Vietnam.

You brought out numerous points that needed airing and you helped set the record straight. In taking to task the White House, the State Department, and the Defense Department you used straight-from-the-shoulder language; not a lot of double talk.

I do not know the answers to the many complex situations of today but I do know it is frustrating to feel the integrity of our own Government is subject to question even while human life is at stake. I love my country, as I am certain you also do, and I can only hope that our other political leaders do too.

Many thanks for coming out as you did and for making your position so very clear.

Sincerely,

VICTOR G. GRUETZNER.

SALEM, OREG.,  
February 27, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: How grateful we are for your courageous leadership on this whole issue of Vietnam. We follow closely day by day the contribution you make to clarify the issue. I sat for almost as many hours as you, viewing the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings. Many of our friends did likewise. More power to you.

We do hope you are successful in getting Congress to rescind the resolution the Congress passed in 1964, which the President has used as a mandate for his action. We trust the Congress will not appropriate the \$4.8 billion for further conduct of the war.

I'm enclosing an ad we ran in the Statesman and the Capitol-Journal dailies. It would be interesting to know what effect it had in your mail, if any, the week following.

We feel a tremendous urgency to do everything in our power to support you and others. Do you have any suggestions? I've spent the whole day, Sunday, just writing to you Senators. Also wrote CBS, both commending them for running the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings and condemning them for subsequent censorship and coloring of news following Friendly's resignation.

Here is a quotable quote:

"Rarely in the history of world affairs has any country indulged in such a colossal act of self-righteous arrogance as did our United States when we decided for the strife-torn people of South Vietnam that they are better off dead than Red."—Rabbi Israel Margolies, Beth Am, the People's temple, New York City, December 11, 1965.

Thanks too, for the reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other material



March 2, 1966

which you sent to keep us informed. I would like to have some of the valuable reprints from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing. Senator FULBRIGHT's summary statement following Dean Rusk's testimony was classic.

Sincerely,

MARVIN and VIOLET NETTLETON.

P.S.—It is not necessary to take up your secretary's time in answering our letters. Just know we are with you 99 percent of the time.

VIOLET NETTLETON.

STAYTON, OREG.,  
February 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

HON. SENATOR MORSE: We are behind you 100 percent in the stand you are taking in Vietnam. Would that more Congressmen were like you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EDW. J. BELL.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
February 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hats off to you and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

We, and many of our neighbors congratulate you for your fine effort in helping to get the facts before the American people.

Apparently, a large segment of the Johnson administration have failed to take a lesson from their defeat in the Korean war. It seems we have failed to champion peace—because it bothers people like Mr. McNamara and Mr. (Gen.) Maxwell Taylor, who apparently act purely for the interest of the war industries—perhaps you will accomplish what our lukewarm or sold-out politicians have failed to do.

For the present, therefore, we are watching the hearings with keen interest.

Sincerely,

The J. W. WALKERS.

(If it were possible to re-do our votes of last election—we'd surely make some changes. But then, there's another in 1968.)

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,  
February 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: First I would like to tell you that my wife and I both Oregon residents, support fully your criticism of present foreign policy in Vietnam and Latin America.

Recently you sent us "The State of the War in Vietnam," a speech you made on January 19, 1966, in the Senate. If you could send us additional copies we would like to send them to various people with whom we are debating the topic. We could very easily make very good use of 5 to 10 copies.

It seems that your arguments have been basically legal ones. Other good points could be made on the moral level of course. But, perhaps unfortunately, the debate seems to hinge in most people's minds on the issue of the seemingly pragmatic question of how to stop communism, morality, and legal questions being peripheral.

The argument as I hear it says that if we don't do what we are doing we will encourage national wars of liberation. It seems to me that the following argument could be made to refute that position. Given that our objective is to inhibit such wars in the future, our efforts in Vietnam should be evaluated in terms of that objective. Such wars seem first to involve a political stage in which forces are gathered for the second stage, the actual military effort. Since the political stage seems to come first, and is in that sense the crucial stage, what effects do our policies have at this political level. It might be suggested that our present efforts

would in fact fertilize anti-American, and pro anti-American organizational, feelings and activities. I imagine this would be easier to show in the case of the Santa Domingo "effort to stop communism," but it would seem likely to be a valid point in Vietnam as well. Also, the illegality and immorality of our position could be seen in this context as working to our practical disadvantage to the extent that it helped generate the political atmosphere in countries that could later be the targets of national wars of liberation.

We wish we could do more in correcting our current policies. We appreciate your efforts.

Sincerely,

GARY R. HAMILTON.

COLLEGE PARK, MD.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I extend my deep appreciation for your courageous effort in enlightening the people of the United States to the horrible situation which presently confronts us all. Needless to say there will be those who will say that you are a member of some Communist conspiracy dedicated to the overthrow of our governmental structure. This sir, as you know, is the price one must pay in order to generate and convince people of a higher principle.

Sir, I am behind you 100 percent.

Respectfully,

RONALD J. PEDONE.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,  
February 21, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I, residents of Oregon, strongly support your courageous stand on Vietnam. The United States is indeed in deep waters there, and strong voices are very much needed at this time to make sure that the people are presented with articulate and thoughtful alternatives to the administration's policies. We hope you will continue to oppose courses of action which seem to you unwise.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN T. MCCLELLAN.

BETHESDA, MD.,  
February 26, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please know that during the entire course of the Vietnam affair you have been speaking for me. I know too little of practical politics to understand why an honest stand on an issue gets a man discounted (or blackwashed) as a crank, and why "statesmanship" must involve shiftiness. I prefer your method.

So if you read a nasty column by one of our latter-day Clausewitz' which accuses you of woolly thinking it might be of minute comfort to remember that one citizen thinks that you are one of the only two Senators who have been on this issue both right and courageous.

Sincerely,

C. W. MCCUTCHEN.

DETROIT, MICH.,  
February 22, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Just a few words of heartfelt thanks for your intelligent and courageous position on Vietnam, and particularly for your being able to bring these discussions to the public.

It is ironic that those in position of power and control do not accept the fact that unless there is public discussion (and freedom of all kinds of expression of opinions) they are jeopardizing the very rights and freedoms

on the domestic front that they claim to be trying to preserve internationally.

Again, thank you and with all good wishes.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. HERBERT T. RIEBLING.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,  
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope that you will find continued energy to keep up your persistent criticism of the Vietnam policy of the administration.

It is without doubt in error; and only by continuing to keep its follies and promises before the public can changes be effected.

Sincerely,

NICOLAUS C. MILLS.

BLOOMFIELD, N.J.,  
February 21, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your honest, wise, and fearless stand that what we are doing in Vietnam is wrong, futile, and dangerous, gives me and many, many others like me a little heart and hope. I fought, bled, and nearly died in the First World War. Now I consider war a complete negation of rational behavior.

Keep on standing out against our tragic waste of money and lives in the undeclared war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

RAY FREEMAN JENNEY.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,  
February 21, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: No answer is requested but pass this letter on to your colleagues.

This is an expression of appreciation of the writer and his friends for your forthright and just stand on our dilemma in Asia. We believe that you and Senator FULBRIGHT can prevent the fruition of the impending holocaust in Asia with a direct television appeal to the American people. The very form and substance of this Government is at stake in this matter and if you fail \* \* \* there appears little hope for the Nation itself.

If you fail, it is too probable that the Chinese Army will march when spring trips north again. You just don't start a ruckus in a man's backyard without a retort from him. Example: The Cuban crisis at our own back stoop \* \* \* we acted and so will China.

Since the Premier of North Vietnam organized and helped to direct the rebellion of Indochina against France, it is a certainty that a great majority of its people remember and respect him. Therefore, to deny the Vietcong representation at the peace table is to invite a never-ending war of attrition \* \* \* one in which the American people will ultimately rebel against forced tyranny at home.

As if our Nation isn't already in deep trouble, it is entering a storm cycle unprecedented in weather history which, in itself will compound the confusion of our leadership. This, together with a major conflict in Asia may well destroy your Nation and mine.

Respectfully,

CLAUDE STRICKLAND.

BROOKLINE, MASS.,  
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to express my appreciation for the persistent and

courageous manner in which you have exposed the folly of our position in Vietnam.

I hope that you have continued to maintain close contact with the people of Oregon during this trying period, for the American Nation would be much the poorer without your presence in the Senate.

With all good wishes,

Very truly yours,

ALLAN SIDD.

PARIS, FRANCE,  
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are young New Yorkers who have been traveling in Europe since the beginning of the year, and it is with ever-increasing dismay that we read and hear of our country's mounting involvement in the Vietnamese war.

Both of us have been active in opposing the war during the last year, and have been uneasy ever since the United States entered into the conflict. Aside from our feeling that political reality makes the involvement of our Armed Forces an absurd and tragic mistake. We are both deeply against war, and the senseless brutality and slaughter, terror and destruction that characterize this war in particular.

Our motivation to write you stems from a troubled feeling we have about what seems to us to be going on in the United States. We looked forward to the open hearings in the Senate, and even though they were not planned as satisfactorily as could be wished, they appeared to us as the greatest existing hope that the Chief Executive's blind misuse of power could begin to be arrested, or at least curbed.

After hearing you speak in New York last summer we were glad to know that there are some clear-sighted, energetic champions of our cause representing us in the Senate. Both you and Senator GRAVENING have shown great courage and intelligence in dealing with the stubborn egotism of the administration.

But we still remain troubled, not only by the threat of flag-waving "superpatriots"—modern day jingoists who seek to discredit us by defamation, but by the large numbers of Americans who seem to be permitting themselves to be led like sheep into the belief that, out of some supreme loyalty, they must support whatever unwise decision made by the administration.

We feel that all Americans are entitled, and should be able to know all the facts, and should judge for themselves. If this would truly happen, we believe that the "great consensus" supposedly supporting the Chief Executive would be exposed as a hollow slogan, and true public opinion would dictate a sane policy.

In our experiences abroad we have found that most Europeans with whom we have come in contact, consider the U.S. role in the war both dangerous and foolish. The French especially, after years of Indochinese bloodshed, are particularly adept at not being fooled by the rosy picture of the war emanating from the information services of the U.S. Government. The newspaper, *Le Monde*, has exposed so many of Rusk's and McNamara's deceptions that it now merely takes them for granted as deceptions and leaves it at that, at least so it seems.

We wish to encourage you in your campaign to enlighten the American people, and to prevent the terrible outcome to which the present policy of the Government must inevitably lead.

We are keenly interested in what we can do to aid the cause of peace.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

ARTHUR BERGEN.  
ROBERTA BERGEN.

LARCHMONT, N.Y.

February 20, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: God bless you, Senator. How wonderful to be a man of conscience long before anyone had the courage to be labeled a "dove."

Our family and many of my friends are your devoted admirers and applaud your stand to oppose this shameful war in Vietnam.

We feel the hope of the world lies with you and other men of courage like you.

Please know there are many, many like us throughout the country and the world.

Yours truly,

JUNE HARRIS.

GROSSE POINTE PARK, MICH.,  
February 20, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you sincerely for bringing before the American people the issues and truths on the war in Vietnam. You are to be congratulated for your statesmanship; there is so little left in our country.

We urge continued "live" TV coverage of public testimony, particularly by McNamara and HUMPHREY. It would be excellent if more of the coverage could be seen during the evening, when the men as well as the women of our country could hear firsthand the opinions and views they need and want to hear. We who "pay the bill" in lives and tax money have the right to hear the issues discussed. It is our men and our money the President and his henchmen are committing to Vietnam. Never has a President had so much power and been so unconcerned about what the people want. President Johnson appears concerned only about his power and political dictatorship, which does exist.

You Senators are our hope—please continue the investigations and make this man (the President) and his advisers account for the commitments they have made in our name but with no authority from us. We have no voice in the choice of the fancy "advisers" when we vote for an official, yet these men are blueprinting our policies—let's put a stop to that.

We do not belong in the Vietnam civil war—let's get out—keep our men and money at home.

Mr. Rusk testified that we are "willing to go along and accept" the result of a free election in South Vietnam, even though they vote for a Communist government. Our men would then be giving their lives for one free election since if the people of South Vietnam choose a Communist government, there will never be another free election. That's too great a sacrifice to ask of an American boy, to say nothing of the American dollars.

With great respect, we remain,

Very truly yours,

RICHARD R. RIPKA,  
NANCY H. RIPKA.

P.S.—We strongly urge the rescission of the 1964 resolution.

ENCINO, CALIF.,  
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your public utterances on the war in Vietnam and your probing questions in the recent Foreign Relations Committee hearings concerning U.S. policy in that unfortunate country deserve the gratitude and commendation of every American citizen.

You are performing a truly great public service in attempting to reveal to the people of this country the very dangerous course our Government is now pursuing and how, if this course is not changed in the direction

of a more rational policy, we may be headed for a nuclear holocaust.

Please keep on calling for a sane and moderating policy in this destructive and immoral war we are carrying on against the people of both North and South Vietnam. You and your colleagues of like mind on the Foreign Relations Committee will be able to reach the good sense and conscience of the American people over the heads of the President and his misguided advisers. Then perhaps you will have achieved the "consensus" for peace the President will find hard to ignore.

All of us who are interested in peace owe you and men like Senator FULBRIGHT a huge debt of gratitude. I wish to express my own feeling of admiration and appreciation to you for trying to return U.S. policy to the course of rationality, morality, and legality.

Sincerely,

HERBERT HERRITT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is an assurance of my continuing support for your continued stance and courageous advocacy of rationality in Vietnam, in southeast Asia, and in foreign policy in general.

Sincerely,

CAROL F. DRISKO.

BRIGHTON, MASS.,  
February 20, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am fully in accord with your position regarding the Vietnam conflict. I urge you strongly to introduce the measure which Secretary Rusk has challenged you to do. The President has continued in his little war unchecked and in violation of the Constitution for too long. We are a democratic nation and contrary to a marked trend in the opposite direction will continue to be so.

I sincerely hope that it passes—and by a wide margin.

Very truly yours,

MICHEL POTHEAU.

ROYAL OAK, MICH.,  
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been reading about and listening to your committee hearings, and the impression I draw from all of the proceedings is that to all except you and Senator FULBRIGHT those of us who disagree with the Johnson decisions are not much better than Benedict Arnold. This is not so. I've had relatives in the armed services since the Revolutionary War. They served their country during times of war, and I have been proud of them, but I am not proud of what we are doing in Vietnam.

This is not a war. President Johnson was given a blank check to do as he pleased in Vietnam. The Congress gave away the stops put into our Constitution. Is there nothing we can do to rescind this action? Let us get back to the three branches of government.

I have an 18-year-old son in college at the present time, and I cannot conceive of his being sent to Vietnam. This is not what I have raised my son for, and I am heartsick for all of our boys who are fighting over there simply because our President has envisioned himself as the father of the world.

We cannot and must not enter into every civil war in the world. I think we are terribly wrong, and have always thought it



March 2, 1966

took more courage to say you're wrong than to stubbornly insist you are always right. I think we should bring our troops home from Vietnam. We are a big enough nation to admit we were wrong, but the head of this country doesn't seem to be. I hope he will someday realize what he has done to the young men and their families that he has involved in this action.

I applaud your courage in not being "yes men," and I hope you can overpower your opponents.

Sincerely,

—  
THERESA A. COLVIN.

—  
LOMBARD, ILL.,  
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God for people like you who have put integrity and decency above politics. You have earned the respect and gratitude of the entire Nation, Democrats and Republicans alike.

As you know, many mothers wrote and telegraphed President Johnson and their various Senators when they saw the impending danger of commitment, but the President chose to disregard the pleas.

Many of us begged to have the problem placed in the U.N. When we were stunned by the President's war address we sent more letters and telegrams trying to stay his hand.

We have been ill, to say the least. Ours are the war babies and we can't forget past tears. We see no necessity for more war.

You are not unaware, of course, that in a sincere effort to make our views known, we have been lumped with Communist sympathizers. Our only interest is in loving our sons and in trying to save their lives. If love is a crime, we are indeed guilty.

It has always been my belief that a President's first duty is to preserve and protect families at home, not desecrate them. I am not alone in this assumption. You will find that any place women meet, President Johnson has become the household word for enemy.

We see him swinging at a mirage and crying wolf in an effort to cover up a bad decision and salvage his image both at home and abroad. He erred in putting the cart before the horse when he chose blood first and economics second. We clearly recognize economic aid as a duty, but in our minds it represented our first and only duty or commitment.

Like many others I voted for President Johnson in the belief that he would keep America out of war. I feel betrayed.

I send you my gratitude and pray that you will keep pressing home the point that war will never end if we refuse to consult with those we blithely term aggressors. It is their home and their country and their right to help solve its problems.

Sincerely,

—  
MRS. ROBERT L. BARTA.

—  
WAUKESHA, WIS.,  
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We congratulate you for the investigation which the Senate is conducting into the Administration's war policies. At this point in history, the U.S. President holds such awesome powers that he can, almost singlehanded, commit the whole country to war against any party he names. It is therefore all the more important in this American democracy to reveal his operations and those of his numerous departments, in particular, the military, State, and the CIA. What is good for the President is not neces-

sarily good for the rest of us, and we favor the restoration of the balance of powers which was and still is prescribed by the magnificent American Constitution.

It is so easy for big war hawks to condemn and smear those who object to wars with charges of cowardice, subversion, stupidity, blindness, willful disobedience, etc., ad nauseam. But we contend that it takes as much courage and bravery to stand up and question the warpower structure, as to face the fire of a foreign opponent. As for stupidity and blindness, how many of the big war hawks of recent history drove their followers not to glorious victory, but to ignominious defeat and disaster? Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, Napoleon, Kaiser Wilhelm—to name but a few. Even Stalin tried to liquidate a small nation in a brief campaign (Finland). The list is endless with names of those whose errors of prophecy were colossal.

It seems that since 1941 the United States has been constantly at war, and in our present state, being entangled everywhere in the world with governments—democratic, dictatorial, feudalistic, and whatnot, it looks as though there can be no end to our armed conflicts. This is sickening, and makes a mockery of national policy that pretends to be the "Great Society." Too much of our national substance, manpower, blood and productive genius is being squandered recklessly in the bottomless pits of war and its consequences. This monstrous folly can only bring us to disastrous ends. Even now, the swelling of hatred and contempt for the United States from many quarters overseas, where we expected to enjoy some respect and affection, is one of the most alarming developments of this decade. The American people are not a gang of international cannon-adeers in the world, but present military preparations and actions make us look that way.

We strongly oppose this U.S. war on Vietnam, and hope that you will continue to expose its follies and corruptions. In particular, we dread the possibility that U.S. military action in Vietnam will provoke the Chinese to war against us—with cooperation of the Russians, of course. We strongly back you in your efforts to bring this war to a halt, and hope that you will vote strongly against any congressional bills that demand expenditures or authorization for it.

Yours most sincerely,

—  
RAY T. WENDLAND.  
CHARLOTTE S. WENDLAND.

—  
GALLIPOLIS, OHIO,  
February 18, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to thank you for your stubborn and most rational efforts in behalf of a sane policy on southeast Asia. Be assured that there are many of us outside of Oregon who support you and agree with you. The cynicism of Dean Rusk's clever play today, challenging the Senate to vote yes or no on the appropriations bill, does not escape notice. Any knowledgeable person, of course, knows the bill will pass (they always do) but those of you who vote against it have already been branded. Naturally this will not in the least discourage you in your efforts.

One need not have the gift of prophecy to see the disaster ahead. Maybe it can be prevented—maybe not. But at least some of us can feel and say, no matter what comes, that we tried. For now we will keep on hoping and working in the cause of sanity and justice.

The courage and tenacity exhibited constantly by you will continue to be an inspiration and source of strength to us.

Sincerely,

—  
CHARLES E. HOLZER, Jr., M.D.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I approve your stand on Vietnam and your courage in maintaining it in the face of much ugly opposition. I am sending letters expressing approval of your views to the White House, our United Nations representative, and other Members of Congress. I hope that future developments relating to Vietnam will soon begin to reflect the triumph of your commonsense attitudes.

Very truly yours,

—  
LILLIAN L. HUBBELL.

—  
NATIONAL CITY, CALIF.,  
February 17, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to let you know that my wife and I are very, very glad that we have men like you serving in the Senate. Most of all, we are 100 percent behind you in ending the Vietnam war.

It is men like you with your courage that make us feel patriotic. L.B.J. and his men have really twisted the truth about the war in Vietnam. It has gotten so bad that rather than burning my draft card, my wife and I registered as Republicans as a protest. Lucky for me I served in the Army before L.B.J. "took over" the Nation.

Best of luck to you and God bless America because we need help.

Yours truly,

—  
OSCAR I. COVEDO.

—  
COLUMBUS, OHIO,  
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would just like to write a few lines telling you that I have been following your position on Vietnam for the past few months and that I fully concur with your stand. It is unfortunate that the United States has been blindly led into the war and that at the present it is extremely difficult to find a solution which the administration will listen to. The President's "peace offensive" in December and January was offensive to everything that I have ever believed about diplomacy.

It is my hope that your position and the Senate Committee's hearings will force the administration to examine its position and the entire foreign policy. It is about time that we find something to replace containment.

I am writing the President to express my dissatisfaction with the present stand that he is taking.

Yours truly,

—  
GARY S. HOROWITZ.

—  
St. LOUIS, MO.,  
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

HONORED SIR: I want to thank you and your colleagues for bringing to the American people a televised account of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's inquiry into the administration's Vietnam policies.

I, like many of my business acquaintances and friends have tried in the past to find out why we are in Vietnam in the first place. All the people who speak for the administration repeatedly say that we have commitments, we must keep our word, etc. However under our late President, John F. Kennedy, we were told that we would never get into a shooting war in Vietnam, and our support would be merely advisory as far as military matters were concerned and, of course economic aid. Mr. Johnson was elected on this premise too, but he has completely

changed the course. Has Mr. Johnson made other commitments? I haven't been able to find out through the administration's Mr. Rusk or General Taylor. The only conclusion I have reached is that the administration has a long record of misjudgment and that we, the American people have been fooled by election promises.

Article I, section 8, paragraph 11 of the U.S. Constitution clearly states that Congress shall have the power to declare war. Why and by what right did Congress give up the powers? I think this was a grave mistake. If we had reason to be at war in Vietnam and we had a declaration of war by the Congress, I would be behind this action 100 percent. The way it stands, I'm against the administration's policy and I believe we should get out of there fast. Pick the most honorable way and get out and stay out. Because we don't like the Communist way of life, does this give us the right to force our ways on an alien people?

Well I've had my little say. I feel better and I share your views in every respect.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. BAGLEY.

GROSSE POINT, MICH.,  
February 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
The Capitol,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is quite impossible to find words with which to thank you for the efforts you are making to bring peace to Vietnam and by thus doing avert a world holocaust.

I am one of the innumerable people in the country who believes that we have no right to interfere with the internal affairs of Vietnam.

We are regarded as cruel transgressors by most of the peoples of the world and certainly by our friends in the Far East.

In spite of the money we are spending to help people and win friends throughout the world, our image grows steadily uglier.

We are praying for your continued health and strength.

Gratefully yours,

IVA K. WILLMORE.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,  
February 15, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our sister State of Oregon may well be proud to have a man of your caliber and far-seeing vision as a Senator. I have, for a long time, admired and applauded your courage in taking the stand that you have taken in the matter of the war in Vietnam, and at this time I am writing to express my sentiments. I am wholly in agreement with your views in this matter, and I am sure that millions of other Americans are likewise in agreement with you. Unfortunately, we were never consulted, yet the lives of all of us, and the preservation of our country and this entire civilization may well be in danger unless this action is stopped before it goes too far.

I cannot see any justifiable reason why this country ever intruded into another country's internal affairs in the first place. We had not been attacked. This was a civil war in a country thousands of miles away. It was then stated that we would act only in an "advisory" capacity, with some economic aid, as needed. Then came the first bombing of Vietnam, which led to an ever-increasing aerial warfare—more troops sent—and every time this belligerent involvement is intensified still further the danger to all of us is intensified in the same ratio. I have written two letters of protest to the President in the past year. Both were acknowledged by someone in the State Department,

and brochures were enclosed which simply justified the action in Vietnam. So, obviously, writing letters of protest does not change one thing. The President offered "unconditional negotiations" in a speech last year, but even while making that speech the bombing of North Vietnam continued, and more troops were sent over—a direct contradiction to any offer of "unconditional negotiations." It is quite understandable why, in the face of such actions, North Vietnam rejected the offer as being "insincere." How could they think otherwise? If that offer had been backed up by a cessation of hostilities, showing that we really meant it—it might have been believed. One cannot offer peace, while continuing to build a war machine, and expect to be believed. The recent "peace offensive" was almost certain to fail for that same reason. "Actions speak louder than words." We cannot, in all fairness, expect North Vietnam to make all the concessions while we make none at all. There has to be a spirit of "give and take" in any negotiations if they are to succeed.

This country has brought criticism upon itself from all over the world because of these actions in Vietnam. If other countries were to send their armies over here to interfere in an internal civil war in our country, we would certainly resent their actions as being acts of aggression, and that is exactly what we are doing in Vietnam. The United Nations has pleaded for a cessation of hostilities, but, again, statements have been made that we are seeking peace, while we continue to enlarge our war effort. We are certainly not adding to our prestige in the world by these actions. Mere words, without appropriate action to back up those words, are not enough.

I am a Democrat. I voted for President Johnson because I firmly believed that he would keep us out of war. I am sure that millions of other Americans who voted for him, did so with the same belief. All of us have been shocked. We hoped that he would follow in the footsteps of F.D.R., and I am sure that if F.D.R. were with us today we would not be in this precarious situation. Under his masterful leadership the beginning of friendly relationship with Russia was made, and if this had been carried on, with tact and diplomacy, our two countries might be working together in a combined venture in the exploration of outer space—a venture bringing tremendous contributions to the world of science, and to mankind. Instead, that friendship has been allowed to suffer because our actions have aroused suspicion of what our real intentions may be.

This is too dangerous a time to take risks that could involve the total destruction of the world. Surely Vietnam is not worth that. If this war is enlarged and expanded enough to eventually bring Communist China into it, then our entire civilization is doomed to annihilation in an all-out nuclear war. Is Vietnam worth that?

Unfortunately, the matter has already been allowed to go so far that a withdrawal now would be taken as a "loss of face," but certainly a "loss of face" is far preferable to the risk of all-out war that would cost millions of innocent lives, and destroy all of us. Other countries did not rush into Vietnam with armies and aircraft, so why did this country alone choose to do so? It was not our business, at any time—and it is not our business now.

I congratulate you on your courageous stand, Senator Morse, and it is my fervent hope and prayer that the present debates in the Senate will result in finding a way to halt this dreadful thing before it goes any further. Surely peace can only be achieved by honestly working toward peace, not by armies or bombs while talking about wanting peace. May God direct you to find the an-

swer—before it is too late. This country needs men like you, and never more keenly than at a time such as this.

Very truly yours,

ROSALIE C. TEMPEST.

IUKA, MISS.,  
February 20, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God you are still in Washington to speak out against the war in Vietnam. I sincerely hope that you and the other men who are against it can do something in time to save us from world war III.

For years I have admired the way you spoke out for what you believed, and I have been grateful for your presence in our law-making department. If only there were more like you there, maybe we could live in a more relaxed manner and without that constant fear of an atomic war.

Usually I am among those well-meaning people who sit back and hope that somebody else will speak out for the right things—but this time I just had to let you know how much both my husband and I appreciate you.

Sincerely yours,

MARY B. DAVIS.

PITTSFIELD, MASS.,  
February 20, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The American people owe you immeasurable gratitude for the stand and courage you have taken against the Johnson policy, in this unpopular war in Vietnam. I wish there were more men of your caliber in Washington.

Best wishes to you and Senator FULBRIGHT.

Very truly yours,

PETER FRANCESE.

LONDON, ENGLAND,  
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
The Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am an American living abroad who ceased to suffer from the oppressive anti-Communist atmosphere that is poisoning America in 1954, but I have never ceased protesting, for the sake of the whole world, against American foreign policy.

On Sunday, my family and I, supporters of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, are joining others in a silent vigil outside 10 Downing Street in an attempt to impress upon Mr. Wilson our shame and disgust over his Vietnam policy.

We watched on TV the other night Kennan's statements to the Foreign Relations Committee and after you had asked Kennan if any country voted democratically for a Communist government, would we have the right to interfere, my two sons got up and cheered you and the older said to me: "Mom, don't ever allow yourself to be bitter about America, not while it has men like Senator MORSE." We were also pleased with FULBRIGHT and considered Senator LAUSCHE a McCarthyite figure who seemed to be intimidating Kennan to some degree.

I have seen a propaganda booklet issued by the Hanoi government with the men and women who compose the National Liberation Force and in my opinion, they are truly representative of the people of all of Vietnam, and they deserve the status of recognition as any of the resistance groups held during the war against the Nazis.

The crux of the whole tragedy is the failure of the United States to accept the legality of the Peiping government and to permit China's entry into the U.N. It may be too late where Peiping is concerned, but we here never give up hope for the U.N. Let there be two Chinas, but let us have peace.



Please accept the sincerest thanks from our family for your persistent efforts to give us a better world and to restore America's name to the reputation it had before F.D.R.'s death.

With warm and affectionate good wishes,

Yours,

ROSALYN BALCOMBE.

WHEELING, ILL.,

February 19, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,

U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: As an Ex-Frenchman, now an American citizen, who lived through part of the Indochina war fiasco, I wish to congratulate you on your wise and courageous stand on the South Vietnam issue.

Keep up the good work, Mr. MORSE, you are on the right track.

Yours very truly,

F. F. VANDERMEERSCH.

ANAHEIM, CALIF.,

February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE B. MORSE,

Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It occurs to me that you might at present be getting a little mail of the uncomplimentary sort. Having been an admirer of yours for many, many years, and not having apprised you of that fact, I feel that this would probably be a good time to do so.

I greatly respect your honesty, your intelligence and your courage. I feel that you stand firmly for the people and on the side of history. I know that when the scores are totaled, you will be one of the great leaders of all time. I hope that Oregon respects you—you are an honor to that State.

Your stand on Vietnam allows this Nation to retain at least a little of its honor.

Stand firm and guard your health, God bless you. We need you badly.

Very warmly yours,

BOB COHEN.

AUSABLE FORKS, N.Y.,

February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me to assure you, on the basis of what I know of the American people and the widespread interest that the televising of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings has aroused that the applause over a certain remark of yours—though promptly and quite properly suppressed—was echoed by perhaps countless millions of Americans, as it was by those of my own household.

If a few hundred million dollars of the billions we are spending killing people could be devoted by the Government to the televising of all important congressional proceedings, it would be a great step toward making ours a Government in fact of, by, and for the people.

I am, sir,

Respectfully yours,

ROCKWELL KENT.

LUTSEH, MINN.,

February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you, and those others in our Congress for speaking up with all your strength and courage against the policy our President and those whose advice he is following in regard to the immoral and utterly unjustified war being waged in southeast Asia.

To me, a disabled veteran of the Rainbow Division of World War I, it borders on an almost unbelievable policy for our country and makes me fearful that the Armed Forces-industrial complex has taken over the foreign policy of our Nation.

May I urge you, and those who stand with you to stand fast and be not discouraged when criticized and called disloyal or near traitors.

I remember how that over 1,900 years ago, someone who we profess to follow and use as our ideal, had to remind those working with Him, that they would have said to them and about them all manner of evil.

May your strength not weaken nor your courage fail.

Sincerely,

JAY WHITSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

February 16, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is my first letter to a Senator, and it is to express my great admiration for you, and my sympathy with your views on our Government's war in Vietnam. Please add me to your statistics. I am 24 years old, a professional cellist.

I hope many more people will speak out, and if they don't very quickly, that you will not give up.

Yours sincerely,

HELEN HARBISON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

February 18, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

U.S. Senator,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I take this opportunity of writing you and extending my appreciation for your gallant stand on the Vietnam war. I trust that you will continue your fight, and I want you to know that there are millions of Americans hoping you will continue to do so.

This may not be a war to some people, but it is a big war for the boys who have to fight it. I see no victory in sight when the same policy is being used as in Korea. We do not fight wars to bring people to the conference table. That's nonsense. We fight wars to win. We cannot win in southeast Asia for many reasons. How can you feed 700 million people if you subdue them militarily? What kind of a stable government could you establish? What would you do if something happened to Ky? How can you make the oriental ever like the white man and vice versa? Nationalism is too strong.

War only decides who lives and who dies. You do not fight a war on the enemies' terms. You go all out to win with the best weapons and equipment possible which our Government to date has not given our men.

My 19-year-old boy says that if he is drafted he will only be gun fodder, and he does not want any part of Vietnam. He would defend this country to the hilt if it was in jeopardy, but he does not believe in what is taking place now in Asia. What would you advise him, Mr. MORSE, to do? I would appreciate hearing from you on this. It's too bad young men have to pay for the mistakes of old men.

Again thanking you for your good efforts and trusting I shall hear from you.

Sincerely,

K. F. SCHADE.

FREEPORT, TEX.,

February 18, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Count me as an American who repudiates the administration's policy on Vietnam.

Yours truly,

ROBERT BING.

DELAWARE, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I am writing to express my support of your position regarding the administration's policy in Vietnam. Although the attitude you have maintained be criticized and attacked by more vocal elements of the

citizenry, rest assured that there are many conscientious citizens who support your effort to investigate the problem in a democratic and open manner.

Sincerely,

CHARLENE DWYER.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,

February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your comments and those of Senator FULBRIGHT at the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee have impressed me a great deal. I think you have all of America thinking.

Sincerely,

AMELIA NUGENT.

TEANECK, N.J.,

February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I support your efforts to secure peace in Vietnam. Everything that you have said about the war there makes sense to me.

Sincerely yours,

AMY HAUSNER.

WILMINGTON, DEL.,

February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We applaud your courage and bravery in speaking out on the war in Vietnam. We urge you to continue to press for a peaceful settlement as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD R. KEARNS.

RUTH S. KEARNS.

AMES, IOWA,

February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to tell you how much I, and my family, appreciate your efforts to end the war in Vietnam. You are a true patriot, and I think I reflect the feelings of most informed Americans when I say that we are proud of you and grateful to you. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. METZLER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

February 15, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please know that my wife and I applaud your courageous stand on the Vietnam policy. Please keep up the good work, sir.

We hope the immorality of U.S. actions in this area are not signs of the general decay of morals and ethics in our society. It is not always easy for a man to take an unpopular stand on issues as you do many times. However, we believe in the honesty and integrity of your convictions and stand behind you.

Sincerely,

LEWIS LITZKY.

DESCANSO, CALIF.,

February 19, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a pioneer Westerner (I am one of seven generations who has lived in San Diego County, and at present am the oldest of four generations still living here); with this introduction to the writer I must heartily commend you for your most proper stand regards to this Vietnam war silly business.

Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, a World War veteran as I happen to be, expressed the true situation in Vietnam.

We are surely in the wrong war at the wrong place and the wrong time. I happened to see your committee recently at Berkeley via Westinghouse TV and then again yesterday at my home here via XER TV, Tijuana, Mexico. It was necessary for me to travel as far as Eureka, Calif., and back (1,800 miles). I encountered quite a few folks in the 12 days I was away and did not encounter a single person who was in favor of us being in Vietnam.

You, therefore, believe me, are not taking the minority view and unless our Constitution is to be thrown overboard we should have Congress declare war just as that fine document provides.

With such deep roots in my beloved country it includes Baker City, Oreg., in 1885 where my Uncle Elmer Holt was admitted to the bar at the ripe age of 18.

Keep up your strength and don't let them get away with it.

Sincerely and with kind regards,  
ROY ARTHUR SILVA.

PROCTOR, MINN.,  
February 17, 1966.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HON. SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express once again my gratitude for your appearances and your stand on Vietnam. Your unruffled countenance during the hearings are very confident to watch, besides the clarity of your position you have outlined.

I applaud you.  
Sincerely,

PHYLLIS LAHLI.

LAKEWOOD, OHIO,  
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have been wonderful on the TV hearings this past few days. Our entire family thinks so.

This quotation from Isaiah which President Johnson quotes so often has me concerned.

Isaiah 1: 18-19: "Come now, and let us reason together. \* \* \* If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land. But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword."

I wish we had many more men like you in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,  
BERNICE OLIPHANT.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: How we rejoice that we have such a great man living in our country today. Your courageous stand in this time of national crisis gives us hope indeed for the future of our country and the world.

With deepest appreciation, I am,  
Sincerely,  
MRS. NORMA GROSSENBACHER.

AUBURNDALE, MASS.,  
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree completely with your statements on the Vietnam war. You and some of your fellow Senators who share your view, seem to be the only sane force in Washington these days.

The committee hearings are a wonderful public service. I believe the American

public is not fully aware of where this dangerous policy of President Johnson can lead and what disastrous events might take place unless caution is exercised.

Thank you for being such a concerned and dedicated public servant.

Mrs. T. R. MERRITT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to convey my support of the investigations which you are conducting. And also to let you know that I am in agreement with your plan to resolve this conflict in the United Nations.

Very truly yours,

JOAN BRUCK.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,  
February 18, 1966.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: You are a great man. I can't find the proper words to express myself, how I feel and how I honor you for your wonderful work and words for us people—our men, husbands, and sons.

I will always honor you.

Mrs. MILLIE KOKAL.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note to urge you to redouble your courageous efforts to terminate the conflict in South Vietnam and bring our fine young American men back home.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. LEMIRE.

PLYMOUTH, MICH.,  
February 15, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my appreciation for your courageous and tireless work for a more reasonable policy by our Government in the Vietnam problem.

If you have any recommendations as to what an individual can do to help promote a less aggressive attitude by our Government, please let me know. I am willing to devote time and energy in the interest of stopping the senseless killing, but I don't know what to do.

Thank you for devoting your time and energy in behalf of peace.

Very truly yours,

BRUCE B. SPRATLING.

INGLEWOOD, CALIF.,  
February 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are writing to encourage you in your attempt to enlighten the public on the true state of affairs in Vietnam and to bring an end to the hostilities there. The majority opinion in the United States today seems to be that our presence in Vietnam is justified because there has been Communist aggression from the north. We feel, however, that the United States especially in support of the Diem regime, has also committed aggression. We realize that our Government finds itself in a touchy situation, that it has a "tiger by the tail," so to speak, but we are convinced that no further good can come from prolonging the present tragic state of affairs. We urge our Representatives in Washington to demand that negotiations with the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese be commenced immediately, before the United States is irreversibly committed to further atrocities.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD HAROLD JOHNSON.  
ANNA VAN ROAPHARST JOHNSON.

NORMAL, ILL.,  
February 14, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please be advised that I support you wholeheartedly in your stand against our present Vietnam policies. They are immoral, impractical, and shortsighted. A country such as ours is capable of solving these problems in a more intelligent manner.

Sincerely yours,

DALE E. BIRKENHOLZ.

PACIFIC PALISADES, CALIF.,  
February 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We feel that the so-called confusion of the American public may be due to lack of a responsible spokesman of views which many have privately come to. May we offer the committee and yourself congratulations for your courageous efforts to bring notice to the American people of the dangers of our present position in Vietnam.

We urge immediate steps to liquidate our commitments in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

FRANCES T. WILLIAMS.  
BYRON D. WILLIAMS.  
JUDITH J. WILLIAMS.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,  
February 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We commend you for your forthright criticism of the foreign policy of the Johnson administration including Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

We urge you and the Foreign Relations Committee to continue investigations and public hearings into every area of foreign affairs of the executive branch including that latest sideshow, the Honolulu conference.

We hope for a new foreign policy in which military force is not an instrument.

Give 'em hell.

Best regards,

JOHN and ALMA DURR.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.,  
February 13, 1966.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Count me as being in full agreement with your views on Vietnam made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Views, substantiated by experts as former Ambassador George F. Kennan and General Gavin.

Thank you for being one of few Senators unafraid to speak out on behalf of logic in a misguided America.

This country was founded out of revolution. History refers to it as the shot heard around the world. For 190 years we have been the envy and aspiration of every backward nation. Instead of holding out our hand in help to others trying to achieve our way of life, we find ourselves denying them our very heritage, the right of free people to form governments of their own choosing. This country is following an asinine foreign policy in Vietnam and especially in the Dominican Republic and the tragedy of it is that young American boys are dying in its futile support.

Sincerely yours,

DINO J. GROSSI.

NORWALK, CONN.,  
February 17, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In closely following the deliberations of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am extremely pleased with the stand you continue to take.



Please do not let up. For, if we continue our present course in Vietnam—both in the south, to try and bolster what appears to me to be an unpopular Government, and in the north, bombing daily a nation with whom we are not at war—it will mean eventual full-scale war with the Chinese, and a possible nuclear war with the Russians.

I have four boys, the oldest of whom is 12; I don't want to send them to Asia to get their legs blown off. Nor do I want my family to be destroyed—either instantaneously in a nuclear blast, or after a week of radiation sickness.

Sincerely,

STEWART H. ROSS.

ELMHURST, N.Y.,

February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Let me be another to congratulate and commend you on your courageous and patriotic position re Vietnam. As an Air Force veteran of both World War II and Korea, I am eager to lend concurrence and encouragement to you since I have no ax to grind, having served my country.

I certainly would not suggest to you any arguments or courses to follow since I feel you are much more than competent to pursue these than I could ever be. However, I must heartily commend you on the statements made by you to General Gavin on the above date.

You, as a U.S. Senator, permit me to maintain confidence in the U.S. Congress. Please continue to represent the people of this country and do not fall prey to pressures and plays for power.

I have remitted a copy of this letter to President Johnson.

Sincerely,

VINCENT J. DEL GRECO.

JACKSON HEIGHTS, N.Y.,

February 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you, indeed, for putting General Taylor in his place. It is a pleasure to hear, in these times, one clear American voice.

Thank you, Senator.

Very sincerely,

DOROTHY HANLEY.

THIEF RIVER FALLS, MINN.,

February 19, 1966.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been listening to the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during the last day or two as they came in over TV, and I want to commend you for your efforts, and to thank you for the stand you are taking.

Congress only has the real power to declare war, but in spite of this we are now engaged in a full-scale war in Vietnam. I read the newspapers quite carefully, and I want to say that in my opinion the resolution of August 1964 was never intended to authorize a war. The people, in general, did not understand it, and it was slipped through Congress, without any full understanding of how it could be used. The President and his advisers are using this resolution for a purpose for which it was never intended.

I hope you can get a few Members of Congress to back you up so that we can find out just where the Senators stand. You may not win, but it is interesting to know just where our Senators stand. As Dean Rusk said, "Let the people know where the Senate stands." Let's have a vote on your resolution to rescind.

The President may be Commander in Chief of the Army, but Congress holds the purse strings. But if you do not appropriate the money, he will have to limit the war.

It seems to me that we have no business in Vietnam, 10,000 miles away from home. Instead of sending our boys to the fighting front to fight and die, let us get them back home. That is the only way to back them up and protect them. There is no reason why we should play the role of world policeman.

Supposing we do blast and bomb Vietnam to pieces, then what have we accomplished. How long are we going to stay there—5 years, 10 years, 25 years, etc.? China is still there right alongside. Are we going to stay there indefinitely and spend the American taxpayers' money? This is our third world war away from home.

I listened to General Taylor and Dean Rusk. Their testimony was highly evasive. They did not want to tell anything to hurt the administration in any way.

It is my opinion that President Johnson and his advisers are leading our country and our people on the road to ruin and destruction. We have adopted Goldwater's policies, and the Republicans are laughing up their sleeves. You will hear a lot about this in the 1966 campaign, and much more in 1968.

You may use this letter in any way you think helpful.

Yours very truly,

H. O. BERVE.

HELLAM, PA.,

February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I am not a man of words so I will not be able to express myself and my feelings as I would like to. I am just one of the millions of American workingmen and taxpayers.

This week I lost time from work to listen to the debate from Washington and I wish I would have lost more so I could have heard it all.

This week I think you have proven yourself one of the greatest men of our time. I wish I could have been there to applaud your every word.

It will take many more Senators like you to keep our country from falling into the hands of the military, which road it is on for the past several years.

The American people are as easily lead as the Germans, which I find hard to believe. Your road to peace is not an easy one. You will have to fight with no letup but I believe you will win. Clear-thinking people are behind you tooth and nail.

I only wish that Premier Ky would have been at the hearings so you could have shown the American people the stupid ass that our Government is forcing on the people of South Vietnam.

My wife and I have always regarded you with great respect and our finest wish and prayer for you is a long, healthy, and happy life.

Sincerely,

ALVIN N. IRWIN and VERA.

DOBBS FERRY, N.Y.,

February 22, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo and God bless you for the good fight you are waging to air this bad stew in Vietnam. We who supported the Johnson administration for its peace platform are appalled by the escalation of this terrible civil war into an international tragedy.

Please know that you have the profound gratitude and support from citizens in every part of the United States.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE ZINER.

SUDBURY, MASS.,

February 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is most heartening to hear reported on television what your views are concerning the war in Vietnam. I have been so completely disillusioned—by the man for whom I voted in the last election, our President.

Let's hope that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee may continue to question our policies in Vietnam before the general public.

The thing that fascinates me is the fact that the news media's choice in reporting, points up your questioning of those who appear before the committee.

I have been your greatest admirer for many years and only wish that there were many more like you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. F. P. MORRISON.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX.,

February 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to inform you that I am in accord with the position you have taken as concerns Vietnam. I believe it is imperative that a cease-fire commence immediately so that we might negotiate with Hanoi, and more importantly, with the N.L.F. I also believe we must uphold the Geneva accords if we are to achieve peace in Vietnam. In the name of humanity and "practical politics," I urge you to continue the fight for peace.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS D. R. MACNAIR.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm a Negro, 65 years old. I'm a veteran of military service with the 10th U.S. Cavalry on the Mexican border in 1920 and 1921. I also served with a quartermaster battalion of the 2d Army during World War II. I'm proud to say I was honorably discharged after these periods of military service.

After constantly watching television programs, listening to the radio, and reading newspaper reports, I'm offering you my heartiest congratulations and pledging to support you during your most worthy effort to prevent our beloved country from becoming involved in an unnecessary world war.

This country never has been more in need of men and women with your courage, foresight, and ability. You are one of the few Members of Congress who seem to really know how to recognize and talk to war-mongering statesmen and militarists. More power to you while so doing. Loyal and peace-loving Americans are desperately depending on you, Senator MORSE, to carry on your campaign for good will among nations and a permanently peaceful world. May you continue to serve your constituents well, and may almighty God forever guide and bless you.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE D. JOHNSON.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,

February 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my whole-hearted approval of your committee's hearings on the U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

I beg you to do everything possible to stop this senseless war in which our standard-

bearer has publicly expressed his admiration for Adolf Hitler.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. MARSHALL.

SPARTA, N.J.,  
February 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your fine job of opening the public's eye. You are so right. At all the gatherings that I attend, the conversation is "Why are we in Vietnam, or why is the Government playing politics instead of winning the war? Please continue your good work. You have my full support.

As a father of two sons of draft age and a veteran of World War II, 28th Infantry Division, the only thing that keeps our sanity, my wife and I, is that some one like you thinks of America first.

Yours truly,

RALPH ROBERTS.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,  
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I support your opposition to the illegal, undeclared war against the Vietnamese people.

Acting as we have outside the procedures of the United Nations has weakened both that organization and our own position.

I look forward to your speech in the Senate and hope it will bring some action from the American people, a voice of protest expression that our Government will accept meaningfully.

Sincerely,

LEONARD ENGEL.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.,  
February 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate, Old Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I have closely followed the hearings which have been taking place regarding our Vietnam policy. I firmly believe that these hearings are extremely essential in bringing before the American people the realities of this senseless, brutal and illegal conflict.

I heartily support your courageous and resolute stand. May others be similarly enlightened before a nuclear holocaust destroys mankind.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM P. ERICKSON.

NEWARK, DEL.,  
February 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my support for your position on the Foreign Relations Committee and thank you for your most intelligent questioning of the witnesses.

Yours truly,

DONNA M. ORGONEST.

PALM DESERT, CALIF.,  
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my heartfelt thanks for what you are doing. Those of us who must look particularly to the Senate for the courage, dedication, and wisdom to keep our country's liberties, freedom of speech and traditional honor unimpaired are fortunate to have men like you to guard them.

Courageous, forthright men are all too rare. May you have a long and distinguished career

in that small band. History proves that it is always those few who must protect the many.

Most sincerely,

CYRIA HENDERSON.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.,  
February 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I take this opportunity to thank you for the service you are rendering your country participating in the debate on the Vietnam war as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I, like most Americans I know, stand behind our Armed Forces in Vietnam who I feel should have full moral, economic, and arms support. I do not, however, support the present and past foreign policy which has so tragically involved our country in this war.

With best wishes.

Gratefully yours,

DAVID ROBERTS III.

MEMONONE FALLS, WIS.,  
February 19, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We strongly support your stand on the Vietnam war. We hope you will continue to struggle to make your viewpoint heard even though we realize that you have been put in the position of receiving very unpleasant opposition.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT P. OVERS.  
MARCELLA M. OVERS.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
February 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank the Almighty for Senators such as you and J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT; real Americans who are not afraid to stand up and be counted. What can we do to help? Keep up the good work.

HOWARD E. SEVERE.

CHEVY CHASE, MD.,  
February 27, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to tell you how grateful we are to you for all the work you are doing to oppose the war in Vietnam, and in fighting the large war budget demanded for this destructive purpose, with all the sadness and grief it can cause.

Are we not, actually, intruders in Vietnam? Are we properly protecting our own citizens when we allow them to be drafted into the jungles of Vietnam? We hope your influence will be widespread.

With gratitude to you,

NATAN and STANWOOD COBB.

EGLIN AFB, FLA.,  
February 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wanted to take this opportunity to applaud you for your stand on U.S. involvement in an unconstitutional and futile war. Your courage as a public servant in expressing dissent has been very heartening to me and I urge you to continue in the future as you have in the past.

In addition, your stand against "government by secrecy" is a view which should be pursued vigorously. Too long have decisions affecting all Americans been made by some public officials without their taking into consideration what many of us really do think and without the American people knowing what was happening until after some action had already been taken; i.e., Vietnam.

I will eagerly be reading your comments and following debates in which you are involved. With a person such as you, I feel sanity can yet prevail.

Thank you for reading my comments.

Respectfully yours,

HARRIS G. KRAHAM,  
Lieutenant, USAF.

MUNCIE, IND.,  
February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am entirely in sympathy with the stand you took at the hearings.

To surrender foreign policy decisions to Johnson, Rusk, and McNamara would be a big mistake.

Sincerely yours,

ROYAL J. MORSEY.

CHULA VISTA, CALIF.,  
February 22, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: You are to be commended in advocating to rescind the joint resolution of August 1964 and your stand on debate of our Vietnam policy. We rely on you as our representative of the people to bring out the true facts, at least as much as possible, and in this way perhaps control the power of the few.

Many of us understand how the consensus of a nation is obtained through a control of information and disguising of facts so that the majority of the people are in no position to judge or recommend action (granted that this is supposedly done for our best interests), so we do and must count on the representatives of the people to act for us and to obtain these facts and truths as was intended. (Or is Congress swayed in the same way by distorted facts, censored information, lack of interest, and fear?)

Perhaps the better policy would be to take into consideration that negotiations should take place with all political elements represented. In disagreement with Mr. Rusk, why not the Buddhists and the Catholics, as well as the Vietcong? Vietnam should be treated as a whole, not as a North and a South. Where did we lose sight of this?

I am sure you have the support of many, and our hope must be that this hearing will lead to a change in our policy in Vietnam, making it more realistic, more universal, more humane.

Very truly yours,

MARTA H. PORTER.

WINNFIELD, LA.,  
February 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My personal thanks for your stand on the war in Vietnam.

This part of the "grass roots of America" seems to be generally in favor of an escalated war up to and including the bombing of Peiping with nuclear weapons, if necessary.

I am not a native of Louisiana. However, I am now a registered voter here. I shall do my best to keep informed, so as to vote as intelligently as possible, and wherever I can, I shall speak out against this war in Vietnam.

In the meantime my thanks to you for doing your thankless task and my commendations to you for your courageous stand in this matter.

Yours truly,

MRS. WILLO L. CURRIER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
February 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please keep up your good and vital fight against the administration's war policy in Vietnam.



Your excellent stand is winning more and more support and will force a change for peace.

Your gallant devotion to truth and justice is a rare example nowadays, and much admired.

Sincerely yours,

NINA and MORRIS INDMAN.

DENVER, COLO.,

February 22, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE: My wife and I are definitely opposed to the administration's policy in Vietnam. We are in full accord with your stand.

It is about time we quit murdering our boys in Vietnam, and if it is a war why doesn't the United States declare war on Vietnam?

Hoping you will give your full support and consideration in stopping to send our boys to Vietnam.

With warm and kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ROGER HAHN.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,

February 22, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to express my sincere appreciation for the conscientious and articulate stand you have taken in challenging the administration's handling of the Vietnam situation. Although I can claim no expert knowledge in southeast Asia, I know from research and active participation in Latin America that the current stand of the United States is objectionable and untenable. Furthermore, I resent the wholesale use of deception on the American people, and the unwarranted assertion that we must police the world, even without a congressional mandate.

It seems of the utmost importance that (1) the public be made aware of the duplicity of the administration in this instance; (2) the Congress engage in a rational debate to clarify legal and moral issues at stake; (3) every possible avenue to negotiation be explored by the United States, without the imposition of unrealistic prerequisites or the exclusion of any interested parties; (4) the United Nations, a Geneva convention, or any other international group which is willing to collaborate in promoting meaningful mediation be given every encouragement to do so, with the expectation that the United States would take advantage of any opportunity so offered.

Please accept my thanks for the key role which you have played in dramatizing the fact that we are now engaged in an illegal war, that we can never hope for victory in the traditional sense, that the democratic process is being seriously eroded at home, and that our posture before the world is inconsistent and dangerous in many respects.

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT B. HEATH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

February 20, 1966.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE.

SIR: I support your attitude toward Vietnam.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE E. EMERY, M.D.

SEATTLE, WASH.,

February 20, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just listened to your committee TV broadcasts, and thank God or the Divine Force for allowing such a man as you, who is not afraid to stick by his convictions—his love for the lives of his fellow man. Senator FULBRIGHT too is to

be congratulated and CHURCH of Idaho. It takes the wideopen spaces to widen men's minds.

I happen to be an older woman and the longer I live, I'm shocked and grieved at the present happenings in this world of ours. I certainly wish you continued success.

Sincerely,

A. ELLA RILEY.

FEBRUARY 21, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for the courage and integrity you have displayed in bringing before the American people an open discussion on the problem of Vietnam.

I believe as you do, that when they know the facts they will refuse to support present policy there.

I beg you continue these hearings, bringing in other witnesses, from the academic sphere among others, who can add the weight of their opinion to those already expressed.

Sincerely,

SEYMOUR C. POST, M.D.

WHITTIER, CALIF.,

February 19, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I deeply admire your courage and your devotion to truth. History books of the future will have to report that at least one voice in the Senate of the United States of America kept insisting that the policy of shooting first and asking questions later was not appropriate in international affairs.

I felt, as you did, that Secretary of Defense McNamara ought to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee prepared to answer questions. Government by secrecy is not representative government. Government of the people, by the people, for the people, can survive many a storm so long as dissent can be distinguished from disloyalty. If a majority of us favor a dangerous policy, the minority must, at least, have the privilege of saying what they think.

All who believe in truly representative government owe you a debt of gratitude.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. MONTGOMERY.

FLUSHING, N.Y.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to express our thanks to you for your unflinching devotion to the cause of peace.

Please keep up your good work.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. M. ALTSCHULER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,

February 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my admiration for you regarding your views on the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. During the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings you have expressed your feelings and criticisms on the administration's policy on Vietnam. I share your views on our involvement with this war, and I applaud your firm and forthright statements made during the hearings. I also applaud Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator GORE.

It disturbs me to hear the testimony of many of the Nation's top military experts and other Government officials stating that they feel we should escalate the war and press on to victory. I do not feel that there is any victory to be obtained. The victory and further escalation of the war appear to me to be a waste of our country's money, resources, and individual lives. It also appears

to me that the United States has no right to intrude in another country's civil war.

I only wish that more people in this country shared your views, and that the United States would disengage itself from this terrible war while it is still within our power to do so.

Sincerely,

JOAN PAVLU.

DULUTH, MINN.,

February 22, 1966.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for the sensible stand you have taken in respect to the involvement of our country in this Vietnam war.

I am sure that most of our citizens, who are loyal to our country, feel that our Government has no business in sending our boys over there to be butchered. It is absurd to think that we as one nation, are going to be able to put an end to aggression all over the world. No country in history ever did it. As far as communism, we have plenty in this hemisphere to combat and how about Cuba off our shores? Let's look after United States first.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. WAKEFIELD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: All Americans will be the winners if your positions and those of Senator FULBRIGHT, as voiced late this afternoon, become the one that are implemented shortly.

Keep public hearings going as long as possible for the sake of world peace.

Most sincerely,

MAXINE R. ARONS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

February 22, 1966.

SENATOR W. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In writing to you I am speaking for myself, my family, and for almost all of my friends. We heartily endorse your efforts to make the Vietnam war an issue for public debate. Public policy and war are too important to be left in the hands of the military. Our people have been misinformed on the Vietnam situation and the administration has been misadvised by professional soldiers and lobbyists. I am writing to let you know that your support is far greater than the press and the polls would have the Nation believe.

Very truly yours,

JACOB A. ARLOW, M.D.

DUBUQUE, IOWA,

February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are doing a tremendous job of restoring dignity and responsibility to the Senatorial office and calling the Executive to account for the disaster we are heading for in Asia.

Needless to say, I agree that we must extricate ourselves from Vietnam as soon as possible and try to establish communications with China.

Yours truly,

EDMUND DEMERS.

YONKERS, N.Y.,

February 16, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to take this time to again tell you that there are hundreds of people that I have talked to in complete accord with yours and many of the other Senators views on the Vietnam fiasco caused against the will of the people of this country. I have seen and heard all of your hearings on television and have yet to see how it is possible for this country of ours to be spending billions of dollars on this very

untasteful foreign policy supported by our President, the killing of the young men of this country in a battle with absolutely no purpose is inhuman, unjust, and should not be permitted since it is definitely illegal from its origin.

Since we have bases located so strategically around China and Russia why is it so necessary to kill ourselves for a people who are near uncivilized than I can think of? In closing I would like to say that the people I have talked to are in full support of your stand against this fiasco we are being forced into by the Government officials who will be paid in full at the next election. Thank God there are Senators like yourself elected to office of this country who would really have us in dire straits.

Sincerely,

GEORGE CHIAVETTA,  
Ex-GI.

KANSAS CITY, Mo.,  
February 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Even though you and some of your dissenting associates have been described as being "blind to experience and deaf to hope" (whatever that means) be mindful of the fact that there are millions of Americans who are privately, and some of them publicly, cheering for all of you.

Jack Kennedy said, "The United Nations is our last best hope in a world where the instruments of war far exceed the instruments of peace" but, in view of the fact that we have violated and repudiated all of the peacekeeping provisions of the charter, many of us have come to the conclusion that our "last best hope" is that small group of dissenters (statesmen) in the Senate who are willing to stand alone for decency and sanity.

We are more than grateful and hope and pray that none of you will be cowed by the inane political blusterings being broadcast by a President who has lost all perspective (if he ever had any) and who is now living in an era, created within his own distorted imagination, entirely outside of history.

Yours truly,

ARCH R. MAULSBY.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,  
February 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I admire your courage and integrity in continually opposing Johnson's war in Vietnam. I strongly support you in urging the halting the bombing of North Vietnam, the recognition of the NLF, the reconvening of the Geneva conference, and most recently your commitment to lead a filibuster to stall the approval of appropriations for the war. I also urge you to work for the defeat of the appropriations, which would just be another blank check for Johnson to continue this bloody and senseless war.

I'm with you all the way.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY A. PETERSON.

TUCKAHOE, N.Y.,  
February 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hitherto I confided in President Johnson's abilities in the Vietnam situation, but since the Hawaii meetings I have lost hope in his competence. It is my sad conclusion that his authority in Vietnam should henceforth be rescinded.

Lives are sacrificed, a nation is destroyed, and now truth is so distorted that words have lost all meaning. In my conviction faulty commitments have been devised to force us into provoked hostilities with China.

The 1950 crossing of the 38th Korean parallel and forced votes have voided the United Nations of credibly respectable authority in Asia. It is impossible to expect

a sovereign country to come to negotiations—unconditional at that—upon the sole unilateral authority of the United States. Still, until the Hawaii meetings one could hope that President Johnson's true desires for peace and a better world might break that paradox.

That hope is dashed. Resumed bombing, needless embarrassment of the United Nations, and now the handshakes with the desperado Saigon generals and the Vice President's preposterous trip make it improbable that President Johnson can still extricate himself from the tangle. Those are gestures aimed at internal idiosyncrasies in our country. Internationally they are worse than irrelevant. India is starving. We are on the threshold of inexhaustible human tragedy.

We need at least the wordless truce attainable by cessation of bombing and retreat into defensible enclaves to protect politically endangered Vietnamese minorities. Ultimately the perverted Korea affair must be wound up to restore international organization to its authorized impartial functions.

Evidence is abundant, the situation most severe, and we pray for our dear President. But it is urgent that his incompetent Vietnam power be now rescinded.

Yours very respectfully,

JOHN V. GRAUMAN.

WHITTIER, CALIF.,  
February 12, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senior Senator From Oregon,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have postponed much too long to thank you for your stand on Vietnam and for your constant, and often solitary, fight for the preservation of our constitutional rights. I do so humbly thank you now.

I have written to our President today (as well as to Senator FULBRIGHT and to the two Senators from California) urging that they follow your leadership in bringing the Vietnam situation to full debate on the floor of the Senate.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS N. EVERETT.

BRONX, N.Y.,  
February 15, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to take this opportunity to thank and praise you on your forthright stand on Vietnam. Your and Senator GRUENING's long and lonely stand from among the whole governmental establishment has been an act of heroism, particularly in the light of administration pressure and its manufactured "public opinion." Of the wide section of people I come in contact with, many of whom are complete strangers, I find concern and fright over our involvement there.

If President Johnson really believes in the Geneva accords, peace and can very easily be achieved, although a final settlement over the long run would take time. To accept the accords would mean to withdraw all troops immediately and concurrently dismantle our bases there. At the same time we should partake in negotiations with the National Liberation Front, the people we are fighting. This may be considered by some as loss of face, but it is better to lose face for a short time than to lose our national honor for all time, much of which is already gone.

I heard you on CBS TV and radio in the last 2 weeks. You were excellent. I would be greatly appreciative if you could send me a copy of the document "Why Vietnam" mentioned by Senator GRUENING, and the following: the State Department policy information paper written in 1949, presented

to the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations in June 1951; the Rand Corp., study commissioned by the U.S. Air Force examining the reasons why China entered the Korean war; the Mansfield report; the latest economic report of the President.

Thank you very much, for everything. Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

ALAN RESPLER.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,  
February 13, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very unhappy over my country's foreign policy in Vietnam and Santo Domingo. I am glad your eloquence is speaking for me so bravely.

Thank you most sincerely.

HILDA MARIE SCHROEDER.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,  
February 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your position on our Vietnam policy is to be commended. Congratulations to you and to the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee for presenting the issues to the public. The testimony of General Gavin and particularly that of Ambassador Kennan elicited by you and the other members of the committee only confirm the view that our military involvement in Vietnam is a monstrous error, and that to increase that involvement will be to compound the error.

Although you will, I am sure, persevere in your course regardless of what your detractors will say, it may nevertheless be heartening to receive expressions of support.

Sincerely yours,

E. A. SCHROEDER.

JEWELL, OREG.,  
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your stand on Vietnam. You and Senator FULBRIGHT are true Americans.

I have followed this war in Vietnam for a long time. Things that you predicted, as well as Walter Lippmann, have come true. We need to be alert so that communism doesn't take hold here.

Have talked with several of my friends, who have the same feeling. I again commend you for your stand.

Very truly,

Mrs. H. E. CARLSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I are extremely proud of your courageous stand with respect to the Vietnamese crisis. If ever the American people needed a tribune to protect them from those who enrich themselves at the expense of the weak, it is today. Our fervent hope is that you and your congressional companions do not weaken under the pressure.

Sincerely,

PETER J. DONAHUE,  
CATHERINE A. DONAHUE.

CARMEL, CALIF.,  
February 14, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As native Oregonians and graduates of the University in Eugene, we want to tell you of our pride in you the past week. You were wonderful as you said just what so many of us wanted you to say.

You may see by the clippings from today's Chronicle that folks out here are behind you of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Sincerely yours,

PAULINE FORD.



March 2, 1966

MILTON-FREEWATER, OREG.,

February 26, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE: It is quite evident that you have pertinent evidence that we should never have taken the stand we did in Vietnam. It is another painful illustration in human history of giving any group enough rope and they will hang themselves.

We have been too preoccupied with foreign communism and looking over the fence at other people's faults and problems that we took too little cognizance of our own.

The handwriting was on the wall when our own Government aid to our own backward groups failed to achieve their purposes. To compound the trouble with foreign borders was deplorable and now we reach a wretched end. We still hate to reach the obvious conclusion that money cannot and will not buy morality.

ARDEN GAWITH.

JERSEY CITY, N.J.,

February 21, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to assure you of my support—and that of many thinking people I know—in your opposition to the Government's handling of the South Vietnam debacle.

We feel that no American President has a right to carry on an undeclared full-fledged war against any people or any nation in the world, sacrificing needlessly American lives and reducing this country's economy and resources.

Any money allotted to the pursuit of this war should instead be used to improve education, eliminate poverty and slums, improve health standards and reduce unemployment in this country. Nations, such as India, where famine is threatening, should be supported and food supplies should be shipped to them by this country. This is a better way to combat communism because people will favor a nation that feeds them but will hate the one that tries to impose an ideology upon them by killing them.

Sincerely yours,

FRED WETMORE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,

February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: You and your chairman, Mr. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, have expressed my every thought concerning the Vietnam war. I was beginning to think all of Congress along with our President had let the people of this country down, but after hearing all your speeches my faith in the men of our Government was renewed.

I firmly believe you should do everything in your power to enforce your ideas concerning this situation. If we have broken the Constitution and this war is illegal, then you should go over the President's head and stop it.

I voted for President Johnson but if he doesn't take constructive steps to bring this Vietnam situation before the United Nations and sincerely strive for a free election in this area, I for one will not vote for him again.

Every night on the newscasts I hear how many men we have killed in Vietnam. I'm not proud of this figure, because I love life—whether it's our side or the enemy. This bragging reminds me of little children playing with toy soldiers.

If our President would only stand up and say he cares more about America than any other country in the world and that because of this great love for us he was going to take immediate action to meet with our allies for a solution, I'm sure he would be running our country for some time. I just don't know how Mr. McNamara could advise anyone when he didn't even vote in this last

election. Anyone who could conveniently forget such an important responsibility couldn't in my view, remember to do anything constructive.

All of you received a standing ovation in my home. My entire family agrees with you and we would all like to know what we can do to force the President to get out of Vietnam as graciously as the Russians left Cuba.

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. WRIGHT.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

February 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your position as an independent American has always been a source of immense gratification to me, and I wish there were more, like you, in the Senate.

Your opposition to the present Vietnam procedure impels me to give you my views in the matter.

Our country suffers under two beliefs that ruin our chances of taking part in the establishment of a peaceful world. The first of these is the delusion that the Communists are a single-minded, well-organized, worldwide, and united group of supermen.

This delusion is strengthened by our practice of classifying anyone as a Communist, who disagrees with us, and of tossing aside any disagreeable movement, as "Communist inspired."

Yet the communism of each Communist country is different from that of all the others, and they are all, and always will be dictatorships.

This is easy to realize when we try to imagine what the picture of Karl Marx is, in the mind of an Albanian shepherd or a Cuban plantation hand. Marx, of course, was utterly impractical, though somewhat justified by the conditions in his time.

There was virtually no capitalism in czarist Russia or imperial China, and most of what is called communism is caused by, and is a revolt against our second delusion.

This second American delusion is really the greatest one, having the approval of most of us, being time-honored, and being so familiar as to be taken for granted as perfectly proper and respectable. But it is to it that we can turn account for most of the misery of this world.

This delusion is: That a small group of individuals can "own" the land of a country and can collect the land rental from its inhabitants. There is no shred of evidence or trace of supporting argument that will justify this firmly established practice.

Yet we are in Vietnam, causing hideous torture and deaths, and swilling out money so direly needed here, helping to destroy the world value of the American dollar, to support a small, landowning class (among whom is a large wealthy alien church) the military, and a "government" of which we are totally ignorant.

These little oriental people have lived along the Chinese border for centuries. They do not think as we do. They do not act like us. And we will never remould them.

The United States of America could, with honor and dignity, request the United Nations, the Geneva Conference, or any disinterested body, to conduct an election there, in which the NFL or Vietcong would participate.

There is no question but that North and South Vietnam would reunite and elect Ho Chi Minh as their type of dictator, and go on with their type of communism until they tired of it. And you can be sure that Karl Marx would not be able to recognize one side of it.

Our alternative is to send a lot of young Wayne Mosers and Joe Thompsons down there, from now on, to police the country, keep the landowners in their privileged

ascendency, and act as the "secular arm" of one church in its squabbles with another.

A third delusion is: That trouble can be ended or corrected by force of arms.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH S. THOMPSON.

MIAMI, FLA., February 21, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I applaud your courage to speak out against our involvement in Vietnam.

It is men like you who make our Constitution a living truth.

Continue your questioning and probing. We need men like you to "check and balance" executive powers.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. HERBERT M. ROSE.

EAST NORTHPORT, N.Y.,

February 20, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We would like, once more, to commend your position as expressed in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on the war in Vietnam.

It is gratifying that the opposition-at-large to this war, which has been slandered in various ways, has been heard in the Senate hearings through your articulate and documented statements and questions.

Respectfully yours,

NORMAN THURAU,  
LILIANE THURAU.

REXFORD, N.Y.,

February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would just like to take the time to thank you for bringing the facts to light with regard to our unfortunate situation in Vietnam. You can be assured of my backing as well as thousands of other Americans who feel the same as you do. I believe we should get out and take care of our own business first or surrender or make some sort of a peace instead of wasting valuable human lives and money. The added fact of a war with Red China should add to this but some say this is an impossibility. I just can't understand why your views aren't 100 percent imposed on them, meaning of course, the President and Congress.

All I can say is that I am behind you 100 percent and please continue your excellent work.

Yours truly,

GERALD M. OSWITT.

#### WHAT THE WAR IN VIETNAM IS DOING TO EDUCATION IN ALASKA (AS EVERYWHERE ELSE IN THE UNITED STATES)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the last decade, public school enrollment in Alaska has increased by 108 percent, which ranks Alaska second in the Nation. This means that public school enrollment in Alaska is 68 percent greater than the national median, which is a healthy 40 percent.

In the last 15 years, the Anchorage Borough School District, which is the largest school district in Alaska, has grown by 700 percent. By 1970, it will almost double itself again.

On a per capita basis, Alaska is spending more for education than any other State—spending almost double the amount spent by Hawaii, the next ranked State. On a per capita basis, we are making a greater revenue effort on the State level than any other State—a third more than New Mexico which ranks

second in the Nation, and one-third of our State budget for the next fiscal year is going for education. We are proud of our public schools, and have good reason to be, for they are among the best in the Nation. But they will not long remain so, if the proposed administrative budget cuts in aid to schools in federally impacted areas is carried out.

This is truer in Alaska than in any other State. Why? Because 49 percent—nearly half—of the students attending public schools in Alaska are federally connected. No other State even approaches this figure—Hawaii is next, with slightly less than 30 percent, and all other States fall below 25 percent.

Admittedly, there are disparities in the payments some school districts now receive under the impacted aid program, and I agree that the Federal payments to the school districts should more clearly reflect the actual burdens imposed by the federally connected child. But, in this regard, payments cannot be adjusted by across-the-board cuts, as proposed by the administration, for it is the most heavily impacted areas that are growing the fastest.

Alaska is making a diligent tax effort to provide good schools. For instance, the two largest school districts, Anchorage and Fairbanks, have a per pupil bonded indebtedness of \$1,251 and \$1,657, respectively. The Office of Education compared these figures to those of four west coast cities, chosen purely at random. Seattle per-pupil bonded indebtedness is only \$604; Tacoma, \$552; Spokane, \$705; San Diego, \$630—thus, in each case, Alaska's burden is double or more. As I have mentioned before, one-third of the State budget goes for education—we are building schools at an unprecedented rate, and will continue to do so with all the resources within our means, but the proposed cutbacks in impacted aid funds will severely damage our efforts. Alaska will lose about \$4 million in payments to school districts and another half a million in construction funds. In terms of teachers, at an average salary of \$8,000—it would mean that we would have to make do with 500 fewer teachers—this we cannot afford—this money must be restored to the 1967 budget.

Yesterday, Congress approved a \$4.8 billion money bill to prosecute a wholly unnecessary war in southeast Asia—is it not obvious that our Federal school aid payments are going to be spent for guns? This is but another of the bitter fruits borne by the malignant weed of war.

Alaska has long been considered to be a potential giant among the States in the richness of its undeveloped natural resources—and the richest of all of these resources is our youth—the youth that will become tomorrow's leaders. We have both a duty and a responsibility to equip them with the best that is obtainable to insure competence in that future leadership—competence that will enable them to avoid the tragic follies in which we have become involved.

Is it not enough that we ask our youth to bear the burden of fighting a wholly unjustifiable war in Vietnam?

Must we also insist that their most uniquely valuable asset—a good education—be shortchanged?

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from Alaska. As he will see as I proceed with my speech on the budget and educational needs, the administration has made cuts not only in impacted area money, but in a good many vital areas in the field of education. In my judgment, this action is tarnishing the whole image of the Great Society and turning it into an empty, meaningless, preachment.

As far as the Senator from Oregon is concerned, this administration is going to have to advance proof that it has not advanced in the President's budget message to justify the program of cutbacks in this field. These cutbacks are, in effect, stabs in the back of the educational forces of this country. I say to the educators, you had better be on your guard, because if the administration succeeds in getting its budget cuts sustained in the Congress, the great progress we have been accomplishing with the great leap forward under President Kennedy will be lost.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator not feel that it is one of the most tragic ironies in our history that, after the magnificent legislative record of this administration and this Congress in the 1st session of the 89th Congress, we are now going to have all that undone?

Mr. MORSE. The fact is that the whole program has rapidly become a tragic irony.

#### THE BUDGET AND EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have hesitated for some time in commenting upon the budget for fiscal year 1967 with respect to the provisions made therein to fund the wealth of legislation which has been added in recent years to our statute books. Adequate funding of our existing laws aiding education is a problem which deeply concerns me as the chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. My subcommittee as it considered each of the proposals had the responsibility of recommending to the Senate and to the Congress what, in our judgment, was the best support we could give at that time to every facet of the American educational system from kindergarten through graduate school.

The dominant philosophy which has underlain our efforts in this area has been to provide, either directly or indirectly, for the needs, not of an administrative hierarchy, but rather for the educational needs of our young citizens. It was our hope that we could, through each of our measures, help to erect an interlocking and interdependent system of financial aids through which the Federal Government could supplement, but not supplant, the funding of activities of our public and private educational systems in the realm of higher education and our public systems at the elementary and secondary levels.

Thus, for example, we built upon the foundation of previous legislation such

as the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Public Laws 815 and 874 of 1950, the Smith-Hughes Act and other vocational education aid measures going back to 1917, as well as the great foundation act for higher education in America which was signed by President Lincoln, in 1862, the Morrill Act. What we strove to do in each instance was to build upon the foundation of experience under older statutes, new programs which were the outgrowth of the old, and which, in our judgment, complemented but did not supplant the older laws. That this was our intention, I think, was made abundantly and explicitly clear in one instance, which took place on September 2, 1965, when in the course of making legislative history on the title IV insured loan program of the Higher Education Act of 1965, I was asked by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], whether by the new authority it was our intention that the guaranteed loans by banks under title IV would in any degree slow down or lessen our commitment to the National Defense Education Act title II direct loan program. As set forth in volume 111, part 17, page 22692 of the Record of that debate, my reply was as follows:

My answer to the question is (that) the insured loan program set forth in the bill does not in any way signal either an elimination of the National Defense Education Act loan program under title II or amend it by weakening it in any respect.

I then went on to point out how the direct loan program with its cancellation features for teacher recruitment incentive purposes distinguished it clearly from other programs, and I concluded by saying in the course of making this legislative history:

The Senator has nothing to worry about so far as continuation of the National Defense Education Act loan program is concerned.

The statement I made at that time was my best understanding of the intent of the committee and my thought as to the intent of the administration.

I wish to say that that was the intent of the administration at that time. We worked closely with the administration and with its educational officials in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on that measure.

As will be seen shortly in my speech, I am utterly surprised, filled with amazement, and aghast that this administration, in my opinion, is walking out on the commitment that I had the perfect right to make as the spokesman for this administration, as its manager on the floor of the Senate, when the insured loan program under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 was passed in this body.

I am therefore somewhat shocked to learn from page 428 of the appendix to the budget for fiscal 1967 that the private credit market is expected to supply loan capital through guarantee programs, authorized in the Higher Education Act of 1965, subsidized by the Federal Government, to replace the \$190 million authorized in the title II student loan provision in the National Defense Education Act of 1958.



Such a suggestion will, of course, have to be reviewed by the legislative committee. It would be my hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee in funding the Labor-HEW programs for fiscal 1967 will provide full funds under the authorization for title II direct loans, if prior to the time the Appropriations Committee acts no new substantive legislation emanating from our committee has been signed into law.

The direct loan program of National Defense Education Act title II was designed to meet financial problems of low income students of ability; the guaranteed loan program was designed to meet the needs of youngsters coming from families in the middle income brackets. To replace the direct loan program by an insured loan program, if this is the intent of the Bureau of the Budget for reasons unconnected with education, demands, I think, that our legislative committee seriously reconsider the authorities we have given already in the insured loan program. It would be far better, if the desire is to make more efficient the operations of the Federal Government in financing undergraduate and graduate education, to make all student loans direct loans, thus insuring that all students regardless of family income have access to adequate sources of credit.

This actually would cost less in the long run than our present system whereby the Federal Government is subsidizing private lenders, since I am convinced that a direct loan of this type to the student category of citizen is one which will ultimately be fully repaid by the borrower. But in approving title IV of the Higher Education Act the committee recognized the problem faced by the Treasury with respect to revenue, and for the middle income student it included the title IV insured loan program authorities. In so doing, I again repeat what I said on September 2, 1965, that this would not mean in any way that we were abandoning the direct loan approach which has been so helpful to so many young people.

As I recall our discussions in committee, in our report, on the floor and in conference, our theory was that we were providing what might be termed a "cafeteria" approach to student financial aid. The direct loan program was complemented by the insured loan program; the work-study program and the scholarship program as well, contributed to the packet of financial aids which could best meet the needs of the youngster as determined by the youngster and the school he attended.

I recognize that there must be compelling reasons on the part of the administration for the course it has proposed in the budget for fiscal 1967 but I wish to serve notice that I, as one Senator, will be pressing in our hearings for full explanation and justification of the proposed action. I will want to have ironclad guarantees from administration witnesses, banking witnesses, and witnesses from higher education that this is a program upon which all are jointly agreed as being in the best interests of all students before I can in good con-

science sanction it, and then only if I receive full assurances that every low-income youngster who now qualifies for a title II, National Defense Education Act loan will qualify and obtain one of the newer insured loans.

In order that we may have full information prior to our hearings upon the potential effect of the budget proposals upon student financial needs, I have asked the commissioner of education in a letter dated February 9, 1966, to furnish the subcommittee with certain data which I feel will be helpful to us. In my letter I said:

I shall appreciate your furnishing the subcommittee at an early date with a list of the institutions of higher education, arrayed by State, which in fiscal year 1966 made initial advances to students and the amount of money so initially advanced for each institution. This table should also contain the number of students at each institution to whom initial loans under title II were made in fiscal year 1966, and the number and amount of supplemental loans made to students during fiscal year 1966 at that institution.

Mr. President, when this material is received by us we will have the basis upon which we can ask our questions of witnesses as to the assurance which can be given with respect to the students of the institutions in question that their education will not be adversely affected by lack of financial resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my speech, as an appendix to it, a compilation prepared by the Office of Education, setting forth on a State-by-State basis title II, National Defense Education Act, student loan estimates for fiscal year 1966. It will enable Senators to gauge the dimensions of the program as it is now operative in their States.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a letter and a resolution, dated March 1, 1966, from the Association of State Colleges and Universities regarding title II loans.

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

ASSOCIATION OF STATE  
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES,  
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
New Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Association of State Colleges and Universities, at its annual meeting in Chicago on February 16, 1966, adopted a resolution calling for the extension and adequate funding of the National Defense Education Act student loan program. (The Association of State Colleges and Universities is comprised of 194 institutions enrolling approximately 1 million students.)

Presidents of member institutions attending the meeting expressed grave concern over the proposed termination of the National Defense Education Act student loan program and the substitution for it of a new guaranteed loan program. They felt the existing program should be continued pending an adequate trial of the guaranteed program to see if it, in effect, is capable of meeting the

need of students who must borrow money in order to attend college.

In any event, early action by Congress is imperative because the colleges need to know what kinds of program or programs will be in effect so they can properly advise students and their parents without further delay.

I know that both the colleges and the students will be most appreciative of your efforts to resolve this situation at the earliest possible date. Please let me know if our association can be of assistance to you.

Cordially,

PATRICIA BLEDSOE  
(For Allan W. Ostar),  
Executive Director.

#### RESOLUTION, ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

(Recommendations of the committee on legislation, President James Cornette, chairman, February 16, 1966)

The Association of State Colleges and Universities' Committee on Legislation moves that the association take the following actions:

1. Endorse the current NASULGC position statement, "National Action Affecting Higher Education," with the provision that the following words be included at the conclusion of the first sentence of II, 3., (2), (3): "including degrees in education which qualify recipients to teach in the above fields."

2. Recommend to the directors of the Association of State Colleges and Universities that they work toward the issuance by ASCU and NASULGC of a joint position statement on National Action Affecting Higher Education.

3. Endorse the recommendations presented to the 89th Congress by the President of the United States for the strengthening of international education programs, and recommend to the Congress that the legislation implementing these programs make provisions for the participation of the ASCU member institutions.

4. Recommend to the 89th Congress of the United States the extension and adequate funding of the National Defense Education Act loan program.

5. Recommend to the 89th Congress of the United States the full funding of the college housing loan program.

#### TITLE III NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT CUTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while speaking on this point, I wish to digress for a moment to bring to the attention of Senators one additional area of budget recommendations for the financing of the National Defense Education Act which causes me concern. I refer to the recommendation that there be a \$25 million cut in appropriations to finance the matching grant provisions of title III of the National Defense Education Act. These are the grants which are made to States on a matching basis for the acquisition of equipment in order to strengthen instruction in science, mathematics, foreign languages, history, civics, geography, English, reading, and economics.

Senators will recall that in the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964 and in the Higher Education Act of 1965, the title III National Defense Education Act instructional categorical areas were greatly broadened. It seems to me somewhat anomalous, at a time when demand is being expanded for services, for the Bureau of the Budget to recommend a curtailment in the funding provided to furnish those very services.

What is our national aim in providing financial assistance for educational purposes?

It has been my impression that we all agreed upon part, at least, or our national aims in education. It is that the Federal Government as a junior partner should use its resources to supplement but never supplant, State and local effort in all of our public schools. Unless I am mistaken the title III National Defense Education Act programs since their inception have steadily grown in acceptance by State and local school systems. My hunch is that we will find, when the testimony is presented to us, that all money appropriated in 1966 for this purpose has been asked for and is being used for the purposes of the title—and none of it is being wasted. I repeat: none of it is being wasted.

Given the new fields which have been added I would hazard the prediction that a full appropriation of the authorized amount could be used with profit to our children by the schools which they attend. A check made on February 28, 1966, with the Office of Education disclosed that some 26 States had requested a total of some \$10 million additional money to meet their needs. Only one State indicated that it was able to release funds, and that only in the amount of \$600,000.

In 1964, \$44 million was appropriated by the Congress for this purpose. In 1965, \$61.6 million was originally appropriated and a supplemental request of \$8.8 million was provided for a total of \$88 million, of which \$79 million was appropriated. The authorization for fiscal year 1967 of \$88 million remains, but in the President's budget it is indicated that only \$54.2 million is requested—a 39-percent cut under the authorized amount. This in the face of a demand of more than \$87 million.

Open the window and let the Great Society fly out. That is exactly what this administration, what this President, is proposing to do. I intend to put the responsibility right where it belongs: squarely on the doorstep of the White House and in the lap of the President.

I say to this administration: "I am the last Senator you ought to try doubletalk on. I am the last Senator you ought to ask to sit in that managerial seat at the center aisle to put through education

legislation on your representations, if in the short period of time since it was put through, you recommend in your budget report, this kind of money cut for this educational purpose and the other kinds of educational fund cuts that I shall discuss this afternoon."

The President can let down the schoolchildren of America, but the senior Senator from Oregon will not. Let that be clearly understood this afternoon at the White House and in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Let it be understood by the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Gardner.

Under the great leadership of that incomparable President, John F. Kennedy, we started a breakthrough in the educational crisis. We cannot justify failing to give to the boys and girls of America every single dollar that we have authorized, because the Senate has heard me say so many times, as I have taken pieces of education legislation through the Senate, that, in my judgment, the educational crisis is one of the five most important issues that face this Republic in the field of foreign policy.

The greatest security weapon we have is the intellectual potential of our youth. We have got to see to it that the brainpower of our youth stays ahead of the brainpower of Russia and China. That is why I am talking about the greatest security weapon this Republic has. I am aghast and amazed that the President would let this budget come to the Senate with these cutbacks of money that is so sorely needed to meet the educational needs of the youth of this country.

What is the alleged justification for this course of action?

We are told in the budget nothing that I can find precisely on this point. I can only surmise that some budgeteer arbitrarily and perhaps capriciously reduced the title III amounts in order to make provision for other expenditure. I anticipate, however, that when justification is provided it may run along the lines of the rather threadbare argument that tremendous funds are being made available to schools under the provisions of Public Law 89-10, title I. Let us examine that line of reasoning.

First, to accept the argument would be, in effect, to admit that Public Law

89-10 is not to be used for its primary purpose of supplementing programs in schools having a high concentration of educationally deprived children. Rather, it is simply a supplanting of funds from one Federal program by another program in those schools.

Second, as in Public Law 874, we must remember that there are a great many schools in this country which do not qualify under Public Law 89-10 but whose children can with profit use the tools of instruction which can be purchased on a matching basis with title III National Defense Education Act funds. To reduce expenditures under title III of the National Defense Education Act would seem, therefore, a program whereby a middle-class school district is being called upon to take a reduced educational opportunity which does not even benefit the "poor Paul" school district.

I know there are many school districts which have not participated in title III National Defense Education Act programs because of economic pressures upon them which prevented their raising the matching funds. Surely the answer to this, however, is not to deprive those schools which have made the effort, but rather to ameliorate the terms of title III to provide for a larger Federal share in matching for the poorer districts.

I have expressed my concern to the Office of Education over this proposed cut in title III funds and, although it is properly an appropriations item, during the course of our hearings before the Education Subcommittee, I feel it only fair to say to the Office of Education, that I shall keep pressing the point to determine what professional factors, if any, are at the root of this reduced estimate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a State-by-State compilation of the grants to the States for acquisition of equipment under title III of the National Defense Education Act. The material was obtained from the Office of Education and shows the effect upon State allotments of the proposals in the budget to fund this important title at only \$54,200,000, instead of the \$88 million that is needed.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION

National Defense Education Act—Title III—Grants to States for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling

State or outlying area	1965 total obligations	1966 total estimated obligations <sup>1</sup>	Estimated 1967 allotment	Decrease	State or outlying area	1965 total obligations	1966 total estimated obligations <sup>1</sup>	Estimated 1967 allotment	Decrease
Total.....	\$69,992,539	\$79,200,000	\$54,200,000	\$25,000,000	Kentucky.....	\$1,267,975	\$1,500,000	\$1,212,799	\$287,201
Alabama.....	1,106,953	2,080,242	1,389,383	640,859	Louisiana.....	1,903,377	1,500,000	1,430,856	469,144
Alaska.....	135,000	96,882	66,300	30,582	Maine.....	339,186	240,182	328,734	+8,552
Arizona.....	783,374	225,000	542,534	+107,534	Maryland.....	1,322,373	1,287,627	881,179	406,448
Arkansas.....	774,901	1,077,890	737,647	340,243	Massachusetts.....	1,540,958	1,531,545	1,048,103	483,442
California.....	4,749,714	6,247,648	3,540,459	2,707,159	Michigan.....	3,321,154	3,871,254	2,478,181	1,393,073
Colorado.....	876,883	816,970	559,088	257,882	Minnesota.....	1,643,409	1,648,202	1,127,636	520,266
Connecticut.....	628,646	710,910	486,507	224,403	Mississippi.....	600,000	1,200,000	982,047	217,953
Delaware.....	135,574	137,073	93,805	43,268	Missouri.....	1,359,973	1,599,030	1,094,286	504,744
Florida.....	2,005,855	2,315,638	1,584,692	730,946	Montana.....	264,181	300,000	246,546	53,454
Georgia.....	2,544,133	2,451,062	1,677,362	773,090	Nebraska.....	611,147	623,534	426,712	196,822
Hawaii.....	485,610	326,009	223,102	102,907	Nevada.....	92,120	102,797	70,348	32,449
Idaho.....	307,914	399,254	278,227	126,027	New Hampshire.....	240,965	272,342	186,375	85,967
Illinois.....	2,871,234	3,541,125	2,081,174	1,459,951	New Jersey.....	1,494,421	1,793,579	1,227,424	566,155
Indiana.....	1,677,895	2,080,004	1,423,437	656,567	New Mexico.....	543,418	500,000	429,600	70,400
Iowa.....	1,209,954	1,233,936	844,436	389,500	New York.....	4,496,945	4,888,259	2,989,389	1,878,870
Kansas.....	911,408	970,548	664,188	306,360	North Carolina.....	2,591,662	2,813,997	1,925,740	888,257
					North Dakota.....	353,223	362,964	248,392	114,572

See footnote at end of table.



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued  
 National Defense Education Act—Title III—Grants to States for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling—Continued

State or outlying area	1965 total obligations	1966 total estimated obligations <sup>1</sup>	Estimated 1967 allotment	Decrease	State or outlying area	1965 total obligations	1966 total estimated obligations <sup>1</sup>	Estimated 1967 allotment	Decrease
Ohio.....	\$3,801,315	\$4,693,630	\$2,869,883	\$1,823,747	Virginia.....	\$1,660,907	\$2,000,000	\$1,461,482	\$538,518
Oklahoma.....	1,143,641	1,153,472	789,371	364,101	Washington.....	1,250,289	1,209,747	827,882	381,865
Oregon.....	809,193	787,606	538,993	248,612	West Virginia.....	1,119,235	1,031,462	705,874	325,588
Pennsylvania.....	4,237,149	4,491,895	2,902,913	1,588,982	Wisconsin.....	1,874,855	1,816,272	1,242,954	573,318
Rhode Island.....	282,713	314,007	214,889	99,118	Wyoming.....	146,864	159,532	109,188	50,364
South Carolina.....	1,441,158	1,577,873	1,079,807	498,066	District of Columbia.....	65,406	100,000	119,962	+19,962
South Dakota.....	362,883	388,225	265,679	122,546	American Samoa.....	0	0	0	0
Tennessee.....	1,600,000	2,075,005	1,420,016	654,989	Canal Zone.....	0	0	0	0
Texas.....	3,577,171	4,500,000	3,605,934	894,066	Guam.....	12,500	50,000	985,455	454,545
Utah.....	624,006	587,336	401,939	185,397	Puerto Rico.....	575,166	1,340,000	0	0
Vermont.....	180,553	198,426	135,791	62,635	Virgin Islands.....	30,000	50,000	0	0

<sup>1</sup> Amounts reflect anticipated reallocation of funds.

PUBLIC LAW 874

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a third item of concern to me, and I am sure to many Senators, relates to proposed changes in Public Law 874, the Impacted Areas Operation and Maintenance Act. A committee print is available in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare office which details the effect of the proposed amendments in terms of the decreases in funds affecting each of the participating school districts.

At a time when there is a great concern on the part of many over the effect of various Senate hearings upon the morale of our fighting men in Vietnam, I find it quite difficult to accept with equanimity, a proposal which would have the effect of cutting the funds available for the education of the children of these troops. Yet, this is precisely what will follow if my mail on this subject is to be given credence.

The alternatives faced by school districts throughout the country which are charged with the responsibility of educating federally connected boys and girls, according to my correspondents, will in far too many instances be a curtailment of the services provided, or an increase in local taxes to a burdensome degree, if, indeed, that alternative is available.

Why? First, because the legal remedies open to such school districts in terms of raising funds to replace those reduced, in many instances cannot be invoked in sufficient time to meet the needs of the school year starting next September. Budgets for next September in my own State have been prepared in a great many instances in the expectation that funds from Public Law 874 sources would be available. Some of our school budget elections are being held in April. Most of them will be held in May.

I can foresee that should this cut be sustained in the Appropriations Committee, in State after State it may become necessary to convene, in special session, legislatures to provide the additional replacement funds, or, failing that, school superintendents will be left with no alternative but to reduce expenditures by any means possible.

Thus, in such schools one can only expect a deterioration of the quality of education provided. One of the school superintendents in my State has advised me as follows:

Your recent communication revealing the administration's recommended changes in

Public Law 874 came as one of the most discouraging announcements we've received in the 12 years the people of this district have earnestly tried to provide educational opportunity to the children of workers on Federal projects. Nearly one-fourth of this district's 1,200 youngsters are federally connected, and to reduce the Public Law 874 contribution of \$56,000 to only \$36,000 would be something of a slap in the face, as well as a blow to the already burdened local taxpayer.

Why in the name of commonsense would an education-oriented administration scuttle a Federal aid program that was founded on the belief that the U.S. Government should assist local school districts meet the educational needs of migrant children whose fathers build our Nation's great Federal projects? Why would an administration that sincerely (and successfully) engineered the greatest educational achievement of all time suddenly turn its back on the thousands of local school districts that reel under the burden of providing migrant children of Federal workers with the quality of education they so richly deserve? Please remind those who look upon the modification of Public Law 874 as a savings plan that a tragically high price will be paid by children for the \$163.6 million decrease in our national budget.

In the event that this district were denied its full allocation under Public Law 874 after June 1, the impact of such a loss would be that of reducing services or eliminating existing programs. There would be no way of collecting funds from any other source.

Funds lost in the event our Federal Government decided against sharing the cost of educating children of Federal construction workers would be compensated for through an increase in the ad valorem property tax at the district level if they were to be replaced at all. In other words, the local taxpayer would be required to pay an even greater share of the cost of educating impact children, and you should be aware of the fact that the present formula does not begin to compensate local districts for the full cost of educating these migrant youngsters. At best, our district receives approximately one-third of the cost of educating these youngsters at the present rate of reimbursement. Reducing the Government's share seems unthinkable.

Twice during the past 12 years this district has shouldered the load of educating a massive impact of federally connected youngsters while, at the same time, trying to do justice to resident youth. The board and the Oregonians it represents have been given some help, but, as you will recall from our previous communications, the unfortunate "lettering" of the statutes made it impossible for us to receive Federal aid under Public Law 815 and pushed upon us the responsibility of building new schools to house John Day Dam workers' children without 1 penny of Federal aid. Now, 874 is being scuttled in the name of economy. Please don't let this happen, Senator Morse.

Another superintendent has told me:

I am very happy to respond to your inquiry concerning Public Law 874 funds which are now a part of our school district operating budget.

My estimate of 1966-67 funds which might accrue from the present Public Law 874 distribution formula is \$10,450. This is almost identical with the estimate which you received from the U.S. Office of Education.

The new proposed formula would to all practical purposes wipe out the entire resource and so we would face a loss of \$10,000 in revenue. What might be done to replace it?

Let me itemize our present dilemma. In the 1947-48 school year the basic school fund of the State of Oregon contributed 36 percent of the operating funds of Oregon's schools. In the year just closed the basic school fund of the State contributed only 27 percent. To fill this void our local property taxes have increased on both county and local levels.

For the coming year our budget committee is already faced with a county loss of income of some \$20,000. The reasons for this loss are complex, but the loss is due to equalization on offset formulas. In addition we are faced with bringing the bachelors salary base up to \$5,100. We are therefore facing a budget increase of some \$31,500 or an increase of 12.8 mills to cover the increase and the budget plus present projected losses.

Warrenton taxes are already in the top 5 percent compared to State averages. We have six local tax codes. For example, tax code 30-3 for the present year is 135.2 mills. This combined with a 4.3 State relief millage nets 130.9 mills. Of this amount the combined county and local millage for school purposes is 75.9 mills.

For this tax code, then, for the ensuing year would mean an increase of 12.8 mills to provide for the present budget with its estimated losses in income, this then would be further increased by 4.25 mills to provide for the loss of 874 revenue. Total tax millage for the ensuing year then for code 30-3 would be 147.95 mills. It is most apparent that property will not absorb these losses of income. I can state without equivocation that should we lose Public Law 874 support it will not be made up by any source now known to us at the local level. Our budget is approved in its entirety at school election the first Monday in May. Estimated revenue for Public Law 874 will be included. If it is removed at a later date we will of necessity have to do without it.

Our children will suffer now, let alone without Public Law 874 loss. We cannot help this state of affairs. State commitment is subjected to heavy political pressure and each succeeding legislature attempts to alter existing distribution formulas to favor the rich and starve the poor.

On the county level political pressure is intense, and as a result in Clatsop County a good portion of our taxable wealth is scheduled to support the Columbia County Inter-

mediate Education District levy rather than that of Clatsop County. This represents a gross miscarriage of justice. There is some possibility that future years will rectify this error.

On the Federal level I am sure the same starvation diet would be forced upon the poor. Our board has previously forwarded to your office a resolution supporting the present philosophy of Public Law 874. This letter will provide information on grassroots impact.

In all seriousness, Senator MORSE, there is no sin in using a Federal dollar to support the bread-and-butter diet of our Nation's schools. The philosophy that all Federal funds must be designated for special projects beyond current local commitment is a shortsighted philosophy.

We appreciate your firm stand in support of education, and we are aware of the responsibility you have in dealing with the new proposals for Public Law 874.

With best wishes for your success in preserving intact the one small Federal commitment that has been made to the regular operating budget of Oregon schools.

These two letters are representative of the replies I am receiving from the 69 school districts in my State which are adversely affected by the proposed amendments. The questions raised in these letters and problems posed to local school boards which they illustrate, render it imperative that the most careful scrutiny be given to any amendment which would have the effect of reducing this program which enjoys such solid popular support.

#### LAND-GRANT COLLEGE CUT

I earlier brought to the attention of Senators the concern expressed to me by the great land-grant university of my State over the item appearing on page 426 of the appendix to the budget eliminating for fiscal 1967 an \$11,950,000 item to fund the act of June 29, 1935, for further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts.

Here, again, I can find no justification in the budget document for the proposed slash in funds which will remove over \$200,000 in the operating budget of Oregon State University at Corvallis. Since there is no concomitant cut affecting only the private segment of higher education, I can only infer that for some reason the Bureau of the Budget has decided to penalize our great public system of colleges and universities through elimination of this relatively small item in the budget.

Since this is a general program support item, albeit categorical in nature, other programs under other legislation cannot effectively be utilized in its place. There is nothing that I can recall in the legislative history of the Higher Education Act which would give any sustenance to the thought that this was part of our intent in passing either the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 or the Higher Education Act of 1965. Because a program has been successfully operated since 1935 with no problems connected with it is no warrant, in my judgment, to eliminate it now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from correspondence with presidents and officers of land-grant colleges relative to the budget

proposals eliminating funds for further endowment of those institutions and for cutbacks on agricultural research funds be printed in the RECORD at this point. These excerpts, to my mind, portray most vividly the great and continuing concern of the academic community over these proposals.

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

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

The gigantic shift from formula grants to a project-type aid has not worked out very well. The larger institutions with more specialized faculty and equipment have received the lion's share of the project grants. Then too, universities the size of those in Rhode Island and the University of Delaware have a much more difficult time in attracting and holding quality faculty when funds to support them—and their concern is for security—come on a project-by-project basis. Please do what you can to continue the Morrill-Nelson funds on the same basis as in previous years.

President JOHN A. PERKINS,  
University of Delaware.

The proposed reduction in teaching funds is the equivalent of at least 22 faculty members and 375 or more students.

The reduction in research funds will make it necessary to curtail, and possibly discontinue, work on problems of importance to agriculture in the State. One solution would be to discontinue certain areas of work, another would be to reduce by 40 percent the number of graduate and research assistants currently employed to assist the research faculty.

The transfer of part of the extension funds to a project allocation basis places the Federal Extension Service in a position of greater control of State programs. This transfer of control is not in keeping with the cooperative relationships that have existed for many years. The shift in funds could result in a reduction of about 10 positions on our Extension staff.

No advance notification of the reduction in teaching and research funds or the shift in extension funds was received.

The 1966-67 legislative budget requests for the University of Maryland was submitted to the State some months ago based upon the funds received for the 1965-66 year. Orderly planning in cooperative programs is not possible when sudden changes are made at the Federal level without notifying the States.

President WILSON H. ELKINS,  
University of Maryland.

None of these funds, as you know, come to support any programs at Indiana University, but they do support programs at Purdue. These are the original grassroots programs which generated an agricultural revolution that now enables 8 percent of our population to feed the rest of us. Cutting back the teaching funds and the agricultural research funds and reallocation of the cooperative extension funds is to knock all three legs off the old milk stool.

As you may also know, this university and I, personally, have had a particular concern for the underdeveloped opportunities for Negro students in the South and are engaged in a continuing search for ways to strengthen the institutions of the South including the Negro land-grant institutions. The impact of the proposed budget cuts and shifts upon these institutions can be well-nigh disastrous.

Even with the great land-grant institutions, like Purdue, the budget impact will be unrecoverable, and budget cuts in education simply means cuts in teachers and programs and opportunities and quality.

Indiana University is concerned for her sister institution and, more broadly for the continued confidence of the people and their government for these "people's" universities and the job they perform along with us in taking educational opportunity to the grassroots. We are concerned with actions which weaken their efforts or render them unable to continue their leadership.

President ELVIS J. STAHR,  
Indiana University.

To Utah State University the above actions would reduce Federal support to educational programs from \$221,169 to \$50,000, or a total of \$171,169. Utah Agricultural Experiment Station Hatch funds would be reduced by 20 percent, or \$84,471. Cooperative extension formula funds would be cut by \$64,900.

These cuts would be extremely serious because these Federal funds have been assured in continuity by historical events and numerous public statements in congressional hearings and the language of the laws of authorization. These cuts have been announced without warning, and have come in the middle of our State biennium when it is not possible to secure supplemental emergency assistance.

We firmly believe program needs for teaching, research, and extension can be better determined at the State level than in Washington. The procedures and practices used in allocating and administering Federal funds in the several land-grant university programs have been heralded as a practical model for Federal support of education and research activities. Repudiation of these historic relationships is a damaging blow to an important part of Federal-State relationships.

President DARYL CHASE,  
Utah State University.

In Connecticut the reduction proposed for the Storrs Station totals \$45,994 of \$295,186 in Hatch funds available for this fiscal year, and a total Storrs Station budget of \$787,186.

Impact of the proposed cut of \$45,994 would be felt by 41 research projects involving 75 research workers (a considerable number on tenure) and other personnel. If the cut you propose materializes, we will have no alternative to releasing some staff members, and cutting expenditures for needed supplies and equipment; these would be the effects on an overall research program which, in our judgment, does represent investigations of high priority.

President HOMER D. BABIDGE, Jr.,  
The University of Connecticut.

This is in reply to your letter of January 28 concerning proposed changes in the budget of the cooperative extension service for 1967. You mention your desire to maintain the same high degree of freedom for local program determination concerning the needs of the people of each State. You mention also the necessity to help people develop their own communities through the resource development program and the need to fortify work with the lower income people. With both objectives we agree.

Nebraska, however, like many other States has already been doing a great deal of self-analysis and revision of its extension programs. We have already shifted staff emphasis to a considerable degree toward area specialization, community development, and leadership training. It is our feeling that the people of the State who are interested in extension work will resent the further shifting of resources away from agricultural pro-



duction, management, family living, and marketing in order to meet some of the new challenges. Furthermore I should like to emphasize that State and county governments have increased their support for extension programs at a faster rate than has the Federal Government during the past several years.

Chancellor CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,  
The University of Nebraska.

There are several other aspects to this proposed change which should also be noted. For cooperative extension programs to be effective, program plans extending over a period of several years must be made. When Federal funds are allocated on a formula basis there is an assurance of continued funding, even though the level may vary from year to year. If funds are to be distributed yearly on a project basis, however, there is no way long-range plans can be made on such a short-term funding basis.

From the time cooperative extension work was started it has been a cooperative effort involving Federal, State and local interests. Programs are planned locally and are directed towards the solution of problems identified by local people in cooperation with State and Federal personnel. This involvement of local people has been one of the greater strengths of cooperative extension and we are strongly opposed to weakening this system by having funds allocated on the basis of program determination made in Washington.

Formula funds require 50-50 matching by State or local funds. It is my understanding that \$10 million proposed to be distributed on a project basis would not have to be matched. Consequently, there is a very real possibility that this proposal could result in the total funds available for cooperative extension work being reduced through the loss of matching State and local funds.

President ELMER ELLIS,  
University of Missouri.

Iowa State University's share of these funds amounts to approximately \$265,000 per year. These funds are earmarked for institutional purposes and are used in helping to pay the salaries of many of our teachers in the basic academic fields. If these funds are lost to us, our institutional program will be seriously jeopardized. Since the Iowa State Legislature does not meet until 1967, there is no way for the State to make up this serious deficit in our teaching funds for next year.

President W. ROBERT PARKS,  
Iowa State University.

It would appear to us that this proposal is premature in the light of the recent cooperative effort of the Department and the State agricultural experiment stations' long-range planning effort. While this study is underway, it is not operational. It would, therefore, seem unwise to impose a serious financial restriction which jeopardizes the very basis of a successful operational system at a time when a procedure for evaluating direction and priorities is underway. The principles embodied in the Morrill, Hatch, and Smith-Lever Acts provides for joint planning by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the States.

W. ROBERT PARKS,  
President, Iowa State University.

Translating these proposed cuts to university budgets:

1. Land-grant teaching funds allocated to Arkansas would be reduced from \$242,455 to \$50,000, a total reduction of \$192,455, representing a reduction of \$140,333 in support of the current university budget and \$52,222 of the budget of Arkansas A.M. & N. College.
2. Agricultural research funds allocated to us for many years on a formal basis and

used in the present budget for our experiment station would be reduced by approximately \$150,000. The failure to find the authorized program of construction of agricultural research facilities in Arkansas by \$42,000.

3. Approximately \$200,000 now incorporated in our current budget will be cut from the formula based allocation to the agricultural extension program in Arkansas, and will be awarded competitively on a nationwide basis. Therefore, there would be no assurance that any of these funds would come to Arkansas.

In summary, these proposed cuts could reduce the Federal support of ongoing programs of education and agricultural research and extension in Arkansas by approximately \$600,000. As opposed to such a reduction, we believe that the crucial importance of our program for Arkansas and the Nation, and the imperative need to raise salaries to a level which will enable us to retain and to recruit faculty, strongly support an increase in the previous level of Federal support.

Apart from their impact on the operating budget of the university, these drastic cuts could signal the demise of a historic relationship between the land-grant colleges and universities and the Federal Government which has proved to be so fruitful to the Nation, to the States, and land-grant universities. The continuity and the degree of institutional responsibility that have characterized these appropriations over the years are in real jeopardy. The proudest example the Nation has of Federal-educational partnership is endangered—a partnership which is serving as a model in many countries of the world.

DAVID W. MULLINS,  
President, University of Arkansas.

Teaching funds would be cut \$11,950,000; \$165,032 for North Dakota State University. Agricultural experiment station funds would be cut \$8,500,000; \$92,784 for NDSU. Additionally funding of Agricultural Research Service projects underway on our campus are slated for a cut of \$124,600, involving five projects conducted cooperatively with our agricultural experiment station.

Cooperative Extension Service funds are to be held to their 1966 level in total, but \$10 million of formula allocations are to be made available to the States on a project grant basis. This means a reduction of formula funds of \$120,700 for our Cooperative Extension Service.

It is true that both the Extension Service and the experiment station could—and will—submit proposals for project grants from the \$10 million of one-time form funds in extension or from the increased (\$2,910,000) funds funded for project grants in experimental stations. It should be pointed out, however, that there is no assurance that schools such as ours would recoup all funds lost by means of additional project grants. We find little solace in Washington's suggestion that its many other new, admittedly valuable, forms of aid to educational institutions are a compensation; we note that research grants particularly go in largest measure to a limited number of universities. Furthermore, the sudden removal of funds will require that we abandon or deemphasize many important and essential lines of work in addition to the low-priority projects the USDA thinks it will help us eliminate through this painful process.

All in all, NDSU stands to lose next July 1, 1966, about \$378,500 of funds which have become traditional in its financial structure. In terms of personnel, all ranks considered, this is about 40 people engaged in teaching, research, and extension. It is the equivalent of about one-tenth of the operational budget of the agricultural experiment station plus

one-third that of universitywide resident instruction, plus over one-fourth of Cooperative Extension. We are at a loss to understand how, after so drastic a paring of our resources, we could respond to the Federal Government's call for increased attention to programs of high priority including those emphasizing the war on poverty. Applying for and succeeding in obtaining project grants is an answer, but not a very helpful one if the usual delays in setting up procedures and gaining approvals are encountered here.

There remains one other problem. We do not know whether the North Dakota Legislature would provide us with sufficient funds to cancel out the funds lost if the Federal budget is approved as presented. Any such help would come too late since the legislature does not meet until January of 1967 and our problem begins this summer and fall when we must decide on whether our research program should be curtailed, and whether we should admit the increased number of students who will want to enroll at NDSU. Coming in the middle of a biennium, a worse time could not have been picked for a downward adjustment in Federal appropriations to the land-grant institutions.

H. R. ALBRECHT,  
President, North Dakota State University.

Included in the budget now before the legislature are increases in salaries for faculty to encourage retention of faculty and to recruit additional needed to teach additional students. These figures of course assume that Federal funds will be received for teaching and research in undiminished amounts. To diminish the salary fund for next year will compound already very difficult problems of retention and recruitment of faculty and competent graduate students who assist in laboratories for both research and instructional purposes. For example, today we have 35 graduate assistants on Hatch funds alone. We have a number of teaching assistants which would have to be curtailed drastically if our salaries budget is reduced. We can ill afford to reduce the number of qualified graduate students because not fewer but a greater number of scientists are needed for future research.

The record of success in education, both teaching and research, in land-grant institutions is one of the great achievements of mankind during the past 100 years. The pattern has been established, and continued support in substantially increased amounts is well justified by the accelerated increase in population in this country and by our commitments, both at home and abroad. The Federal Government is certainly ill advised to practice economy in this area at this critical time. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will find it possible to restore these unfortunate cuts that are recommended by the President.

President RICHARD A. HARVILL,  
The University of Arizona.

These moneys have been an integral part of our funding of the university budgets since the original act—Morrill (1862), Hatch (1887), and Smith-Lever (1914)—were enacted. The proposed reductions were made without prior notice and after our budget had been defended before both appropriation committees of the State legislature.

Dean HAROLD E. MYERS,  
College of Agriculture,  
the University of Arizona.

However, your proposal for the 1967 budget, in which Cooperative Extension Service proposes to earmark \$10 million of existing program funds for specified purposes, leaves no recourse but for us to view this as an unwarranted exertion of Federal control over pro-

grams of work which are agreed as being developed, established and led by the cooperating States.

President CHARLES J. ARMSTRONG,  
*University of Nevada.*

This proposed reduction would mean that the University of Nevada would have \$50,000 in fiscal 1967 instead of the \$206,781 it has been receiving and has already budgeted for next year. The President's proposal to reduce resident teaching funds is the first such recommendation sent to Congress since passage of the Second Morrill Act in 1890 and, is, therefore, entirely unprecedented and we are completely at a loss to understand any justification for it.

The University of Nevada's 1966-67 budget is only 5 percent more than for the current year because of a reduction made by the legislature in 1965 in our State appropriated moneys. As you may know the university has requested a supplemental appropriation by a special session of the State legislature this year but the prospects for a special session appear very dim. This proposed \$156,781 reduction in the university's operating budget assumes, therefore, the magnitude of a disaster. This reduction represents the equivalent of approximately 19 assistant professors at the current average salary. Consequently, therefore, if the cutback proposed in the President's budget holds up, we will be forced to eliminate all proposed new faculty positions on both campuses of the university for next year and, in addition, we will have to make drastic reductions in teaching and in scientific equipment and library books on both campuses. This will have to be done in the face of an anticipated enrollment increase in the fall, 1966, of about 14 percent for the university as a whole.

President CHARLES J. ARMSTRONG,  
*University of Nevada.*

Two letters from Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, which are carefully worded double talk. He talks of supporting both agricultural research and extension and how he wants them to be efficient and effective, but for a considerable part of the work, his office in Washington will make the decisions as to what is efficient and effective. In 100 years of land-grant educational experience based on solving the problems of agriculture and based on the farmers' problems themselves, no such move has ever previously been suggested. In a sense it is a move in the direction of the failing program of centralized agriculture in Russia and away from the successful program of decentralized and farmer-oriented research and extension in America.

President R. B. CORBETT,  
*New Mexico State University.*

This action comes at a time when our institutions are attempting to make faculty arrangements for the coming academic year. As I reported to this board in September, some adjustment in student fees effective with the 1966-67 academic year is almost inevitable. It has been my hope to keep that increase as modest as possible and in concert with what I believe to be the role of the State university. It would take no less than \$10 per year per student just to cover the anticipated loss from land-grant funds exclusive of the other problems that must be met by such fee increases.

Finally, in States that have biennial sessions of their legislatures, this anticipated action on the part of the Federal Government comes at a time when the States, except through special session, cannot very well come to the rescue of the land-grant institutions.

President NOVICE G. FAWCETT,  
*Ohio State University.*

These funds, available under previous appropriations in accordance with the intent of the Congress, have provided firm support for our teaching, research, and cooperative extension efforts. The loss of the funds indicated will force us to curtail our efforts, to cut personnel from our employment, and to become less effective in our service to Virginia. Today, with Virginia surging ahead on all fronts it is a severe setback that its land-grant university, VPI, should be forced to reduce its efforts in support of the Commonwealth.

Today, as never before, Virginia needs expanding services from its land-grant university in teaching, research, and extension educational programs to assist it in making adjustments to meet the challenges and opportunities that face the State.

President T. MARSHALL HAHN, Jr.,  
*Virginia Polytechnic Institute.*

The proposed cut in Federal support of the land-grant colleges can be interpreted as a departure from the historical relationship between the Federal Government and institutions of higher learning.

We believe that just the opposite should be the case and that larger amounts of Federal funds should be made available on a continuous and predictable basis, whereby these institutions can plan their operations.

President R. C. GOODWIN,  
*Texas Technological College.*

In addition to the reduction in teaching funds, the reduction in experiment station funds will be most serious and in our agricultural States it strikes me that it is a move in the wrong direction. These two blows in themselves are bad enough, but then there is the reduction in extension funds. Certainly, this is going to call for considerable cutting back in the program. I understand that there will be grants made to the States; but it is most difficult for a director to plan worthwhile programs if he must go hat in hand and ask for grants to maintain staff. Worse than that, you lose staff and then the grant comes along and you must go into the market and hire new staff. This seems like a very backward approach and one that is diametrically opposed to the well-established working relationship that we have had between the Federal Government and our land-grant universities.

President H. M. BRIGGS,  
*South Dakota State University.*

Policy changes indicated in the budget would produce these immediate effects, the regents said:

1. Reduction (practically elimination) of land-grant instructional support at a time when enrollments are increasing at their greatest rate;
2. Singling out of agriculture for the major reductions though agricultural progress remains one of the world's primary problems;
3. Substitution of project support for general research support—to some extent substituting Washington judgments for Wisconsin judgments;
4. Loss of university flexibility in instruction, research, and extension programs; and reduction of the university's ability to originate programs of special importance to its State;
5. Virtual abandoning of the Nation's most successful and traditional (dating from Abraham Lincoln) system of Federal support for higher education.

The board also adopted these basic principles in regard to Federal support of the university:

1. We seek balanced support for instruction, research, and extension; for the humanities, the social sciences, the natural sciences; for basic work as well as applications, both the practical and the theoretical;

for all campuses and all fields of human endeavor;

2. We seek shared programs with Federal, State, and (where applicable) local contributions and control;

3. We seek major institutional support, along with project grants, to enable the university to build and to continue programs best suited to this university and most useful to this State.

BOARD OF REGENTS,  
*University of Wisconsin.*

The three recommendations which cause me concern are:

1. Land-grant teaching funds have been recommended for a cut of \$11,950,000. In Alabama, Auburn University has received \$182,477 from last year's appropriation of \$14,500,000, while Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College received \$95,170, or a total allocation of \$277,647. Under the new recommendation this State would receive a total of \$50,000 for both institutions. This would mean the loss of about 30 positions or more in our institutions.

2. Agricultural research funds have been recommended for a cut of \$8,500,000. It is my understanding that a portion of this cut would be transferred to research programs at predominantly Negro institutions. I am firmly in favor of developing research programs in these institutions but cannot see the economic reasoning behind stopping projects now underway in other institutions in order to obtain funds to start projects somewhere else. Auburn University stands to lose \$154,803 if this recommendation prevails. Our only recourse would be to curtail our agricultural research program and release some of the scientific personnel on our staff.

3. Ten million dollars would be shifted from the Cooperative Extension Service funds now allocated to the States and would be allocated "competitively" by the Agriculture Department in Washington. In other words, the historic determination of extension needs which now resides at the State level would be breached, in that a portion of extension funds would be released only as grants from the Department of Agriculture. The implications of this change from cooperative consultation to Federal direction are disturbing, to say the least. The State of Alabama through the Cooperative Extension Service of Auburn University would lose \$248,700 of their present funds. How much of this would be returned by the Department of Agriculture in the form of grants is, of course, unknown.

While we are, naturally, concerned with the loss of these funds we feel also that the failure to restore them could be the beginning of the end in the historic relationship we have had with the Federal Government. Since the beginning of the land-grant college program the continuity of funds and the degree of institutional responsibility for their allocation characterized this relationship. The land-grant college relationship has been used as a model for other Federal programs of aid to education. The across-the-board modification of our institutionally related programs, at a time when Federal support of higher education is being increased in federally selected categories, can only open the way for less institutional autonomy in meeting local needs.

President HARRY M. PHILPOTT,  
*Auburn University.*

We strongly believe that the decision for specific extension program determination—within the broad purposes of the law—should rest with the State extension service. We are convinced that the success enjoyed by the extension service programs have been



accomplished with a maximum of institutional independence through a decentralized decisionmaking process. The proposed transfer of funds would materially modify this time-tested philosophy.

President W. ROBERT PARKS,  
Iowa State University.

The following immediate effects of the Budget proposals are evident:

1. Virtual elimination of land-grant instructional support at a time when enrollments are increasing and when many other Federal programs in education are being initiated or enlarged.

2. Singling out agricultural research for major reductions at a time when agricultural progress is one of the world's primary problems.

3. Substitution of project support for formula grants, which means substituting Washington judgments for institutional autonomy. This means also loss of flexibility in originating programs, in research and extension, of special importance to the States.

Together these changes constitute a fundamental alteration in, if not a complete abandonment of, the Nation's most successful system of Federal support for higher education.

President DAVID D. HENRY,  
University of Illinois.

We are further distressed by declines in Federal assistance for research at State institutions (Hatch funds). A decline of 18 percent in this assistance, totaling \$190,000 for the Minnesota Experiment Station, is outlined in the new budget. The effect on tenured personnel and their research could create chaotic situations. We feel dutybound to impress upon you the adverse effect the proposed reductions would have on research work that is critical to the State and the Nation. A reduction in agricultural research funds at this time, when world attention is being increasingly directed to a world food crisis, seems particularly incongruous to us.

My conversations aimed at discovering motives behind this change in policy from formula support of research to grant support of research have troubled me. The implications seems to have been that the grant research in space science or under the National Science Foundation has been more successful than agricultural research. I am a great admirer of what has been done by these Federal agencies and what has been done by the National Institutes of Health. But as a historian I think the record is clear: American achievements in agriculture are our most impressive achievements and perhaps our strongest weapon against propaganda of Communist countries. Our agricultural progress has been based upon agricultural research that has been supported through the Hatch Act formula. I find it hard to understand why Federal policy would want to abandon a clearly successful policy which has given us unquestioned leadership for other policies where our leadership is still in dispute.

Proposed changes in the administering of cooperative extension funds worry us as well. Suggested changes call for a shift in \$10 million in support from institutional allocation by the Federal Government. We feel this suggested shift does an injustice to men administering our agricultural extension programs. We are particularly proud of the ability of our Minnesota Extension Service to gage correctly the needs of the people of the State and devise programs to serve these needs. We do not favor the change. We want you to know, however, that our position is based upon the nature of funding and not upon the direction of proposed program adjustments. As you know, the University of Minnesota has been a

leader in the development of community and resource development programs.

President O. MEREDITH WILSON,  
University of Minnesota.

It is my purpose to express to you grave concern over proposed cuts in Federal appropriations for instructional programs in the land-grant institutions as revealed in President Johnson's 1967 budget. Cuts proposed would deal a crippling blow to the instructional programs of the University of Minnesota.

It seems incongruous that this proposed reduction of Federal support should come at a time when the Federal Government seems to be seeking acceptable ways to help meet demands for expansion of instruction on university campuses. Our own institution, for example, has experienced a doubling of enrollment in the past 11 years. Undergraduate enrollment has increased sharply from over 20,000 in 1954 to more than 42,000 in 1965. Our concern becomes even more pronounced when we recognize that the total number of college-aged youth in the State of Minnesota has risen from nearly 167,000 in 1954 to over 232,000 in 1965. During the same period persons attending colleges in Minnesota have risen from over 38,000 to over 90,000 with projections calling for further increases in the years ahead. In light of projections of continued increases in Minnesotans desiring college training, and in light of the significant proportions of these people served by the University of Minnesota, we are alarmed by the suggestion that Federal instruction funds be curtailed. Clearly such a curtailment would markedly impair the ability of this land-grant institution to serve the educational needs of the State and the Nation.

President O. MEREDITH WILSON,  
University of Minnesota.

We at Purdue University were deeply disturbed by the proposal to reduce the Hatch Act funds by \$8.5 million, even if the supporting funds for the Cooperative State Research Service for project grants are increased by \$4.9 million. This substantial impairment in experiment station research funds will seriously impair the Purdue station's ability to continue its total research program—particularly in view of the increasing costs of performing fundamental, basic agricultural research—at a time when successful agricultural research is the only way we know to attack the rapidly approaching world food crisis. We have more high priority research problems and needs for Midwest agriculture than we can staff and support now.

Speaking very frankly, this is one of the most penny wise and pound foolish proposed budget reductions that we have seen in a long time.

The specific earmarking of Cooperative Extension funds is likewise of deep interest to us. For your information, one-third of our current contacts in agriculture, home economics, and youth programs are with people who would be classified as low income. Our county extension administrators commit 40 to 80 percent of their time on an organized basis to community development and 15 percent of our total staff effort is specifically committed to these people and related problems.

In recent years we have intensified our efforts to the point that more than 10 percent of our total extension staff effort is specifically with lower-income people. One-fourth of our cooperative extension effort is committed to community development and lower-income projects. Therefore, we are currently directing twice as much effort to these programs as you suggest on a matching basis (we are currently spending \$1,200,000

per year). If earmarking of funds for agriculture had been an earlier established policy, for example, it would have prevented Indiana from concentrating on these problems in the significant fashion that it has for a number of years. We are pleased to note that the U.S. Department of Agriculture now feels this would be an important problem.

While we are seriously concerned with the reduction in Hatch funds, we are even more concerned that converting Smith-Lever and Hatch funds to a project-grant basis will put the management of this portion of the funds and the decisionmaking for research and extension programs entirely in the hands of the administrators in the Department of Agriculture and take these functions away from the people on the operating front in the land-grant universities.

Your letter (Secretary of Agriculture) indicates that new money has been specifically earmarked for soybean research because it is a high priority item. I respectfully call your attention to the fact that several years ago the Purdue station recognized the high priority of this crop, submitted a project to CSRS for grant support, and was advised that work on this crop was not on the CSRS priority list (tobacco was).

President FREDERICK L. HOVDE,  
Purdue University.

This proposal would reduce the University of Tennessee's annual allocation for resident instruction from \$233,187 to approximately \$30,000 and would take away funds to pay 20 or more faculty members who are badly needed to meet rapidly rising enrollments. The university has no hope of replacing the \$200,000 with State funds since our 1965-66 and 1966-67 State appropriations are fixed. Also, the proposed change in land-grant appropriations comes as a complete surprise since no reduction has been recommended to Congress since 1890.

President A. D. HOLT,  
University of Tennessee.

Of our operations, the first major function to be hit is the very heart of our instructional effort, namely, the undergraduate teaching program. It is here that the action proposed in the executive budget is inapplicable to us. Since the year 1890 these so-called land-grant endowment funds have been available on a continuing appropriation in an amount which, as late as the year 1960, was adjusted by unanimous action of Congress to allow for the long time upward trend in the price level. To quote the language of the original legislation, these funds were for the continued endowment of the instructional program at these institutions for the purpose of placing them on a firm instructional foundation for as long as this Nation shall live.

For all these years the Colorado General Assembly has, when making its appropriations to CSU, taken into account the fact that we are to receive these funds. Currently our land-grant allotment is \$241,689. This would be cut to \$50,000. The cut of \$191,000, plus, made at the 11th hour after the General Assembly has already acted on our money bill would simply murder us, to speak plainly on this subject.

In testimony that will be presented by the National Association of State Universities and land-grant colleges, this proposed reduction in research and extension funds, will, I believe, be referred to as the spigot theory. Under this theory one simply turns on the spigot when research results are needed and results are expected to flow forth. Then the spigot is turned off until more results are needed. The theory assumes that standby ability to serve can be maintained

as easily in the form of faculty members, research workers and graduate students as it is in a fire extinguisher hanging on a wall. Were it not for the unfolding world food crisis and the prospect for telling leverage that American calories can give to American foreign policy, these proposed budget cuts might be understood.

President W. E. MORGAN,  
Colorado State University.

According to information received, if the proposed budget reductions are approved by the Congress, the Agricultural Research Service would be forced to close out or cut back significant projects at a number of experiment stations. In Washington these would include:

1. Elimination of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Western Wheat Quality Laboratory with headquarters here, amount involved, \$81,000.

2. Cereal disease work at Pullman, cut back by \$15,000.

3. Plant physiology, genetics, and breeding program at Pullman, cut back by \$14,300.

4. Elimination of sugarbeet-disease-insect-vector research at Yakima, amount involved, \$30,000.

5. Substantial reduction in barberry eradication, amount still in question.

This is a total reduction in excess of \$141,300 for Department of Agriculture research at the university's agricultural research center and at Yakima.

If these proposed reductions in research funds and the shift of extension funds are approved by Congress, they might well become permanent. Thus, the total impact on the 1967-69 biennial budget for Washington State University could well be in excess of a million dollars.

President C. CLEMENT FRENCH,  
Washington State University.

If we lose these Federal funds we shall be faced with only two courses of action:

1. Reducing the quality and/or extent of our instruction, research, and extension programs.

2. Or, increasing our tuition, already one of the highest in the Nation for land-grant institutions, and thus possibly pricing a college education out of the reach of many Maine young people.

Since the Maine Legislature will not convene in regular session until January 1967, and probably will not adjourn until about June 1967, it is impossible for us to turn now to this source as a way of replacing the funds we are in danger of losing.

President EDWIN YOUNG,  
University of Maine.

Why the land-grant universities were singled out for such devastating treatment when education generally is receiving enormous increases in Federal aid is incomprehensible. The land-grant schools have been in part a Federal system of higher education, research, and extension. They have for years been the first institutions enlisted in behalf of the national service in time of emergency or to serve special needs. Our ROTC units were indispensable to the staffing of the Armed Forces in the two World Wars. The food-for-victory programs conducted by our agricultural research and extension divisions made major contributions to national strength in World War II. Our universities have for many years been the Nation's major source of scientists, engineers, and agricultural specialists not only at the B.S. but at Ph. D. level as well.

At present, the land-grant universities are deeply involved, at considerable sacrifice, in

conducting technical assistance programs in developing nations.

Many other examples can be cited of the unique role of our universities in the national service.

It should be obvious to anyone familiar with higher education that the proposed reductions would do irreparable damage. In the case of resident instruction, it is the height of irony that at a time when new Federal loans and scholarships are encouraging more students to attend college, these cuts in instructional funds will make it necessary for our universities to reduce salaries or eliminate faculty positions or disperse with equipment, or, more likely, resort to all three types of cutbacks.

The loss in experiment station funds will not only reduce project support for research but eliminate positions for scientists as well. The cut in Agricultural Research Service funds in Kansas will eliminate important investigations in the area of wheat, sorghums, and other grains generally at the very time that these crops are expected to play a major role in the program our Nation is mounting to provide food to the starving peoples of the developing countries. Closer to home, these reductions could easily reduce farm income in Kansas by \$25 to \$50 million annually.

President JAMES A. MCCAIN,  
Kansas State University.

Such a program as this heralds a dark day particularly for an institution like Langston which must operate on such a narrow margin and is therefore extremely sensitive to the slightest change in the economic picture. Any reduction in teaching funds with no possible means of securing replacement funds will be immediately reflected in the quality of our program we are working so hard to improve with an already grossly insufficient budget.

President WILLIAM H. HALE,  
Langston University.

The loss to Oklahoma State University under the administration's estimate to the Congress for fiscal 1967 would add up to \$600,000 with respect to the three named authorizations. Our gain under the association proposal over the 1966 level would come to \$390,000. The difference between the administration estimate and the association proposal would amount to \$990,000 for Oklahoma State University, under the Morrill-Nelson, Hatch, and Smith-Lever authorizations.

The other funds than these three basic ones, as shown in the tables, are important; however, it is these three which provide the solid base of support, and they determine the sound relationship between the land-grant universities and the Federal Government with respect to agriculture, a relationship in which for more than a century desirable national objectives have been accomplished with a maximum of institutional independence and decentralized decisionmaking, and which have long been hailed as a model of Federal-State relationships in education.

President OLIVER S. WILLHAM,  
Oklahoma State University.

I will certainly agree with Secretary Freeman that we need to be working on high priority research rather than low priority research. I completely disagree with him that persons sitting in Washington are better able to determine what is of high priority than our own directors of research at our respective land-grant institutions. These are men of ability and integrity with a keen

awareness of the seriousness of the problems that they attack.

President HILTON M. BRIGGS,  
South Dakota State University.

In Idaho, which operates on a biennial legislative system, there would be absolutely no chance for us to find State augmentation to cover Federal cuts for fiscal 1967, since our next regular legislative session will not convene until January 1967 to consider budgets becoming operative on July 1 of that year. We and all States like us, therefore, would face the coming fiscal year's operation at a tremendous handicap.

President ERNEST W. HARTUNG,  
University of Idaho.

Virginia's funds of \$196,193 for Virginia Polytechnic Institute and \$98,097 for Virginia State College will be cut to a total of \$50,000, which will be divided between the two institutions on the same ration. As you so well know, both VPI and Virginia State have very tight operating budgets. The vital work that both institutions do for Virginia will be severely crippled by these drastic and wholly unanticipated cuts.

Virginia will lose \$165,377 needed for its agricultural experiment station funds plus additional losses in its share of a reduction of \$2,380,000 in regional research funds.

VPI and Virginia State will be deprived of needed funds for specific continuing extension programs long planned by the two institutions, and will be required to "compete" for funds, with the programs and funds to be determined by the Department of Agriculture. I hope that you can take time to read the enclosed release (especially its marked passages) issued by our Executive Committee of the NASULGC on February 4.

I hope, too, that you will then share my indignation over these drastic cuts and the abrupt alteration in a historic relationship of the land-grant colleges with the Federal Government.

President EDGAR F. SHANNON, Jr.,  
University of Virginia.

The teaching funds (proposed to be eliminated in the amount of \$389,000) \* \* \* have long been an integral part of the University's regular operating budget. Their loss would be a serious blow in financing the University's work in 1966-67 and in succeeding years. Other Federal assistance for higher education is earmarked for other purposes and cannot be considered as an offset to the commitments made by the University of Illinois in the planned use of teaching funds.

President DAVID D. HENRY,  
University of Illinois.

A crippling blow to instructional programs of the University of Minnesota would accompany the proposed decline of Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds available to the university. Proposed is a decline from \$281,144 available currently to \$50,000 in the coming fiscal year. This, in the face of growing enrollment pressures, is catastrophic.

President O. MEREDITH WILSON,  
University of Minnesota.

#### OTHER AREAS OF UNDERFUNDING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am disappointed to find that programs which were hailed by the President as recently as last July now are treated in the budget as poor relations. Title V of the Higher Education Act with its Teacher Corps and fellowship provisions are funded at less than half the authorized amounts. Title VI of the Higher Education Act, which



was fought for so vigorously by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas received but 15 percent of its authorization for TV equipment, 26 percent of its authorization for other equipment, nothing for the State committees to draw up the State plans and but half of the institute training funds which we authorized. Even our college work-study program with its \$165 million authorization is cut to \$134,100,000. This \$31 million reduction for this purpose at the rate of \$500 per student eliminates about 62,000 youngsters from a chance to work their way through school. To my view this is inexcusably short-sighted economy.

Mr. President, we will do more to defend freedom here and in the world by restoring to the educational system of this country the cuts that the President of the United States has apparently authorized in his Bureau of the Budget report than we will by slaughtering unjustifiably and inexcusably hundreds of American boys in a war in South Vietnam where we have no place to be.

This kind of an economy move, this kind of a funds slashing, is what we can expect in increasing amounts, if we permit the President to continue unchecked in his career of escalation of that slaughter in South Vietnam.

I warn the American people today, as we deal only with this one phase of what this President is assuredly going to do, that if we proceed to give him the unchecked power we have been giving him in connection with the fighting of that war, the Great Society programs are going to be scuttled.

I would yield to no one in urging the most stringent cutbacks at all levels of American expenditure, if we were involved in a war which had been officially declared and approved by the American people. I will not go along with this kind of cut under these circumstances. I am going to continue to urge a cutback in that war. As I stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday, I shall continue to urge adoption of the General Gavin program which will give to our boys in South Vietnam the protection which they must have. If it were to be adopted we would not be plunged deeper and deeper into the jungle in an escalating war. Our present course if continued will take increasing thousands of lives. I cannot support the waving of the flag into tatters as justification—and we will hear that—from the administration for its proposals to cut back and cut back on sorely needed domestic aid programs in the United States.

#### CONCLUSION

This has been an unpleasant cataloging of the facts as I see them. Happily, I can hail with pleasure other areas in which significant increases are forecast. I wholeheartedly approve of the increase in economic opportunity grants to \$118.5 million from the \$58 million appropriated this year. I shall certainly do my best to gain approval for this \$50 million authorization increase.

I also approve and applaud the increases in title I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I only hope that the amounts requested are appropriated in full and that they will prove to be adequate to meet the full entitlement of whatever formula or dollar amount changes are made in the authorization bill.

I shall give full and careful attention to the many other proposals for changes in the basic acts which I am sure will be offered during the legislative course in the months ahead. But I stress again, as I have so often before, that our expenditures for the education of our citizens at every level and every age are, and ought to be, considered as investments which will be repaid to our country and its people many times over.

I shall give support to any of my colleagues on this matter to see what we can do to restore the proposed cuts. I pledge myself to work with them in the best interests of our country's students.

Mr. President, I have spoken, so far, on the basis of the budget forecast of educational activity in terms of administration plans for funding and the announced plans for recommendations for changes in basic statute authority upon which the funding estimates are based. The education message and the draft bills which accompany it have been delayed by the administration for many weeks as they sought to write the language which would accomplish the aims of the Bureau of the Budget as set forth in the appendix to the budget on pages 421 through 424.

The message has just been sent to the Congress on March 1, 1966. I have not as yet had an opportunity to review it or the accompanying legislation in detail. This I shall do in the next few days, to determine the degree to which it bears out the budget forecast in those areas I have stressed in the course of my speech.

It is more in sorrow than in anger that I have spoken this afternoon. I am disappointed in the administration in its overly cautious approach to funding the splendid programs for education it has advanced in the past 3 years. But the proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof. If the programs which Congress has approved are good programs in the best interests of the country, as I, for one, firmly believe, then they are deserving of stronger presidential support through the budget process than our President has given to them.

The cuts I have discussed, which seem in certain instances to hamstring the programs, ought not to be sustained. Riding with the budget hounds, while running with the educational hares, may be a diverting pastime, but it raises serious questions, either as to the belief on the part of the responsible Cabinet officers and their professional advisers in the validity of their own past proposals, or of their ability, in the arcane jungles of the Bureau of the Budget, effectively to fight for them.

This is a matter, however, which can be explored further in our hearings. To

deserve the name of an education administration requires a commitment of treasure as well as words.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the appendix to the budget for fiscal year 1967 pages 421 to 435 inclusive with reference to this subject.

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

#### OFFICE OF EDUCATION GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS *Expansion and improvement of vocational education*

For carrying out the provisions of titles I, II, and III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U.S.C. 151-15m, 15o-15q, 15aa-15j, 15aaa-15ggg) section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31-33), section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34), section 2 of the Act of September 25, 1962 (48 U.S.C. 1677), sections 3 and 9 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 (74 Stat. 1037, 1041), and the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35-35n); [\$252,491,000] \$250,791,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall be for practical nurse training under title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, \$375,000 shall be for vocational education in the fishery trades and industry including distributive occupations therein under title I of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, \$15,000,000 shall be for area vocational education programs under title III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, [\$25,000,000] \$10,000,000 shall be for work-study programs under section 13 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, \$3,500,000 for residential vocational education schools under section 14 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, [and] \$177,500,000 shall be for vocational education programs under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, \$8,000,000 shall be for area vocational school construction under section 211 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and \$1,800,000 for advances for reserve funds and interest payments on insured loans under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 of which \$775,000 for interest payments shall remain available until expended and \$1,025,000 for advances shall remain available until June 30, 1968. (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966.)

#### Program and financing (In thousands of dollars)

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES			
1 Grants to States under Vocational Education Act of 1963 and George-Barden and Supplemental Acts	156,270	209,741	209,741
2 Grants to States under Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965		8,000	8,000
3 Research and special project activities	10,258	17,750	17,750
4 Work-study program	4,759	25,000	10,000
5 Residential vocational schools			3,500
6 Vocational loan interest payments and advances			1,800
10 Total program costs, funded—obligations (object class 41.0)	171,287	260,491	250,791

Program and financing—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>FINANCING</b>			
16 Comparative transfers from other accounts	-15,000		
21 Unobligated balance available, start of year		-8,000	
24 Unobligated balance available, end of year	8,000		
25 Unobligated balance lapsing	2,009		
40 New obligational authority (appropriation)	166,296	252,491	250,791
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
10 Total obligations	171,287	260,491	250,791
70 Receipts and other offsets (Items 11-17)	-15,000		
71 Obligations affecting expenditures	156,287	260,491	250,791
72 Obligated balance, start of year		31,631	110,222
74 Obligated balance, end of year	-31,531	-110,222	-146,353
77 Adjustments in expired accounts	-369		
90 Expenditures	124,388	181,800	214,660

Under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the George-Barden Act, matching grants are made to the States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia for support and improvement of vocational education programs. Training for gainful employment as semi-skilled or skilled workers and for business and office occupations is emphasized, and construction of area vocational schools is included.

Grants are made for research and special project activities designed to meet special vocational education needs of youths, particularly those in economically depressed communities that have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs. A work-study program provides employment for students enrolled in vocational classes who are in need of financial assistance in order to continue their education. Funds will be provided for planning experimental residential vocational schools designed to meet special needs of youths in urban slums where high dropout rates and youth unemployment prevail.

Under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, grants are made to States in the Appalachian region for construction of vocational education facilities.

Under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 advances are made for State and nonprofit private loan insurance funds for students in postsecondary business, trade, technical, and vocational schools. Payments are made for interest costs on behalf of students whose family income falls below \$15,000.

Proposed for separate transmittal:

Expansion and improvement of vocational education

PROGRAM AND FINANCING  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Vocational loan interest payments and advances		950	
2 Vocational loans purchased upon default by student borrowers		10	
10 Total program costs, funded—obligations		960	

Expansion and improvement of vocational education—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>FINANCING</b>			
21 Unobligated balance available, start of year			40
24 Unobligated balance available, end of year, U.S. securities (par)		40	40
40 New obligational authority (proposed supplemental appropriation)		1,000	
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures)		960	
72 Obligated balance, start of year			390
74 Obligated balance, end of year		-390	
90 Expenditures		570	390

Under existing legislation, 1966: A supplemental appropriation of \$1 million is anticipated in order to permit initiation of activities under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965. It is expected that \$950,000 will be used for grants for interest subsidies and advances to State and nonprofit private student loan insurance programs and \$50,000 will be used for the Federal insurance program. Of the latter \$10,000 is estimated for obligation on defaulted loans and \$40,000 will be carried as an insurance reserve.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For grants and payments under title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended by title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and under titles II, III, and V of said 1965 Act, [\$967,000,000] \$1,342,410,000 of which [\$775,000,000] \$1,070,410,000 shall be for meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children under title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended: *Provided*, That determinations and payments under such title shall be on the basis of the amount [authorized to be] appropriated for such title, [\$100,000,000] \$105,000,000 shall be for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials under title II of said Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, [\$75,000,000] \$145,000,000 shall be for supplementary educational centers and services under title III of said Act, and [\$17,000,000] \$22,000,000 shall be for strengthening State departments of education under title V of said Act. (Additional authorizing legislation to be proposed.) (Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.)

Program and financing  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Assistance for educationally deprived children		775,000	1,070,410
2 School library materials		100,000	105,000
3 Supplementary educational centers and services		75,000	145,000
4 Strengthening State departments of education		17,000	22,000
10 Total program costs, funded — obligations (object class 41.0)		967,000	1,342,410

Program and financing—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>FINANCING</b>			
40 New obligational authority (appropriation)		967,000	1,342,410
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures)		967,000	1,342,410
72 Obligated balance, start of year			672,000
74 Obligated balance, end of year		-672,000	-998,410
90 Expenditures		295,000	1,016,000

The 1967 estimate is based on the extension of the existing act.

1. *Assistance for educationally deprived children:* Payments are made to assist local school districts in expanding and improving their educational programs in order to meet the special educational needs of children from low-income families; and to assist State educational agencies in administering the program. It is estimated that approximately 7.5 million disadvantaged children will receive benefits in 1967, compared to 6.5 million in 1966.

2. *School library materials:* Grants are made to States for procurement of library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for use by students and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. Each State may use up to 3 percent of its grant to assist in administering the program.

3. *Supplementary educational centers and services:* Grants are made to local public schools, working jointly with other local agencies, to stimulate and assist in establishing educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in the ongoing curriculum. Development of programs to serve as models for regular school programs is emphasized.

4. *Strengthening State departments of education:* Grants are made to State educational agencies to stimulate and support planning, research, and technical assistance capabilities so that such agencies can more effectively meet their educational leadership responsibilities.

Proposed for separate transmittal:

Elementary and secondary educational activities

PROGRAM AND FINANCING  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
10 Assistance for educationally deprived children (costs—obligations)		184,000	
<b>FINANCING</b>			
40 New obligational authority (proposed supplemental appropriation)		184,000	
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures)		184,000	
72 Obligated balance, start of year			184,000
74 Obligated balance, end of year		-184,000	
90 Expenditures			184,000



Under existing legislation, 1966: A 1966 supplemental request of \$184 million is anticipated for assistance for educationally deprived children in order to provide the full amounts required by States and local educational agencies.

#### HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For grants, contracts, payments, and advances under titles I, II, III, IV (except payments under parts C and D), V and VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for grants under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, [\$160,000,000] \$475,272,000, of which [\$10,000,000] \$20,000,000 shall be for grants [and contracts] for college and university extension education under title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, \$3,000,000 shall be for transfer to the Librarian of Congress for the acquisition and cataloging of library materials under part C of title II of that Act, [\$5,000,000] \$30,000,000 shall be for the purposes of title III, [\$60,000,000] \$122,000,000 shall be for programs under part A of title IV of that Act, [\$10,000,000] \$43,000,000 shall be for loan insurance programs under part B of title IV of that Act of which [\$2,500,000] \$33,000,000 for [the student loan insurance fund and] interest payments shall remain available until expended and [\$7,500,000] \$10,000,000 for advances shall remain available until June 30, 1968, [\$15,000,000] \$17,000,000 shall be for the purposes of title VI of the Act, and [\$40,000,000] \$134,100,000 shall be for grants for college work-study programs under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 [Provided, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 9567, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation: Provided, That in administering the appropriation included in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966, related to elementary and secondary educational activities, the amount authorized to be appropriated by title II of the authorizing Act shall be deemed to include amending provisions contained in section 6 of H.R. 9022, Eighty-ninth Congress]. (Additional authorizing legislation to be proposed for \$30,000,000. Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.)

#### Program and financing

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Grants to States for community service and continuing education programs.....		10,000	20,000
2 College library, training and research assistance.....			35,300
3 Strengthening developing institutions.....		5,000	30,000
4 Educational opportunity grants.....		60,000	122,000
5 Insured loans.....		9,500	43,000
6 Work-study programs.....	54,938	99,968	134,100
7 Teacher training and services programs.....		20,000	73,872
8 Undergraduate instructional equipment.....		15,000	17,000
10 Total program costs, funded—obligations.....	54,938	219,468	475,272
<b>FINANCING</b>			
16 Comparative transfers from other accounts.....	-54,938		
22 Unobligated balance transferred from "Economic opportunity program" (79 Stat. 1251).....		-845	
New obligational authority.....		218,623	475,272

#### Program and financing—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY</b>			
40 Appropriation.....		160,000	475,272
41 Transferred to "Student loan insurance fund" (appropriation act—proposed).....		-500	
42 Transferred from "Economic opportunity program" (79 Stat. 1251).....		59,123	
43 Appropriation (adjusted).....		218,623	475,272
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
10 Total obligations.....	54,938	219,468	475,272
70 Receipts and other offsets (Items 11-17).....	-54,938		
71 Obligations affecting expenditures.....		219,468	475,272
72 Obligated balance, start of year.....			142,061
74 Obligated balance, end of year.....		-142,061	-128,783
90 Expenditures.....		77,407	288,550

Grants and payments are made to States, educational institutions, and individuals under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

1. *Grants to States for community service and continuing education programs:* Grants are made to States on a matching basis for strengthening community service programs of institutions of higher education in order to assist in solution of community problems:

	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of institutions participating.....	200	250

2. *College library training and research assistance:* Grants are made to higher educational institutions for acquisition of library books and materials and for training in the information sciences. Research and demonstrations, financed by grants and contracts, are conducted in the improvement of libraries and training. In addition, funds are transferred to the Librarian of Congress for acquisition of materials and for providing catalog and bibliographic information:

	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of grants supported for higher education library resources.....		2,675
Number of individuals trained in information sciences.....		800
Number of research and demonstration projects supported.....		70

3. *Strengthening developing institutions:* Grants are made for cooperative projects to upgrade faculty and curriculums, and to support exchange of faculty, teaching fellowships, and other programs to raise the academic quality of developing colleges:

	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of cooperative programs supported.....	110	660
Number of individuals receiving national teaching fellowships.....	30	180

4. *Educational opportunity grants:* Funds are allotted among the States for payments

to institutions to provide educational opportunity grants for financially needy undergraduate students. Contracts are supported to identify such youths and school dropouts and to encourage them to complete their education:

	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of students receiving educational opportunity grants.....	115,000	220,000

5. *Insured loans:* Advances are made for State and nonprofit private loan insurance funds for students in higher education institutions, and payments are made for interest costs for students whose adjusted family incomes fall below \$15,000:

	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of students for whom interest subsidy is paid.....	300,000	775,000

6. *Work-study programs:* Funds are allotted among the States for payments to colleges and universities to provide part-time jobs during the school year and full-time summer jobs for needy youths particularly from low-income families. Funds cover the costs of employment on campus or in public or nonprofit organizations, and must be matched at the rate of \$1 from institutional or local sources for each \$9 of Federal support.

	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of students participating in work-study programs:		
Spring semester.....	110,000	150,000
Summer.....	60,000	90,000
Fall semester.....	150,000	210,000

7. *Teacher training and services programs:* Payments are made for salaries and training and other expenses for experienced teachers and teacher interns under the National Teacher Corps to serve in low-income areas. Grants are made to higher education institutions for developing and strengthening teacher education programs and for fellowships for elementary and secondary teachers, including stipends for individuals and cost-of-education allowances for participating institutions:

	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of National Teacher Corps members in service.....		3,750
Number of teacher education programs supported.....	50	50
Number of teachers receiving fellowships.....	2,354	5,800

8. *Undergraduate instructional equipment:* Grants are made on a matching basis to higher education institutions for acquisition of television and other equipment and minor remodeling of space in order to improve undergraduate instruction:

	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of institutions receiving equipment grants.....	300	315

#### Object classification

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
25.1 Other services.....		2,000	3,200
25.2 Services of other agencies.....			3,000
33.0 Investments and loans.....		7,500	10,000
41.0 Grants, subsidies, and contributions.....	54,938	209,968	460,072
99.0 Total obligations.....	54,938	219,468	475,272

Proposed for separate transmittal:  
Higher educational activities

PROGRAM AND FINANCING  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 College library, training and research assistance		11,000	
2 Teacher training and services programs		13,200	
10 Total program costs, funded—obligations		24,200	
<b>FINANCING</b>			
40 New obligatory authority (proposed supplemental appropriation)		24,200	
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures)		24,200	
72 Obligated balance, start of year			20,200
74 Obligated balance, end of year		-20,200	-200
90 Expenditures		4,000	20,000

Under existing legislation, 1966: A supplemental request of \$24,200,000 for 1966 is anticipated for separate transmittal in order to initiate the programs of library assistance and the National Teacher Corps under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION

For grants, loans, and payments under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, [\$632,700,000] \$722,744,000, of which not to exceed [\$460,000,000] \$458,000,000 shall be for grants for construction of academic facilities under title I [including not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the purpose authorized in section 105]; \$60,000,000 shall be for grants for construction of graduate academic facilities under title II; and [\$110,000,000] \$200,000,000 shall be for loans for construction of academic facilities under title III. (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966.)

Program and financing  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Grants for construction of facilities:			
(a) Public community colleges and technical institutes	47,362	103,998	100,760
(b) Other higher education facilities	177,001	359,639	357,240
2 Grants for construction of graduate facilities	60,000	60,000	60,000
3 Construction loans	1,710	60,000	135,000
4 Grants for State administrative expenses	1,768	2,000	2,000
5 Technical services	600	2,700	2,744
Total program costs, funded	288,441	588,337	657,744
Change in selected resources <sup>1</sup>	105,727	50,000	65,000
10 Total obligations	393,668	638,337	722,744
<b>FINANCING</b>			
21 Unobligated balance available, start of year		-5,637	

Program and financing—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>FINANCING</b>			
24 Unobligated balance available, end of year	5,637		
25 Unobligated balance lapsing	63,845		
40 New obligatory authority (appropriation)	463,150	632,700	722,744
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures)	393,668	638,337	722,744
72 Obligated balance, start of year		390,080	881,417
74 Obligated balance, end of year	-390,080	-881,417	-1,208,161
90 Expenditures	3,588	147,000	396,000

<sup>1</sup> Selected resources as of June 30 are as follows: Unpaid undelivered orders, 1964, \$0; 1965, \$105,227,000; 1966, \$155,227,000; 1967, \$220,227,000.

Under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, loans are made for academic facilities, and grants are awarded on a matching basis for undergraduate and graduate academic facilities and for public junior colleges and technical institutes. Technical engineering and other review services are rendered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for construction projects. Proposed legislation would specify the 1967 authorizations for construction, extend the authorization for grants for expenses incurred by States in administration of the undergraduate and public junior college and technical institute grants and provide for enlargement of the loan program through use of the private credit market in sale of loan participations.

Numbers of construction project approvals

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Grants for public community colleges and technical institutes and other higher education facilities	516	1,137	1,137
Grants for graduate facilities	85	85	85
Loans	133	135	250

Object classification  
[In thousands of dollars]

Identification code	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
25.2 Services of other agencies	600	2,700	2,744
33.0 Investments and loans	1,710	60,000	135,000
41.0 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	286,131	525,637	520,000
Total costs, funded	288,441	588,337	657,744
94.0 Change in selected resources	105,227	50,000	65,000
99.0 Total obligations	393,668	638,337	722,744

Proposed for separate transmittal:

Higher education facilities construction

PROGRAM AND FINANCING  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
10 Construction loans (costs—obligations)			100,000

Higher education facilities construction—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>FINANCING</b>			
14 Receipts and reimbursements from: Non-Federal sources (sale of participation certificates)			-100,000
40 New obligatory authority (proposed supplemental appropriation)			
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
10 Total obligations			100,000
70 Receipts and other offsets (items 11-17)			-100,000
71 Obligations affecting expenditures			
74 Obligated balance, end of year			-85,000
90 Expenditures			-85,000

Under proposed legislation, 1967: Legislation will be proposed to authorize the sale of certificates of participation in pools of college academic facilities loans. It is proposed that proceeds from the sale (estimated at \$100 million for 1967) be placed in a revolving fund, through which the program would be funded hereafter, and that such receipts (up to \$100 million) be made available for new loan commitments. The Federal National Mortgage Association will be authorized to serve as trustee for these sales.

[FURTHER ENDOWMENT OF COLLEGES OF AGRICULTURE AND THE MECHANIC ARTS]

[For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 329), \$11,950,000.] (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966.)

Program and financing  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
10 Grants to States (costs—obligations) (object class 41.0)	11,950	11,950	
<b>FINANCING</b>			
40 New obligatory authority (appropriation)	11,950	11,950	
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures)	11,950	11,950	
90 Expenditures	11,950	11,950	

This appropriation has supported college instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, and related fields, in the 68 land-grant colleges. No funds are being requested for this activity for 1967.

GRANTS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

For grants to the States, pursuant to the Act of June 19, 1956, as amended (20 U.S.C. 351-358; Public Law 88-269), [\$55,000,000] \$57,500,000, of which [\$25,000,000] \$27,500,000 shall be for grants for public library services under title I of such Act, and \$30,000,000 shall be for grants for public library construction under title II of such Act. (Additional authorizing legislation to be proposed; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966.)



## Program and financing

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Grants for library services	25,000	25,000	27,500
2 Grants for library construction	29,864	30,000	30,000
10 Total program costs, funded—obligations (object class 41.0)	54,864	55,000	57,500
<b>FINANCING</b>			
25 Unobligated balance lapsing	136		
40 New obligational authority (appropriation)	55,000	55,000	57,500
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures)	54,864	55,000	57,500
72 Obligated balance, start of year		28,716	48,716
74 Obligated balance, end of year	28,716	48,716	55,116
77 Adjustments in expired accounts	-37		
90 Expenditures	26,111	35,000	51,100

Grants are made to the States, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands on a matching basis for the promotion and further development of public library service and for construction of public library buildings.

Services will be extended to approximately 2.5 million additional people in 1967 and service will be improved for approximately 25 million people presently receiving inadequate service. About 400 building projects will be under construction in 1966 and an additional 400 in 1967.

The 1967 estimate is based on the extension of the existing act.

## PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 13), [347,000,000] \$183,400,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such act. (*Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966.*)

## Program and financing

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Payment to local educational agencies	312,897	325,000	158,900
2 Payments to other Federal agencies	17,671	22,000	24,500
10 Total program costs funded—obligations	330,568	347,000	183,400
<b>FINANCING</b>			
21 Unobligated balance available, start of year	-25		
25 Unobligated balance lapsing	1,457		
40 New obligational authority (appropriation)	332,000	347,000	183,400

## Program and financing—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures)	330,568	347,000	183,400
72 Obligated balance, start of year	83,039	94,193	126,266
74 Obligated balance, end of year	-94,193	-126,266	-79,666
77 Adjustments in expired accounts	-7,995	-8,000	-8,000
81 Balance not available, start of year	67	73	
82 Balance not available, end of year	-73		
90 Expenditures	311,413	307,000	222,000

Payments are made to assist in operation of schools in areas where enrollments are affected by Federal activities. The eligible districts are located in all States, Puerto Rico, various territories, and, since July 1964, the District of Columbia. Under certain circumstances, payments are made to other Federal agencies to make arrangements for education of children where local school districts do not assume responsibility for such children. Arrangements may be made for free public education of children of members of the Armed Forces on active duty not residing on Federal property.

Amendments to the law decreasing total 1967 requirements by \$233 million will be proposed. The amendments will base grants on per pupil costs in comparable school districts in the same State, and require school districts to absorb the costs of education for a number of Federal children representing a minimal portion of total enrollment.

	1964	1965	1966	1967
Number of districts receiving grants	4,000	4,100	4,200	3,150
Number of federally connected children (thousands)	1,900	2,100	2,222	1,551

## Object classification

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
25.2 Services of other agencies	17,671	22,000	24,500
41.0 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	312,897	325,000	158,900
99.0 Total obligations	330,568	347,000	183,400

## ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 19), including not to exceed [\$708,000] \$620,000 for necessary expenses during the current fiscal year of technical services rendered by other agencies, [\$50,078,000] \$22,937,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: *Provided further*, That applications filed on or before [June 30, 1965] June 30, 1966, shall receive priority over applications

filed after such date. (*Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966.*)

## Program and financing

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Assistance to local educational agencies	66,605	45,883	14,552
2 Assistance for school construction on Federal properties	8,851	17,309	9,940
3 Payments for technical services	794	708	620
Total program costs, funded	76,250	63,900	25,112
Change in selected resources <sup>1</sup>	750		
10 Total obligations	77,000	63,900	25,112
<b>FINANCING</b>			
21 Unobligated balance available, start of year	-46,619	-28,019	-14,197
24 Unobligated balance available, end of year	28,019	14,197	12,022
40 New obligational authority (appropriation)	58,400	50,078	22,937
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures)	77,000	63,900	25,112
72 Obligated balance, start of year	35,794	74,536	91,436
74 Obligated balance, end of year	-74,536	-91,436	-71,548
90 Expenditures	38,258	47,000	45,000

<sup>1</sup> Selected resources as of June 30 are as follows: Unpaid undelivered orders, 1964, \$4,269,000; 1965, \$5,010,000; 1966, \$5,019,000; 1967, \$5,019,000.

Payments are made to assist in construction of schools in areas where enrollments are affected by Federal activities. From 1951 through 1966, \$1,283 million has been appropriated for this program, aiding in the construction of an estimated 65,000 classrooms to house about 1.9 million pupils in the 50 States, Puerto Rico, Guam, and Wake Island.

The estimate for 1967 will allow funds to pay all approvable construction projects of local educational and other Federal agencies under the permanent sections of the law which provide assistance primarily for children whose parents reside and work on Federal property. About 1,000 classrooms for approximately 29,000 pupils will be provided. The temporary sections of the law, which provide assistance for children whose parents either work or reside on Federal property, expire June 30, 1966.

The authorized program for 1967 will support the following activities:

1. *Assistance to local educational agencies:* Grants are made to local districts for school construction, principally on behalf of increased numbers of children residing on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property.

2. *Assistance for school construction on Federal properties:* Where the local educational agency is unable to provide school facilities for increased numbers of children living on Federal property, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to arrange for the construction of schools. Under certain circumstances, the Commissioner may also arrange to provide school facilities on a temporary basis for children of members of the Armed Forces on active duty who do not reside on Federal property.

3. *Payments for technical services:* Technical services are rendered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the construction of school facilities.

**Object classification**  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>			
41.0 Grants, subsidies, and contributions.....	66,605	45,883	14,552
<b>ALLOCATION TO DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT</b>			
<b>PERSONNEL COMPENSATION</b>			
11.3 Positions other than permanent.....	39	46	46
12.0 Personnel benefits.....	3	4	4
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons.....	9	10	10
25.2 Services of other agencies.....	794	708	620
32.0 Lands and structures.....	8,800	17,249	9,880
Total costs, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	9,645	18,017	10,560
94.0 Total costs, funded.....	76,250	63,900	25,112
99.0 Change in selected resources.....	750		
99.0 Total obligations.....	77,000	63,900	25,112

**Personal summary**

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>ALLOCATION TO DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT</b>			
Average number of employees.....	5	6	6

**DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES**

For grants, loans, and payments under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended (20 U.S.C. ch. 17; Public Law 83-665), [1412,608,000] \$273,544,000, of which [180,900,000] \$34,187,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and [loans for non-Federal capital contributions to student loan funds under title II, of which not to exceed \$1,600,000 shall be for such loans for non-Federal contributions, \$88,200,000] \$63,200,000 shall be for grants to States and loans to nonprofit private schools for equipment and minor remodeling under title III and for grants to States for supervisory and other services under title III: *Provided*, That allotments under sections 302(a) and 305 for equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of [179,200,000] \$54,200,000 for grants to States and on the basis of [10,800,000] \$7,390,909 for loans to private nonprofit schools, and allotments under section 302(b) for supervisory and other services shall be made on the basis of \$9,000,000; and \$24,500,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling under title V: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of science, mathematics, and modern language teaching equipment, or equipment suitable for use for teaching in such fields of education, which can be identified as originating in or having been exported from a Communist country, unless such equipment

is unavailable from any other source: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for graduate fellowships awarded initially under the provisions of the Act after the date of enactment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1962, which are not found by the Commissioner of Education to be consistent with the purpose of the Act as stated in section 101 thereof.

*Loans and payments under the National Defense Education Act, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after March 31 of the current fiscal year, loans and payments under title II of the National Defense Education Act, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation for the same purpose for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid for the same purposes for the first quarter of the current fiscal year.] (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966.)*

**Program and financing**  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Student loans:			
(a) Contribution to loan funds.....	120,737	179,300	
(b) Loans to educational institutions.....	1,089	1,600	
(c) Cancellation of student loans.....	516	650	
2 Instructional assistance:			
(a) Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling:			
(1) Grants to States.....	69,993	79,200	54,200
(2) Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	400	1,500	1,500
(b) Grants to States for supervision and administration.....	4,531	7,500	7,500
3 Graduate fellowships.....	31,359	55,961	51,957
4 Guidance counseling and testing:			
(a) Grants to States.....	20,485	24,494	24,500
(b) Institutes for counseling personnel.....	6,864	7,250	7,250
5 Advanced training:			
(a) Language and area centers.....	7,984	11,064	11,950
(b) Research.....	1,924	2,589	2,851
6 Educational media research.....	6,594	4,531	4,258
7 Grants to States for statistical services.....	1,996	2,250	2,250
8 Institutes.....	19,293	32,638	37,856
Total program costs, funded.....	293,765	410,527	236,072
Change in selected resources.....	11,965	2,081	3,285
10 Total obligations.....	305,730	412,608	239,357
<b>FINANCING</b>			
16 Comparative transfers to other accounts.....	15,000		
25 Unobligated balance lapsing.....	18,222		
28 Appropriation available from subsequent year.....	-34,187	-34,187	
29 Appropriation available in prior year.....	43,838	34,187	34,187
40 New obligational authority (appropriation).....	348,603	412,608	273,544

**Program and financing—Continued**  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
10 Total obligations.....	305,730	412,608	239,357
70 Receipts and other offsets (items 11-17).....	15,000		
71 Obligations affecting expenditures.....	320,730	412,608	239,357
72 Obligated balance, start of year.....	117,528	146,312	238,920
74 Obligated balance, end of year.....	-146,312	-238,920	-223,277
77 Adjustments in expired accounts.....	-21,663		
90 Expenditures.....	270,283	320,000	255,000

<sup>1</sup> Selected resources as of June 30 are as follows: Unpaid undelivered orders, 1964, \$15,933,000 (1965 adjustments, -\$977,000; 1965, \$26,921,000; 1966, \$29,002,000; 1967, \$32,287,000.

Grants and payments are made to States, educational institutions, and individuals.

1. *Student loans:* Funds are allotted among the States for payments to institutions of higher education, including post-secondary business schools and technical institutes, to provide capital contributions to student loan funds. Under proposed legislation, the special teacher cancellation and other benefits available to needy students will be continued, but the private credit market will supply loan capital through guarantee programs, authorized in the Higher Education Act of 1965, subsidized by the Federal Government.

	1964 actual	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of participating institutions.....	1,574	1,616	1,704	1,754
Number of students receiving loans.....	247,000	317,000	400,000	375,000

2. *Instructional assistance:* Grants are made to States on a matching basis for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling of laboratory or other space in order to strengthen instruction in science, mathematics, foreign languages, history, civics, geography, English, reading, and economics. Loans are made to nonprofit private schools for similar uses, and matching grants are also made to States for supervision and administration of the program.

3. *Graduate fellowships:* Grants are made to institutions of higher education for expansion of graduate programs, and include both fellowship stipends for individuals and cost-of-education allowances for participating institutions. A primary objective is to promote better geographic distribution of graduate facilities throughout the Nation. In selection of fellows, preference is given to persons interested in college teaching.

	1964 actual	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of fellowships supported.....	4,255	5,883	10,494	15,000
Number of participating institutions.....	161	167	171	175

4. *Guidance, counseling, and testing:* Grants are made to States on a matching



basis to assist in establishing and maintaining programs of testing, guidance, and counseling in public elementary and secondary schools and public junior colleges and technical institutes. Contracts are made with institutions of higher education for operation of institutes for improved training of counseling personnel, including provision for stipends to personnel in attendance.

	1964 actual	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
Number of students in schools with guidance and counseling programs (thousands).....	11,130	14,000	17,000	18,000
Number of tests administered (thousands).....	8,452	15,000	20,000	21,000
Number of institute participants.....	1,902	1,733	1,560	1,530

5. *Advanced training:* Contracts are made with institutions of higher education for Federal payment of up to one-half the cost of operation of language and area study centers, and stipends are granted to individuals for advanced training in modern foreign languages. Contracts are made for research and studies relevant to foreign language instruction.

	1964 actual	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
Number of language and area study centers.....	55	98	98	106
Number of individuals receiving stipends for language and area studies.....	1,074	1,727	1,915	2,175
Number of research projects initiated.....	47	66	80	92

6. *Educational media research:* Research and demonstrations, financed by grants and contracts, are conducted in the use of new media for educational purposes.

	1964 actual	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
Number of projects initiated.....	72	82	58	72

7. *Grants to States for statistical services:* Grants are made on a matching basis to assist the States in improving educational statistics. Total payments to any State may not exceed \$50,000 annually.

8. *Institutes:* Contracts are made with institutions of higher education for full costs of institutes for teachers or supervisors (or student teachers or supervisors) of modern foreign languages, reading, history, geography, English, economics, civics, industrial arts, disadvantaged youth, school library personnel, and educational media specialists. Stipends are paid to persons in attendance.

	1964 actual	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
Number of institute participants.....	4,468	20,427	23,985	28,000

### Object classification

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
25.1 Other services.....	35,699	50,511	55,723
33.0 Investments and loans.....	122,226	182,400	1,500
41.0 Grants, subsidies, and contributions.....	135,840	177,616	178,849
Total costs, funded.....	293,765	410,527	236,072
94.0 Change in selected resources.....	11,965	2,081	3,285
99.0 Total obligations.....	305,730	412,608	239,357

Proposed for separate transmittal:

### Defense educational activities

#### PROGRAM AND FINANCING

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
FINANCING			
17 Recovery of prior year obligations.....			-34,187
40 New obligational authority (proposed supplemental appropriation).....			-34,187
RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES			
70 Receipts and other off-sets (items 11-17).....			-34,187
71 Obligations affecting expenditures.....			-34,187
74 Obligated balances, end of year.....			34,187
77 Adjustments in expired accounts.....			-34,187
90 Expenditures.....			-34,187

Under proposed legislation, 1967: Legislation will be proposed to terminate the direct loan program under the National Defense Education Act. The legislation will facilitate the substitution of loan insurance (under programs authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965) for direct loans.

It will also provide financial arrangements to continue teacher cancellation and other benefits now authorized for students aided under the NDEA program. It is anticipated that insured loans can be substituted for obligations incurred for direct loans during a transitional period at the start of 1967.

#### EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT FOR THE HANDICAPPED

For grants for training and research and demonstrations with respect to handicapped children pursuant to the Act of September 6, 1958, as amended (20 U.S.C. 611-617), and section 302 of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-164), [\$21,500,000] as amended (79 Stat. 429), \$32,600,000.

[For an additional amount for "Educational improvement for the handicapped", \$4,000,000.] (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966; Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.)

### Program and financing

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES			
1 Training grants.....	14,499	19,500	24,500
2 Research and demonstrations.....	2,000	6,000	8,100
10 Total program costs, funded—obligations (object class 41.0).....	16,499	25,500	32,600
FINANCING			
25 Unobligated balance lapsing.....	1		
40 New obligational authority (appropriation).....	16,500	25,500	32,600
RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures).....	16,499	25,500	32,600
72 Obligated balance, start of year.....	13,904	16,479	25,979
74 Obligated balance, end of year.....	-16,479	-25,979	-34,579
77 Adjustments in expired accounts.....	-75		
90 Expenditures.....	13,849	16,000	24,000

1. *Training grants:* Grants are made to support training of teachers, supervisors, speech correctionists, research and other professional personnel in fields related to the education of handicapped children.

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
Number of individuals supported for full academic year.....	2,355	3,153	3,870
Number of individuals supported in summer programs.....	2,660	3,424	5,262
Number of grants to strengthen institutional training programs.....	50	40	20

2. *Research and demonstrations:* To make education of the handicapped more effective, grants are awarded for the development of new curricular materials, teaching techniques, other research and demonstration projects, and for the construction of a research facility.

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
Number of projects supported.....	66	150	155

#### [COOPERATIVE RESEARCH]

[For cooperative research, surveys, and demonstrations in education as authorized by the Act of July 26, 1954 (20 U.S.C. 331-332), \$25,000,000.]

#### RESEARCH AND TRAINING

For research, surveys, training, dissemination of information, and demonstrations in education as authorized by the Act of July 26, 1954 (20 U.S.C. 331-332), as amended by title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, [\$45,000,000] \$80,000,000, of which not to exceed [\$20,000,000] \$12,400,000 shall remain available until expended for construction of regional facilities for research and related purposes under sec-

tion 4 of such Act [Provided, That funds appropriated in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966, under the heading "Cooperative research", shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.] (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966; Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.)

#### Program and financing

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Research, surveys, and demonstrations.....	13,248	43,385	64,861
Construction and equipment grants for research facilities.....		20,000	12,400
Total program costs, funded.....	13,248	63,385	77,261
Change in selected resources <sup>1</sup> .....	2,592	6,615	2,799
16 Total obligations.....	15,840	70,000	80,000
<b>FINANCING</b>			
40 New obligatory authority (appropriation).....	15,840	70,000	80,000
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures).....	15,840	70,000	80,000
72 Obligated balance, start of year.....	8,229	10,796	59,396
74 Obligated balance, end of year.....	-10,796	-59,396	-81,396
77 Adjustments in expired accounts.....	-25		
90 Expenditures.....	13,248	21,400	58,000

<sup>1</sup> Selected resources as of June 30 are as follows: Unpaid undelivered orders 1964, \$8,229,000 (1965 adjustments, -\$25,000); 1965, \$10,796,000; 1966, \$17,411,000; 1967, \$20,210,000.

Title IV of Public Law 89-10 amended the Cooperative Research Act (Public Law 85-531) by adding authority for support of construction and operation of regional laboratories. In these laboratories institutions of higher education, States, private enterprise and other agencies will pool their strengths to bring the results of educational research and new curriculum design to the Nation's classrooms. The 1965 amendments also extended financial flexibility by permitting award of grants in addition to contracts and authorized special attention to increasing the supply of manpower equipped to undertake research in educational problems.

In 1967 research centers will concentrate on such questions as education of the disadvantaged, individualized instruction, early childhood learning, teacher education, and development of institutions of higher education. Support will be given to preparation of new curricular materials in such fields as English, history, economics, government, and the arts at the elementary and secondary level and literature and the social sciences at the college undergraduate level.

	1964 actual	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of regional laboratories.....			8	12
Number of educational research centers.....	2	4	9	11
Number of curriculum improvement projects.....	73	99	144	150

	1964 actual	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of research projects.....	378	518	656	750

#### Object classification [In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
25.1 Other services.....	13,248	18,385	29,801
41.0 Grants, subsidies, and contributions.....		45,000	47,400
Total costs, funded.....	13,248	63,385	77,201
94.0 Change in selected resources.....	2,592	6,615	2,799
99.0 Total obligations.....	15,840	70,000	80,000

#### EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States, for necessary expenses of the Office of Education, as authorized by law, [\$1,000,000] \$1,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available in addition to other appropriations to such agency, for payments in the foregoing currencies. (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966.)

#### Program and financing [In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Research in foreign education.....	248	558	1,449
2 Training, research, and study grants.....		500	1,035
10 Total program costs, funded—obligations (dollar equivalent).....	248	1,058	2,484
<b>FINANCING</b>			
21 Unobligated balance available, start of year.....	-490	-742	-684
24 Unobligated balance available, end of year.....	742	684	
40 New obligatory authority (appropriation).....	500	1,000	1,800
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures).....	248	1,058	2,484
72 Obligated balance, start of year.....	276	395	753
74 Obligated balance, end of year.....	-395	-753	-2,137
90 Expenditures.....	129	700	1,100

Foreign currencies which are in excess of the normal requirements of the United States are used to support research and grant projects which will add to educational and scientific knowledge in the United States. The funds are used for the promotion of foreign language training and area studies by assisting in the support of overseas activities of American institutions of education for purposes of improving the knowledge and abilities of U.S. educators and by research and study of foreign educational systems, experiences, and developments that will be of value to American educational systems.

#### Object classification

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>			
21.0 Travel and transportation of things.....	33	30	75
25.1 Other services.....	183	1,000	2,381
Total obligations, Office of Education.....	216	1,030	2,456
<b>ALLOCATION TO NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION</b>			
25.1 Other services (total obligations, National Science Foundation).....	32	28	28
99.0 Total obligations.....	248	1,058	2,484

#### FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING AND AREA STUDIES

For payments to carry out the provisions of section 102(b)(6) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 529), [\$2,000,000] \$3,500,000. (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966.)

#### Program and financing [In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
10 Research, training, and studies (costs—obligations) (object class 41.0).....	1,500	2,000	3,500
<b>FINANCING</b>			
40 New obligatory authority (appropriation).....	1,500	2,000	3,500
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures).....	1,500	2,000	3,500
72 Obligated balance, start of year.....	1,352	1,496	2,296
74 Obligated balance, end of year.....	-1,496	-2,296	-3,596
90 Expenditures.....	1,356	1,200	2,200

Study and research grants are made and seminars are held for teachers and prospective teachers to improve teaching of modern foreign languages and area studies in schools, colleges, and universities in the United States. These grants are concerned with the studies of modern languages and cultures of all areas of the world.

1965 1966 1967  
actual estimate estimate

Number of individuals receiving grants for foreign language training and area studies.....	306	381	645
--	-----	-----	-----

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; development of library service throughout the country; purchase, distribution, and exchange of education documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; [\$22,562,000] \$41,563,000.



For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$2,935,000, of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be for the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf, and not to exceed \$100,000 shall be for the National Conference on Education of the Deaf: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 9567, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation.] (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966; Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.)

**NOTE.**—Excludes \$32,000 for activities transferred in the estimates to "Salaries and expenses, Office of General Counsel." The amounts obligated in 1966 are shown in the schedules as comparative transfers.

#### Program and financing

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Office of the Commissioner.....	2,412	4,141	4,982
2 National center for educational statistics.....	2,048	3,482	7,627
3 Administration and contract service.....	1,113	1,613	2,265
4 Elementary and secondary education.....	4,782	7,566	9,985
5 Adult and vocational education.....	1,504	2,472	3,320
6 Higher education.....	3,005	4,488	6,190
7 Research.....	3,517	5,756	7,194
Total program costs, funded.....	18,381	29,518	41,563
Change in selected resources <sup>1</sup> .....	1,010	600	-----
10 Total obligations.....	19,391	30,118	41,563
<b>FINANCING</b>			
16 Comparative transfers to/ from other accounts.....	-170	18	-----
25 Unobligated balance lapsing.....	907	-----	-----
New obligational authority.....	20,128	30,136	41,563
<b>NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY</b>			
40 Appropriation.....	20,008	29,547	41,563
41 Transferred to "Operating expenses, Public Buildings Services," General Services Administration (79 Stat. 531).....	-----	-77	-----
42 Transferred from—"Assistance to refugees in the United States," "Economic opportunity program" (79 Stat. 1251).....	120	666	-----
43 Appropriation (adjusted).....	20,128	30,136	41,563
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
10 Total obligations.....	19,391	30,118	41,563
70 Receipts and other offsets (items 11-17).....	-170	18	-----
71 Obligations affecting expenditures.....	19,221	30,136	41,563
72 Obligated balance, start of year.....	2,410	3,865	5,001
74 Obligated balance, end of year.....	-3,865	-5,001	-7,264
77 Adjustments in expired accounts.....	-33	-----	-----
90 Expenditures.....	17,732	29,000	39,300

<sup>1</sup> Selected resources as of June 30 are as follows: Unpaid undelivered orders, 1964, \$1,796,000 (1965 adjustments—\$33,000; 1965, \$2,773,000; 1966, \$3,373,000; 1967, \$3,373,000.

The Office of Education administers programs of educational research, captioning and distributing motion picture films for the deaf, elementary and secondary education,

higher education, adult and vocational education, a National Center for Educational Statistics, central management and other staff services required in accomplishing the mission of the Office. In 1967 there will be a considerable expansion of technical assistance and other field services, consistent with the considerable expansion in program responsibility recently assigned to the Office of Education by new legislation.

#### Object classification

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>PERSONNEL COMPENSATION</b>			
11.1 Permanent positions.....	11,726	16,301	23,166
11.3 Positions other than permanent.....	747	1,018	971
11.5 Other personnel compensation.....	79	91	91
Total personnel compensation.....	12,552	17,410	24,228
21.0 Personnel benefits.....	869	1,218	1,761
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons.....	1,083	2,117	2,212
22.0 Transportation of things.....	2	19	19
23.0 Rent, communications, and utilities.....	377	1,076	1,228
24.0 Printing and reproduction.....	554	874	1,038
25.1 Other services.....	2,423	6,142	10,449
26.0 Supplies and materials.....	179	252	268
31.0 Equipment.....	340	409	358
42.0 Insurance claims and indemnities.....	2	1	2
Total costs, funded.....	18,381	29,518	41,563
94.0 Change in selected resources.....	1,010	600	-----
99.0 Total obligations.....	19,391	30,118	41,563

#### Personnel summary

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
Total number of permanent positions.....	1,539	2,192	2,740
Full-time equivalent of other positions.....	88	90	85
Average number of all employees.....	1,293	1,765	2,453
Average GS grade.....	9.3	9.2	9.2
Average GS salary.....	\$9,566	\$9,674	\$9,583

#### CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For carrying out the provisions of title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 relating to functions of the Commissioner of Education, [\$5,000,000] \$11,115,000, of which not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be for salaries and expenses, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a). (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966.)

#### Program and financing

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Institutes for school personnel and grants to school boards.....	3,909	5,246	7,673
2 Administration.....	467	1,500	1,465
Total program costs, funded.....	4,376	6,746	9,138
Change in selected resources <sup>1</sup> .....	3,405	-1,746	1,977
10 Total obligations.....	7,781	5,000	11,115

#### Program and financing—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>FINANCING</b>			
25 Unobligated balance lapsing.....	219	-----	-----
40 New obligational authority (appropriation).....	8,000	5,000	11,115
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures).....	7,781	5,000	11,115
72 Obligated balance, start of year.....	-----	6,490	6,990
74 Obligated balance, end of year.....	-6,490	-6,990	-10,855
90 Expenditures.....	1,292	4,500	7,250

<sup>1</sup> Selected resources as of June 30 are as follows: Unpaid undelivered orders, 1964, \$0, 1965, \$3,405,000, 1966, \$1,659,000, 1967, \$3,636,000.

Institutes for school personnel: Contracts are made with institutions of higher education for institutes for special training of school personnel to deal effectively with specific educational problems occasioned by desegregation.

Grants to school boards: Grants are made to school boards and to State departments of education to pay in whole or in part for the inservice training of school personnel and for professional services in dealing with problems incident to desegregation.

Administration: Technical assistance is given in the desegregation of public schools.

#### Object classification

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>PERSONNEL COMPENSATION</b>			
11.1 Permanent positions.....	182	512	791
11.3 Positions other than permanent.....	64	188	188
Total personnel compensation.....	246	700	979
12.0 Personnel benefits.....	13	43	63
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons.....	75	128	151
22.0 Transportation of things.....	2	-----	-----
23.0 Rent, communications, and utilities.....	17	72	56
24.0 Printing and reproduction.....	10	31	35
25.1 Other services.....	984	3,865	2,693
26.0 Supplies and materials.....	8	6	9
31.0 Equipment.....	21	1	2
41.0 Grants, subsidies, and contributions.....	3,000	1,900	5,150
Total costs, funded.....	4,376	6,746	9,138
94.0 Change in selected resources.....	3,405	-1,746	1,977
99.0 Total obligations.....	7,781	5,000	11,115

#### Personnel Summary

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
Total number of permanent positions.....	68	60	92
Full-time equivalent of other positions.....	3	10	10
Average number of all employees.....	27	66	98
Average GS grade.....	9.3	9.2	9.2
Average GS salary.....	\$9,566	\$9,674	\$9,583

Proposed for separate transmittal:  
Civil rights educational activities

PROGRAM AND FINANCING  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1. Institutes for school personnel and grants to school boards.....		3,000	
2. Administration.....		250	
10 Total program costs, funded—obligations.....		3,250	
<b>FINANCING</b>			
40 New obligational authority (proposed supplemental appropriation).....		3,250	
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures).....		3,250	
72 Obligated balance, start of year.....			1,750
74 Obligated balance, end of year.....		-1,750	
90 Expenditures.....		1,500	1,750

Under existing legislation, 1966: A supplemental appropriation will be requested for 1966 to finance additional training and technical assistance activities for alleviation of problems occasioned by desegregation of schools.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For carrying out sections 12 and 13 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, \$1 million. (Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.)

Program and financing  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
1 Instructional assistance to schools.....		500	500
2 Teacher training institutes.....		500	500
10 Total program costs, funded—obligations.....		1,000	1,000
<b>FINANCING</b>			
40 New obligational authority (appropriation).....		1,000	1,000
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures).....		1,000	1,000
72 Obligated balance, start of year.....			800
74 Obligated balance, end of year.....		-800	-800
90 Expenditures.....		200	1,000

1. Instructional assistance: Grants are made to States on a matching basis and loans are made to nonprofit private schools for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling of space in order to strengthen instruction in the arts and humanities.

2. Teacher training institutes: Contracts are made with institutions of higher education for full costs of institutes for teachers or supervisors (or student teachers or supervisors) of arts and the humanities. Stipends are paid to persons in attendance.

	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Number of institute participants.....	300	300

Object classification  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
25.1 Other services.....		500	500
33.0 Investments and loans.....		60	60
41.0 Grants, subsidies, and contributions.....		440	440
99.0 Total obligations.....		1,000	1,000

Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (permanent)

PROGRAM AND FINANCING  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
10 Grants to States (costs—obligations) (object class 41.0).....	2,550	2,550	2,550
<b>FINANCING</b>			
60 New obligational authority (permanent appropriations).....	2,550	2,550	2,550
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures).....	2,550	2,550	2,550
90 Expenditures.....	2,550	2,550	2,550

Each State and Puerto Rico receives \$50,000 for college instruction, including facilities, in agriculture, the mechanic arts, and related fields, and for the training of teachers in these fields (7 U.S.C. 301-308; 321-328).

Promotion of Vocational Education Act, Feb. 23, 1917 (permanent, indefinite)

PROGRAM AND FINANCING  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
10 Grants to States (costs—obligations) (object class 41.0).....	7,161	7,161	7,161
<b>FINANCING</b>			
60 New obligational authority (appropriation).....	7,161	7,161	7,161
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
71 Total obligations (affecting expenditures).....	7,161	7,161	7,161
77 Adjustments in expired accounts.....	-24		
90 Expenditures.....	7,137	7,161	7,161

Grants are made to the States on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis for the purpose of cooperating with the States in paying the salaries of teachers of agriculture, trade, home economics, and industrial subjects, and for the training of teachers of these subjects (20 U.S.C. 11-18) (74 Stat. 412).

Public enterprise funds:

STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FUND

For the Student Loan Insurance Fund created by section 431 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1245) and the Vocational Student Loan Insurance Fund created by section 138 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1046), \$3,200,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That said funds shall be merged into one account.

Program and financing  
[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
<b>PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES</b>			
Operating costs, funded:			
2 Vocational student loan:			
(a) Interest to Treasury.....			
			1
Total operating costs.....			
			1
Capital outlay, funded:			
1 Higher education student loan:			
(a) Loans purchased upon default by student borrowers.....			
		30	180
2 Vocational student loan:			
(a) Loans purchased upon default by student borrowers.....			
			120
Total capital outlay.....			
		30	300
10 Total obligations.....		30	301
<b>FINANCING</b>			
Receipts and reimbursements from:			
Administrative budget accounts:			
Interest on U.S. securities.....			
		-3	-87
Non-Federal sources:			
Insurance fees:			
		-4	-14
Revenue.....			
21.98 Unobligated balance available, start of year:			
Cash.....			-77
U.S. securities.....			-400
24.98 Unobligated balance available, end of year:			
Cash.....		77	577
U.S. securities.....		400	2,900
New obligational authority.....			
		500	3,200
<b>NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY</b>			
40 Appropriation.....			3,200
42 Transferred from "Higher Educational Activities".....		500	
Appropriation (adjusted).....			
		500	3,200
<b>RELATION OF OBLIGATION TO EXPENDITURES</b>			
10 Total obligations.....		30	301
70 Receipts and other offsets (items 11-17).....		-7	-101
71 Obligations affecting expenditures.....		23	200
90 Expenditures.....		23	200



## Program and financing—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
CASH TRANSACTIONS			
93 Gross expenditures		30	301
94 Applicable receipts		-7	-101

Under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, the Office of Education received authority to insure loans of students in eligible institutions which do not have reasonable access to a State or private nonprofit program of student loan insurance.

It is anticipated that 1,000 loans of \$500 each and 5,000 of \$200 each will be insured in 1966, and 6,000 loans of \$500 each and 5,000 of \$400 each in 1967. Of these, it is estimated that 1 percent of the total value will default due to death or total and permanent disablement, and 5 percent of the total value will default due to dropout and other causes.

The balance of outstanding loans at the end of 1966 will be \$1,360,000, and \$6,160,000 at the end of 1967. All insurance premiums earned, computed at one-fourth of 1 percent per annum of the unpaid principal amount of the loan (excluding interest added to principal), as well as interest received, will be retained in the fund to meet possible additional requirements for payments of defaulted loans. The fund may borrow from the Treasury if at any time the moneys available are insufficient to make payments on defaults of insured loans. It is estimated that the appropriation requested will make it unnecessary to utilize the authority in 1967. The fund will take over loans on which it pays insurance claims and seek to collect on them, but the schedules contemplate a full reserve for losses on such loans.

The business-type schedules for this fund reflect an estimated \$50,000 to be provided in 1966 through a supplemental appropriation for expansion and improvement of vocational education.

## Revenue, expense, and retained earnings

(In thousands of dollars)

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
Higher education student loans:			
Revenue		4	96
Expense (writeoff of defaulted loans)		-30	-180
Net operating loss, higher education student loans		-26	-84
Vocational student loans:			
Revenue		3	5
Expense (writeoff of defaulted loans)		-10	-121
Net operating loss, vocational student loans		-7	-116
Net loss for the year		-33	-200
Deficit, start of year			-33
Deficit, end of year		-33	-233

## Financial condition

(In thousands of dollars)

	1964 actual	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
Assets:				
Treasury balance			117	617
Investment in U.S. securities (par)			400	2,900
Total assets			517	3,517
Government equity:				
Interest-bearing capital:				
Start of year				550
Appropriations			550	3,200
End of year			550	3,750
Deficit			-33	-233
Total Government equity			517	3,517

## Analysis of Government equity

(In thousands of dollars)

	1964 actual	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
Unobligated balance			117	617
Invested capital and earnings			400	2,900
Total Government equity			517	3,517

## Object classification

(In thousands of dollars)

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
42.0 Insurance claims and indemnities		30	300
43.0 Interest and dividends			1
99.0 Total obligations		30	301

## Intragovernmental funds—Advances and reimbursements

## PROGRAM AND FINANCING

(In thousands of dollars)

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES			
1 College housing loan program (Department of Housing and Urban Development)	30	30	31
2 Survey of research activities: National Science Foundation	27	30	
3 Civil defense adult education activities (Defense)	3,754	4,200	4,204
4 Ryukyuan national project (Department of Army)	15	15	
5 Consultative services to non-Federal agencies (5 U.S.C. 623; 71 Stat. 224)	42	50	50
6 Miscellaneous services to other agencies	21	134	134
10 Total program costs, funded—obligations	3,889	4,459	4,419

## Intragovernmental funds—Advances and reimbursements—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
FINANCING			
Receipts and reimbursements from:			
11 Administrative budget accounts	-4,076	-4,379	-4,369
14 Non-Federal sources <sup>1</sup>	-42	-50	-50
21 Unobligated balance available, start of year	-1	-30	
24 Unobligated balance available, end of year	30		
25 Unobligated balance lapsing	200		
New obligatory authority			
RELATION OF OBLIGATIONS TO EXPENDITURES			
10 Total obligations	3,889	4,459	4,419
70 Receipts and other offsets (Items 11-17)	-4,118	-4,429	-4,419
71 Obligations affecting expenditures	-229	30	
72 Obligated balance, start of year	1,096	1,911	1,998
74 Obligated balance, end of year	-1,911	-1,998	-1,985
77 Adjustments in expired accounts	-365		
90 Expenditures	-1,409	-57	13

<sup>1</sup> Reimbursements from non-Federal sources are for consultative services rendered at the request of States, institutions of higher education, and other agencies and organizations (40 U.S.C. 481(c); 68 Stat. 439).

## Object classification

(In thousands of dollars)

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
PERSONNEL COMPENSATION			
11.1 Permanent positions	129	249	264
11.3 Positions other than permanent	27	29	24
11.5 Other personnel compensation	1		
Total personnel compensation	157	278	288
12.0 Personnel benefits	12	20	21
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons	58	78	77
23.0 Rent, communications, and utilities	4	12	12
24.0 Printing and reproduction	5	7	7
25.1 Other services	3,632	4,042	4,008
26.0 Supplies and materials	3	3	3
31.0 Equipment	5	4	3
41.0 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	13	15	
99.0 Total obligations	3,889	4,459	4,419

## Personnel summary

	1965 actual	1966 esti- mate	1967 esti- mate
Total number of permanent positions	20	29	29
Full-time equivalent of other positions	0	1	0
Average number of all employees	15	26	27
Average GS grade	9.3	9.2	9.2
Average GS salary	\$9,566	\$9,674	\$9,583

## EXHIBIT 1

NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
ALABAMA						
Alabama A. & M. College.....	\$242,100	\$26,900	\$1,000		\$270,000	450
Alabama College.....	88,200	9,800	15,000	\$8,500	121,500	245
Auburn University.....	216,000	24,000	30,000	5,000	275,000	500
Alabama State College.....	128,922	14,325	16,503		159,750	360
Athens College.....				1,655	1,655	
Birmingham Southern College.....	46,951	5,217	9,000	3,832	65,000	131
Daniel Payne College.....	83,200	9,255	500	45	93,000	305
Florence State College.....	157,477	17,496	16,313	30,264	221,550	411
Howard College.....				8,394	8,394	
Huntingdon College.....	69,048	7,672	5,000	80	81,800	140
Jacksonville State College.....	250,632	27,848	11,174	696	290,350	435
Judson College.....	29,340	3,260	1,900	500	35,000	70
Livingston State College.....	87,750	9,750	2,500		100,000	200
Marion Institution.....	3,870	430	260	1,440	6,000	12
Miles College.....	137,982	15,331	5,762	1,500	160,575	340
Oakwood College.....	43,155	4,795	1,850		49,800	94
Sacred Heart College.....	22,545	2,505		950	26,000	45
St. Bernard College.....	48,083	5,342	2,500	1,750	57,675	75
Snead Junior College.....	15,120	1,680	1,200		18,000	60
Southeastern Bible College.....				2,314	2,314	
Southern Union College.....	11,120	1,235	1,500	2,345	16,200	50
Spring Hill College.....	91,485	10,165	3,750	2,100	107,500	165
Stillman College.....	64,822	7,203	5,000		77,025	147
Talladega College.....	34,418	3,824	532	226	39,000	130
Troy State College.....	158,400	17,600	14,880	1,500	192,380	257
Tuskegee Institute.....	314,433	34,937	40,000	950	390,320	680
University of Alabama.....	697,712	77,524	45,014		820,250	1,655
University of South Alabama.....	36,000	4,000			40,000	150
Walker College.....				3,515	3,515	
Alabama Christian College.....	26,820	2,980	150	50	30,000	500
Northeast Alabama State Junior College.....	60,030	6,670			66,700	110
Mobile College.....				500	500	
Total, 32 institutions.....	3,165,615	351,744	231,288	78,106	3,826,753	7,716
ALASKA						
Alaska Methodist University.....	16,647	1,850	3,000	7,753	29,250	50
Sheldon Jackson Junior College.....	1,660	184		156	2,000	7
University of Alaska.....	42,173	4,686	2,000	1,141	50,000	110
Total, 3 institutions.....	60,480	6,720	5,000	9,050	81,250	167
ARIZONA						
American Institute of Foreign Trade.....	67,876	7,542	15,382	2,000	92,800	131
Arizona State College.....	86,850	9,650	4,000	2,000	102,500	400
Arizona State University.....	721,080	80,120	23,000	20,000	844,200	1,563
Arizona Western College.....	10,053	1,117		1,330	12,500	16
Grand Canyon College.....	45,900	5,100	3,500	500	55,000	110
Phoenix College.....	7,020	780	1,200	1,000	10,000	40
University of Arizona.....	396,036	44,004	45,750	15,254	501,044	740
Total, 7 institutions.....	1,334,815	148,313	92,832	42,084	1,618,044	3,000
ARKANSAS						
Agricultural, Mechanical, & Normal College.....	359,622	39,958	6,000	900	406,480	1,050
Arkansas A. & M. College.....	103,860	11,540	14,000	3,100	132,500	270
Arkansas College.....	30,600	3,400	3,500	7,500	45,000	75
Arkansas Polytechnic College.....	95,357	10,595	4,448		110,400	276
Arkansas State College.....	193,500	21,500	25,000		240,000	425
Arkansas State Teachers College.....	111,127	12,348	10,025		133,500	390
College of the Ozarks.....	17,100	1,900	500		19,500	65
Fort Smith Junior College.....	16,380	1,820	900	400	19,500	65
Harding College.....	141,232	15,693	10,500	1,000	168,425	455
Henderson State Teachers College.....	135,000	15,000	4,000	4,000	158,000	329
Hendrix College.....	23,850	2,650	1,500		28,000	70
John Brown University.....	14,400	1,600	2,000	250	18,250	35
Little Rock University.....	22,795	2,532	3,238	1,435	30,000	100
Ouachita Baptist College.....	122,561	13,618	4,250	50	140,479	235
Philander Smith College.....	70,002	7,778	6,500	500	84,780	263
Shorter College.....	17,897	1,989	114		20,000	90
Southern Baptist College.....	51,300	5,700	2,500	500	60,000	190
Southern State College.....	213,273	23,697	27,000	500	264,470	596
University of Arkansas.....	326,803	36,311	10,500	13,450	387,064	711
Arkansas Baptist College.....	8,024	892	284	800	10,000	30
University of Arkansas Medical School.....	52,419	5,824		1,757	60,000	60
Total, 21 institutions.....	2,127,102	236,345	136,759	36,142	2,536,345	5,780
CALIFORNIA						
California State College at Hayward.....	222,870	24,763	2,367		250,000	420
Art Center School.....	67,815	7,535	13,100		88,450	145
Azusa College.....	62,000	6,890	4,000	2,500	75,390	122
Bakersfield College.....	18,270	2,030	2,200		22,500	62
Bethany Bible College.....	56,160	6,240	3,500	100	66,000	150
Bible Institute of Los Angeles.....	83,880	9,320	5,600	1,200	100,000	175
California Baptist College.....	65,556	7,284	3,793	2,717	79,350	113
California College of Arts & Crafts.....	28,665	3,185	5,500	5,500	42,850	72
California Podiatry College.....	74,430	8,270	8,300		91,000	70
California Institute of Technology.....	139,567	15,507	11,990	13,530	180,594	205
California Lutheran College.....	131,620	14,624	1,000	1,200	148,444	260

See footnote at end of table.



## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover 1 funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
CALIFORNIA—continued						
San Francisco Art Institute.....	\$3,825	\$425	\$550	\$200	\$5,000	10
California State Polytechnic College.....	378,227	42,025	37,398	950	458,600	699
California Western University.....	186,372	20,708	22,120	5,800	235,000	300
Chaffey College.....	7,108	790	1,000	102	9,000	20
Chapman College.....	117,000	13,000	10,000	10,000	150,000	250
Chico State College.....	238,707	26,523	22,000	770	288,000	460
Chouinard Art Institute.....				4,000	4,000	5
City College of San Francisco.....	11,457	1,273	924	846	14,500	39
Claremont University College.....	42,255	4,095	3,000	450	50,400	85
Coalinga College.....	4,050	450	357	134	5,000	20
College of the Desert.....				500	500	
College of the Holy Names.....	22,500	2,500	3,000	2,000	30,000	38
College of Marin.....	13,410	1,490	100		15,000	36
Loma Linda University.....	45,630	5,070	9,000	5,800	65,500	105
College of Notre Dame.....	48,870	5,430	200		55,000	89
California College of Medicine.....				3,554	3,554	
University of the Pacific.....	314,550	34,950	8,000		357,500	415
College of San Mateo.....	6,994	777	450	1,279	9,500	20
College of the Sequoias.....	2,171	241	200		3,000	12
College of the Siskiyous.....	9,360	1,040		3,600	14,000	22
Contra Costa College.....	8,220	913	668	99	9,900	12
Diablo Valley College.....	4,342	483	500	175	5,500	20
Dominican College of San Rafael.....	21,694	2,410	3,690	56	27,850	42
El Camino College.....	7,969	886	240	4,905	14,000	30
Electronic Technical Institute.....	10,800	1,200			12,000	24
Foothill College.....	9,080	1,009	500	61	10,650	34
Fresno State College.....	245,790	27,310	22,400	4,500	300,000	623
Pepperdine College.....	108,219	12,024	8,000	12,000	140,243	222
Golden Gate College.....	5,310	590	1,300	1,600	8,800	28
Humboldt State College.....	149,310	16,590	9,000	1,600	176,500	445
Humphreys College.....	7,069	789	5,591	4,070	17,549	39
Immaculate Heart College.....	90,076	10,009	6,674	10,241	117,000	152
La Sierra College.....	126,045	14,005	7,450		147,500	250
Lassen Junior College.....	4,500	500			5,000	10
La Verne College.....	45,900	5,100	14,500	7,000	72,500	135
California State College at Long Beach.....	360,000	40,000	20,000		420,000	720
Los Angeles Baptist College.....	28,107	3,123	756	14	32,000	57
Los Angeles College of Optometry.....				3,080	3,080	
California State College at Los Angeles.....	424,580	47,177	17,123		488,880	705
Loyola University of Los Angeles.....	119,700	13,300	12,000	9,000	154,000	215
Marymount College.....	48,330	5,370	800	500	55,000	60
Menlo College.....			2,500	9,500	12,000	12
Merritt College.....	17,640	1,960	700	500	20,800	26
Mills College.....	44,227	4,914	153	706	50,000	75
Modesto Junior College.....	26,955	2,995	1,625	2,575	34,150	50
Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies.....	35,960	3,995	45		40,000	60
Monterey Peninsula College.....				1,748	1,748	4
Mount St. Marys College.....	10,800	1,200	500	2,500	15,000	20
Mount San Antonio College.....	12,055	1,339	2,113	493	16,000	60
Napa College.....	5,220	580	200		6,000	15
Northrop Institute of Technology.....	125,581	13,953	42,000	33,466	215,000	220
Occidental College.....	75,150	8,350	14,000	1,500	99,000	185
Orange Coast College.....	12,195	1,355	2,050	400	16,000	40
California State College at Fullerton.....	130,950	14,550	4,500		150,000	500
Pacific College.....	55,800	6,200	500	500	63,000	160
Pacific Oaks College.....	2,107	234		484	2,825	7
Pacific Union College.....	147,600	16,400	12,000	4,000	180,000	260
Palomar College.....	2,430	270	600	700	4,000	14
Palo Verde Junior College.....	1,327	147	50	36	1,560	18
Pasadena City College.....	2,756	306	1,600	1,838	6,500	22
Pasadena College.....	159,866	17,763	20,400		198,029	450
Pasadena Playhouse College.....	25,650	2,850	1,000	500	30,000	30
Pomona College.....	13,500	1,500			15,000	75
Reedley College.....				239	239	
Sacramento City College.....	13,040	1,449		1,054	15,543	25
Sacramento State College.....	225,000	25,000	15,000	5,000	270,000	604
St. Marys College of California.....	110,000	12,222	3,000	500	125,722	251
St. Patrick's Seminary.....	6,750	750	2,000	3,500	13,000	25
Gavilan College.....	3,086	343	317	654	4,400	6
San Bernardino Valley College.....	12,071	1,341	750	138	14,300	37
San Diego Junior College.....	18,000	2,000	5,100	2,500	27,600	45
San Diego State College.....	247,500	27,500	50,000	10,000	335,000	500
San Fernando Valley State College.....	263,250	29,250	5,500	2,000	300,000	630
San Francisco College for Women.....	24,967	2,774	3,000	1,884	32,625	60
Academy of Art.....	9,517	1,058			10,575	15
California State College (Palos Verdes).....	9,000	1,000			10,000	13
San Francisco Conservatory of Music.....	19,886	2,210	376	1,478	23,950	38
San Francisco State College.....	385,775	42,864	30,402		459,041	591
San Jose City College.....	21,600	2,400	1,100	900	26,000	48
San Jose State College.....	565,383	62,820	184,019		812,222	1,490
Santa Barbara City College.....	5,400	600			6,000	20
Santa Rosa Junior College.....	20,925	2,325	750		24,000	30
Scripps College.....	12,960	1,440			15,000	30
Shasta College.....				9,696	9,696	
Sierra College.....	5,400	600	130	210	6,340	17
Simpson Bible College.....	10,337	1,149	2,000	500	13,986	42
Sonoma State College.....	79,200	8,800	500		88,500	240
Southern California College.....	63,510	7,090	7,600	500	79,000	140
Stanford University.....	735,000	81,667	89,700		906,367	1,300
Stanislaus State College.....	67,230	7,470	850	2,450	78,000	135
San Joaquin Delta College.....	3,915	435	50	200	4,600	10
Taft College.....	2,353	262	500	185	3,300	13
University of California at Berkeley.....	1,149,200	127,689	100,000	20,000	1,396,889	3,200
University of California at Davis.....	291,600	32,400	20,000	6,000	350,000	630
University of California at San Diego.....	102,898	11,433	597		114,928	65

See footnote at end of table.

NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and Institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
CALIFORNIA—continued						
University of California at Los Angeles.....	\$708,400	\$78,711	\$38,000		\$825,111	1,720
University of California at Riverside.....	118,590	13,177	11,758		143,525	295
University of California at San Francisco Medical School.....	147,548	16,394	34,058	\$15,000	213,000	134
University of California at Santa Barbara.....	459,000	51,000	39,500		549,500	1,114
University of Redlands.....	99,000	11,000	2,000		112,000	148
University of San Diego College (Men).....	45,090	5,010	600	800	51,500	65
California State School at San Bernardino.....	18,000	2,000			20,000	30
University of California at Irvine.....	50,000	5,555			55,555	122
University of California at Santa Cruz.....	27,000	3,000			30,000	60
San Francisco College of Mortuary Science.....	2,700	300			3,000	10
Zweegman School for Medical Secretaries.....	6,300	700			7,000	10
University of San Francisco.....	232,704	25,856	37,661	29,279	325,500	495
University of Santa Clara.....	361,796	40,200	889	15,115	418,000	490
University of Southern California.....	464,858	51,651	100,000	71,824	688,333	850
Ventura College.....	7,200	800		400	8,400	30
Victor Valley College.....	1,863	207		430	2,500	5
Westmont College.....	67,500	7,500	10,000	5,000	90,000	200
Whittier College.....	162,900	18,100	13,500	6,500	201,000	400
Yuba College.....	7,200	800	1,700	300	10,000	14
Total, 125 institutions.....	12,608,879	1,400,986	1,230,284	402,803	15,642,952	26,979
COLORADO						
Adams State College.....	121,500	13,500	4,200		139,200	298
Colorado College.....	122,879	13,653	20,870	18,550	175,952	250
Colorado School of Mines.....	36,900	4,100	9,000		50,000	125
Colorado State College.....	473,662	52,629	26,000	5,000	557,291	1,025
Colorado State University.....	331,932	36,881	35,000	10,000	413,813	871
Colorado Womens College.....	83,385	9,265	5,000	3,100	100,750	121
Fort Lewis A. & M. College.....	52,200	5,800	1,500		59,500	100
Hill School of Theology.....	13,815	1,535	750	100	16,200	36
Lamar Junior College.....	5,407	601	691	401	7,100	18
Loretto Heights College.....	38,295	4,255		10,350	58,900	87
Mesa County Junior College.....	31,500	3,500	2,000		37,000	75
Northeastern Junior College.....	15,074	1,675	350	151	17,250	40
Otero Junior College.....	11,520	1,280	1,000	1,000	14,800	39
Southern Colorado State College.....	89,190	9,910	900		100,000	175
Regis College.....	102,074	11,342	9,664	2,370	125,450	185
Trinidad State Junior College.....	24,615	2,735	5,150	500	33,000	77
University of Colorado.....	450,000	50,000	63,000	7,000	570,000	1,100
University of Denver.....	431,000	47,889	20,000	10,000	508,889	650
Western State College of Colorado.....	65,592	7,288	3,400	1,000	77,280	168
Rangely Junior College.....	17,126	1,903	300	1,071	20,400	42
Total, 20 institutions.....	2,517,666	279,741	208,775	76,593	3,082,775	5,482
CONNECTICUT						
Albertus Magnus College.....	54,146	6,016	3,473	1,365	65,000	120
Annhurst College.....	15,515	1,724	957	304	18,500	29
Central Connecticut State College.....	108,000	12,000	18,000		138,000	340
Connecticut College.....	81,000	9,000			90,000	210
Danbury State College.....	27,450	3,050	5,500		36,000	100
Fairfield University.....	111,193	12,355	6,100	1,602	131,250	250
Manchester Community College.....	2,700	300		180	3,180	11
Mitchell College.....	2,146	238	1,033	1,743	5,160	20
New Haven College.....	29,674	3,297	2,354	300	35,625	95
Norwalk Community College.....				4,000	4,000	8
Quinnipiac College.....	75,587	8,399	8,338	1,928	94,250	195
St. Joseph College.....	27,360	3,040	4,000	10,600	45,000	75
Southern Connecticut State College.....	108,900	12,100	15,500	10,000	146,500	298
Trinity College.....	28,935	3,215	3,300		35,450	56
University of Bridgeport.....	160,094	17,788	18,721	13,397	210,000	360
University of Connecticut.....	512,500	56,944	65,000	10,000	644,444	1,075
University of Hartford.....	222,300	24,700	8,000	20,000	275,000	425
Wesleyan University.....	116,100	12,900	300	2,700	132,000	235
Willimantic State College.....	77,040	8,560	1,900	500	88,000	185
Yale University.....	761,400	84,600	16,500		862,500	1,150
Sacred Heart University.....	28,800	3,200			32,000	75
Total, 21 institutions.....	2,550,840	283,426	178,976	78,617	3,001,859	5,322
DELAWARE						
Delaware State College.....	60,255	6,695	1,800		68,750	210
Wesley College.....	28,800	3,200			32,000	65
University of Delaware.....	109,231	12,137	2,700	14,732	138,800	466
Total, 3 institutions.....	198,286	22,032	4,500	14,732	239,550	741
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						
American University.....	316,800	35,200	35,000	15,000	402,000	460
Capitol Institute of Technology.....	63,000	7,000			70,000	100
Catholic University of America.....	432,459	48,051	88,565	64,814	633,889	650
District of Columbia Teachers College.....	9,009	1,001	990	3,000	14,000	40
Dunbarton College of the Holy Cross.....	5,427	603	1,420	500	7,950	16
Gallaudet College.....	11,340	1,260	2,600	200	15,400	52
Georgetown University.....	468,500	50,944	20,000	5,000	534,444	835
George Washington University.....	381,564	42,396	25,000	15,025	463,985	855
Howard University.....	316,215	35,135	12,000		363,350	650
Trinity College.....	58,950	6,550	6,000	3,500	75,000	110
Wesley Theological Seminary.....			755	928	1,683	
Total, 11 institutions.....	2,063,264	228,140	192,330	107,967	2,581,701	3,768

See footnote at end of table.



## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
FLORIDA						
Barry College	\$27,297	\$3,033	\$2,000	\$200	\$32,530	60
Bethune Cookman College	110,310	12,257	800	1,633	125,000	300
Brevard Engineering College	25,650	2,850		1,000	29,500	62
Brevard Junior College	11,496	1,277	1,500	1,727	16,000	40
Central Florida Junior College	8,627	959	1,485	1,929	13,000	25
Miami-Dade Junior College	78,173	8,686	396		87,255	243
Daytona Beach Junior College	12,819	1,424	450	307	15,000	30
Edwards Waters College	78,646	8,738	2,091	525	90,000	250
Florida A. & M. University	76,500	8,500	5,000	10,000	100,000	374
Florida Atlantic University	90,000	10,000			100,000	120
Florida College	17,460	1,940	1,500	100	21,000	45
Florida Memorial College	111,180	12,353	3,500		127,033	200
Florida Presbyterian College	288,900	32,100	4,000		325,000	432
Florida Southern College	115,047	12,783	20,000	2,000	149,830	220
Florida State University	500,000	55,555	70,000	5,000	630,555	1,050
Gibbs Junior College				1,485		
Hampton Junior College	8,370	930	1,200		10,500	35
Indian River Junior College	18,256	2,029	212	713	21,210	102
Jacksonville University	121,500	13,500	9,500	1,500	145,000	225
Lake Sumter Junior College				665	665	
North Florida Junior College	3,510	390	150	300	4,350	17
Rollins College	115,200	12,800	1,700	300	130,000	185
Rosenwald Junior College	720	80	100	2,100	3,000	15
St. Johns River Junior College	37,350	4,150	1,000		42,500	95
St. Leo College	12,874	1,430	78	618	15,000	26
Southeastern Bible College	52,380	5,820	9,000		67,200	171
Stetson University	201,600	22,400	20,000		244,000	495
Suwannee River Junior College	3,872	430		198	4,500	15
University of Florida	740,700	82,300	102,000	75,000	1,000,000	1,330
University of Miami	341,378	37,931	30,691	10,000	420,000	525
University of South Florida	439,345	48,818	4,837	7,000	500,000	800
University of Tampa	180,000	20,000			200,000	440
Marymount College	4,500	500			5,000	5
Cape Kennedy College of Business	104,400	11,600			116,000	450
New College	31,000	3,444			34,444	100
Total, 35 institutions	3,969,060	441,007	293,190	124,300	4,827,557	8,482
GEORGIA						
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	36,000	4,000	0	0	40,000	80
Albany State College	42,300	4,700	5,000	1,000	53,000	152
Andrew College	0	0	2,500	0	2,500	10
Atlanta University	4,465	496	450	50	5,461	19
Berry College	234,810	26,090	9,100		270,000	435
Brewton-Parker College	14,314	1,591	500	845	17,250	44
Clark College	23,004	2,556	1,200	240	27,000	80
Columbus College	10,374	1,153	618	55	12,200	32
Dekalb College	28,350	3,150			31,500	120
Emmanuel College	8,666	963	250	21	9,900	27
Emory University	278,100	30,900	35,000	7,000	351,000	543
Fort Valley State College	69,930	7,770	2,300		80,000	266
Georgia Institute of Technology	221,116	24,569	28,575		274,260	358
Georgia Military College				2,500	2,500	5
Georgia Southwestern College	14,670	1,630	1,200	500	18,000	45
Georgia State College	44,100	4,900	468	657	50,125	125
Womens College of Georgia	48,870	5,430	15,000	5,000	74,300	143
Georgia Southern College	225,000	25,000	10,000		260,000	350
La Grange College	41,287	4,588	625		46,500	90
Medical College of Georgia	5,946	661	893		7,500	15
Mercer University	91,769	10,197	2,014	500	104,480	149
Middle Georgia College	28,710	3,190	2,600	1,500	36,000	74
Morehouse College	93,330	10,370	3,500	6,400	113,600	230
Morris Brown College	128,700	14,300	5,000	2,000	150,000	415
Norman College	3,600	400			4,000	0
North Georgia College	57,201	6,356	3,000	4,943	71,500	180
Oglethorpe University	12,150	1,350	1,000	500	15,000	55
Paine College	20,385	2,265	4,000	1,350	28,000	70
Piedmont College	28,215	3,135	1,300		32,650	75
Reinhardt College	12,150	1,350	500	2,250	16,250	50
Savannah State College	54,000	6,000	560	3,000	63,560	145
Shorter College	81,000	9,000	10,500		100,500	305
South Georgia College	12,747	1,416	837		15,000	50
Spelman College	62,100	6,900	5,500	1,500	76,000	190
Tift College	31,950	3,550	3,500	1,000	40,000	85
Toccoa Falls Institute, Inc.	6,210	690	125	1,975	9,000	25
University of Georgia	394,200	43,800	64,500	500	503,000	920
Valdosta State College	20,700	2,300			23,000	46
West Georgia College	90,000	10,000	4,500		104,500	220
Young Harris College	17,460	1,940	1,600		21,000	60
Total, 40 institutions	2,597,879	288,656	228,215	45,286	3,160,036	6,233
HAWAII						
Chaminade College of Honolulu	8,010	890	1,000	2,400	12,300	39
Jackson College				14	14	
University of Hawaii	189,000	21,000	37,000	500	247,500	440
Total, 3 institutions	197,010	21,890	38,000	2,914	259,814	479
IDAHO						
Boise Junior College	40,892	4,543	3,793	2,572	51,800	74
College of Idaho	77,220	8,580	8,000	8,400	102,200	261
Idaho State University	135,000	15,000	5,000	1,500	156,500	250
Lewis Clark Normal School	16,213	1,802	215	4,270	22,500	50
North Idaho Junior College	16,740	1,860	1,600	800	21,000	60

See footnote at end of table.

## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/3 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
IDAHO—continued						
Northwest Nazarene College	\$49,500	\$5,500	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$59,000	120
University of Idaho	184,072	20,453	20,000		224,525	431
College of Southern Idaho	14,850	1,650			16,500	35
Magie Valley Christian College				1,746	1,746	0
Total, 9 institutions	534,487	59,388	40,608	21,288	655,771	1,281
ILLINOIS						
American Conservatory of Music	7,670	852	708	70	9,300	22
Augustana College	265,415	29,491	4,000	6,500	305,406	517
Aurora College	27,447	3,050	2,500	88	33,085	66
Barat College of Sacred Heart	22,284	2,476	238	2	25,000	50
Blackburn College	9,000	1,000			10,000	30
Bloom Community College	1,585			1,239	3,000	12
Bradley University	169,200	18,800	15,000	1,000	204,000	340
Canton Community College	4,936	549	50	65	5,600	17
Chicago City Junior College			501	999	1,500	5
Chicago College of Chiropody				165	165	15
Chicago College of Osteopathy				338	338	0
Chicago Kent College of Law	3,420	380	150	50	4,000	15
Chicago Medical School				749	749	
Illinois Teachers College, Chicago South	66,487	7,387	5,220	906	80,000	200
Illinois Teachers College, Chicago North	67,095	7,455	350	100	75,000	75
Columbia College	7,705	856	605	334	9,500	10
Concordia Teachers College	27,405	3,045	700	8,850	40,000	100
Danville Junior College	10,800	1,200			12,000	40
DePaul University	366,979	40,775	55,000	14,196	476,950	628
Eastern Illinois University	124,200	13,800	10,000		148,000	375
Elmhurst College	76,500	8,500	5,000	15,000	105,000	180
Eureka College	38,250	4,250	1,500		44,000	80
Freeport Community College	11,790	1,310		1,900	15,000	49
Garrett Biblical Institute	7,380	820	300	1,500	10,000	20
George Williams College	50,175	5,575	5,000	750	61,500	105
Greenville College	97,200	10,800	12,000	5,000	125,000	258
Illinois College	89,100	9,900	5,500	500	105,000	210
Illinois College of Podiatry	35,100	3,900	600	400	40,000	50
Illinois College of Optometry				4,768	4,768	0
Illinois Institute of Technology	126,450	14,050	30,000	28,000	198,500	250
Illinois State University	192,600	21,400	10,000	16,000	240,000	650
Illinois Wesleyan University	133,200	14,800	12,000	5,000	165,000	330
Kendall College	3,060	340	300	1,100	4,800	17
Knox College	189,000	21,000	9,000	1,000	220,000	350
Lake Forest College	77,400	8,600	4,500	1,500	92,000	265
Lewis College	43,020	4,780	2,200		50,000	70
Lincoln College	8,509	946	200	245	9,900	18
Loyola University	311,850	34,650	35,000	8,500	390,000	530
MacMurray College	173,700	19,300	8,000	7,000	208,000	465
McCormick Theological Seminary	7,197	800	990	4,513	13,500	25
McKendree College	29,983	3,331	1,560	1,840	36,714	63
Millikin University	110,852	12,317	12,533	5,298	141,000	340
Monmouth College	140,400	15,600	12,000	7,000	175,000	275
Monticello College	10,500	1,167	863	2,345	14,875	17
Mundelein College	51,233	5,692	3,000	7,200	67,125	128
National College of Education	72,450	8,050	3,500	2,000	86,000	112
North Central College	135,450	15,050	6,000	12,500	169,000	235
Northern Illinois University	210,819	23,424	48,000	20,757	303,000	606
North Park College and Theological Seminary	82,350	9,150	4,500	10,000	106,000	165
Northwestern University	478,800	53,200	78,000	45,050	655,050	900
Olivet Nazarene College	232,276	25,809	3,000	1,000	262,085	335
Principia College	82,768	9,196	13,649	6,887	122,500	150
Quincy College	149,400	16,600	23,000		189,000	260
Rockford College	25,447	2,828	4,125	2,100	34,500	75
Roosevelt University	217,350	24,150	21,500		263,000	600
Rosary College	45,900	5,100	3,200	1,200	55,400	117
St. Procopius College	51,948	5,772	2,300	1,000	61,020	113
St. Xavier College	88,191	9,799	1,000	1,010	100,000	200
Schools of Art Institute of Chicago	36,000	4,000			40,000	175
Seabury Western Theological Seminary	15,930	1,770	2,800	2,000	22,500	15
Shimer College	55,080	6,120	4,000	5,000	70,200	108
Southern Illinois University	454,500	50,500	48,000	7,000	560,000	1,200
Trinity Christian College	9,000	1,000			10,000	20
Trinity Theological Seminary and Trinity College	90,900	10,100	1,700	100	102,800	147
University of Chicago	1,110,700	123,411	42,000	5,000	1,281,111	1,450
University of Illinois	568,500	63,167	65,000		696,667	1,150
Western Illinois University	264,510	29,390	7,640	3,290	304,830	603
Wheaton College	189,000	21,000	15,000		225,000	600
Judson College	15,840	1,700			17,540	51
University of Illinois Medical Center at Chicago	72,000	8,000			80,000	100
Hebrew Theological College	13,050	1,450			14,500	20
University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division	81,000	9,000			90,000	190
Total, 72 institutions	8,045,236	893,916	664,982	287,904	9,892,038	16,959
INDIANA						
Anderson College and Theological Seminary	226,440	25,160	27,200	200	279,000	550
Ball State University	404,500	44,944	43,000	1,200	493,644	995
Bethel College, Inc.	49,734	5,526	5,240		60,500	190
Butler University				33,849	33,849	
Christian Theological Seminary	12,757	1,418	1,200	375	15,750	40
Earlham College	73,670	8,185	3,145		85,000	245
Evansville College	160,200	17,800	25,000		203,000	460
Fort Wayne Bible College	23,845	2,650	2,500	525	29,520	72
Franklin College of Indiana	43,200	4,800			48,000	104
Goshen College	108,576	12,064	11,500		132,140	207
Grace Theological Seminary and College	43,200	4,800	5,500	500	54,000	90

See footnote at end of table.



## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover 1 funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
INDIANA—continued						
Huntington College	\$40,230	\$4,470	\$300		\$45,000	95
Indiana Central College	71,437	7,938	2,600	\$2,400	84,375	135
Indiana State University	319,275	35,475	21,750	1,000	377,500	565
Indiana Institute of Technology	89,865	9,985	25,000	4,000	128,850	140
Indiana University	1,750,200	194,467	100,000	30,000	2,074,667	1,620
Manchester College	72,000	8,000	4,000	6,000	90,000	160
Marian College, Indianapolis	16,200	1,800	4,200	3,800	26,000	52
Marion College, Marion	48,712	5,412	4,299	50	58,473	117
Oakland City College	44,824	4,980	1,737	59	51,600	115
Purdue University	760,000	84,444	150,000		994,444	1,800
Rose Polytechnic Institute	92,700	10,300	4,000	1,000	108,000	145
St. Benedict College	13,076	1,453	55	416	15,000	20
St. Francis College	72,000	8,000	500		80,500	90
St. Josephs College	83,700	9,300	13,500	1,500	108,000	100
St. Marys College	83,124	9,236	5,000	3,040	100,400	138
St. Mary of the Woods College	8,685	965	200	2,150	12,000	12
Taylor University	88,200	9,800	4,000	7,000	109,000	160
University of Notre Dame	357,597	39,733	20,000	18,670	436,000	545
Valparaiso University	459,990	51,110	25,900	13,000	550,000	916
Vincennes University	42,129	4,681	7,500	3,690	58,000	140
Frankfort Pilgrim College	15,300	1,700	200		17,200	25
Total, 32 institutions	5,675,366	630,596	519,026	134,424	6,959,412	10,133
IOWA						
Boone Junior College	1,854	206	100	240	2,400	6
Briar Cliff College	21,600	2,400	400	4,600	29,000	55
Buena Vista College	91,800	10,200	5,300	2,700	110,000	194
Centerville Community College	22,927	2,548	500	25	26,000	60
Central College	95,535	10,615	6,500	2,500	115,150	218
Vennard College	12,240	1,360	2,500	2,500	18,600	48
Clarinda Community College	2,447	271	400	32	3,150	12
Clarke College	26,550	2,950		9,900	39,400	75
Clinton Community College				854	854	
Coe College	95,400	10,600	10,500		116,500	205
College of Osteopathic Medicine and Surgery				433	433	0
Cornell College	70,200	7,800	8,000	16,000	102,000	255
Creston Community College	810	90	165	935	2,000	6
Dordt College	53,550	5,950	400	100	60,000	100
Drake University	184,500	20,500	25,000	500	230,500	415
Eagle Grove Junior College	2,121	236	200	1,043	3,600	12
Ellsworth Junior College	10,566	1,174	1,260		13,000	50
Emmetsburg Community College	1,409	157		134	1,700	6
Estherville Junior College	7,020	780	800	400	9,000	30
Graceland College	156,778	17,420	2,800	1,778	178,776	288
Grand View College	15,300	1,700	500		17,500	45
Grinnell College	122,130	13,570	250	150	136,100	277
State College of Iowa	346,050	38,450	10,000		394,500	900
Iowa State University of Science and Technology	600,000	66,667	72,500	24,000	763,167	1,690
Iowa Wesleyan College	107,949	11,994	4,500	1,000	125,443	225
Luther College	336,643	37,405	20,000	10,000	404,048	717
Marshalltown Junior College				400	1,500	5
Marycrest College	71,550	7,950	300	4,200	84,000	145
Mason City Junior College	16,000	1,800	2,000		20,000	70
Morningside College	282,456	25,829	16,200	9,000	283,485	503
Mount Mercy College	54,000	6,000	330	670	61,000	85
Mount St. Clare College	1,215	135	300	150	1,800	6
Northwestern College	72,000	8,000	1,500	2,500	84,000	210
Ottumwa Heights College				865	865	
Parsons College	193,500	21,500	5,000		220,000	300
St. Ambrose College	88,859	9,873	8,000	3,768	110,500	160
Simpson College	156,856	17,429	12,500	2,000	188,875	385
University of Iowa	905,250	100,583	77,500		1,083,333	1,500
University of Dubuque	162,990	18,110	6,150		187,250	353
Upper Iowa University	148,500	16,500	6,000	1,600	172,600	250
Waldorf College	38,930	4,326	644	2,500	46,400	118
Wartburg College	187,200	20,800	5,500	1,500	215,000	360
Webster City Junior College	2,474	275		1,251	4,000	20
Westmar College	132,448	14,717	9,000	15,835	172,000	365
American Institute of Business	45,000	5,000			50,000	110
William Penn College	85,500	9,500	5,000		100,000	170
Total, 46 institutions	4,980,847	553,430	329,089	126,063	5,989,429	11,004
KANSAS						
Crowley County Community Junior College	2,877	320		803	4,000	10
Baker University	51,300	5,700	2,000	1,000	60,000	85
Bethany College	31,860	3,540	2,570	2,030	40,000	82
Bethel College	74,250	8,250	5,500		88,000	114
Central College	21,600	2,400	1,000	1,000	26,000	69
Coffeyville College	2,700	300	60	340	3,400	17
Colby Community College	13,500	1,500			15,000	33
College of Emporia	19,800	2,200	1,500	500	24,000	60
Dodge City College	2,160	240	1,000	3,600	7,000	20
Fort Hays Kansas State College	192,292	21,366	18,635	19,033	251,326	382
Friends University	37,080	4,120	1,700	2,100	45,000	125
Garden City Junior College				3,500	3,500	10
Hesston College	29,769	3,308	173	2,750	36,000	60
Doniphan County Community Junior College	3,770	419	111	1,700	6,000	20
Hutchinson Junior College	7,020	780	700	1,500	10,000	20
Allen County Community Junior College	2,700	300			3,000	25
Kansas State College of Pittsburg	360,000	40,000	20,000	22,000	442,000	892
Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia	588,600	65,400	63,600		717,600	1,475
Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	642,150	71,350	98,700	12,000	824,200	1,268
Kansas Wesleyan University	68,400	7,600	900	5,100	82,000	178
Manhattan Bible College				30	30	

See footnote at end of table.

NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and Institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
KANSAS—continued						
Marymount College.....	\$54,000	\$6,000	\$4,000	\$2,000	\$66,000	100
McPherson College.....	68,093	7,566	5,500	3,216	84,375	167
Miltonvale Wesleyan College.....	19,350	2,150	1,500	100	23,100	45
Mount St. Scholastica College.....	70,008	7,779	3,000	4,000	84,787	111
Ottawa University.....	81,000	9,000	2,700	300	93,000	186
Pratt Junior College.....	6,660	740	400	600	8,400	23
Sacred Heart College.....	20,880	2,320	600	400	24,200	62
St. Benedict's College.....	124,166	13,796	3,449	1,189	142,600	195
St. John's College.....	8,604	956	500	740	10,800	28
St. Mary College.....	36,855	4,095	2,000	2,050	45,000	75
St. Mary of the Plains College.....	22,500	2,500	1,500	1,500	28,000	70
Southwestern College.....	64,305	7,145	6,000	5,500	82,950	196
Sterling College.....	59,872	6,653	1,500	5,050	73,075	129
Tabor College.....	72,000	8,000	1,500	1,000	82,500	135
University of Kansas.....	837,000	93,000	45,000	25,000	1,000,000	1,350
Wichita State University.....	265,500	29,500	20,000	40,000	355,000	550
Washington University of Topeka.....	59,161	6,574	11,265	10,000	87,000	200
Total, 38 institutions.....	4,021,782	446,867	328,563	181,631	4,978,843	8,567
KENTUCKY						
Asbury College.....	17,055	1,895	7,300		26,250	75
Asbury Theological Seminary.....	13,500	1,500	729	114	15,843	42
Bellarmino College.....	76,500	8,500	4,000	1,000	90,000	23
Berea College.....	104,400	11,600	3,000	1,000	120,000	300
Brescia College.....	27,000	3,000	2,500	2,500	35,000	65
Campbellsville College.....	66,490	7,388	9,000	2,122	85,000	200
Alice Lloyd College.....	23,165	2,574		1,261	27,000	100
Centre College of Kentucky.....	60,030	6,670	1,800	1,500	70,000	210
College of the Bible, The.....	5,500	610	2,248	3,157	11,515	35
Cumberland College.....	165,600	18,400	6,000	2,000	192,000	320
Eastern Kentucky State College.....	432,450	48,050	14,000	2,000	496,500	1,110
Georgetown College.....	70,981	7,887	8,532	1,000	88,400	162
Kentucky State College.....	212,227	23,581	7,942		243,750	425
Kentucky Wesleyan College.....	51,538	5,727	455	2,280	60,000	110
Lees Junior College.....	27,900	3,100	1,500	2,500	35,000	100
Lindsey Wilson College.....	19,800	2,200	700	300	23,000	75
Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary.....	4,005	445	50		4,500	11
Morehead State College.....	328,442	36,494	3,500	572	369,008	650
Murray State College.....	346,832	38,537	16,000	24,000	425,369	709
Catherine Spalding College.....	52,669	5,852	5,160	10,681	74,362	98
Nazareth College of Kentucky.....	17,325	1,925		750	20,000	35
Pikeville College.....	94,814	10,535	4,000	651	110,000	265
St. Catharine Junior College.....	5,915	657	634	794	8,000	20
Southeastern Christian College.....	12,845	1,427		478	14,750	35
Sue Bennett College.....	4,860	540	300	1,800	7,500	25
Transylvania College.....	63,000	7,000			70,000	115
Union College.....	130,500	14,500	8,000	9,000	162,000	280
University of Kentucky.....	419,800	46,644	22,000	6,000	494,444	1,100
University of Louisville.....	337,500	37,500	30,000	10,000	415,000	700
Ursuline College.....	9,396	1,044	680	380	11,500	18
Villa Madonna College.....	21,563	2,396	5,175	4,300	33,434	76
Western Kentucky State College.....	245,700	27,300	14,000	12,000	299,000	705
Kentucky Southern College.....	78,120	8,680	200	3,000	90,000	170
Total, 33 institutions.....	3,547,422	394,158	179,405	107,140	4,228,125	8,364
LOUISIANA						
Centenary College.....	34,200	3,800	3,000	2,000	43,000	90
Dillard University.....	95,200	10,580	2,700	9,000	117,500	320
Francis T. Nicholls State College.....	89,820	9,980	200		100,000	150
Grambling College.....	180,000	20,000	30,000	900	230,900	270
Louisiana College.....			7,000	7,706	14,706	165
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute.....	173,250	19,250	24,000	9,000	225,500	515
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.....	451,550	50,150	59,500	5,000	566,000	870
Louisiana State University in New Orleans.....	27,000	3,000			30,000	50
Loyola University.....	112,616	12,502	43,185	31,797	200,000	200
McNeese State College.....	62,370	6,930	2,700		72,000	180
Northeast Louisiana State College.....	108,450	12,050	4,500		125,000	250
Northwestern State College of Louisiana.....	176,175	19,575	13,500	4,500	213,750	450
St. Marys Dominican College.....	20,070	2,230	1,700	2,000	26,000	32
Southeastern Louisiana College.....	99,622	11,069	10,000	3,221	123,912	200
Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.....	281,250	31,250	7,500	5,000	325,000	650
University of Southwestern Louisiana.....	165,020	18,336	16,918	13,372	213,646	412
Tulane University of Louisiana.....	530,725	58,969	44,000	6,000	639,694	820
Xavier University.....	58,500	6,500	5,000		70,000	200
Total, 18 institutions.....	2,665,538	296,171	275,403	99,496	3,336,608	5,829
MAINE						
Aroostook State Teachers College.....	16,141	1,794	390	1,675	20,000	45
Bates College.....	100,083	11,120	6,000	1,797	119,000	184
Bowdoin College.....	129,016	14,335	12,000	4,649	160,000	275
Colby College.....	118,532	13,170	6,000	12,298	150,000	265
Farmington State Teachers College.....	8,986	998		16	10,000	40
Fort Kent State Teachers College.....	6,777	753	320	150	8,000	35
Husson College.....	18,000	2,000			20,000	50
Gorham State Teachers College.....	36,450	4,050	3,500		44,000	144
Maine Maritime Academy.....	9,000	1,000	1,098		11,098	70
Nasson College.....	28,381	3,154	720	2,745	35,000	64
Ricker College.....	53,023	5,891	1,086		60,000	75
St. Francis College.....	76,950	8,550	500		86,000	102
St. Josephs College.....	34,335	3,815	1,800	50	40,000	50
University of Maine.....	416,700	46,300	29,616	7,384	500,000	1,175
Washington State Teachers College.....	12,150	1,350	500	2,000	16,000	40
Total, 15 institutions.....	1,064,524	118,280	63,530	32,764	1,279,098	2,614

See footnote at end of table.



NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MARYLAND						
Allegany Community College	\$4,698	\$522			\$5,220	15
Catonsville Community College	9,000	1,000			10,000	20
College of Notre Dame of Maryland	20,646	2,294	\$1,275	\$385	24,600	70
Coppin State Teachers College	19,850	2,205	200	900	23,155	110
Eastern College	7,371	819	352	224	8,766	18
Goucher College	39,782	4,420	2,000	3,798	50,000	75
Hood College	33,682	3,743	2,570	5	40,000	70
Johns Hopkins University	261,000	29,000	30,000	5,000	325,000	500
Loyola College	67,500	7,500	10,000	10,000	95,000	225
Montgomery Junior College	9,720	1,080	600		11,400	30
Morgan State College	457,600	52,844	36,000	5,000	569,444	1,050
Mount St. Agnes College	62,215	6,913	5,471	3,186	77,785	90
Mount St. Marys College	49,500	5,500	2,000	850	57,850	89
Ner Israel Rabbinical College	51,795	5,755	1,000	1,450	60,000	80
Peabody Institute of Baltimore	10,476	1,164		360	12,000	20
St. Johns College	23,562	2,618		820	27,000	80
St. Joseph College	30,840	3,427		1,733	36,000	50
St. Marys College of Maryland	6,300	700		650	7,650	17
Bowie State College	18,805	2,090	700	405	22,000	75
Frostburg State College	17,280	1,920	800		20,000	50
Salisbury State College	24,840	2,760	700	250	28,550	55
Towson State College	39,870	4,430	3,000	700	48,000	155
University of Maryland	450,000	50,000	60,000	15,000	575,000	1,175
University of Maryland State College	47,250	5,250	3,000	6,000	61,500	214
Villa Julie College, Inc.	3,594	399	2,145	262	6,400	8
Washington College	12,673	1,408	1,780	2,139	18,000	40
Columbia Union College	37,638	4,182	5,180	1,000	48,000	90
Xaverian College	13,500	1,500			15,000	30
Western Maryland College	36,675	4,075	2,650	1,600	45,000	100
Total, 29 institutions	1,885,662	209,518	171,423	61,717	2,328,320	4,601
MASSACHUSETTS						
American International College	67,426	7,492	2,932	2,300	80,150	142
Amherst College	64,800	7,200			72,000	163
Anna Maria College for Women	24,376	2,708	483	2,433	30,000	50
Assumption College	51,390	5,710	1,500	3,400	62,000	105
Atlantic Union College	115,020	12,780	3,000	1,200	132,000	180
Babson Institute	23,085	2,565	5,500	1,850	35,000	54
Becker Junior College	17,703	1,967	2,200	130	22,000	45
Bentley College	78,840	8,760	2,200	200	90,000	225
Berkshire Christian College	4,027	447	786	40	5,300	18
Berkshire Community College	17,865	1,985	150		20,000	70
Boston College	671,193	74,577	45,000	9,230	800,000	1,100
Boston Conservatory of Music				436	436	
Boston University	644,542	71,615	50,000	22,730	788,887	1,400
Brandeis University	270,000	30,000	8,500	1,500	310,000	460
Cambridge Junior College				3,000	3,000	5
Cape Cod Community College	19,552	2,172	250	1,026	23,000	65
Cardinal Cushing College	13,935	1,548	142	375	16,000	35
Clark University	191,880	21,320	7,000		220,200	390
College of the Holy Cross	312,300	34,700	4,500	6,400	358,000	470
College of Our Lady of Elms	6,130	681	2,157	1,032	10,000	50
Dean Junior College	43,650	4,850	1,500		50,000	80
Eastern Nazarene College	98,730	10,970	5,000	2,550	117,250	245
Emerson College	28,980	3,220	800	2,000	35,000	100
Emmanuel College	203,149	22,576	8,502	10,777	245,004	291
Fisher Junior College	12,924	1,436	5,040	5,600	25,000	60
Forsyth School of Dental Hygiene	13,500	1,500			15,000	30
Franklin Institute of Boston	2,544	283	1,000	2,173	6,000	30
Garland Junior College	4,500	500			5,000	12
Gordon College	124,650	13,850	6,000	3,000	147,500	200
Harvard University	1,310,399	145,599	7,000		1,462,998	2,119
Holyoke Junior College	2,430	270	700	1,850	5,250	20
Lasell Junior College	1,328	148	23	501	2,000	7
Lesley College	17,208	1,912	880		20,000	36
Lowell Technological Institute	35,193	3,910	6,897	4,000	50,000	200
Massachusetts Bay Community College	12,627	1,403		3,470	17,500	50
Massachusetts College of Art	6,785	755	800	650	9,000	30
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	850,000	94,444			944,444	1,200
Merrimack College	95,850	10,650	3,000	5,500	115,000	210
Mount Holyoke College	94,750	10,528	722	4,000	110,000	200
New England Conservatory of Music	16,110	1,790	2,100	2,000	22,000	60
Newton Junior College	3,600	400	300	700	5,000	18
Nichols College of Business	25,354	2,817		809	28,980	35
Northeastern University	489,000	54,333	38,000	2,000	583,333	1,650
Northern Essex Community College	8,100	900			9,000	50
Quincy Junior College	1,170	130		800	2,100	10
Quinsigamond Community College	19,520	2,169		131	21,820	68
Radcliffe College	70,664	7,852	728	2,006	81,250	250
Greenfield Community College	6,120	680		2,200	9,000	25
Regis College	67,500	7,500		5,000	80,000	200
Simmons College	57,946	6,439	10,000	5,615	80,000	175
Smith College	81,900	9,100	5,500		96,500	135
Southeastern Massachusetts Technological Institute	37,299	4,144	10,207	2,350	54,000	150
Springfield College	159,750	17,750	15,000	7,500	200,000	410
State College at Bridgewater	132,036	14,671	2,000	1,293	150,000	300
State College at Fitchburg	40,623	4,514	5,242	5,095	55,474	170
State College at Framingham	22,365	2,485	400	250	25,500	85
State College at Lowell	19,068	2,122	1,780		23,000	100
State College at North Adams	21,469	2,388	120	25	24,000	80
State College at Salem	35,325	3,925	750		40,000	200
State College at Westfield	45,450	5,050	1,200		51,700	210
State College at Worcester	33,300	3,700	3,000	2,000	42,000	124
State College at Boston	71,723	7,969	1,600	308	81,600	240
Stonehill College	52,650	5,850	1,500	2,500	62,500	150

See footnote at end of table.

## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MASSACHUSETTS—continued						
Suffolk University	\$58,675	\$6,520	\$4,000	\$805	\$70,000	280
Tufts University	378,000	42,000	25,000		445,000	700
University of Massachusetts	434,700	48,300	12,000	5,000	500,000	836
Wellesley College	45,000	5,000			50,000	60
Wentworth Institute	84,091	9,344	13,000	1,565	108,000	180
Bay State School of Business	9,450	1,050			10,500	13
Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School	81,000	9,000			90,000	90
North Shore Community College	3,622	403			4,025	35
Mount Wachusett Community College	9,000	1,000			10,000	50
Western New England College	32,692	3,632	1,476	500	38,300	65
Wheaton College	91,350	10,150	300	8,200	110,000	160
Wheelock College	28,700	3,189	1,827	1,534	35,250	47
Williams College	42,147	4,683			46,830	150
Worcester Junior College	47,250	5,250	3,500	2,000	58,000	170
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	250,076	27,786	12,000	1,588	291,450	335
Total, 78 institutions	8,667,096	963,014	356,794	167,127	10,154,031	18,206
MICHIGAN						
Adrian College	33,300	3,700	3,000	2,000	42,000	55
Albion College	87,480	9,720	2,000	800	100,000	200
Alma College	90,000	10,000			100,000	130
Alpena Community College	18,672	2,074	773	981	22,500	58
Aquinas College	28,710	3,190	7,000	1,600	40,500	70
Calvin College	109,440	12,160	14,000		135,600	218
Calvin Theological Seminary	6,480	720	1,200	100	8,500	17
Central Michigan University	388,575	43,175	8,000	38,000	477,750	803
Lake Michigan College	4,500	500			5,000	10
Cleary College				1,395	1,395	2
Davenport College of Business	49,500	5,500			55,000	99
Delta College	21,420	2,380	1,700		25,500	85
Detroit Bible College	4,856	540		604	6,000	16
Detroit College of Law	13,725	1,525	450	200	15,900	22
Detroit Institute of Technology	22,690	2,522	2,288		27,500	50
Eastern Michigan University	426,219	47,358	14,000	39,000	526,577	922
Andrews University	36,900	4,100	11,000	5,000	57,000	100
Ferris Institute	138,600	15,400	31,000	2,200	187,200	473
Flint Community College	28,935	3,215	3,000	1,000	36,150	90
Grand Rapids Baptist Theological Seminary				336	336	
Grand Rapids Junior College	18,225	2,025	4,000	750	25,000	65
Grand Valley State College	45,000	5,000			50,000	128
Henry Ford Community College	13,990	1,555	1,500	870	17,915	39
Hillsdale College	127,350	14,150	1,500		143,000	210
Hope College	81,000	9,000	10,000		100,000	250
Jackson Community College			1,000	16,000	17,000	40
Kalamazoo College	62,235	6,915	4,950	1,000	75,100	447
Kellogg Community College	3,196	355	74	275	3,900	10
Lansing Community College	28,682	3,187	810	321	33,000	75
Madonna College	12,091	1,343	865	701	15,000	43
Marygrove College	57,870	6,430	6,000	2,000	72,300	103
Mercy College	89,959	9,995	4,000	846	104,800	144
Merrill Palmer Institute	3,015	355	100	350	3,820	16
Michigan Christian Junior College	58,132	6,459	2,500	501	67,592	110
Michigan Technological University	191,995	21,335	11,958	15,824	241,112	342
Michigan State University of Agriculture	1,130,917	125,658	93,425	10,000	1,360,000	3,050
Nazareth College	9,000	1,000			10,000	20
North Central Michigan College	4,269	474	230	27	5,000	20
Northern Michigan College	222,300	24,700	2,940		249,940	485
Northwestern Michigan College	18,000	2,000	500	250	20,750	40
Olivet College	48,177	5,353	3,000	2,970	59,500	85
Owosso College	15,435	1,715	500	650	18,300	42
Port Huron Junior College	4,743	527	325	1,301	6,896	36
Spring Arbor College	83,329	9,259	1,500		94,088	202
Suomi College	34,020	3,780	2,000	200	40,000	80
University of Detroit	222,300	24,700	59,000	39,000	345,000	480
University of Michigan	1,082,500	120,278	75,000		1,277,778	1,900
Oakland Community College	144,000	16,000			160,000	800
Saginaw Valley College	9,000	1,000			10,000	20
Lewis Business College	10,859	1,206			12,065	
Wayne State University	492,300	54,700	40,000	10,000	597,000	996
Western Michigan University	440,000	48,889	39,722	1,000	529,611	1,061
Western Theological Seminary	4,500	500			5,000	20
Concordia Lutheran Junior College	7,853	872		1,275	10,000	20
Oakland University	294,930	32,770	10,000	2,800	340,500	690
Total, 55 institutions	6,581,174	731,264	476,810	202,127	7,991,375	15,489
MINNESOTA						
Augsburg College and Theological Seminary	263,905	29,323	10,000	6,872	310,100	550
Austin Junior College	2,898	322	350	1,430	5,000	16
Bemidji State College	482,100	53,567	6,000	5,000	546,667	1,050
Bethany Lutheran College	13,113	1,458	320	109	15,000	108
Bethel College and Seminary	51,840	5,760	2,000		59,600	80
Brainerd Junior College	2,700	300			3,000	25
Carleton College	83,340	9,260	400	2,000	95,000	150
College of St. Benedict	66,330	7,370	3,200	100	77,000	220
College of St. Catherine	81,387	9,043	7,500	6,500	104,430	155
College of St. Scholastica	66,600	7,400	18,800	6,500	99,300	125
College of St. Theresa	56,700	6,300	3,000	2,000	68,000	170
College of St. Thomas	220,548	24,505	4,800	147	250,000	430
Concordia College at Moorhead	338,940	37,660	26,000		402,600	671
Concordia College at St. Paul	38,911	4,323	500	1,466	45,200	76
Crosier Seminary	2,720	302	200	908	4,130	7
Fergus Falls State Junior College	5,400	600			6,000	24
Gustavus Adolphus College	180,774	20,086	15,000	4,140	220,000	430

See footnote at end of table.



## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MINNESOTA—continued						
Hamline University	\$157,500	\$17,500	\$5,500	\$1,500	\$182,000	300
Hibbing Junior College				1,000	1,000	3
Itasca Junior College	6,003	667	408	922	8,000	20
Macalester College	126,900	14,100	8,000	1,000	150,000	250
MacPhail College of Music	8,428	937	360	25	9,750	29
Mankato State College	339,300	37,700	30,000	37,552	444,552	516
Minneapolis School of Art	9,000	1,000	156	2,144	12,300	35
Minnesota Bible College				125	125	
Moorhead State College	369,000	41,000	15,000	8,000	433,000	802
North Central Bible College	26,073	2,897	3,125	9,655	41,750	125
Northwestern College	18,000	2,000			20,000	40
St. Cloud State College	416,025	46,225	24,000		486,250	885
Rochester Junior College	18,000	2,000			20,000	66
St. John's University	139,590	15,510	1,500	5,000	161,600	282
St. Mary's College	113,165	12,574	3,100	1,161	130,000	200
St. Olaf College	270,000	30,000	6,000	39,000	345,000	610
St. Paul Bible College	21,307	2,368	6,000		29,675	115
University of Minnesota at Minneapolis	1,019,500	113,278	165,000	50,000	1,347,778	2,900
University of Minnesota at Duluth	154,173	17,130	14,400	14,297	200,000	380
Virginia Junior College	10,800	1,200			12,000	40
Winona State College	219,708	24,412	20,000	4,880	269,000	465
Willmar Community College	9,450	1,050			10,500	22
Worthington Junior College	32,400	3,600	1,500	500	38,000	90
Total, 40 institutions	5,442,528	604,727	402,119	219,933	6,669,307	12,462
MISSISSIPPI						
Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College	302,883	33,654	20,041	11,502	368,080	726
Belhaven College				1,628	1,628	
Blue Mountain College				370	370	
J. P. Campbell College				2,355	2,355	
Clarke Memorial College				240	240	
Coahoma Junior College	51,489	5,721	2,500	290	60,000	200
Copiah Lincoln Junior College				910	4,250	10
Delta State College	103,221	11,469	6,380	11,930	133,000	335
East Central Junior College	24,750	2,750	2,500		30,000	75
East Mississippi Junior College	4,740	527	291	1,492	7,050	30
Holmes Junior College	10,440	1,160	300	5,500	17,400	60
Itawamba Junior College				250		
Jackson State College	334,080	37,120	3,800		375,000	950
Jones County Junior College	7,682	854	1,826	5,638	16,000	55
Mary Holmes Junior College	25,650	2,850	1,000	500	30,000	100
Millsaps College	94,500	10,500	8,000		113,000	195
Mississippi College	165,780	18,420	11,800		196,000	370
Mississippi Industrial College	20,597	2,289	4,000	3,114	30,000	110
University of Southern Mississippi	280,800	31,200	18,000	20,000	350,000	575
Mississippi State College for Women	260,100	28,900	6,000	1,890	296,890	414
Mississippi State University	561,873	62,430	35,141		659,444	1,100
Mississippi Valley State College	203,130	22,570	1,800	37,500	265,000	1,200
Natchez Junior College	31,222	3,469		309	35,000	85
Northeast Mississippi Junior College	5,671	631	1,200	298	7,800	30
Northwest Mississippi Junior College	4,320	480	200	2,500	7,500	30
Okolona College				237	237	
Pearl River Junior College	6,613	735	1,000	1,252	9,600	24
Prentiss Normal and Industrial Institute	122,254	13,584	1,137	250	137,225	255
Rust College	61,650	6,850	2,000		70,500	145
Southwest Mississippi Junior College				1,739	1,739	
Mississippi Delta Junior College	5,032	559	300	3,109	9,000	30
T. J. Harris Junior College	13,740	1,520	700	700	16,660	105
Tougaloo Southern Christian College	113,422	12,603	2,000	10,000	138,025	325
University of Mississippi	450,000	50,000	50,000	25,000	575,000	710
William Carey College	95,325	10,592	6,034		111,951	309
Total, 35 institutions	3,360,964	373,437	188,860	152,933	4,076,194	8,563
MISSOURI						
Central Bible Institute	68,756	7,640	13,604	5,000	95,000	325
Central Methodist College	40,750	4,528	6,905	6,517	58,700	140
Central Missouri State College	642,280	71,364	41,500	300	755,444	1,545
Christian College	8,095	900	91	914	10,000	15
Avila College	41,419	4,602	325	0	46,346	71
Concordia Seminary	18,000	2,000	0	0	20,000	40
Culver Stockton College	78,300	8,700	4,500	500	92,000	143
Crowder College	3,168	352	0	0	3,520	24
Drury College	38,475	4,275	2,000	500	45,250	75
Evangel College	123,750	13,750	6,000	0	143,500	300
Fontbonne College	63,680	7,076	1,430	2,814	75,000	113
Hannibal-La Grange College	67,950	7,550	1,500	1,500	78,500	125
Harris Teachers College	26,235	2,915	800	50	30,000	300
Missouri Southern College	2,725	303	83	9	3,120	25
Junior College District of Jefferson City	3,150	350		0	3,500	40
Junior College District of St. Louis	57,965	6,441	594	0	65,000	3,500
Junior College of Flat River	7,470	830	800	0	9,100	30
Metropolitan Junior College	7,785	865	350	25	9,025	50
Kansas City Art Institute	18,093	2,010	2,097	1,800	24,000	40
Kansas City College Osteopathy	0	0	0	1,859	1,859	0
Kirksville College Osteopathy	0	0	0	14,028	14,028	0
Lincoln University	71,766	7,974	2,200	500	82,500	275
Lindenwood College for Women	21,510	2,390	1,850	1,250	27,000	40
Maryville College Sacred Heart	12,486	1,387	27	1,100	15,000	30
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary	0	0	0	5,443	5,443	0
Missouri Valley College	122,355	13,565	5,091	0	141,041	232
Moberly Junior College	0	0	14	586	600	9
Northwest Missouri State Teachers College	347,737	38,638	25,000	3,625	415,000	800
Northwest Missouri State College	304,437	33,826	59,782	10,000	408,045	770

See footnote at end of table.

## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from O.E. records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MISSOURI—continued						
Park College	\$87,300	\$9,700	\$500	\$2,500	\$100,000	125
Rockhurst College	58,050	6,450	3,000	2,500	70,000	140
St. Louis College of Pharmacy	18,540	2,060	2,200	1,200	24,000	41
St. Louis Institute of Music	19,988	2,221	3,000	1,791	27,000	30
St. Louis University	666,000	74,000	80,000	30,000	850,000	1,300
St. Paul's College	3,323	369	31	277	4,000	10
Southeast Missouri State College	136,800	15,200	18,000	5,000	175,000	500
Southwest Baptist College	76,970	8,552	478	0	86,000	320
Southwest Missouri State College	150,000	16,667	6,000	2,000	174,667	306
Stephens College	55,576	6,175	3,000	249	65,000	125
Tarkio College	106,650	11,850	500	1,000	120,000	544
University of Missouri at Kansas City	146,610	16,290	28,600	11,500	203,000	625
University of Missouri at Columbia	504,000	56,000	80,000	10,000	650,000	1,377
University of Missouri at Rolla	110,700	12,300	7,000	25,000	155,000	220
University of Missouri at St. Louis	13,500	1,500	0	0	15,000	40
Washington University	348,750	38,750	50,000	30,000	467,500	700
Webster College	108,900	12,100	7,000	2,000	130,000	190
Westminster College	25,200	2,800	1,700	300	30,000	60
William Jewell College	85,500	9,500	6,000	2,000	103,000	210
William Woods College	13,308	1,479	569	4,644	20,000	25
Total, 49 institutions	4,934,002	548,224	474,181	190,281	6,146,688	15,935
MONTANA						
Carroll College	122,085	13,565	8,000		143,650	245
College of Great Falls	74,822	8,314	3,321	2,543	89,000	150
Eastern Montana College of Education	81,000	9,000	4,000	400	94,400	173
Montana College of Mines, Science, and Technology	18,000	2,000	2,800	200	23,000	55
Montana State University	188,550	20,950	20,000	20,500	250,000	435
University of Montana	199,800	22,200	5,000	3,000	230,000	380
Northern Montana College	32,805	3,645	1,050		37,500	75
Rocky Mountain College	63,900	7,100	5,300	700	77,000	20
West Montana College of Education	29,047	3,227	5,200	746	38,220	91
Total, 9 institutions	810,009	90,001	54,671	28,089	982,770	1,624
NEBRASKA						
College of St. Mary	20,569	2,285	892	254	24,000	60
Concordia Teachers College	35,010	3,890	1,100	10,000	50,000	100
Creighton University	130,500	14,500	17,000	13,000	175,000	315
Dana College	47,070	5,230	4,025	11,475	67,800	130
Doand College	42,547	4,728	7,100	4,500	58,875	90
Duchesne College of the Sacred Heart	47,096	5,344	5,260	3,300	62,000	80
Hastings College	81,900	9,100	4,500	2,000	97,500	160
McCook Junior College				339	339	
Midland Lutheran College	63,000	7,000	2,600	400	73,000	182
Municipal University of Omaha	109,800	12,200	6,000	2,000	130,000	130
Chadron State College	108,000	12,000	5,000		125,000	350
Kearney State College	81,000	9,000	15,000	12,000	117,000	304
Peru State College	27,562	3,063	3,500	3,000	37,125	105
Wayne State College	54,000	6,000	35,000	10,000	70,000	140
Nebraska Wesleyan University	64,575	7,175	2,000	1,500	75,250	180
Scottsbluff College	7,335	815	250		8,400	27
The Hiram Scott College	40,500	4,500			45,000	150
Union College	42,930	4,770	8,735	2,565	59,000	130
University of Nebraska	324,000	36,000	35,000	10,000	405,000	815
York College	45,252	5,028	2,100	975	53,355	120
Total, 20 institutions	1,373,646	152,628	120,062	87,308	1,733,644	3,558
NEVADA						
University of Nevada	145,125	16,125	6,000	1,000	168,250	250
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
Dartmouth College	280,800	31,200	60,000	8,000	380,000	750
Keene Teachers College	82,713	9,190	2,400	697	95,000	216
New England College	52,290	5,810	2,000	200	60,300	90
Plymouth Teachers College	74,489	8,277	1,500	234	84,500	195
Rivier College	45,747	5,083	2,500	2,170	55,500	95
St. Anselms College	131,580	14,620	9,100	1,900	157,200	244
Franconia College	32,400	3,600			36,000	60
University of New Hampshire	266,850	29,650	30,000		326,500	550
Franklin Pierce College	18,000	2,000			20,000	20
Nathaniel Hawthorne College	35,037	3,893		1,670	40,600	52
Total, 10 institutions	1,019,906	113,323	107,500	14,871	1,255,600	2,272
NEW JERSEY						
Bloomfield College	38,700	4,300	1,500	4,000	48,500	150
Caldwell College for Women	39,505	4,390	10,040		53,935	67
College of St. Elizabeth	75,150	8,350	2,000	4,500	90,000	115
Drew University	163,080	18,120	1,950	12,850	196,000	241
Fairleigh Dickinson University	279,000	31,000	40,000		350,000	600
Georgian Court College	14,025	1,558	1,175	242	17,000	58
Glassboro State College	99,000	11,000	9,000	1,000	120,000	500
Jersey City State College	77,130	8,570	4,800		90,500	265
Monmouth College	186,409	20,713	8,359	7,019	222,500	375
Montclair State College	193,500	21,500	2,000	3,000	220,000	550
Newark College of Engineering	36,000	4,000	4,500	7,500	52,000	150
Newark State College	94,500	10,500	5,000		110,000	250
Paterson State College	46,350	5,150		3,500	55,000	110
Princeton Theological Seminary	18,000	2,000			20,000	30
Princeton University	402,196	44,689	2,185	930	450,000	900
Rider College	74,790	8,310	7,200	5,700	96,000	265
Rutgers, the State University	434,745	48,305	15,000	3,000	501,050	1,092
St. Peter's College	78,300	8,700	7,600	5,400	100,000	200

See footnote at end of table.



## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover 1 funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
NEW JERSEY—continued						
Seton Hall University.....	\$337,500	\$37,500	\$9,500	\$20,000	\$404,500	430
Shelton College.....				1,944	1,944	10
Stevens Institute of Technology.....	144,000	16,000	10,000	5,000	175,000	275
Trenton Junior College.....	4,383	487	1,283	1,647	7,800	30
Trenton State College.....	175,282	19,476	3,000	2,242	200,000	500
Union Junior College.....	8,550	950	1,210	7,290	18,000	50
Upsala College.....	74,250	8,250	9,000	9,600	101,100	144
Westminster Choir College.....	30,375	3,375	7,000	3,000	43,750	65
Total, 26 institutions.....	3,124,720	347,193	163,302	109,364	3,744,579	7,422
NEW MEXICO						
College of St. Joseph on the Rio Grande.....	79,857	8,873	5,220	300	94,250	105
Eastern New Mexico University.....	58,500	6,500	5,500	8,500	79,000	280
New Mexico Highlands University.....	109,215	12,135	10,000	2,000	133,350	330
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology.....	14,490	1,610	3,200	300	19,600	59
New Mexico Military Institute.....	3,461	385	880	274	5,000	10
New Mexico State University.....	144,934	16,104	17,105	18,787	196,930	452
Western New Mexico University.....	58,860	6,540	3,600		69,000	115
St. Michaels College.....	58,725	6,525	2,500	1,250	69,000	120
St. John College.....	23,400	2,600			26,000	35
University of New Mexico.....	301,950	33,550	17,000	30,000	382,500	850
Total, 10 institutions.....	853,392	94,822	65,005	61,411	1,074,630	2,356
NEW YORK						
Academy of Aeronautics.....	9,000	1,000	0	0	10,000	30
Adelphi University.....	44,100	4,900	20,000	1,000	70,000	125
Alfred University.....	53,577	5,953	3,000	4,000	66,530	78
Bank Street College of Education.....	6,390	710	1,450	1,450	10,000	22
Bard College.....	7,920	880	2,000	0	10,800	27
Bronx Community College.....	1,737	193	350	720	3,000	20
Brooklyn College.....	24,300	2,700	500	500	28,000	40
Broome Technical Community College.....	28,112	3,124	1,900	4,364	37,500	75
Canisius College.....	175,193	19,466	18,000	12,341	225,000	385
Cazenovia College.....	900	100	0	0	1,000	2
City College of City of New York.....	207,000	23,000	14,000	6,000	250,000	400
Borough of Manhattan Community College.....	45,000	5,000	0	0	50,000	50
Clarkson College of Technology.....	119,790	13,310	500	16,400	150,000	275
Kingsborough Community College.....	7,425	825	0	0	8,250	45
Colgate University.....	139,500	15,500	5,000	0	160,000	250
College of Mount St. Vincent.....	28,905	3,211	300	3,584	36,000	37
College of New Rochelle.....	65,331	7,259	20,000	6,200	98,790	111
College of St. Rose.....	23,040	2,560	0	3,000	28,600	51
Columbia University.....	522,980	58,109	85,000	30,000	696,089	1,585
Cooper Union.....	0	0	0	10,400	10,400	14
Cornell University.....	454,950	50,550	55,000	71,000	631,500	945
Corning Community College.....	5,825	647	428	200	7,100	24
D'Youville College.....	28,800	3,200	4,000	3,000	39,000	60
Elmira College.....	97,200	10,800	5,000	12,000	125,000	177
Fashion Institute of Technology.....	43,200	4,800	3,000	6,000	57,000	140
Fordham University.....	270,180	30,020	12,000	3,300	315,500	460
Fulton Montgomery Community College.....	18,000	2,000	0	0	20,000	50
Hamilton College.....	47,700	5,300	2,500	5,509	61,000	105
Hartwick College.....	27,000	3,000	2,000	1,000	33,000	100
Hobart and William Smith College.....	55,975	6,219	5,793	2,338	70,325	108
Hofstra College.....	448,200	49,800	15,000	0	513,000	610
Holy Trinity Orthodox Seminary.....	2,133	237	130	2,000	4,500	8
Houghton College.....	62,352	6,928	10,629	8,323	88,232	150
Hudson Valley Community College.....	0	0	0	2,330	2,330	875
Hunter College of City of New York.....	134,550	14,950	3,000	0	152,500	195
Iona College.....	93,713	10,412	24,000	15,000	144,125	165
Ithaca College.....	618,250	68,694	25,000	70,000	781,944	1,025
Jamestown Community College.....	18,000	2,000	1,000	0	21,000	45
Jewish Theological Seminary of America.....	8,100	900	1,200	9,600	19,800	22
Juilliard School of Music.....	13,500	1,500	0	0	15,000	33
Keuka College.....	37,890	4,210	2,000	2,000	46,100	74
Kings College.....	82,816	9,202	434	7,548	100,000	157
Ladycliff College.....	0	0	1,200	200	1,400	2
Le Moyne College.....	66,600	7,400	8,000	3,000	85,000	170
Long Island University.....	268,011	29,779	75,254	20,706	393,750	530
Manhattan College.....	117,900	13,100	16,000	23,000	170,000	425
Manhattan School of Music.....	19,800	2,200	3,000	1,000	26,000	59
Manhattanville College of Sacred Heart.....	97,552	10,839	0	6,609	115,000	180
Mannes College of Music.....	18,000	2,000	0	0	20,000	30
Marist College.....	91,350	10,150	1,500	2,000	105,000	150
Marymount College.....	62,429	6,936	2,500	1,135	73,000	73
Marymount Manhattan College.....	13,500	1,500	1,900	100	17,000	35
Mercy College.....	8,419	935	0	246	9,600	12
Mills College of Education.....	20,992	2,333	750	2,100	26,175	51
Mohawk Valley Technical Institute.....	21,567	2,397	6,900	6,636	37,500	250
Mount St. Joseph College.....	43,200	4,800	0	0	48,000	70
Mount St. Mary College.....	33,439	3,715	0	896	38,050	55
Nazareth College.....	20,790	2,310	650	1,250	25,000	40
New School for Social Research.....	0	0	0	11	11	0
New York City Community College.....	1,660	184	3,388	4,918	10,150	38
New York College of Music.....	22,050	2,450	0	0	24,500	35
New York Institute of Technology.....	33,761	3,751	3,000	2,488	43,000	80
New York Medical College.....	0	0	0	4,568	4,568	10
New York University.....	580,400	64,489	50,000	50,000	744,889	835
Niagara University.....	140,850	15,650	31,500	12,000	200,000	250
Notre Dame College of Staten Island.....	13,550	1,505	95	850	16,000	40
Nyack Missionary College.....	55,710	6,190	4,000	100	66,000	170
Orange County Community College.....	3,600	400	2,000	0	6,000	20
Pace College.....	55,800	6,200	3,000	5,000	70,000	95

See footnote at end of table.

## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and Institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover 1 funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
NEW YORK—continued						
Parsons School of Design	\$31,950	\$3,550	\$500	\$7,500	\$43,500	75
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	38,700	4,300	7,000	0	50,000	50
Pratt Institute	564,300	62,700	30,000	23,000	680,000	900
Queensborough Community College	225	25	300	1,200	1,750	8
Queens College of City of New York	131,215	14,580	2,000	5,330	153,125	210
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	606,300	67,367	13,000	20,000	706,667	1,050
Roberts Wesleyan College	167,300	18,588	4,000	400	190,288	293
Rochester Institute of Technology	7,587	843	6,570	21,000	36,000	65
Rosary Hill College	56,430	6,270	5,000	4,300	72,000	120
Russell Sage College	62,100	6,900	2,000	0	71,000	85
St. Bernardine of Siena College	61,272	6,808	4,500	420	73,000	135
St. Bonaventure University	70,200	7,800	3,000	1,000	82,000	250
St. Francis College	26,465	2,941	2,850	994	33,250	50
St. John Fisher College, Inc.	51,688	5,743	1,250	439	59,120	80
St. John's University	254,253	28,250	22,100	4,286	308,889	550
St. Joseph's College for Women	20,763	2,307	3,000	3,300	29,370	48
St. Lawrence University	56,565	6,285	30,000	20,000	112,850	160
St. Thomas Aquinas College	10,000	1,111	0	0	11,111	45
St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary	6,210	690	0	0	6,900	16
Sarah Lawrence College	17,100	1,900	0	1,000	20,000	40
Skidmore College	41,535	4,615	1,000	500	47,650	78
Staten Island Community College	3,150	350	1,000	1,000	5,500	38
State University of New York at Binghamton	193,500	21,500	8,600	51,400	275,000	425
State University of New York at Albany	457,200	50,800	17,000	20,000	545,000	850
State University of New York College at Brockport	401,543	44,616	7,500	0	453,659	737
State University of New York College at Buffalo	444,510	49,390	12,000	1,000	506,900	886
State University of New York College at Cortland	331,200	36,800	12,000	0	380,000	670
State University of New York College at Fredonia	401,224	44,581	16,250	0	462,055	774
State University of New York College at Geneseo	253,134	28,126	4,200	15,370	300,830	450
State University of New York College at New Paltz	284,400	31,600	5,000	4,000	325,000	545
State University of New York College at Oneonta	258,072	28,675	8,151	3,492	298,390	530
State University of New York College at Oswego	411,300	45,700	18,000	0	475,000	863
State University of New York College at Plattsburgh	298,350	33,150	6,000	0	337,500	750
State University of New York College at Potsdam	372,150	41,350	4,000	0	417,500	560
State University of New York Graduate School of Public Affairs	24,074	2,675	125	126	27,000	70
State University of New York at Stony Brook	152,550	16,950	2,000	3,500	175,000	500
State University of New York Maritime College	65,700	7,300	2,000	0	75,000	150
State University of New York College of Forestry	73,170	8,130	12,000	4,700	98,000	140
State University of New York Downstate Medical Center	3,241	360	1,800	599	6,000	6
State University of New York Upstate Medical Center	5,850	650	3,500	0	10,000	13
State University of New York Agricultural and Technical Institute at Morrisville	66,802	7,423	6,000	2,000	82,225	115
State University of New York Agricultural and Technical Institute at Alfred	123,615	13,735	16,250	14,400	168,000	280
State University of New York Agricultural and Technical Institute at Canton	134,874	14,986	12,000	8,883	170,743	275
State University of New York Agricultural and Technical Institute at Cobleskill	78,300	8,700	9,000	0	96,000	160
State University of New York Agricultural and Technical Institute at Delhi	123,300	13,700	4,000	0	141,000	200
State University of New York Agricultural and Technical Institute at Farmingdale	83,700	9,300	17,000	0	110,000	183
Syracuse University	418,500	46,500	20,000	5,000	490,000	725
Union College and University	143,384	15,932	30,000	15,000	204,316	288
Union Theological Seminary	9,000	1,000	0	0	10,000	50
State University of New York at Buffalo	946,716	105,191	12,000	1,000	1,064,907	2,541
University of Rochester	246,600	27,400	64,000	2,000	340,000	490
Vassar College	33,300	3,700	0	3,000	40,000	80
Wagner College	128,250	14,250	7,500	0	150,000	255
Yeshiva University	331,550	36,839	8,000	0	376,389	1,000
Catan-Rose Institute of Art	0	0	0	18	18	0
Union College and University, Albany College of Pharmacy	0	0	0	838	838	0
Union College and University, Albany Law School	4,566	507	4,835	92	10,000	20
Columbia University Barnard College	36,000	4,000	0	0	40,000	133
Columbia University Teachers College	335,800	37,311	1,500	1,500	376,111	538
Columbia University College of Pharmacy	9,000	1,000	500	5,051	15,551	25
Utica College of Syracuse University	126,065	14,007	9,428	0	149,500	290
Rabbinical Academy	21,240	2,360	0	0	23,600	31
Total, 131 institutions	16,006,502	1,778,499	1,059,960	749,549	19,594,510	33,808
NORTH CAROLINA						
Agricultural and Technical College	209,250	23,250	10,000	15,000	257,500	550
Appalachian State Teachers College	220,140	24,460	7,000	2,000	253,600	512
Asheville Biltmore College	14,400	1,600	0	0	16,000	50
Atlantic Christian College	68,688	7,632	11,680	3,000	91,000	184
Barber Scotia College	8,190	910	1,100	800	11,000	44
Belmont Abbey College	14,642	1,627	1,476	32	17,777	42
Bennett College	107,204	11,911	3,285	0	122,400	206
Brevard College	16,180	1,798	1,668	129	19,775	35
Campbell College	171,180	19,020	4,300	0	194,500	354
Central Piedmont Community College	8,822	980	100	1,198	11,100	40
Catawba College	48,550	5,394	4,872	5,634	64,450	105
Charlotte College	16,961	1,885	644	1,310	20,800	65
Chowan College	57,330	6,370	3,800	4,000	71,500	110
College of the Albemarle	15,300	1,700	0	0	17,000	17
Davidson College	42,354	4,706	2,600	2,000	51,660	126
Duke University	463,818	51,535	32,847	15,000	563,200	704
East Carolina College	251,100	27,900	6,000	15,000	300,000	750
Elizabeth City State Teachers College	97,789	10,886	1,850	995	111,500	500
Elon College	84,015	9,335	7,300	0	100,650	122
Fayetteville State College	87,300	9,700	1,000	2,000	100,000	333
St. Andrews Presbyterian College	52,110	5,790	2,000	100	60,000	105
Gardner Webb Junior College, Inc.	21,600	2,400	2,000	0	26,000	65
Greensboro College	17,141	1,905	1,864	3,090	24,000	80
Guilford College	48,055	5,339	5,000	2,855	61,249	155
High Point College	39,600	4,400	6,000	20,000	70,000	190
Johnson C. Smith University	78,262	8,696	14,422	620	102,000	260
Lees McRae College	22,500	2,500	3,500	100	28,600	60
Lenoir Rhyne College	62,914	6,990	3,000	2,096	75,000	150
Livingstone College	65,700	7,300	3,000	0	76,000	265

See footnote at end of table.



## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
NORTH CAROLINA—continued						
Louisburg College	\$14,040	\$1,560	\$500	\$400	\$16,500	50
Mars Hill College	15,603	1,734	735	1,929	20,001	50
Meredith College	17,280	1,920	2,000	800	22,000	55
Methodist College	20,357	2,269	250	2,131	25,007	84
Mitchell College	22,883	2,543	2,200	374	28,000	40
Montreat-Anderson College, Inc.	11,430	1,270	2,000	500	15,200	38
Mount Olive Junior College	6,750	750	1,300	1,200	10,000	25
North Carolina College at Durham	405,000	45,000	5,165	5,400	460,565	1,400
North Carolina Wesleyan College, Inc.	41,898	4,656	1,741	252	48,547	143
Peace College				91	91	
Pembroke State College	20,070	2,230	700	500	23,500	170
Pfeiffer College	94,050	10,450	6,500	5,000	116,000	250
Piedmont Bible College, Inc.			913	2	915	10
Queens College	39,150	4,350	3,000	3,500	50,000	70
Sacred Heart Junior College	2,761	307	700	232	4,000	8
St. Augustine's College	285,750	31,750	2,500		320,000	530
Salem College	19,800	2,200		2,500	24,500	38
Shaw University	220,232	24,470	5,288		250,000	380
University of North Carolina (Chap. H.)	597,600	66,400	40,000	40,000	744,000	940
University of North Carolina State College (Raleigh)	411,750	45,750	35,000	175,000	667,500	1,020
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	109,350	12,150	4,500	1,500	127,500	320
Wake Forest College	46,800	5,200	8,000		60,000	130
Western Carolina College	140,400	15,600	4,000		160,000	400
Wilmington College	14,849	1,650	500	1	17,000	50
Wingate College	10,602	1,178	820		12,600	28
Winston Salem State College	90,000	10,000	1,500		101,500	310
Kittrell College	17,109	1,901	700	290	20,000	80
Southern Pilgrim College	1,730	192	578		2,500	3
Total, 57 institutions	5,088,339	565,379	273,408	338,561	6,265,687	12,851
NORTH DAKOTA						
Bismarck Junior College	18,000	2,000	200	200	20,400	35
Lake Region Junior College	43,681	4,854	3,965		52,500	20
Jamestown College	10,513	1,168	60	269	12,000	75
Mary College	12,802	1,423	300	475	15,000	29
North Dakota State University	398,083	44,232	25,000		467,315	853
North Dakota School of Forestry	5,625	625	100	2,650	9,000	15
North Dakota State School of Science	35,565	3,951	484		40,000	110
Ellendale State Teachers College	13,500	1,500		50	15,480	36
Dickinson State College	126,450	14,050	2,500	1,000	144,000	220
Mayville State College	40,950	4,550	7,500	2,000	55,000	110
Minot State College	55,125	6,125	3,000		64,250	120
Valley City State College	51,570	5,730	1,200	1,500	60,000	140
University of North Dakota	647,100	71,900	15,000		734,000	1,032
Total, 13 institutions	1,458,964	162,108	59,729	8,144	1,688,945	2,795
OHIO						
Antioch College	107,100	11,900			119,000	189
Ashland College	104,518	11,613	7,082	987	124,200	285
Baldwin Wallace College	360,900	40,100	20,500		421,500	575
Bluffton College	105,660	11,740	7,000	2,000	126,400	160
Bowling Green State University	386,100	42,900	46,000	15,000	490,000	1,000
Capital University	174,348	19,372	17,280	2,750	213,750	487
Case Institute of Technology	233,100	25,900	25,000	6,000	290,000	402
Central State College	299,350	33,261	15,000	13,500	361,111	833
Cleveland Institute of Music	3,981	442	500	1,017	5,940	15
Cleveland Marshall Law School	9,600	1,067	3,125		13,792	35
College of Mount St. Joseph on Ohio	59,496	6,611	6,066	2,427	74,600	130
College of St. Mary of the Springs	45,000	5,000	250	950	51,200	57
College of Steubenville	115,020	12,780	3,200	1,000	132,000	200
College of Wooster	48,438	5,382	2,000		55,820	95
Cuyahoga Community College	28,800	3,200			32,000	100
Defiance College	112,185	12,465	7,000	1,550	133,200	229
Denison University	55,891	6,210	2,500	399	65,000	100
Dyke College	15,128	1,681	1,373	2,818	21,000	30
Cleveland State University	87,750	9,750	3,000		100,500	425
Findlay College	101,781	11,309	17,550		130,640	192
Franklin University	1,800	200	600	400	3,000	10
Heidelberg College	103,648	11,517	4,235	600	120,000	246
Hiram College	84,150	9,350	4,000	2,500	100,000	180
John Carroll University	194,707	21,634	15,200	10,500	242,050	527
Kent State University	300,754	33,417	21,600	22,859	378,630	630
Kenyon College	22,905	2,545	300	3,250	29,000	95
Lake Erie College	17,193	1,910	1,500	8,772	29,375	47
Ursuline College	13,593	1,510		897	16,000	40
Walsh College	35,431	3,938	550	81	40,000	55
Western College for Women	22,036	2,449	3,225	1,290	29,000	66
Western Reserve University	362,357	40,260	12,000	11,825	426,442	683
Wilberforce University	61,200	6,800	1,500	500	70,000	200
Wilmington College	27,900	3,100	200	200	31,400	82
Wittenberg University	211,500	23,500	23,000	12,000	270,000	450
Xavier University	140,107	15,568	11,275	3,050	170,000	325
Youngstown University	108,900	12,100	15,000		136,000	295
Cleveland Institute of Art	7,331	815	275	679	9,100	28
Columbus College of Art and Design	9,900	1,100	1,000		12,000	40
Total, 65 institutions	7,566,471	840,718	534,792	266,965	9,208,946	17,424
OKLAHOMA						
Bacone College	21,510	2,390	500	600	25,000	50
Benedictine College				921	921	
Bethany Nazarene College	123,750	13,750	7,375	125	145,000	400
Cameron State Agricultural College	12,786	1,521	400	1,373	15,980	40
Central Pilgrim College	7,085	788	2,027	100	10,000	27

See footnote at end of table.

## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
OKLAHOMA—continued						
Central State College	\$189,000	\$21,000	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$235,000	600
Connors State Agricultural College	54,000	6,000	7,500	3,000	70,500	210
East Central State College	350,000	38,888	20,000		408,888	807
Eastern Oklahoma A & M College	112,849	12,539	5,374	3,738	134,500	420
El Reno Junior College	1,890	210			2,100	8
Langston University	115,920	12,880	1,200		130,000	460
Murray State Agricultural College	54,000	6,000	4,000	4,400	68,400	180
Northeastern Oklahoma A & M College	50,512	5,614	6,840	34	63,000	220
Northeastern State College	315,000	35,000	20,000	50,000	420,000	900
Northern Oklahoma Junior College	10,552	1,173	200	75	12,000	35
Northwestern State College	138,253	15,362	7,260		160,875	375
Oklahoma Baptist University	60,975	6,775	20,000	1,500	89,250	205
Oklahoma Christian College	34,718	3,857	2,200	475	41,250	100
Oklahoma City University	138,713	15,413	12,474		166,600	227
Oklahoma College for Women	37,287	4,143	6,979	341	48,750	115
Oral Roberts University	135,000	15,000			150,000	150
Oklahoma Military Academy	11,905	1,323	784	288	14,300	20
Oklahoma State University	559,800	62,200	65,000	8,000	695,000	1,340
Panhandle A. & M. College	43,650	4,850	5,000	1,500	55,000	150
Phillips University	124,200	13,800	6,000		144,000	240
Poteau Community College	5,670	630	1,000	1,200	8,500	40
St. Gregorys College	8,586	954	125	335	10,000	20
Sayre Junior College			1,000	10,000	11,000	30
Southeastern State College	212,670	23,630	6,000	3,300	245,600	600
Southwestern College	17,010	1,890			18,900	23
Southwestern State College	202,950	22,550	4,500		230,000	460
University of Oklahoma	523,017	58,113	104,208	64,187	749,525	1,040
University of Tulsa	63,900	7,100	18,500	10,500	100,000	210
Total, 33 institutions	3,737,158	415,243	346,446	180,992	4,679,839	9,702
OREGON						
Blue Mountain Community College	4,500	500			5,000	13
Cascade College	113,400	12,600	4,000		130,000	170
Central Oregon College	4,437	493	70		5,000	15
Clatsop College	6,543	727		230	7,500	14
Eastern Oregon College	115,650	12,850	6,000	500	135,000	230
George Fox College	44,550	4,950		500	50,000	83
Lewis and Clark College	153,450	17,050	13,500	500	184,500	359
Linfield College	78,975	8,775	5,500		93,250	210
Marylhurst College	13,815	1,535	850	1,800	18,000	38
Mount Angel College	26,550	2,950	1,500	500	31,500	70
Multnomah College				1,152	1,152	
Oregon College of Education	217,800	24,200	3,000		245,000	350
Oregon State University	448,043	49,782	52,000	50,000	599,825	888
Oregon Technological Institute	99,200	11,022	22,218	3,000	135,440	200
Pacific University	83,700	9,300	3,000		96,000	240
Portland State College	151,200	16,800	5,525	1,475	175,000	465
Southern Oregon College	188,275	20,919	3,806		213,000	465
Southwestern Oregon College	9,000	1,000		1,500	11,500	28
Treasure Valley Community College	27,180	3,020		300	30,500	70
Umpqua College	6,750	750			7,500	25
University of Oregon	448,200	49,800	35,000	10,000	543,000	965
University of Portland	77,400	8,600	20,000	2,000	108,000	165
Warner Pacific College	34,947	3,883	3,095		41,925	87
Willamette University	101,997	11,333	3,300	2,000	118,630	205
Columbia Christian College	20,880	2,265	180		22,825	50
Total, 25 institutions	2,475,942	275,104	182,544	75,457	3,009,047	5,375
PENNSYLVANIA						
Albright College	127,994	14,222	12,659		154,875	194
Allegheny College	175,230	19,470	8,300		203,000	321
Alliance College	27,000	3,000			30,000	30
Alvernia College	3,600	400			4,000	5
Beaver College	49,500	5,500	5,000		60,000	120
Bryn Mawr College	52,335	5,815		1,850	60,000	105
Bucknell University	90,000	10,000	20,000	11,000	131,000	260
Point Park Junior College	31,417	3,491	12,500	3,592	51,000	100
Carnegie Institute of Technology	273,508	30,389	75,000	17,603	396,500	505
Cedar Crest College	42,704	4,745	2,051	100	49,600	80
Chatham College	82,890	9,210	5,000		97,100	185
Chestnut Hill College	18,090	2,010	3,725	175	24,000	47
Christ the Savior Seminary	1,800	200	700	100	2,800	7
College Misericordia	57,270	6,364	4,000	2,366	70,000	105
Dickinson College	99,720	11,080	7,200	8,000	126,000	210
Drexel Institute of Technology	432,000	48,000	20,000		500,000	840
Duquesne University	519,199	57,689	15,000		591,888	1,094
Eastern Baptist College	42,480	4,720	2,300	500	50,000	110
Eastern Pilgrim College	16,595	1,844	1,054	7	19,500	35
Elizabethtown College	109,233	12,137	3,496	2,334	127,200	190
Franklin & Marshall College	149,351	16,595	21,120	8,120	195,186	331
Gannon College	68,400	7,600	8,000	2,000	86,000	196
Geneva College	68,715	7,635	4,000	3,600	83,950	170
Gettysburg College	156,691	17,410	4,663	2,736	181,500	250
Gwynedd-Mercy College	13,500	1,600			15,000	20
Hahnemann Medical College & Hospital				2,000	2,000	3
Harcum Junior College	16,285	1,810	1,767	1,388	21,250	25
Harrisburg Area Community College	10,062	1,118			11,180	35
Holy Family College	35,278	3,920	400	402	40,000	50
Immaculata College	29,250	3,250	3,000	3,000	38,500	55
Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia				16,140	16,140	
Juniata College	74,700	8,300	5,000	7,500	95,500	220
Keystone Junior College	26,100	2,900	700	1,500	31,200	85
Kings College	124,200	13,800	5,000		143,000	290

See footnote at end of table.



## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover 1 funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
PENNSYLVANIA—continued						
Lafayette College	\$102,600	\$11,400	\$17,000	\$14,000	\$145,000	320
La Salle College	321,368	35,708	34,936	20,988	413,000	535
Lebanon Valley College	100,008	11,112	7,925	71	119,116	180
Lehigh University	148,500	16,500	35,347	3,653	204,000	270
Lincoln University	18,445	2,049	3,121	760	24,375	65
Lycoming College	173,025	19,225	14,300	1,200	207,750	385
Marywood College	115,600	12,845	1,500	55	130,000	160
Mercyhurst College	27,900	3,100	2,000	3,000	36,000	60
Messiah College	32,850	3,650	500	500	37,500	80
Moore College of Art	8,787	976	152	85	10,000	20
Moravian College	60,730	6,748	5,722	3,300	76,500	160
Mount Aloysius Junior College				3,357	3,357	
Mount Mercy College	146,021	16,224	13,812	13,943	190,000	210
Muhlenberg College	125,570	13,952	450	10,028	160,000	275
Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture	111,870	12,430	11,800	7,900	144,000	180
Peirce Junior College	10,800	1,200			12,000	30
Pennsylvania Military College	108,440	12,049	13,011	1,500	135,000	270
Pennsylvania College of Optometry				2,317	2,317	
Pennsylvania State University	800,000	88,889	71,111	10,000	970,000	1,480
Philadelphia College of Osteopathy			5,466	4,534	10,000	10
Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science	73,080	8,120	5,000	2,000	88,200	105
Philadelphia College of Art	47,023	5,225	1,400	4,352	58,000	115
Philadelphia Musical Academy	9,454	1,050	1,515	331	12,350	19
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science	20,250	2,250	5,000	2,500	30,000	80
Robert Morris Junior College	27,000	3,000			30,000	60
Rosemont College	10,800	1,200			12,000	17
St. Francis College	94,095	10,455	1,416	4,034	110,000	158
St. Joseph College	238,500	26,500	20,000	2,000	287,000	480
St. Vincent College	157,950	17,550	5,500	1,000	182,000	252
Seton Hill College	38,643	4,294	3,333	4,830	51,100	112
Bloomsburg State College	96,795	10,755	5,000		112,550	300
California State College	24,742	2,749	2,734		30,225	195
Cheyney State College	29,430	3,270	300	2,000	35,000	190
Clarion State College	175,950	19,550	4,500		200,000	415
East Stroudsburg State College	81,360	9,040	4,600		95,000	200
Edinboro State College	126,540	14,060	4,200	1,200	146,000	365
Indiana State College	200,000	22,222	11,000		233,222	555
Kutztown State College			1,750	7,000	8,750	75
Lock Haven State College	54,544	6,061	6,895	2,500	70,000	219
Mansfield State College	54,000	6,000	2,000		62,000	177
Millersville State College	53,550	5,950	5,000	500	65,000	225
Shippensburg State College	63,000	7,000	5,000		75,000	200
Slippery Rock State College	81,000	9,000	4,000		94,000	225
West Chester State College	97,650	10,850	3,000	4,500	116,000	300
Susquehanna University	55,584	6,176	1,000	7,000	69,760	188
Swarthmore College	40,365	4,485	150		45,000	110
Temple University	604,120	67,124	50,000	23,200	744,444	1,310
Thiel College	126,000	14,000	10,000		150,000	300
University of Pennsylvania	591,934	65,770	130,521	33,441	821,666	1,970
University of Pittsburgh	944,329	104,925	90,000	60,190	1,199,444	1,950
University of Scranton	168,300	18,700	15,000	8,000	210,000	360
Villa Maria College	52,250	5,806	1,800	144	60,000	80
Villanova University	150,000	16,667	7,655	7,100	181,422	242
Washington Jefferson College	63,900	7,100	1,000	1,000	73,000	200
Waynesburg College	49,444	5,494	3,562		58,500	140
Westminster College	88,200	9,800	7,500	3,960	109,460	245
Westminster Theological Seminary	6,300	700		1,000	8,000	13
Wilkes College	202,500	22,500	15,000	3,000	243,000	540
Wilson College	76,365	8,485	2,900		87,750	117
Womans Medical College of Pennsylvania				7,877	7,877	
York Junior College	20,144	2,238	1,414	204	24,000	40
Northeastern Institute of Christian Education	33,014	3,669	2,000	67	38,750	80
Pennsylvania College of Podiatry	37,787	4,198		15	42,000	28
Total, 97 institutions	10,603,503	1,178,169	932,433	392,149	13,106,254	23,915
RHODE ISLAND						
Brown University	364,500	40,500	50,000	25,000	480,000	940
Bryant College	68,361	7,596	11,622	11,421	99,000	260
Barrington College	59,006	6,556	4,600	1,938	72,100	146
Johnson and Wales Junior College	22,500	2,500			25,000	50
Providence College	281,925	31,325	15,000	13,000	341,250	525
Rhode Island College	176,400	19,600	3,000	1,000	200,000	400
Rhode Island Junior College	13,500	1,500			15,000	50
Rhode Island School of Design	43,312	4,813	6,614	5,661	60,400	80
Roger Williams Junior College	18,000	2,000	525	25	20,550	54
Salve Regina College	23,365	2,596	2,174	1,865	30,000	60
Our Lady of Providence Seminary	14,220	1,580			15,800	24
University of Rhode Island	300,000	33,333	20,667		354,000	790
Total, 12 institutions	1,385,089	153,899	114,202	59,910	1,713,100	3,379
SOUTH CAROLINA						
Allen University	86,400	9,600	20,000		116,000	335
Anderson College	7,650	850	4,500	500	13,500	45
Benedict College	167,850	18,650	6,000	1,500	194,000	450
Bob Jones University	135,900	15,100	45,000		196,000	460
Central Wesleyan College	18,959	2,107	1,331	120	22,517	66
Citadel	29,700	3,300	1,500	500	35,000	75
Clafin College	60,120	6,680	3,000	200	70,000	200
Clemson University	83,771	9,308	4,000	2,921	100,000	158
Coker College				2,210	2,210	
College of Charleston	41,535	4,615	500		46,650	71
Columbia College	52,380	5,820	1,200	600	60,000	75
Converse College				3,543	3,543	0
Ersine College	39,150	4,360	1,175	325	45,000	90

See footnote at end of table.

## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover 1 funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SOUTH CAROLINA—continued						
Friendship Junior College.....	\$26,910	\$2,990	\$900	\$200	\$31,000	80
Furman University.....	135,000	15,000	9,300	5,700	165,000	210
Lander College.....	24,647	2,739	682	9,662	37,730	80
Limestone College.....			3,000	2,000	5,000	10
Medical College of South Carolina.....				7,476	7,476	0
Morris College.....	104,047	11,561	9,392		125,000	250
Newberry College.....	42,962	4,773	2,100	175	50,000	105
North Greenville Junior College.....	18,273	2,030	450	1,247	22,000	40
Presbyterian College.....	84,513	9,390	2,450	1,147	97,500	130
South Carolina State College.....	44,550	4,950	500		50,000	166
University of South Carolina.....	327,071	36,341	46,588	10,000	420,000	700
Voorhees College.....	19,800	2,200	1,200	1,800	25,000	65
Winthrop College.....	137,250	15,250	15,000		167,500	350
Wofford College.....	101,678	11,297	3,500	5,000	121,475	200
Total, 27 institutions.....	1,790,106	198,901	183,268	56,826	2,229,101	4,411
SOUTH DAKOTA						
Augustana College.....	178,852	19,873	4,000	6,000	208,725	451
Black Hills State College.....	87,389	9,710	1,000	1,901	100,000	200
Dakota Wesleyan University.....	114,853	12,762	8,000	9,455	145,070	260
Freeman Junior College.....	7,011	779	200	10	8,000	16
General Beadle State College.....	64,800	7,200	3,000		75,000	160
Huron College.....	95,355	10,595	3,500	350	109,800	250
Mount Marty College.....	20,178	2,242	580	700	23,700	55
Northern State College.....	207,000	23,000	35,000	20,000	285,000	460
Presentation Junior College.....	13,500	1,500			15,000	25
Sioux Falls College.....	60,750	6,750	3,000	1,500	72,000	190
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology.....	63,685	7,076	7,386	4,978	83,125	175
South Dakota State University.....	253,035	28,115	28,500	15,550	325,200	564
University of South Dakota.....	273,087	30,343	6,000	2,000	311,430	729
Yankton College.....	89,010	9,890	4,600	1,800	105,300	195
Southern State College.....	51,500	5,722	4,000	2,774	63,996	200
Total, 15 institutions.....	1,580,005	175,557	108,766	67,018	1,931,346	3,930
TENNESSEE						
Austin Peay State College.....	152,100	16,900	8,000	2,000	179,000	330
Belmont College.....	53,550	5,950	3,000	1,500	64,000	160
Bethel College.....	81,000	9,000	10,000		100,000	175
Carson Newman College.....	64,732	7,193	4,500		76,425	140
Christian Brothers College.....	34,110	3,790	400	5,200	43,500	90
Cumberland College of Tennessee.....	21,330	2,370	100	200	24,000	40
David Lipscomb College.....	135,000	15,000	5,000		155,000	220
East Tennessee State University.....	134,595	14,955	8,500	3,200	161,250	215
Fisk University.....	128,816	14,313	7,500	2,000	152,629	225
Freed Hardeman College.....	58,050	6,450	5,500	5,000	75,000	140
Free Will Baptist Bible College.....	10,746	1,194	3,000	1,700	16,640	44
George Peabody College for Teachers.....	256,950	28,550	7,000		292,500	350
Hiwassee College.....	57,487	6,388	5,000	4,595	73,470	120
Johnson Bible College.....			141	317	458	
Knoxville College.....	53,550	5,950	4,500		64,000	210
Lambuth College.....	74,250	8,250	6,000	2,000	90,500	170
Lane College.....	48,933	5,437	580	250	55,200	95
Lee College.....	44,100	4,900	800	700	50,500	120
Le Moyne College.....	80,000	8,889	3,001	110	92,000	365
Lincoln Memorial University.....	47,700	5,300	10,000	4,500	67,500	150
Martin College.....	17,865	1,985	1,000	150	21,000	55
Maryville College.....	36,900	4,100	1,000	3,000	45,000	75
Meharry Medical College.....				5,670	5,670	
Memphis State University.....	181,698	20,177	22,610	620	225,000	400
Middle Tennessee State College.....	188,550	20,950	1,000	2,000	212,500	500
Milligan College.....				15,000	15,000	30
Morristown College.....	38,250	4,250	1,500	1,000	45,000	100
Owen College.....	37,530	4,170	400	300	46,000	90
Sierra College.....	8,788	975	190	57	10,000	15
Southern Missionary College.....	53,499	5,944	3,000	57	62,500	120
Southwestern at Memphis.....	36,961	4,107	1,000	3,249	45,317	116
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University.....	126,000	14,000	15,000	3,000	158,000	494
Tennessee Technological University.....	123,300	13,700	23,000	1,000	161,000	330
Tennessee Temple College.....	29,728	3,303	1,943	300	35,272	121
Tennessee Wesleyan College.....	70,380	7,820	2,800	3,000	84,000	175
Trevecca Nazarene College.....	63,000	7,000	2,600	100	72,700	150
Tusculum College.....	27,504	3,056	1,200	1,100	32,860	70
Union University.....	129,150	14,350	3,500	1,000	148,000	295
University of Chattanooga.....	61,425	6,825	10,000	1,000	79,250	155
University of the South.....	126,000	14,000	10,000		150,000	265
University of Tennessee.....	335,853	37,317	70,000	6,830	450,000	920
Vanderbilt University.....	415,916	46,213	30,967	16,904	510,000	600
William J. Bryan College.....	9,000	1,000	3,225	1,775	15,000	40
Henderson Business College, Inc.....	1,397	155	2,106	442	4,100	15
McKenzie College.....	90,000	10,000			100,000	200
Griggs Business College.....	11,304	1,256		400	12,960	24
Steed College of Technology.....	6,365	707	928		8,000	20
Total, 47 institutions.....	3,763,245	418,139	305,091	101,226	4,587,701	8,734
TEXAS						
Abilene Christian College.....	304,731	33,859	24,742	9,208	372,540	646
Texas A. & M. College.....	42,160	4,685	24,750	18,405	90,000	300
Arlington State College.....				2,500	2,500	3
Austin College.....	62,311	6,924	6,032	4,733	80,000	200
Baylor University.....	473,400	52,600	24,000		550,000	775
Bishop College.....	279,900	31,100	4,000		315,000	815
Blinn College.....	43,695	4,855	10,000	10,000	68,550	154

See footnote at end of table.



## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
TEXAS—continued						
Butler College	\$26,100	\$2,900	\$1,000		\$30,000	86
Cisco Junior College	20,790	2,310	900	\$4,000	28,000	40
Clarendon Junior College				284	284	
Dallas Baptist College	36,000	4,000			40,000	150
Del Mar College	30,240	3,360	500	600	34,700	66
East Texas Baptist College	94,230	10,470	8,000	3,500	116,200	295
East Texas State University	87,252	9,695	1,051		97,998	230
Hardin Simmons University	225,000	25,000	30,000	5,000	285,000	540
Henderson County Junior College	38,198	4,244	6,000		48,442	157
Hill Junior College	8,048	894	319	139	9,400	45
Howard County Junior College	4,680	520	850	6,300	12,350	26
Howard Payne College	139,500	15,500	15,000	5,000	175,000	290
Huston Tillotson College	80,820	8,980	5,200	5,000	100,000	255
Incarinate Word College	60,202	6,689	12,334	10,775	90,000	110
Jacksonville College	13,932	1,548	800	700	16,980	34
Jarvis Christian College	238,675	26,519	18,000		283,194	450
Lamar State College	90,000	10,000	39,038	962	140,000	219
Lee College	13,336	1,482	2,500	932	18,250	35
Letourneau College	76,050	8,450	500		85,000	200
Lon Morris College	17,955	1,995	3,000	3,300	26,250	50
Lubbock Christian College	52,470	5,830	3,500	9,200	71,000	120
Mary Allen College				11	11	
Mary Hardin Baylor College	55,575	6,175	5,000	9,500	76,250	200
McMurry College	99,000	11,000	3,500	8,500	122,000	288
Midwestern University	35,100	3,900	4,400	2,600	46,000	100
Navarro Junior College	20,913	2,324	1,200	233	24,670	55
North Texas State University	44,493	4,944	17,800	13,175	80,412	129
Our Lady of the Lake College	85,500	9,500	25,000	10,000	130,000	220
Pan American College	88,067	9,785	2,148		100,000	251
Paris Junior College	12,600	1,400	1,000		15,000	11
Paul Quinn College	38,337	4,260	2,802		45,399	140
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College	61,414	6,824	11,762		80,000	200
Ranger Junior College	34,177	3,798	1,200	25	39,200	95
Rice University	162,000	18,000	2,000	13,000	195,000	300
Sacred Heart Dominican College	5,179	576	2,200	3,105	11,060	14
St. Edward's University	46,800	5,200	4,300	2,700	59,000	102
St. Mary's University	200,700	22,300	10,000	2,000	235,000	310
Sam Houston State Teachers College	130,986	14,554	9,000	13,460	168,000	420
San Angelo College	21,285	2,365	3,225	2,000	28,875	45
San Antonio Junior College District	31,331	3,481	2,854	5,459	43,125	125
San Jacinto College	20,466	2,274	750		23,490	87
Southern Methodist University	198,000	22,000	37,000	100	257,100	373
South Plains College	55,125	6,125	3,500	1,000	65,750	90
Southwestern Assemblies of God	21,960	2,440	1,500	300	26,200	70
Southwestern Union College	45,000	5,000			50,000	78
Southwest Texas State College	78,525	8,725	1,200	899	89,250	210
Stephen F. Austin State College	57,625	6,403	5,045	3,127	72,200	112
Sul Ross State College	67,788	7,532	4,800	400	80,520	198
Tarleton State College	78,637	8,738	3,000	1,125	91,500	320
Texarkana College	8,512	946	2,500	6,042	18,000	80
Texas Christian University	155,700	17,300	15,000	15,000	203,000	342
Texas College	168,300	18,700	8,000		195,000	340
Texas College of Arts and Industries	50,137	5,571	12,395	12,837	80,940	182
Texas Lutheran College	36,000	4,000	4,000	2,000	46,000	100
Texas Southern University	92,250	10,250	2,500		105,000	220
Texas Southmost University	4,320	480	700	500	6,000	30
Texas Technological College	227,129	25,237	10,919	15,600	278,885	466
Texas Wesleyan College	33,097	3,677	13,700	11,726	26,200	77
Texas Western College	90,000	10,000	22,000		122,000	220
Texas Woman's University	114,762	12,751	32,487		160,000	479
Trinity University	163,012	18,113	7,000	7,500	195,625	425
Tyler Junior College				1,447	1,447	
University of Corpus Christi	60,840	6,760	5,500	4,900	78,000	120
University of Dallas	123,248	13,694	3,000	158	140,100	184
University of Houston	277,000	30,778	51,720	2,402	380,900	586
University of St. Thomas	30,997	3,444	2,151	408	37,000	95
University of Texas	256,500	28,500	65,000	25,000	375,000	580
Wayland University	71,550	7,950	500		80,000	175
West Texas State University	178,200	19,800			198,000	360
Wharton County Junior College	11,399	1,267	122	372	13,160	10
Wiley College	222,300	24,700	15,000	3,000	265,000	305
Fort Worth Christian College	30,240	3,360	500	900	35,000	65
Houston Baptist College	67,500	7,500			75,000	75
University of Texas Dental Branch				4,147	4,147	26
University of Texas Medical Branch				7,403	7,403	5
University of Texas Southwestern Medical School				5,838	5,838	
Total, 83 institutions	6,829,251	758,810	682,896	339,338	8,610,295	16,651
UTAH						
Dixie College	12,600	1,400	4,000	200	8,200	34
University of Utah	337,500	37,500	34,000	2,000	400,000	540
Utah State University	291,398	32,378	23,400	7,199	34,375	675
Weber State College	54,900	6,100	4,600		45,600	160
Westminster College	41,957	4,662	4,933	5,848	57,400	98
College of Southern Utah	80,739	8,971	15,140	5,650	110,500	182
Snow College	17,010	1,890	2,100		21,000	35
College of Eastern Utah	11,340	1,260	650	750	14,000	40
Total, 8 institutions	847,444	94,161	88,823	21,647	1,052,075	1,764
VERMONT						
Goddard College	18,720	2,080	400	1,300	22,500	75
Green Mountain College	4,365	485	3,112	2,838	10,800	18
Marlboro College	3,132	348	30	490	4,000	15
Middlebury College	81,112	9,012	15,000	4,876	110,000	190

See footnote at end of table.

## NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and Institution	Federal contribution (from O.E. records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
VERMONT—continued						
Norwich University	\$60,480	\$6,720	\$5,800	\$7,000	\$80,000	120
St. Michael's College	127,800	14,200	1,600	8,000	151,600	204
Castleton State College	62,109	6,901	4,646	11,344	85,000	170
Johnson State College	45,225	5,025	4,000	750	55,000	124
Lyndon State College	56,064	6,229	2,500	5,207	70,000	100
Trinity College	7,277	809		2,314	10,400	38
University of Vermont and State Agricultural College	369,000	41,000	30,000	10,000	450,000	750
Windham College	11,056	1,229	1,955	760	15,000	30
Total, 12 institutions	846,340	94,038	69,043	54,879	1,064,300	1,834
VIRGINIA						
Bridgewater College	66,150	7,350		5,000	78,500	145
College of William and Mary	129,608	14,408	15,000	7,324	166,400	320
Old Dominion College	54,000	6,000	4,000	1,000	65,000	216
Richmond Professional Institute	80,032	8,893	5,000	5,600	99,525	215
Eastern Mennonite College	54,900	6,100	2,325		63,325	115
Emory and Henry College	13,975	1,553	3,000	1,472	20,000	57
Ferrum Junior College	75,150	8,350	2,000		85,500	190
Hampton Institute	100,800	11,200	10,000	3,000	125,000	320
Hollins College	34,200	3,800			38,000	48
Longwood College	25,200	2,800	1,000	5,000	34,000	125
Lynchburg College	77,363	8,596	4,800	3,866	94,025	155
Madison College	83,897	9,333	4,670		98,000	205
Mary Baldwin College	28,800	3,200	5,000	3,000	40,000	100
Marymount College	8,059	896	500	545	10,000	12
Medical College of Virginia	4,320	480	6,700	6,000	17,500	36
Radford College	104,580	11,620	3,800		120,000	320
Randolph and Macon College	18,000	2,000			20,000	40
Randolph Macon Woman's College	40,252	4,473	1,475	1,200	47,400	154
Roanoke College	26,100	2,900	5,000	2,000	36,000	60
St. Paul's College	164,673	18,297	3,155		186,125	250
Shenandoah College and Conservatory of Music	14,220	1,580	900	3,300	20,000	38
Sweet Briar College	14,331	1,592	3,922	4,155	24,000	60
University of Virginia	288,900	32,100	55,800	1,200	378,000	500
Mary Washington College, University of Virginia	43,200	4,800	2,000	3,000	53,000	160
Virginia Military Institute	28,620	3,180	500	700	33,000	70
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	230,580	25,620	30,475	6,575	293,250	565
Virginia State College	229,500	25,500	10,000		265,000	600
Virginia Union University	243,000	27,000	6,288	4,000	280,288	527
Virginia State College	225,000	25,000	10,200	100	260,300	700
Total, 29 institutions	2,507,570	278,621	197,510	68,037	3,051,738	6,385
WASHINGTON						
Centralia College				7,080	7,080	
Central Washington State College	285,750	31,750	15,000	5,000	337,500	450
Clark College	4,740	527	470		6,000	20
University of Puget Sound	250,000	27,777	9,800	7,423	295,000	470
Columbia Basin College	7,271	808	1,508	413	10,000	15
Eastern Washington State College	338,220	37,580	10,000	5,000	390,800	604
Gonzaga University	159,300	17,700	9,000	4,000	190,000	425
Fort Wright College of Holy Names	22,860	2,540	1,620	980	28,000	36
Northwest Bible College	25,287	2,810	1,096	2,607	31,800	116
Pacific Lutheran University	177,300	19,700	18,000		215,000	363
Peninsula College				4,600	4,600	10
St. Martin's College	36,045	4,005	1,250	800	42,100	82
Seattle Pacific College	124,200	13,800	21,000	1,000	160,000	270
Seattle University	201,600	22,400	33,000	2,000	259,000	697
Skagit Valley College	1,500	167	20	80	1,767	12
Tacoma Community College	3,600	400			4,000	15
University of Washington	819,000	91,000	125,000	40,000	1,075,000	1,950
Walla Walla College	87,602	9,734	12,000	6,064	116,000	240
Washington State University	436,500	48,500	25,000	40,000	550,000	1,000
Western Washington State College	183,000	20,000	5,000	2,000	210,000	414
Whitman College	130,500	14,500	7,500		152,500	310
Whitworth College	182,700	20,300	3,200		206,200	304
Yakima Valley College	2,520	280			2,800	10
Total, 23 institutions	3,566,495	396,278	299,464	129,910	4,392,147	7,813
WEST VIRGINIA						
Alderson Broadus College	53,550	5,950	6,000	2,000	67,500	125
Bethany College	147,468	16,385	9,000	2,147	175,000	240
Bluefield State College	33,840	3,760	1,800	600	40,000	126
Concord College	72,900	8,100	6,000	5,000	92,000	310
Davis and Elkins College	48,960	5,440	1,500	600	56,500	115
Fairmont State College	101,200	11,245	7,555		120,000	275
Glenville State College	86,000	9,556	3,500	944	100,000	290
Marshall University	170,756	18,972	7,200	6,822	203,750	459
Morris Harvey College	142,705	15,856	12,500	1,439	172,500	379
Ohio Valley College	36,000	4,000	1,100	1,400	42,500	95
Potomac State College	46,800	5,200	700	300	53,000	100
Salem College	93,938	10,437	2,000	5,000	111,375	205
Shepherd College	91,125	10,125	5,000		106,250	225
West Liberty State College	87,525	9,725	1,500	500	99,250	295
West Virginia Institute of Technology	119,250	13,250	7,500		140,000	280
West Virginia State College	34,425	3,825	3,500	3,250	45,000	124
West Virginia University	386,100	42,900	54,000		483,000	1,040
West Virginia Wesleyan College	41,189	4,576	8,693	5,542	60,000	150
Wheeling College	75,408	8,379	5,713	500	90,000	127
Total, 19 institutions	1,860,139	207,681	144,761	36,044	2,257,625	4,951

See footnote at end of table.



NDSL estimated level of student lending, fiscal year 1966—Continued

State and institution	Federal contribution (from OE records)	Institutional contribution (1/9 of col. 1)	Collections to be re-loaned (from institutions)	Carryover <sup>1</sup> funds (from institutions)	Total loan funds available (sum of cols. 1 to 4)	Number of students estimated to receive loans (from institutions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
WISCONSIN						
Alverno College.....	\$32,133	\$3,570	\$1,320	\$2,257	\$39,280	82
Beloit College.....	152,100	16,900	1,000		170,000	289
Cardinal Stritch College.....	19,357	2,151	2,467	1,025	25,000	40
Carroll College.....	109,683	12,187	9,230	7,800	138,900	218
Carthage College.....	117,531	13,059	4,220	4,990	139,800	235
Columbia County Teachers College.....	2,520	280			2,800	4
Dodge County Teachers College.....	2,952	328		1,220	4,500	5
Dominican College.....	23,631	2,626	1,643	800	28,700	55
Edgewood College of Sacred Heart.....	5,400	600	2,800	2,100	10,900	16
Lakeland College.....	29,250	3,250	1,500	1,000	35,000	58
Lawrence University.....	136,822	15,203	7,975	2,000	162,000	360
Layton School of Art.....	23,992	2,666	1,317	2,025	30,000	60
Marian College of Fond du Lac.....	12,204	1,356		190	513,750	19
Marquette University.....	408,420	45,380	12,000	53,000	18,800	710
Milton College.....	16,335	1,815	1,800	1,200	21,150	45
Milwaukee Institute of Technology.....	4,410	490	600	3,700	9,200	26
Milwaukee School of Engineering.....	50,400	5,600	11,000		67,000	100
Mount Mary College.....	5,557	618	6,500	8,500	21,175	26
Mount Senario College.....	22,500	2,500			25,000	33
Northland College.....	61,956	6,884	2,273	6,487	77,600	160
Ripon College.....	124,740	13,861	4,000	879	143,480	211
St. Norbert College.....	92,700	10,300	12,000		115,000	175
Stout State University.....	106,200	11,800	7,000		125,000	345
University of Wisconsin, Madison.....	994,500	110,500	50,000	65,000	1,220,000	1,600
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.....	180,000	20,000	10,000		210,000	390
Viterbo College.....	23,054	2,562	1,500	1,204	28,320	41
Wisconsin State University, Eau Claire.....	118,346	13,150	6,000	3,504	141,000	360
Wisconsin State University, La Crosse.....	63,450	7,050	5,500	4,000	80,000	157
Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh.....	146,746	16,305	5,600	11,349	180,000	310
Wisconsin State University, River Falls.....	126,000	14,000	3,000		143,000	286
Wisconsin State University, Stevens Point.....	166,500	18,500	6,000	4,000	195,000	442
Wisconsin State University, Superior.....	78,327	8,704	2,300	5,389	94,720	185
Wisconsin State University, Whitewater.....	181,800	20,200	15,000	8,000	225,000	477
Wisconsin State University, Platteville.....	84,870	9,430	11,700	6,000	112,000	255
Wood County Teachers College.....				162	162	0
Total, 35 institutions.....	8,724,386	413,825	207,245	207,871	4,553,237	7,775
WYOMING						
Casper College.....	19,500	2,166	1,372	1,962	25,000	50
Northwest Community College.....				564	564	
University of Wyoming.....	227,700	25,300	20,000	2,000	275,000	510
Total, 3 institutions.....	247,200	27,466	21,372	4,526	300,564	560
GUAM						
College of Guam.....				2,035	2,035	4
PUERTO RICO						
Catholic University of Puerto Rico.....	253,350	28,150	10,000	21,000	312,500	700
College of the Sacred Heart.....	10,584	1,176		740	12,500	25
Inter American University of Puerto Rico.....	216,000	24,000	10,000		250,000	525
Puerto Rico Junior College.....	44,066	4,896	982	56	50,000	150
University of Puerto Rico.....	360,000	40,000	80,000		480,000	1,700
Total, 5 institutions.....	884,000	98,222	100,982	21,796	1,105,000	3,100
VIRGIN ISLANDS						
College of the Virgin Islands.....	9,000	1,000			10,000	20
Total, 1,687 institutions.....	178,900,471	19,877,900	13,740,217	6,488,255	219,006,843	408,809

<sup>1</sup> Retained funds for loans from previous allocations and collections.

NOTE.—Estimated average loan, \$536.

Source: Program Studies and Services Branch, Division of Student Financial Aid, Bureau of Higher Education, Office of Education.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. YARBOROUGH addressed the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have two commitments, one to the Senator from New York and one to the Senator from Texas. I made the first to the Senator from New York that I would yield to him, although I am willing to yield the floor. I yield to the Senator from New York and then, afterwards, to the Senator from Texas; but the Senator from Texas may wish me to yield to him, or take the floor in his own right—I do not know whether he wishes to ask me questions on my statement. Of course, that is up to his discretion, but as of now, let me say to the Senator from Texas that I am morally and ethically bound to yield at this moment to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I will take only a few minutes. As I am the ranking Republican member on the committee, what I have to say would perhaps fit in at this point.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I wish to yield to the Senator from New York. Before he says a word, let me say that it is not agreement for which I ask, on the views which I have expressed this afternoon. I am asking only that committee members proceed to study the subject in light of the criticisms I have made of some of the cuts.

Once again, let me thank the Senator from New York, who is the ranking Republican member of the full committee. I also wish to thank the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the ranking member of the Education Subcommittee

who is in the Chamber, for his unfailing cooperation with me, even though we find ourselves in some disagreement on some issues, but never on the objectives that we mutually have in mind.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon and say to him that he is rendering a valuable service to the Senate in what he is doing for the Nation in the field of education. To me, it is extraordinary—and I have stated this before—how, in this particular area, the education field, he bespeaks the broad consensus of the Nation and the highest interests of our people. It involves not merely the controversy which he sometimes gets into on other subjects—more power to him that he is willing to take them on—but in the field of education, it is extraordinary the degree of con-

currence and unanimity which the Senator from Oregon has created. To me, it is one of the finest services he renders to us in the Senate.

Mr. President, I should like to make clear that although we are in a grave situation internationally, we are also a very powerful Nation. I consider that what the Senator from Oregon is asking us to do, in which I join him—is as essential to the national security as any appropriation for any war of defense in which we are engaged anywhere in the world.

We are able to do it. The National Planning Association, the CED, and other objective organizations have made that clear.

However the Senator from Oregon and I may differ, whether it be on Vietnam or any other subject, one thing we are together. That is that in this field of education we can do what needs to be done and we dare not do otherwise.

First and foremost, I join with my colleague [Mr. MORSE] and the other colleagues who have or will speak on the subject.

Second, I wish to say, as the ranking minority member on the committee, I shall do everything I can to see that we accomplish these objectives.

As a Senator from the largest taxpaying State in the Nation, let me say that I shall lend my voice and my vote to footing the bill.

Last year, in enacting the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, and other legislation expanding educational opportunities, this Congress rightfully earned the sobriquet of the "education Congress." This year, unless we successfully repel the assaults on this carefully erected structure of education laws by the administration's budget and legislative proposals, that crown will become very much tarnished. And the Nation's children will be the losers.

The administration, for example, is advocating extensive reductions in the amounts authorized in the Higher Education Act of 1965—cuts, for instance, of more than half in grants to States for community service and continuing education—title I; library assistance—title II; fellowships for teachers—title V; and financial assistance for the improvement of undergraduate instruction—title VI.

In a shortsighted effort to shift the National Defense Education Act student loan program to the newly authorized loan guarantee program, the administration—as I detailed in my remarks in this Chamber on February 23—has met the opposition of both college educators and the bankers. Yet, opposed by the two major groups who would be responsible for the program's success, the administration persists in its proposals to shift from the colleges to the banks some \$200 million in loans for needy college students.

RESTRICTIONS IN PROGRAMS OF DIRECT BENEFIT TO NEGROES

Publicity and White House public relations to the contrary, a close examina-

tion of the administration budget reveals cuts and retreats in education programs of direct benefit to Negroes. Citation of some specifics are in order:

First. The budget cuts by \$12 million—nearly 80 percent—the funds for further endowment of the instructional programs of land-grant colleges. The land-grant law—the Morrill Act—was first enacted more than a century ago during the administration of Abraham Lincoln and has been expanded in the ensuing years; its worth has been clearly established.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, in a February 4 statement, underlined the effect of these contemplated administration reductions on the education of Negroes:

We note particularly the impact of the proposed cut on the 16 land-grant institutions predominantly attended by Negro students, which involves a reduction in instructional support of more than \$1 million, representing more than 100 staff members at current rates and, through them, some 1,500 students. This is the equivalent to a 15- to 20-percent reduction in next fall's freshman class at these institutions, unless the funds are replaced from other sources—emergency appropriations from State legislatures, many of which are not in session and some of which meet only biennially, or increase in student fees and tuition. In several institutions, the Federal support proposed to be withdrawn represents the total amount of Federal funds going to the institutions. In one case, it represents one-fourth of the instructional budget.

The threat of a 15- to 20-percent cut in the freshman class at these 16 predominantly Negro colleges is an unfortunate prospect, especially in the light of the hopes and expectations raised for so many Negro young people by the promises of yesteryear.

Second. Last year when Congress enacted the Higher Education Act of 1965, title III of that measure authorized \$55 million for the current fiscal year for developing institutions. It was generally accepted that the term "developing institutions" was meant to include the many poorer, but accredited, colleges attended principally by Negroes. Title III, unlike other titles in the bill, was only for 1 year. The appropriation was \$5 million, just one-eleventh of the authorization. However, in its report on the funding bill, the Senate Appropriations Committee specifically chided the administration for its lateness in submitting the budget request and the justifications for it which gave the committee "inadequate time to study and analyze the request."

For fiscal year 1967, \$30 million is budgeted for these developing institutions; that is, 45 percent of the amount originally authorized. While the administration rationalizes this \$30 million budget request as a \$25 million increase from fiscal year 1966, the fact is plain that the second year of the program is to be cut from the starting year's authorization. The Education Subcommittee envisioned progress, not retrogression, when title III was approved last year.

This is indeed another unfortunate blow to the colleges which serve Negroes.

Third. President Johnson, in his address to the Atlantic City, N.J., convention of the National Education Association, proposed the National Teachers Corps to serve in city slums and areas of rural poverty, a program inspired by proposals made earlier by Senators GAYLORD NELSON and EDWARD KENNEDY. Testimony on the Teachers Corps before the Education Subcommittee emphasized the positive effect it would have in the many schools attended by Negro children coming from families of modest income.

Now that the banners of this anti-poverty education program have been furled, an examination of the budget reveals a cut of slightly more than half from the authorization; that is, a budget request of \$31.372 million against an authorization of \$64.715 million.

Fellowships for teachers and the strengthening of teacher education programs, also a part of the same proposal by President Johnson, are budgeted at 26.6 percent of the authorization.

Fourth. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is directed principally at poverty-related children. A major thrust of the bill is the upgrading of the schooling of Negro youngsters.

When this measure was originally submitted by the administration, the Commissioner of Education was empowered at his discretion to increase the \$2,000 family income limit which determined which children might benefit from the provisions of the bill. The Congress changed this provision and fixed for the current fiscal year an income limitation of \$2,000 plus AFDC children. However, the Congress did not delete from the bill the provision for special incentive grants for fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1968 which would give additional funds to school districts which increase their per pupil expenditures.

What has the administration budget proposed? It not only would eliminate the incentive grant provision but it has deferred until fiscal year 1968 any increase in the so-called poverty level to \$3,000. This is despite the fact that in antipoverty legislation, generally, the poverty level is considered at \$3,000 per annum earnings.

Thus, the promise of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been frustrated to the detriment of the many Negro children—especially those in the ghettos of the large cities—from poor families whose incomes are above \$2,000 and below \$3,000, a modest enough level.

Fourth. Vocational education is of especial importance to young Negroes who seek to take advantage of the still unfilled demands for trained technicians in an economy which is progressively becoming more complex. Grants to States under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 are budgeted at 78.9 percent of authorization; residential vocational schools and their work-study programs are only 38.6 percent of authorization



and the \$1 million fund authorized last year for direct loans to post-secondary vocational students will never get off the ground—it is not included in the budget at all.

#### IMPACTED AREA AID

The Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has performed a singular service by publishing a committee print of statistical tables showing the effects of the proposed administration amendments to Public Law 874 upon school districts presently participating in the program. For fiscal year 1967, if the administration proposal is adopted, 2,846 school districts would receive \$158,439,000 instead of 4,077 school districts receiving \$375,196,000, as would be the case without amendment to the law. My own State of New York is cut some two-thirds by this proposal; some States—for example, Alabama—receive even greater slashes.

But what the subcommittee print did not reveal is the losses to big city school districts expected to be eligible for Public Law 874 funds by virtue of the amendment to the impacted aid law in Public Law 89-313, enacted last year. These losses run to some \$19,078,717, ranging from an estimated \$7,587,500 for the New York City schools to an estimated \$215,101 for the Richmond, Va., schools.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the relation of the budget cut to the big cities.

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

*Large school districts expected to be eligible for Federal assistance under Public Law 874 under the "big city" amendment reducing their eligibility requirements from 3 to 6 percent and estimated entitlement of each district for fiscal year 1966*

BIG CITIES		Estimated entitlement
California: Los Angeles City unified schools.....		\$3,069,233
Florida: Dade County schools (Miami).....		873,506
Georgia: Atlanta City schools.....		860,585
Indiana: Indianapolis schools.....		448,875
Kentucky: Louisville City schools.....		209,955
Louisiana: (New) Orleans Parish schools.....		602,871
Louisiana: Jefferson Parish schools.....		219,184
Maryland: Baltimore City schools.....		1,077,323
Massachusetts: Boston schools.....		720,000
Missouri: Kansas City No. 33 schools.....		466,020
Missouri: St. Louis City schools.....		559,224
New Jersey: Newark schools.....		453,234
New York: New York City schools.....		7,587,500
Oregon: Portland unified schools.....		388,312
Tennessee: Memphis City schools.....		553,728
Texas: Dallas schools.....		472,976
Utah: Salt Lake City schools.....		301,090
Virginia: Richmond City schools.....		215,101
Total.....		19,078,717

Mr. JAVITS. Let it be remembered that this has been a long continuing cam-

paign in New York, and we feel strongly about it. In this case we are dealing with major cities in large industrial States of the Nation, which are particularly hard hit by the cuts. I do not think we can in good conscience not protest against it.

#### CONCLUSION

I close as follows: It is very evident to me that there has been no line drawn here as between conservatives and liberals, but that both have joined in supporting aids to education which are essential. This is not an area in which Government is preempting private enterprise. We have had a great bipartisan partnership in the field of education, which the Senator from Oregon has been so active in forging.

As this colloquy discloses, we have not stopped having a bipartisan partnership, but it appears as if the administration is withdrawing from the partnership. This I deprecate.

I hope very much that the resounding voices from both parties will be sounding in the ears of the President. I do not think there is any personal indisposition on his part in this matter. He is looking at it as one problem among the enormous problems of war and peace. But we must emphasize that there is a unity among forces in the country and that we are united in emphasizing the priority which education deserves and our willingness to foot the bill.

We are going to have a chance to do that next Friday and Monday, in the very moderate tax revision bill which will be before us. We must pledge ourselves to be responsible in action on tax increases which are needed in the interest of the Nation, by showing our willingness to foot the bill. I pledge myself to it.

I hope the President will rejoin the bipartisan partnership, in view of what I have said and in view of what other Senators have said, so we may drive forward and that the progress that we have made in the past in the field of education may not be irretrievably lost.

The national consensus is the same this year as it was in the 1st session of the 89th Congress in 1965. It was a landmark Congress for education. So let us keep the country moving forward once again in the field of education.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the Senator from Vermont without losing the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from New York in commending the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for a vastly important statement which he has made this afternoon. No Member of the Congress has contributed more, or perhaps as much, to the cause of education in this country than has the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, and I pay tribute to him most sincerely.

The Johnson administration is waging an undeclared war against the Univer-

sity of Vermont and the other 67 land-grant institutions.

The administration proposal would completely eliminate \$11,940,000 out of a total \$14,500,000 in annual appropriations for resident instruction in land-grant institutions. This would mean a cut of \$209,267 for the University of Vermont.

Agricultural research grants are being slashed by \$8.5 million, which amounts to a cut of \$50,502 for the University of Vermont. This is a 20-percent reduction in its previous appropriations, and furthermore, to compound this grave injustice, the budget proposes a transfer of \$67,500 from the University of Vermont Extension Service and putting it under Federal jurisdiction.

I do not feel that it should be necessary, at this stage of affairs, to battle for recognition of a tried and proven fundamental approach to educational objectives. It is inconsistent with the recent effort of Congress to expand educational opportunities.

I intend to defend education against the contradictions and inconsistencies in the administration approach and would oppose the cutting back of any funds which could well mark the beginning of the end for a program that is one of the most worthy ever to be adopted in this country.

I am also dismayed over President Johnson's proposed cutback of \$70,920 in Public Law 874 funds to 10 of our Vermont school districts. The reason for this aid program is to provide financial assistance for educational services in school districts which must accommodate the children of Federal employees.

The cutback in these funds, together with the \$10 million cut this year and \$82 million cut next year in the school milk program is a serious attack on the welfare and safe-being of our schoolchildren and is so shortsighted in its approach as to put in jeopardy the health and education opportunities of our young citizens.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Vermont on his statement. Our work on the Education Subcommittee is conducted in a bipartisan spirit, and I consider myself fortunate to be associated there with such an able advocate of better education for all Americans. It is likewise inspiring to work on these education measures with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for his leadership in the field of education. I agree basically with all that he said today about the danger of these cuts. He has long been both a great thinker and a great doer for the cause of education. He is a great leader and deserves a major share of the credit for congressional approval of the education enactments of the past few years.

Our votes were dissimilar in the matter of commitments in southeast Asia. I have voted for every administration request for funds for southeast Asia, but I

do not see that as an excuse for crippling our educational effort at home.

I do not believe that the \$10 billion a year that we are spending in southeast Asia is any excuse for denying educational opportunities for the boys and girls of America at home.

#### A PROPHECY UNFORTUNATELY COMES TRUE

Last year while the Senate was considering a higher education bill and a new provision for insured reduced interest-rate loans, the so-called middle class income loan in addition to National Defense Act Government loans which had been in existence since 1958, I called attention to the danger that the bill posed for the National Defense Education Act student loan program.

I was assured in committee last year by officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that my fears were groundless; that this private bank loan plan for middle income families was to help students in higher income brackets and this posed no danger to the existence of the National Defense Education Act student loan program.

After this assurance from the executive department of the Government I was surprised to read in the 1967 budget the following statement:

Legislation will be proposed to shift the National Defense Education Act student loan program to the newly authorized subsidized loan guarantee program, retaining the special assistance for students who subsequently teach. As a result, National Defense Education Act student loan expenditures will decline by \$149 million to a level of \$30 million in 1967.

They say "will decline." They do not say "we recommend it decline." They say that it will decline as though we were a rubberstamp to act on their orders. I say that Congress should stay here for 365 days of the year before that comes to pass.

I was astounded that this proposal was advanced. The National Defense Education Act is one of the most successful educational programs that this country has ever had. It was bipartisan, passed in 1958, when it took a bipartisan effort on both sides to get this legislation.

In October of 1957 the Russians had launched their Sputnik I and we were wondering if we were keeping up with them in scientific education. Out of that concern, came the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Up until September of 1965, approximately 800,000 students had gone to college in America with student loans down \$619 million.

Now, the Office of Education proposes to kill this great program and replace it with an untried program that lacks many of the desirable features of the National Defense Education Act.

This is a historic day. The people of Texas 130 years ago today declared their independence as a republic. In their declaration of independence, they wrote into that declaration as a cause for revolution that the government failed to maintain a system of public education. They were the first people on earth

to revolt and state as a grounds for the revolution the failure of the government to establish and maintain a system of public education.

I think it is time to have a redeclaration today that we are going to maintain what this Congress has brought out in the last 8 years in the field of public education.

Point after point has been mentioned by the senior Senator from Oregon, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Vermont. The administration has recommended a retreat in education. They have recommended a retreat from the support of the land-grant colleges of this country comprising a few colleges—far less than 100; yet having within their halls 20 percent of our students. It is a retreat from the student loan program and from help for impacted areas.

Does the Great Society mean that we talk about education but falter when it comes time to pay the bills?

I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon for opening that matter. I think this is a bipartisan matter that should call for the support of every Member of Congress who is interested in education.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a privilege and a responsibility to join with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], in a discussion this afternoon which concerns the entire membership of this body, as we consider the commitments already made—commitments which must be continued and not diminished.

It is a privilege to work energetically for those thousands of boys and girls and young men and women, who are preparing for vital and constructive roles in the complex and challenging society in which they will very soon have their careers fashioned and forged.

After I have spoken briefly, by an arrangement made several days ago, I will engage the Senator from Texas in a colloquy which will include questions and answers which will produce factual information which has been brought to the Chamber in part by the formal presentation of the effective chairman of the Subcommittee on Education in the Senate, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. President, I, too, am distressed, and I am disappointed, at the proposed transfer of funds in the National Defense Education Act loan program which appeared in the budget proposal of the President and in his message on education.

I remind Senators that on February 23 the President sent to Congress an eloquent plea for the preservation of natural resources. In his message he stressed the "consequences for every child born on our continent from this day forward" of our actions in the area of conservation. That statement is absolutely correct. But we must also recognize that in the equally important area

of education our decisions now will affect our children and our children's children for years to come—and we cannot afford, as Senators, to make mistakes.

Not only do we agree that our youth is our most highly treasured natural resource; we must also insist, as thinking men and women that your youth be given the one most necessary tool, the really vital weapon it needs, as it faces a world made complex by vast technological and social changes.

Each of the programs enacted by Congress which strengthens our educational system, which assists our children to prepare for a fuller, more contributory role in our society, is a program of conservation. Education is conservation in the truest sense.

The National Defense Education Act loan program is in the vanguard of the vital measures to prepare our youth to meet the challenges now, and even more importantly the challenges of tomorrow.

Consider the number of students who are participating in this program as of 1965: 319,075. This is not merely a statistic. These are the young men and the young women of America who are becoming better educated and, I believe, more fully equipped to cope with the multiplicity of problems to be faced in these grave and perilous times.

I know these promising youngsters. I talk with them in the schoolrooms and on the campuses, in the elementary and secondary schools, the junior colleges, the colleges, and the universities of the State of West Virginia. I shall do so again this weekend in the southwest section of West Virginia, in the hill country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield? I do not wish to interrupt him unnecessarily, but when the Senator speaks about the students to whom he has talked on the campuses of our colleges, I want the RECORD to show, once again, as I have said before, that I have come to know the Senator from West Virginia as probably the best informed Member of the entire Senate on the problems of the small college.

The Senator from West Virginia has been a trustee of a small college; in fact, he was a trustee of a small college when he was still a student at that college. That is a remarkable record.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I interrupt the Senator from Oregon at this point?

Mr. MORSE. Surely.

Mr. RANDOLPH. This is true. Perhaps I am the only person who ever became a member of a college board of trustees while still a student at the institution.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is remarkable.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have often thought that someone, perhaps my father, wanted to be certain that I would be graduated. He therefore arranged for me to be in a position to pass on my own qualifications. Perhaps that was the reason. [Laughter.]

But speaking seriously, I remember how my grandfather saddled his horse



and rode over the mountains through rain and snow. He had only three winters of schooling in his life. But he wanted to found a college. Others came to accept that responsibility with him. The college was founded, and he became president of the board of trustees and held that position for 12 years.

My father went to that institution there in the hills. He became the first holder of a bachelor of arts degree from that college. When, for understandable reasons, it became necessary for him to resign from the board, I became a member. That was in 1923.

My son has been graduated from that college. Perhaps I am becoming nostalgic, but I believe in roots going deep in this country if we are really to have something that moves forward. The institution I refer to is Salem College. I am gratified that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has received an honorary degree from Salem. I assure my friend that our student body was inspired and challenged by his address at that time.

Forgive me for making this personal reference.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is important for the record. I am proud to have the Senator from West Virginia on my subcommittee, because of his wealth of information so that he can be our source of check and reference as we consider the problems of the small college. When he comments about his being on that board of trustees as a student, he was many years ahead of his time, because I know he has been reading recently of the great movement taking place in higher education in this country—the increasing consideration by boards of trustees of various institutions of the possibility or desirability of placing a student or two on the board of trustees.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; that is true.

Mr. MORSE. This shows one aspect of the great evolutionary changes that are taking place in our educational administrative policies in this country.

This is the only time I shall interrupt the Senator during his speech. I shall continue this year, as in the past, to rely upon the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], whose devotion to meeting the financial needs of all our young students has been a mainstay to me, and upon the other members of my subcommittee to reason through the policies that are being raised by the President's budget message, to the end that we may come to a decision on the merits, in accordance with the facts. But I am sure that if the facts support the fears we have expressed here this afternoon, we shall put the schoolchildren and the young people of this country first, and any partisan consideration far down on the ladder.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Oregon. The young men and young women of whom and for whom I speak are promising people. They build for themselves, through study and in the

quest for truth, the preparation for careers which will bring them not only monetary rewards but also a sense of service. They enrich the American heritage. We must not forget that this is as important now as it was 50 or 100 years ago.

On February 18, I spoke in support of the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966. That was only a few days ago. I cosponsored that measure, as did other Senators, with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I indicated then that it was not too long ago that the masters in the Kremlin boasted that they would win the cold war by beating us in the classrooms. I stated: "We have long recognized that our classrooms, producing as they do, future generations of Americans, are our first line of defense,"—not our second, not our third. I referred to the students who are in colleges and other institutions of learning in this country as our "academic troops."

I think this is a correct characterization.

Mr. President, we must not lessen and we must not endanger funds needed for these "troops." I truly fear that the transfer of this loan program to the banking community—which I indicated earlier that we would discuss—will impair its effectiveness.

I am very grateful that I have the opportunity to engage in this colloquy with the Senator from Texas.

I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that some difficulties have already been faced by those persons who desire loans. What is the problem that faces these young people when they apply to banks for student loans in accordance with the regulations of other loan programs?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and I have been on the Subcommittee on Education for a good many years. We have worked closely on these matters. Our interests and our votes coincide, I believe, between 90 and 99 percent of the time.

We represent States which have great rural populations. There are large numbers of people in our States without means of their own with which to attend college.

Texas ranks 33d in the country in average annual per capita income. It is necessary that these funds be available if each young person is to have an opportunity to get a college education.

I have heard of difficulties that students have been having at different places in the country when they try to get loans under various private loan programs.

I have a letter written by a student in Washington who states that when he applied for a loan at a local bank in Washington, the bank indirectly, but unmistakably, let him know that he would get a loan only if he opened an account with the bank. This loan would have been under a plan operated under the united student aid program.

USAP is expected to play a major role in the guaranteed reduced-interest loan program created by Congress last year, with which the Office of Education now recommends that we replace the National Defense Education Act student loans.

It appears to me that the Commissioner of Education probably has the power to withhold Federal guarantees from banks that are engaged in such practices. However, I can foresee great difficulties in attempting to guard against them. They would be most difficult to prove. Furthermore, so much bureaucratic machinery would have to be moved before anything could be done. Indeed, the Commissioner, for these and other reasons, might decide not to take action in such instances.

In the meantime, the student would be without a loan and would have to drop out of school, thus missing his change for a college education.

I wish to make it clear that I believe most banks would not engage in these practices. Perhaps only a very few banks would. However, this is sufficient reason for treating very warily any proposal to replace the National Defense Education Act loan program with one which is subject to this kind of abuse.

Mr. President, I now read the letter which I received from a student in Washington. The student stated that he wanted to have his name withheld.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We are not making any attack on banks.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is correct. The bank has a legitimate interest in trying to increase its accounts.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The primary purpose of the banks is quite properly to make a profit.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is correct. That is the reason that people buy stock in banks. If the officers and directors of bank did not operate the bank in such a manner as to produce a profit, they would be looking for jobs elsewhere.

The letter reads:

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I am writing to call to your attention an abuse arising from the operation of the united student aid program in the Washington area.

A short time ago, I was advised by the loan committee at George Washington University that I was authorized to obtain a student loan under the united student aid program for the spring semester of this year. I was told that, if an area resident, I should contact either the Union Trust Co., or Suburban Trust for approval of a note after further processing. When I called Union Trust, the united student aid plan was explained to me as a customer service plan. It was made clear that the only way in which I would be given favorable consideration as to residency requirements would be to establish an "account relationship" with the bank. I was told that this would be the only way the bank felt it could justify the risk of possible collection of funds in case of default. It seems clear to me that the bank was attempting to use the control of funds as a coercive device to stimulate investment there. I might add that at no time was I asked to identify myself.

Union Trust apparently feels no need to disguise its conduct.

This is just customary banking practice. I am not indicting the banks. However, it shows the great difference between this so-called guaranteed loan plan and the National Defense Education Act loan program, which is an education plan.

I continue to read the letter:

The Suburban Trust Co., the only other area bank participating in the plan, has made no such demand of me. It seems likely that I will be able to secure the necessary funds through them.

The process, however, is long and involved. After having filled out numerous forms for the university, I must now repeat the process for the bank. This is very different from the procedure under the National Defense Education Act program under which I have borrowed money at another school. Moreover, at least a month shall have passed before I receive confirmation of the loan note. Therefore, I am now attending classes on the strength of the loan committee's authorization. If funds do not become available, I shall have a very difficult time setting things aright.

Under the National Defense Education Act, only one authorization was required—that of the school. Rates were lower than the united student aid's 6 percent, disbursement predictable, and economic coercion such as above mentioned impossible. Unfortunately, since there is no provision for students of economically poorer universities, and I am a student at such a school, I have little choice but to make use of the united student aid fund.

I hope you will give full consideration to possibilities for changing this unhealthy situation.

I must ask that my name not be used in connection with this correspondence.

Mr. President, I have been contacted by schools, universities, and colleges, both public and private, and by students in my State who view with dismay this plan to phase out the best loan program that the American people have ever had for college education, at a time when the impossibility of an adequate substitute by private loans is already apparent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has covered this point very well. The compelling comments contained in the letter which the Senator read are proof positive of the concern which we have in this situation which confronts us now.

This leads us to a second question which is involved here.

I have received from Mrs. Betty Hornbeck a brief but revealing letter. It gives an insight into the situation and it will take but a few moments to read this letter. The letter reads:

I wish to vigorously oppose any proposal to drop the National Defense Education Act which has provided ways and means for students to attend colleges and universities.

In my case, a divorcee who provides the entire support of three children on an income of less than \$5,000, the National Defense Education Act loan is the only means by which one son is now attending West Virginia Wesleyan College.

I interpolate to say that college is at Buckhannon, W. Va., the community from which the letter comes—

and another son hopes to enroll next fall in the School of Engineering at West Virginia University.

Without collateral in the form of property (which I do not own), no local bank or lending institution is going to loan me money for college costs. Your programs seem to be aimed at either the dirt poor or the very wealthy; surely, there is someplace in this world for the low middle class.

Would the Senator not agree that when education is at stake, the administration of a loan program should be placed under the guidance of the educator—whose interest is education and its service to the community and the Nation—rather than the banker—whose interest is, properly, the financial return for his institution and for the stockholders within it. And would my colleague not agree that a banker's approach to a loan will naturally and understandably be colored by long years in the banking community, by his concern over the stability of interest rates, and by the regulations established within his own bank as to proper procedure for screening applicants?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in answer to the inquiry by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, I wish to point out that, as the Senator knows from his vast experience with this act, the National Defense Education Act program is administered by the colleges. The Government now pays for one-half of the administrative cost. Many colleges appoint a person specially trained for this task. His primary aim is to work with the student, to determine how he can arrange his finances so that he can go to college. His interest is in seeing that the student gets through college.

The guaranteed loan program will be run by lending institutions, and their chief obligation is to their stockholders. They must make a profit. I do not quarrel with that; it is the American system of free enterprise. But the difference in primary emphasis is important.

I am not saying we should coddle students; but one of the reasons why the National Defense Education Act has been so successful is that it has been tailored to the needs of the student, and the student has received sympathetic guidance and assistance from counselors who are interested in his welfare. The guaranteed, reduced interest loan program is tailored to the needs of the bank.

This difference can have quite an impact on how valuable this program turns out to be to the individual student. The whole attitude of students is likely to be much different and less enthusiastic toward bank loans than toward the National Defense Education Act. This type of loan is not treated as a part of education; it is treated as a part of a private business venture.

Just one more word about free enterprise: At the heart of the free enterprise system is the notion of profit as a return for taking a risk. With these Government guaranteed loans, there is no risk; the banks are guaranteed a full return for their investment. Yet under their

practices, they have not been able to disassociate that fact from their usual banking practices, and they tend to treat one of these loans as any other loan from the bank. Thus, while the student is waiting 30 days to see if his collateral is sufficient, while the bank is waiting for him to open up an account—while all this is going on, the student is losing his chance for an education.

With the wide experience the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has had with small colleges—I believe he was on the governing boards of two of the small colleges of West Virginia at one time; is that not correct? As the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has said, he is the most knowledgeable man in the Senate as to the problems of small colleges and students in small colleges. With that background of experience, I wish to ask the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia whether he has had any expressions of distress from those fine small colleges which depend upon this program to assist their needy students, to whom these loans are so important, because many of them are not able to go to distant points to attend the so-called prestige schools.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct. Of course, the reason for many of these institutions being brought into being on the broad plains of Texas or in the hills of West Virginia, was to provide educational facilities near at home, instead of forcing the students to go to the Yales and the Harvards, the Columbias, the Northwesterns, the Ohio States. These are fine institutions; I assure the Senator of my very sincere appreciation of the educational excellence of those universities.

But there is a special excellence, also, which can develop at a smaller institution, where we have not only the capable instructor, but also the inspired instructor. I have seen that often, as I am sure, has my colleague from Texas.

Yes; I have heard from colleges in West Virginia. I have two letters from Bethany College. This is a splendid institution in the northern section of our State, at Bethany, W. Va. I read from a letter from the dean of students, Robert A. Sandercox.

He said:

It has come to my attention that there is some effort in Congress to "phase out" the national defense student loan program. This letter is to express my objections to this proposal.

The national defense student loan program has worked beautifully at this college. Hundreds of needy students have been able to complete their education because of the availability of these funds.

This college is proud of its collection record and low rate of default. We do not find the administration of the program cumbersome.

During recent years—largely in accordance with Government guidelines—we have reorganized and centralized our financial aid program to such an extent that one application, one evaluation of need, and one "packaged offer" (including scholarship, loan, and employment) does the job. To "phase



out" the institutionally controlled loan program is to regress and to promote inefficient use of available funds.

Furthermore, if our past experience with State and private loan programs is any guide, we do not expect that the "phasing out" of the NDSL program will in any way save the institution from endless paperwork. All such programs in the past have required much support in terms of applications and reports from the colleges.

I do hope that the national defense student loan program is continued and expanded.

The second letter is from Mr. John A. Graham, director of admissions at the same college, who said:

It has come to our attention recently that President Johnson plans to "phase out" the national defense student loan program. This note is to express my objections to this move.

The national defense student loan program has provided necessary funds for needy youngsters to attend college, and has proved to be a satisfactory program with the exception of a few schools.

I would personally appreciate anything that you could do to save the national defense student loan program.

I call to the attention of my colleagues, also, the fact that on February 17, the Southern Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators adopted a resolution, urging the Congress to continue this loan program. This resolution reads, in part:

Whereas Congress encouraged educational institutions to search out and bring to campus many students who would not be able to attend college without financial aid, failure to continue the loan programs would appear to be a breach of trust between Congress and the students and their families.

Now I return with a question to the Senator from Texas: Is the 6-percent rate of interest which has been mentioned enough to attract the banks to full participation?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. First, before I answer the Senator's question, I wish to say that I agree with him thoroughly on the need for National Defense Education Act loans now and in the future; and I agree with that message from that small college that they wish to see the program expanded.

I do not agree with the statement made a few minutes ago by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that the phaseout of the National Defense Education Act is too rapid, and that there should be a more orderly transition—I do not believe there should be any transition. I am opposed to the liquidation of the national defense student loan program, period.

The other program was meant to be a guaranteed loan program for middle-income families who had so much income they could not qualify under the National Defense Education Act. The whole record and purpose shows that this guaranteed private loan program was not to cover the same group of students who have an opportunity to go to school under the National Defense Education Act.

To return to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from West Vir-

ginia, from what I have been hearing, I should say that the 6 percent interest limitation on the guaranteed loan program will probably keep many banks from participating. I have here a clipping from the Sunday, February 20, 1966, issue of the Houston Chronicle, a major Texas newspaper, presenting a survey on that question in the Houston area. It is under the heading, "Loans for College Students More Difficult To Get Today."

It is implied in that story that with the recent rise in the Federal Reserve rediscount rate from 4 to 4½ percent, additional banks will not find it worthwhile to participate in the program. The story mentions that the Bank of the Southwest, a large Houston bank, does not intend to add any additional student loans to its portfolio, and that the Pinemont State Bank had considered getting into the federally supported student loan business, but decided against it, that it was not worthwhile. This story in the Houston Chronicle says that "spokesmen at both banks said the reason was the low-interest rate on the loans, and the fact that students are not required to begin repaying until a year after they graduate."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire article published in the Houston Chronicle concerning the difficult situation being faced by college students today in trying to obtain a loan from private institutions.

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

#### LOANS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS MORE DIFFICULT TO GET TODAY (By Dave McNeely)

Two recent developments will tend to make it more difficult for college students to obtain governmentally guaranteed loans to finance their education, this year.

One is the decrease in the total Federal funds available for such loans. The other is the recent increase in the rediscount rate, imposed by Federal Reserve.

Student loans, by Federal regulation, may not be charged more than 6-percent interest, a fact which, coupled with their long-term nature, makes them no longer attractive to bankers.

The Johnson administration has dropped its budget request for National Defense Education Act loan funds from \$190 million for this school year to \$30 million for the next.

Students at University of Houston, for example, have borrowed more than \$2 million under the National Defense Education Act during the last 7 years.

For 1965-66, the University of Houston had \$370,000 to lend under the National Defense Education Act, of which \$267,000 came from the Government. The rest came from repayment of previous loans and from university funds.

The \$30 million in National Defense Education Act loan funds is appropriated for next year, the University of Houston will have about \$85,000 available for such loans. Of this, \$45,000 will come from the Government.

Meanwhile, as the Higher Education Act of 1965 replaces the National Defense Education Act, Houston area banks apparently aren't interested in participating in the program.

The Higher Education Act was signed into law, November 8, by President Johnson with a great deal of fanfare. Loan administrators, however, had not been told how the act would be applied, even though it took effect immediately.

They still don't know.

The law supposedly makes available long-term, low-interest federally subsidized and guaranteed loans to students whose adjusted family income is less than \$15,000 annually.

Mrs. Georgia Robinson, director of loans and scholarships at the University of Houston, figures about 95 percent of the University of Houston students could qualify for such loans.

Besides, she says, the other 5 percent could qualify for federally guaranteed deferred-payment loans on which they must pay all the interest.

Under the program, students may borrow up to \$1,000 a year (\$1,500 for graduate and professional students) for up to 5 years while they are in college.

The Federal Government pays the 6 percent simple interest for students (whose family income is less than \$15,000 annually) while they are in school.

No later than a year after the student gets out of school, he begins paying off the note. After he starts payment, he pays the principal and 3 percent of the interest. The Government pays the other 3 percent interest.

The student has a minimum of 5 years to pay, but must pay a minimum of \$360 yearly once he begins payment.

The Higher Education Act guaranteed loan program must be arranged through individual States.

"We're not sure how it's going to be handled," Mrs. Robinson said. "That has to come out of Austin. The State's working on it, but they haven't come to any conclusions that we know of."

The rediscount rate—the interest banks pay to borrow money—was raised in December from 4 to 4.5 percent. The Higher Education Act, however, requires that loans to students under the act have a 6-percent interest ceiling.

This means that banks cannot raise interest rates on student loans to compensate for the rediscount rate hike as they are doing on other loans.

The Bank of the Southwest has some loans out under the United Student Aid Fund, a private loan organization that will be eligible for Federal support under the Higher Education Act. Southwest spokesmen say, however, that they don't intend to add to their student loans.

The Pinemont State Bank had considered getting into the federally supported loan business but decided against it.

Spokesmen at both banks said the reason was the low interest of the loans and the fact that students are not required to begin repaying until a year after they graduate.

Borrowers of money on shorter terms begin repayment almost immediately, the spokesman said. This makes money available for other loans and the banks get more turnover for their money.

Mrs. Robinson said she can understand the banks' reluctance, and adds that student loans offer banks no tangible security, as do loans on cars, homes or land.

John Gray, chairman of the coordinating board of university and college systems and president of the City National Bank of Beaumont, says a committee of representatives of the Texas Bankers Association and college loan officials is being set up to study the best means of arranging loans to students.

Gray said he would prefer that the Higher Education Act loans be made through banks if possible, but adds that it is "highly prob-

able" that colleges themselves would have to act as lending agencies.

They would get the necessary funds from the State, he said.

The State loan program—the Texas opportunity plan—is to be financed by \$85 million in bonds approved by constitutional amendment by Texas voters November 2. Gray reports that the first block of bonds should be sold by September.

Suggested amount for the first bond sale is \$25 million. This would finance direct loans from the State to college students, and wouldn't require bank participation.

The State program, however, is different from the Federal program in that students must show economic need. Other conditions:

Recipients must be Texas residents accepted for enrollment at accredited colleges or universities in Texas.

Students must meet the minimum scholastic requirements of the institution they wish to attend. Outstanding scholarship is not necessary.

The student must meet any other conditions which might be set up by the coordinating board.

Loans must be repaid within 5 years after getting out of college, and amount of loans must be low enough that they can be repaid in 5 years. (These figures have yet to be defined by the coordinating board.)

Ray Fowler, acting assistant commissioner of the coordinating board, believes the Texas opportunity plan will qualify as an "eligible lender" under the Higher Education Act. This will allow interest subsidies to students borrowing under the State plan.

If the State program is set up by fall, needy students will have some loan funds available despite possible bank disinterest in the Higher Education Act program and despite the National Defense Education Act cutback.

The publicity surrounding the signing of the Higher Education Act spurred student interest almost immediately. Mrs. Robinson has more than 1,000 address envelopes stacked in her office, waiting to be stuffed with answers to inquiries about the loans program.

She reports students asking about loans have increased 60 percent over last year, while the University of Houston enrollment went up only 9 percent.

"I'm just at a loss as to what to do," she said. "We have all these questions and we don't know the answers."

#### MANY BANKS WILL NOT PARTICIPATE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the controller, Mr. E. W. Bailey, of Hardin-Simmons University at Abilene, Tex., which has a student body approaching now approximately 2,000 students, but it is still a small college. The letter sheds further light on the problem from the standpoint of the small college.

It points out that two major banks, the First National Bank of Fort Worth and the Southwest Bank of Houston, dropped the united student aid fund program due to low interest.

Mr. Bailey writes in part:

I understand that such a move is contemplated by other major banks. Apparently, the 6-percent rate of interest is inadequate in the present market, and therefore any guaranteed loan program faces the probability of being forced back upon State and Federal funds.

The guaranteed loan program will not be as acceptable to students as is the NDSL program since it does not provide such equal

subsidy and convenient repayment provisions. I am personally not a strong advocate of the teacher cancellation and similar subsidy provisions, but have accepted them as Government policy to attain chosen ends. If the Government is changing its policy, I suggest that this be clearly stated in the legislation, subsequent regulations, and public information releases.

We are sympathetic with the Presidential administration at the point of balancing the budget. I am, however, of the opinion that the availability of a college education for every qualified youth is a basic need of our Nation, and the Federal Government should not disrupt the present program of aiding needy students without making other adequate provisions for meeting such needs.

At this time I have the impression that the U.S. Office of Education finds itself in a difficult situation not of its own making. I am finding no fault with them; but on the other hand, I believe they have the interest of the schools at heart and are doing all they can for us. My purpose in writing is to acquaint you with our fears and concerns, and to request the use of your influence to the end that an adequate financial aid program for needy students shall continue to be made available. Early action by the Congress could be most helpful to our colleges for now is the time we are committing student aid to next fall's students.

This is a fine letter, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

#### HARDIN-SIMMONS UNIVERSITY,

Abilene, Tex., February 14, 1966.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Last week at the annual regional meeting of the College Scholarship Service Association of the College Entrance Examination Board I learned that the President's budget included a request for only \$34 million national defense student loan funds, whereas the Congress has authorized \$194 million for the next fiscal year. It was the consensus and fear of the college financial aid officers present that this indicated a phasing out of the national defense student loan program.

Informal mention was made in the discussion by a representative of the U.S. Office of Education that national defense student loan applications from colleges were exceeding the \$194 million authorized. Therefore the appropriation of the full amount authorized would apparently result in a proration below the amount requested to meet our needs. If only \$34 million was appropriated, the effect upon college student aid programs of the Nation's colleges would be tragic.

National defense student loan borrowing seemingly has become a way of life for a large portion of our students. In view of the ever increasing number of needy students attending college, any reduction in the program would be traumatic. Tuition at Hardin-Simmons is being increased from \$18.50 to \$23 per semester hour, and we have already advised our student body that application has been made for increased Federal student aid funds to enable needy students to continue to attend here. Consultation among my collobormen in other private colleges reveals that financial aid officers throughout this area are most disturbed and concerned. We may not be aware of provisions "in the mill" to meet the situation,

but there appears to be a feeling of being "let down" without even having been advised of how "they" planned to meet the needs of our students.

It would appear that greater reliance be placed upon the guaranteed loan program. Unfortunately to date we have received little information about the program, but assume reliance will be placed upon State loan programs, the U.S. loans and similar programs. Such programs provide "hunting licenses" for students to seek loans, and are quite burdensome for student aid offices to administer and to coordinate into a unified "packaged" student aid program. Last week two major Texas banks, the First National Bank of Fort Worth and the Southwest Bank of Houston, have dropped the U.S. program due to low interest rates, and I understand that such a move is contemplated by other major banks. Apparently the 6-percent rate of interest is inadequate in the present market, and therefore any guaranteed loan program faces the probability of being forced back upon State and Federal funds.

The guaranteed loan program will not be as acceptable to students as is the national defense student loan program since it does not provide such equal subsidy and convenient repayment provisions. I am personally not a strong advocate of the teacher cancellation and similar subsidy provisions, but have accepted them as government policy to attain chosen ends. If the Government is changing its policy, I suggest that this be clearly stated in the legislation, subsequent regulations and public informational releases.

We are sympathetic with the Presidential administration at the point of balancing the budget. I am, however, of the opinion that the availability of a college education for every qualified youth is a basic need of our Nation, and the Federal Government should not disrupt the present program of aiding needy students without making other adequate provisions for meeting such needs.

At this time I have the impression that the U.S. Office of Education finds itself in a difficult situation not of its own making. I am finding no fault with them; but on the other hand, I believe they have the interest of the schools at heart and are doing all they can for us. My purpose in writing is to acquaint you with our fears and concerns, and to request the use of your influences to the end that an adequate financial aid program for needy students shall continue to be made available. Early action by the Congress would be most helpful to our colleges for now is the time we are committing student aid to next fall's students.

Respectfully yours,

E. W. BAILEY,  
Controller.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am gratified that the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has been in the Chamber during discussion of this important problem. The Senator from Montana studied at the Montana State School of Mines and also from the University of Montana. He later taught at the Montana School of Mines. I feel that the problems in West Virginia, the problems in Texas, and the problems in any of the other States of the Union are somewhat comparable. I am wondering whether the Senator from Texas will not find that if we transfer from the present system to this suggested system, actually it will cost more money.



Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is correct. Yes, I believe it would cost more money. Any saving in Government expenditures under the proposed shift would be purely illusory. Under the National Defense Education Act the student pays a 3-percent interest rate, which goes into the National Defense Education Act loan fund.

A study which the Office of Education conducted last year showed that the 2-year student loans cost less than 1 percent of the amount of the loan to administer and that 4-year loans cost less than one-half of 1 percent to administer.

Let me make that clear, because claims have been made that the cost was so excessive it would cost more than the interest rate. Actual experience shows that even though a 4-year loan is made, it cost less than one-half of 1 percent to administer, and a 2-year loan costs 1 percent of the amount of the loan to administer.

On page 296 of the Senate hearings on the Higher Education Act of 1965, this information will be found.

At present, the Government under the National Defense Education Act program, pays up to one-half of the administrative costs of the loan program which, by this analysis, comes to one-fourth or one-half percent of the amount of the loan.

With the insured reduced interest loan program, the Government pays the bank on behalf of the student at the rate of 3 percent. The Government pays half, and the student pay half. Therefore, assuming other costs of the two programs to be equal, there is a difference between the two programs of 5 to 5½ percent.

The Government will be losing 5 to 5½ percent. This is a rather unusual way to save money, it seems to me.

While we are on this point, let me state another disastrous effect of the proposed shift in phasing out the National Defense Education Act program. I hold in my hand a letter from the office of the University of Houston, which has over 20,000 students—one of the two largest universities in the State and in the Southwest. It is signed by the financial aid officer of the loans.

She writes:

MY DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Attached you will find a resolution worked out by a group of financial aid administrators which covers the reasons why we feel that the Congress has erred in cutting the volume of National Defense Education Act loans so abruptly.

Please do everything you can to restore this program before we are all mobbed by irate parents and students.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGIA A. ROBINSON,  
Financial Aid Officer, Loans  
and Scholarships.

Mr. President, she is mistaken, of course. This message from the Bureau of the Budget that, "It will be cut," is one of those dictatorial things which come from the Bureau of the Budget which I hope Congress will slap down hard by a tremendous majority. Con-

gress votes the money. Congress votes the taxes. Congress votes the appropriations.

The Bureau of the Budget has become so arrogant it says, "It will be cut."

Let me read what the administrators of the program say. Here is a resolution from the Southwest:

Whereas the national defense student loan program and the health professions loan program have proved to be both an inspiration and an invaluable source of aid for needy students aspiring to receive college training; and

Whereas students currently borrowing have expectations of being able to continue to borrow as needed until their degree programs are completed; and

Whereas the college work-study program and the educational opportunity grant program were predicated upon the continuation of the loan programs; and

Whereas it seems clear that no comparable program providing long-term, low-interest loans to college students can be implemented in every State by the 1966-67 academic year; and

Whereas many institutions have, in good faith, already made National Defense Education Act loan commitments to freshman and other new student candidates for the 1966-67 academic year; and

Whereas Congress encouraged educational institutions to search out and bring to campus many students who would not be able to attend college without financial aid, failure to continue the loan programs would appear to be a breach of trust between Congress and the financial aid administrators and the students and their families: Be it therefore

Resolved, That as a member of the Southwest Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, I respectfully urge the Congress to continue the above-mentioned loan programs.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON,  
GEORGIA A. ROBINSON.

FEBRUARY 25, 1966.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in full in the RECORD.

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

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON,  
Houston, Tex., February 25, 1966.

HON. RALPH WEBSTER YARBOROUGH,  
U.S. Courthouse,  
Austin, Tex.

MY DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Attached you will find a resolution worked out by a group of financial aid administrators which covers the reasons why we feel that the Congress has erred in cutting the volume of National Defense Education Act loans so abruptly.

Please do everything you can to restore this program before we are all mobbed by irate parents and students.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGIA A. ROBINSON,  
Financial Aid Officer, Loans and Scholarships.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have the floor and we will conclude our colloquy in just a moment. I wish to be cooperative with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I have listened to the letters and to the comments of the Senator from Texas,

and I am sure that Senators who have been present in the Chamber today recall that on February 23 the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] read a communication from the American Bankers Association indicating that the transfer proposal was not a valid way to handle this matter of student loans.

This is my plea. I believe we would be derelict in our duty to our Nation's bankers as well as our students should we proceed with the proposed transfer.

I am wondering if the Senator has any comment on this matter.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I think the Senator from West Virginia is correct. The letter to which the Senator refers was placed in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from New York at page 3861 of the RECORD for February 23, 1966. I refer to the part of the letter in which it is stated that:

It would seem that the better course would be for the private sector to concentrate its energies and attention on a successful launching of the guaranteed loan program, and to withhold a decision on the proposed change in the National Defense Education Act loan program until the guaranteed private loan program has gained some experience and maturity.

I agree with this position up to a point. I have seen nothing about the guaranteed loan program which makes me believe that even after it has gained some experience and maturity that it would be a desirable substitute for the National Defense Education Act. I feel this way for all the reasons I have been stating here this afternoon. However, it seems certain that if the bankers themselves are opposed to the move, then without question the whole idea should be abandoned, and I hope that the Office of Education will realize this and drop this proposal.

I hope the administration will drop this proposal for the student loan proposal program.

My colleague from West Virginia has referred to our students as this Nation's "academic troops." May I ask him whether he does not agree that a nation which may be sending 200,000 troops to far-off Asia to defend freedom there, is certainly under an obligation, to itself, to prepare its academic troops for their responsibility in maintaining our freedom here?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator for that question. It demonstrates my colleague's insight into the meaning of my remarks. I most certainly agree that the defense of freedom at home—through responsible citizen participation at every level of our society—is as necessary to our security as is our defense program abroad. And we have long recognized that those who have served this Nation in uniform should be encouraged to serve further as educated citizens. We have recently passed, under the able direction of the Senator, the cold war GI bill. The senior Senator from Texas labored on behalf of the thousands of fine citizens who will benefit. Surely, this action is a testament to

our desire for educated citizens; and surely we can agree that the Americans being educated today will, tomorrow, be the leaders in our battle for freedom and justice for all peoples—at home and abroad.

I am grateful for the interchange and the viewpoints which have been expressed with respect to this matter.

There is another question which requires attention. I am particularly concerned about the proposed cut in the land-grant colleges program. West Virginia University has calculated its budget schedule for the school year on the basis of receiving, among other revenues, Bankhead-Jones and Morrill-Nelson funds. The withdrawal of these funds, without sufficient prior notification, will result in the loss of 34 of the present faculty positions in the areas of biology, chemistry, mathematics, and English.

The West Virginia Legislature has already adjourned, so there would be no recourse to State funds in an emergency. The university would have no alternative other than the curtailment of class schedules. And further, the loss of these faculty members and these classes is only a part of the entire picture, since the current agricultural research and extension programs would also be adversely affected. Instead of the \$244,220 West Virginia University is now receiving, it would receive only \$50,000—and this in an era when we are emphasizing the gains we are making in strengthening our educational institutions.

I ask my colleagues to listen to this proposed cut—from \$244,220 to \$50,000. We can understand why President Paul A. Miller is concerned, why members of the faculty are concerned, why members of the board of governors are concerned, why the Senator from West Virginia is concerned, and why others of us are concerned, over the prospective loss of an adequate teaching staff. This is not merely a superficial reduction. It is an undercutting of the educational program in West Virginia.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It is an undercutting. I am glad the Senator from West Virginia has brought out that point.

Mr. President, when the National Education Act was passed in 1958, we had 1,600 institutions of higher learning in this country. Now we have 2,100. But at that time only 100 institutions of higher education out of the 1,600 had student loan funds. Today there are 2,100 institutions of higher learning, and more than 1,600 of them have student loans. More colleges and universities have student loan funds now than there were colleges and universities in existence at the time the act was passed.

Mr. President, I wish to refer briefly to a prophetic colloquy in which the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I engaged when the higher education bill was being considered on the floor. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 17, page 22692. We were

talking about the student loan program. I asked the Senator from Oregon:

Is it intended that these guaranteed loans by banks will in any degree slow down or lessen the National Defense Education Act program?

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] answered:

My answer to the question is the insured loan program set forth in the bill does not in any way signal either an elimination of the National Defense Education Act loan program under title II or amend it by weakening it in any respect.

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

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. My question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is this: Is it intended that these guaranteed loans by banks will in any degree slow down or lessen the National Defense Education Act program?

Mr. MORSE. No one on my committee has been a more able advocate of the strengthening of the national defense education program than the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

My answer to the question is the insured loan program set forth in the bill does not in any way signal either an elimination of the National Defense Education Act loan program under title II or amend it by weakening it in any respect.

For the legislative history, let me say this. Since its establishment in 1958, the National Defense Education Act student loan program has become an integral part of the institutional student aid program in more than 1,000 colleges and universities across the Nation. The cancellation provisions for teaching service continue to be a significant factor in recruiting teachers not only for elementary and secondary schools, but now for our colleges and universities as well. Other aspects, including loans to part-time students, deferment of repayment for students who serve in the Armed Forces and the Peace Corps, suspension of payments for students continuing in graduate study—distinguish this from all other student loan programs, both State and private.

As we have stated in the committee report, the requirement for student assistance is so vast and is mounting so rapidly, that measures must be taken to stimulate and broaden the State efforts which in turn involve the private sector, that is, guaranteed loans from commercial sources. To this end, we propose in part B, title IV of the bill, a program of interest reduction in State and private guaranteed loan programs as a companion to the National Defense Education Act student loan program. Efforts of the institutions through the National Defense Education Act, efforts of the States through guaranteed programs, and efforts in the private sector through such organizations as united student aid funds must all be continued and assisted if we are to make good on the promise that no student will be denied the opportunity for postsecondary education.

The Senator has nothing to worry about so far as continuation of the National Defense Education Act loan program is concerned.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I wish to say, not only for myself, but for

other members of the Subcommittee on Education who have engaged in this discussion in some depth that we are grateful for the understanding of the majority leader this afternoon. We have had sufficient time to discuss important aspects of this subject. I want to thank him for his patience and cooperation and for the interest with which he has listened to the debate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from West Virginia. It was an informative discussion.

#### TITLE VI—HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to refer briefly to certain other items in the education budget. I was honored to be the sponsor, along with several other Senators, of title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This title authorizes matching grants to colleges for purchasing equipment to improve the quality of education at the institution.

Only 15 percent of the authorization for television equipment, 26 percent of the authorization for other equipment and 50 percent of the authorization for institutes was requested.

Most important, no funds were requested for administrative expenses of State commissions. This is the first thing that should be requested, because before the program can go into operation in any State the State commission must draw up an acceptable State plan. This is a cute trick to try to sabotage this at the beginning so that the program will not even get into operation, thus cutting down on expenditures. This kind of underhanded gutting of a program should not go on in the U.S. Government.

There are other programs in this act for which requests are well below authorizations:

Community service and continuing education programs—40 percent of authorization.

Library assistance—less than 50 percent of authorization.

National Teachers Corps—48.5 percent.

Fellowships for teachers—26.6 percent.

The total request for the Higher Education Act is \$475,272,000 out of an authorization of \$647,030,000, which is 73.5 percent. This is commendable, but the above programs are seriously underfinanced.

#### LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

The budget proposes a reduction of \$11,950,000 in Federal appropriations for the further endowment of the instructional programs of the land-grant institutions. In Texas the reduction would be \$106,924 for Prairie View A. & M. and \$320,774 for Texas A. & M.

No funds, not a dime, are being asked for this program. The apparent reason is the contention that other Federal programs have supplanted this program, which was originally authorized by Congress in 1890. This line of argument will not stand up. None of the new Federal programs do what this one does—directly support instruction. These



funds are for instruction or instructional materials in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering, agriculture, and related subjects. No other Federal program does this. It seems to me that this proposed phaseout is not only unfounded, but irresponsible. The Office of Education proposes to abruptly terminate a program which has enriched this country for 76 years.

Where are the colleges to get money to replace that which would be lost? The proposed reduction is the equivalent of 1,200 faculty members. How do you go out and raise that much money at the drop of a hat?

Public Law 874 payments would be reduced from \$375,196,000 to \$158,439,000. The Texas entitlement would fall from \$33,359,000 to \$8,444,000. Education in my State would suffer greatly from this proposal.

LET US BE WILLING TO PAY THE BILL FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS

Finally, if the economy seems to be showing signs of strain, and if inflation seems to be a potential problem, which it seems to be at the present time, then let us face that fact squarely and raise taxes to meet it. But let us not sacrifice these Great Society programs. Merely having these programs on the books does not solve problems. Only when these programs actually begin working will we be making progress.

Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from West Virginia in thanking the majority leader for his interest and patience. We are grateful to him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. Let me say that the discussion we had this afternoon was worthwhile.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am deeply disturbed about several of the proposed cuts in the 1967 education budget. Prudent reductions in the Federal budget are perhaps necessary if we are to meet current military commitments in Vietnam. Yet it would be most unwise to meet these commitments by undercutting sorely needed education programs which are vital to our long-range strength as a nation.

The proposed budget would bring about cuts in aid to impacted schools under Public Law 874, aid to school districts under title III of the National Defense Education Act, and aid to land-grant colleges and universities.

The recommended reduction in aid to impacted school districts amounts to approximately \$233 million. This seriously affects thousands of school districts throughout the country. In Wisconsin alone, the present entitlement of \$1,127,957 would be reduced to \$377,462. Moreover, since no supplemental appropriation has been requested for this year's program, impacted school districts will have to face the prospect of prorated reductions of 10 to 15 percent in their current entitlements.

If these cuts are allowed to stand, participating school districts will face severe financial crises. Already overwhelmed by growing demands, they will

either have to find other funds to continue their current programs or curtail some of the services they now offer. Their situation will not necessarily be eased by the growing availability of funds under title I of the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act. For not all of the schools eligible for Public Law 874 aid also qualify for title I assistance, which is directed toward schools with high concentrations of low-income children.

I am opposed to cuts in this program. I will therefore support a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1966 and efforts to maintain the 1967 budget at current levels of support. The impacted aid program was designed to provide financial support to those school districts which must accommodate children of Federal employees who live and work on Federal property, and children residing with a parent who is employed on Federal property. The communities which must absorb substantial numbers of Federal employees need and deserve help to provide educational services to them.

The budget further proposes a reduction in the appropriation for title III of the National Defense Education Act, from the present \$79.2 million to \$54.2 million. This includes about a 30-percent cutback in funds for equipment acquisition.

Reduction of effort in the title III program will seriously jeopardize efforts to upgrade education in the critical subject areas covered by the act. During the present fiscal year, Wisconsin's equipment acquisition allotment amounted to \$1.8 million. I am advised that, as of February 1, 1966, requested projects from local school districts exceeded this allotment by \$400,000. This oversubscription of more than 20 percent indicates the urgent need for the equipment and materials provided under title III. I understand that many other States are faced with similar demands. It would be a real disservice to public education to reduce appropriations for this program at a time when it is obviously meeting a real need.

A reduction of more than \$20 million in instructional and research funds for the 1968 land-grant colleges and universities is also proposed in the budget. This recommendation comes at a time when college enrollments are at an alltime high and increasing rapidly. Between 1960 and 1965 enrollments in the land-grant institutions alone increased 67 percent, a rate of growth surpassed only by our junior colleges. In the face of this growth, there is recommended a reduction equivalent to more than 2,000 faculty members or, if put in terms of endowment, equal to a capital investment of \$400 million. The University of Wisconsin will lose \$293,929 in instructional funds—enough to pay nearly 30 professors—if this cut is not restored.

In my opinion, this is another example of a shortsighted economy.

A sizable portion of the proposed cut of \$20 million—\$8.5 million—is in research funds for the agricultural research stations of the land-grant institutions.

This is a surprising economy at a time when we are trying to tool up our agricultural manpower and technology to face the world hunger crisis. Wisconsin alone would lose \$176,452 under the Hatch Act formula for agricultural experiment station funds if this reduction is accepted.

Up to this point, I have been critical of the proposed education budget, but I fully support many of the President's proposals in that budget. For example, I am pleased that the President recommends an increase in the supplementary educational center authorization of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, from the present \$100 million to \$145 million. I am also pleased to learn that the title I program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be expanded. I fully support as well the proposal to grant educational opportunity grants to 220,000 talented but needy young people in the next fiscal year, as compared with the 115,000 now being supported. And, of course, I am gratified to learn that the President has requested funds for the Teacher Corps.

I have received a number of letters and telegrams from both educators and laymen in Wisconsin expressing their concern about the proposed cuts in the impact aid, National Defense Education Act, and land-grant programs. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have some of these messages printed in the RECORD.

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

MADISON, WIS.,  
February 25, 1966.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,  
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge restoration of drastic cuts by the administration in budget for teaching agricultural research and cooperative extension work. Elimination of Morrill Nelson funds seriously handicaps teaching programs in agriculture and mechanic arts. Cuts in funds under the Hatch Act and Public Law 88-74 will damage research work performed by agricultural experiment stations. Shift in cooperative extensions funds from institutional support to individual projects will destroy effective continuity of program. Problem is immediate and urgent since faculty and program plans for the coming fiscal year are in final stages of development with no alternate funding sources available. Your strong support of position of national association State universities and land-grant colleges earnestly solicited.

FRED HARVEY HARRINGTON,  
President, University of Wisconsin.

JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 1,  
Winter, Wis., February 17, 1966.

HON. GAYLORD NELSON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Communications are coming to me with regard to the possibility of cutting off a good percentage of the funds for Public Law 874, for National Defense Education Act, and for the school milk program. All these programs are of great concern to us here in northern Wisconsin—as I suspect they are in other communities where the income per family is very low.

Our school district for which we are directly concerned is made up largely from

low-income families. We have 30 or more children from families living on nontaxable lands. These families contribute nothing in helping to finance the cost of schools or their municipal governments. Yet their children need and deserve an education—and they need food. Some of these families have insufficient income to provide family necessities.

Much is being done in this, our country, to combat poverty, but on the other hand, the young people in our area have been denied work programs. To take away the aid from Public Law 874 means that others in our area will have to provide school lunches for the children of needy parents and they will also have to furnish them with teachers.

The programs I have mentioned above have helped us a great deal but to take them away will hurt not only the children in the area—it will hurt all of us. Our school taxes are up to the limit now but cutting down on the three programs, National Defense Education Act, Public Law 874, and the school milk program, will mean a definite problem for us.

If there is a desire to help people who have low incomes, or are impoverished, the programs as they now stand, have helped. The other antipoverty programs have not helped us in any way.

Our board of education met last evening and each member was much concerned about the possible legislation to cut the aids mentioned above.

I am sure that you, as Senator, will realize that these losses will affect your areas, too. I hope you can find it in your heart to move against any bill to cut these funds.

My best regards to you,

B. T. SMITH,  
Administrator.

MADISON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,

Madison, Wis., February 11, 1966.

HON. GAYLORD NELSON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NELSON: It is with considerable concern that we have become aware of the possibility that Impact Aid under Public Law 874 is in jeopardy. This concern is not brought on by the planned phase-out of Truax Field although that in turn is a serious problem.

Impact aid for 1965-66 school year is part of our adopted budget. It is an important income item amounting to approximately \$235,000. If we are required to absorb 10 to 15-percent loss or proration, this \$23,500 to \$35,250 reduction would further cut back our school district budget. The Madison Common Council previously forced a \$350,000 reduction in local school tax levy for 1966 which leaves us in a position where we can ill afford any additional loss. It seems very unreasonable to complete over half a school year depending upon the stated commitments of the Federal Government under Public Law 874 and then be advised that you may only receive 85 to 90 percent of what you were entitled.

Impact aid for the 1966-67 school year apparently faces even a more severe curtailment of up to 50 percent with further restriction of 3b (work on, live off) type pupils. This does not square with the intention of the law which aims at a more gradual phase-out such as is expected at Truax Field preventing a harsh impact on local school tax levy requirements.

Your assistance is urgently sought in supporting a supplemental appropriation to pay 1965-66 entitlements in full. School programs suffer from budgets unbalanced by the apparent inability of the U.S. Office of Education to meet its financial commitments.

Furthermore in the changing situation which may develop at Truax Field our school system needs the protection of an extended Public Law 874 into 1966-67 in its same essential form.

Any help you can give us will be appreciated by me in behalf of the Madison Public Schools and the 1,500 pupils who come under Public Law 874.

Very truly yours,

R. D. GILBERTS,  
Superintendent.

NEW LISBON COMMUNITY SCHOOLS,

New Lisbon, Wis., February 8, 1966.

HON. GAYLORD NELSON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: We note with dismay and alarm that Congress is considering a reduction of funds available to public school districts through Public Law 874. Unless my information is incorrect it appears that a reduction from \$416 million to the Bureau of the Budget's recommendation of \$183,400,000 is quite possible.

As a school administrator of a district affected adversely by such contemplated action may I urge you to contact the Appropriation Committee members asking them to take whatever action is necessary to make additional appropriations to avoid this loss.

As you so well know our greatest source of revenue is the local property tax. The people of the New Lisbon School District have shown their good will and desire to provide the finest education for their children by taxing themselves to the extent of \$22.70 per \$1,000 equalized valuation. There never has been any effort or inkling to exclude children whose parents are employed on Federal property from attending our schools. The electors have welcomed them. We feel, however, that the tax burden cannot become greater and loss of Federal aid will have this effect.

May we urge you to support any legislation which will insure that funds will be appropriated for continuing Federal support under Public Law 874.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT A. JUNEAU,  
Superintendent.

SCHOOL DISTRICT JOINT NO. 2,

Black River Falls, Wis., February 9, 1966.

SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: It has come to our attention that appropriations to schools located in federally impacted areas and affected by Public Law 874 are not sufficient to pay the entitlements and that an approximate 20-percent reduction will result this year.

We are also being informed that the program may be seriously curtailed next year.

This program has been a great help to our school district and it is an aid that definitely assists the local property taxpayer. We also use it in lieu of the Johnson-O'Malley Indian Act, and, of course, this is of essential concern to our school district.

We respectfully request that you consider the value of Public Law 874 and use your influence to maintain its effectiveness.

Sincerely yours,

M. C. SCHMALLENBERG,  
Superintendent.

BOARD OF EDUCATION,

Eau Claire, Wis., February 14, 1966.

HON. GAYLORD NELSON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NELSON: This is to inform you of my stand on the President's proposal to drastically reduce the appropriation for title III of the National Defense

Education Act, from \$88.2 million to \$63.2 million. In my judgment, it would be doing a disservice to public education in this country to make such a reduction at this time. All youth benefit from the materials and equipment which can be secured under the National Defense Education Act, title III, not only selected segments of the population. The job which needs to be done is only partially completed. I believe that title III funds have been judiciously used, on the whole, and a real need is being met by their availability.

Your efforts in behalf of maintaining the National Defense Education Act, the title III funds at their present level will be sincerely appreciated, and will constitute a real service to education in Wisconsin and all the States.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN VODACEK, Ph. D.,  
Assistant Superintendent.

MADISON, Wis.,  
February 15, 1966.

HON. GAYLORD NELSON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: As you know, the administration's budget as submitted to the Congress January 24, 1966, proposes a reduction in the appropriation for title III, National Defense Education Act, from the present \$88.2 million to \$63.2 million. This includes about a 30-percent cutback in the funds for equipment acquisition.

During the present fiscal year, the State of Wisconsin's acquisition allotment amounts to \$1.8 million. Projects from local school districts as of February 1, 1966, exceed this allotment by \$400,000. This represents an amount of more than 20 percent over our allotment.

The school districts of Wisconsin urgently need the equipment and materials they are requesting. They also urgently need the support of the National Defense Education Act program.

It should be pointed out that these increased requests have come even though the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is also progressing very well in Wisconsin. However, this is not unexpected because:

1. The objectives of the National Defense Educational Act are clearly different than the objectives of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

2. The National Defense Education Act program in Wisconsin continues to grow at a constant and healthy rate.

The specific information in this letter can be documented and expanded if you desire. At this point, I urge you to give strong support to maintaining at least the present level of support to the National Defense Education Act program and hopefully increasing the level of support as new critical subject areas are added to the list of subject areas now covered by the National Defense Education Act, title III program.

Sincerely yours,

ARNOLD M. CHANDLER.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, education leaders, parents, responsible civic groups and concerned citizens of California have written to me protesting the administration's proposals regarding Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. If the Congress accepts these proposals, California school districts would lose over \$35 million under Public Law 874 and approximately \$4 million under Public Law 815.

According to the Office of Education's estimated entitlements for the States



under Public Law 874 for fiscal year 1967, 515 eligible school districts in California under present law would receive \$64,704,000. Under the administration's proposal, entitlement for 374 school districts in California would be reduced to \$29,265,000.

Mr. President, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has prepared a committee print showing the impact of the proposed amendments to Public Law 874 on the school districts throughout the country. I ask unanimous consent that a table from this study showing the

estimated entitlement for the States under Public Law 874 appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

*Estimated entitlement under title I of Public Law 874 for fiscal year 1967 and estimated number of districts eligible for assistance with and without proposed amendments to reduce the cost of the program, by State*

[Data are rounded to the nearest \$1,000]<sup>1</sup>

[Data are rounded to the nearest \$1,000]<sup>1</sup>

State and territories	Amount of entitlement		Number of eligible districts		State and territories	Amount of entitlement		Number of eligible districts	
	Without amendments	With amendments	Without amendments	With amendments		Without amendments	With amendments	Without amendments	With amendments
Total	\$357,196,000	\$158,439,000	4,077	2,846	Montana	\$3,695,000	\$2,310,000	83	78
Alabama	7,327,000	985,000	53	38	Nebraska	4,456,000	2,123,000	44	32
Alaska	11,923,000	8,112,000	27	27	Nevada	2,787,000	950,000	13	11
Arizona	7,842,000	3,752,000	122	104	New Hampshire	2,148,000	1,105,000	50	29
Arkansas	2,078,000	531,000	52	26	New Jersey	9,555,000	4,870,000	177	109
California	64,704,000	29,265,000	515	374	New Mexico	8,652,000	1,346,000	44	36
Colorado	11,534,000	4,830,000	62	40	New York	9,848,000	3,254,000	174	85
Connecticut	3,043,000	1,159,000	47	17	North Carolina	4,794,000	1,021,000	26	21
Delaware	421,000	87,000	9	9	North Dakota	2,388,000	1,537,000	56	45
District of Columbia	5,241,000	3,405,000	1	1	Ohio	8,994,000	3,485,000	145	80
Florida	11,089,000	3,764,000	16	13	Oklahoma	10,950,000	4,988,000	361	298
Georgia	9,729,000	1,958,000	68	45	Oregon	2,021,000	834,000	68	55
Hawaii	7,829,000	4,609,000	1	1	Pennsylvania	7,875,000	1,650,000	132	88
Idaho	2,785,000	1,114,000	51	40	Rhode Island	3,052,000	1,547,000	23	14
Illinois	7,276,000	3,573,000	138	94	South Carolina	5,561,000	974,000	35	27
Indiana	2,020,000	672,000	86	41	South Dakota	3,137,000	2,104,000	57	52
Iowa	1,657,000	594,000	39	23	Tennessee	4,310,000	812,000	54	39
Kansas	9,085,000	5,426,000	146	106	Texas	22,359,000	8,444,000	246	197
Kentucky	1,884,000	306,000	51	25	Utah	4,761,000	1,670,000	19	17
Louisiana	1,638,000	459,000	7	5	Vermont	71,000	9,000	10	33
Maine	3,230,000	1,337,000	69	56	Virginia	24,959,000	14,119,000	46	148
Maryland	17,180,000	10,212,000	14	11	Washington	12,878,000	3,371,000	197	0
Massachusetts	11,062,000	2,986,000	183	68	West Virginia	231,000	29,000	6	13
Michigan	3,475,000	1,797,000	58	33	Wisconsin	1,128,000	377,000	25	16
Minnesota	885,000	319,000	39	19	Wyoming	1,633,000	822,000	19	9
Mississippi	2,043,000	402,000	19	14	Guam	1,282,000	881,000	1	1
Missouri	4,590,000	2,113,000	100	72	Virgin Islands	116,000	40,000	1	1

<sup>1</sup> Estimates for 1967 are based on projections from data reported by applicants for 1965. Only entitlements under subsec. 3(c)(1) are included. This subsection accounts for about 99 percent of all entitlements of school districts under the act.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, these laws enacted in 1950, and better known as the aid-to-impacted-areas laws, provide Federal assistance for the operating and construction of schools in areas affected by Federal activity.

The administration's proposals, Mr. President, for fiscal year 1967 would reduce the Public Law 874 program by \$233 million and would not extend expiring provisions of Public Law 815. These laws were enacted in recognition of the fact that the Government has a responsibility to assist local communities and those school districts where Federal activities have resulted in a great influx of children into the schools. Not only does the Federal activity hand the school districts many children, but it also removes from the local tax rolls the property on which the Federal activity is located. Thus the school district has additional children and less of a tax base to support the schools. Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 were enacted and have helped tremendously to ease this burden.

The impacted-area laws have been very well received in my State of California, and since the inception of the program, California schools have placed great reliance on these funds and many

of the programs in the schools are based on the continuance of the program.

Mr. President, that a great hardship would result to California schools has been made very clear to me by California educators. At the conclusion of my remarks, I would ask unanimous consent that a small sample of letters that I have received on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the impacted area laws have been very popular in Congress and since 1950 the Congress, in its wisdom, has seen fit to expand the program. Only last year, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which I am a member, again voiced its support and confidence in the program by accepting an amendment to the law reducing the eligibility for large school districts under Public Law 874 from 6 to 3 percent. This was accepted by the Congress and is now Public Law 89-313. Under the 1965 law, Los Angeles Unified School Districts will receive over \$3 million in needed funds.

Mr. President, if Congress concurs in the recommendations of the administration on the impacted area legislation, I

am convinced that one of two things will happen. The school districts will be forced to reduce or eliminate important and needed educational programs and services or find additional sources of revenue.

Certainly the intent of Congress in passing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was not to reduce the educational programs in areas benefiting from impacted-aid laws, but rather to assist in upgrading the programs in those school districts serving children from families of low income. Yet, as pointed out, that is what will be done, because I am convinced that the school districts will be adversely affected and not be able to find—particularly when no opportunity was given to the districts to adjust to such a change—additional sources of revenue. I intend to oppose the administration's recommendations and support full implementation of Public Law 874.

Mr. President, at this point in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed a breakdown of the effect of the administration's proposal on the school districts in my State of California.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

School districts affected by proposed amendments to Public Law 874 by State, and by congressional district, within State

## CALIFORNIA

Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget	Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget
Shurtleff School District, Napa	1	\$14,003	\$6,832	Grant School District, Shasta	2	\$2,649	\$1,317
Sausalito School District, Marin	1	44,277	20,577	Twin Harte Long Barn Union School District, Tuolumne	2	1,892	0
Mount George Union School District, Napa	1	24,221	11,359	Mineral School District, Tehama	2	2,397	1,235
Napa Union High School District, Napa	1	254,883	163,604	Buck Meadows Elementary School District, Tuolumne	2	4,163	1,152
Napa City School District, Napa	1	115,049	52,350	Jamestown School District, Tuolumne	2	4,658	0
Mill Valley School District, Marin	1	30,402	906	Summersville Union High School District, Tuolumne	2	11,262	7,728
Salvador Union School District, Napa	1	84,899	42,391	Alpine County Unified School District, Alpine	2	2,271	906
Tamapals Union High School District, Marin	1	88,066	1,118	Canyon Union School District, Shasta	2	3,532	1,482
San Rafael School District, Marin	1	27,122	0	MacDoel Elementary School District, Siskiyou	2	33,945	12,658
San Rafael High School District, Marin	1	221,605	96,521	Fall River Joint Unified School District, Shasta	2	1,640	329
San Jose School District, Marin	1	474,811	278,857	Johnstonville School District, Lassen	2	1,766	659
American Canyon School District, Napa	1	55,632	31,361	Bellevue School District, Tuolumne	2	1,892	1,070
Petaluma City School District, Sonoma	1	42,386	11,442				
Fairfax School District, Marin	1	6,686	0	Congressional district total		1,062,869	405,254
Larkspur School District, Marin	1	16,021	906				
Carneros Los Amigos Union School District, Napa	1	5,677	2,470	Folsom Joint Unified School District, Sacramento	3	945,375	624,100
Soda Canyon School District, Napa	1	1,766	659	Elverta Joint School District, Sacramento	3	14,003	6,091
San Anselmo Elementary School District, Marin	1	8,452	0	North Sacramento School District, Sacramento	3	160,967	66,426
Two Rock Union School District, Sonoma	1	20,057	11,523	Robla School District, Sacramento	3	35,448	15,228
Petaluma City High School District, Sonoma	1	47,693	11,367	Rio Linda Union School District, Sacramento	3	570,323	301,919
St. Helena Unified School District, Napa	1	16,814	3,464	Del Paso Heights School District, Sacramento	3	42,260	16,709
Novato Unified School District, Marin	1	121,027	53,430	Grant Joint Union High School District, Sacramento	3	507,769	332,239
Dixie School District, Marin	1	52,352	13,416	Sacramento City Unified School District, Sacramento	3	941,410	269,413
Reed Union School District, Marin	1	6,181	0	American River Junior College District, Sacramento	3	253,586	131,611
Old Adobe Union School District, Sonoma	1	16,778	6,749	Center Joint School District, Sacramento	3	232,612	140,499
Browns Valley School District, Napa	1	10,975	4,938	Elk Grove Unified School District, Sacramento	3	119,758	44,636
Arena Union School District, Mendocino	1	18,670	8,560	San Juan Unified School District, Sacramento	3	1,527,828	841,415
Klamath Trinity Unified School District, Humboldt	1	121,503	77,013	Galt Joint Union School District, Sacramento	3	7,317	0
Reservation School District, Sonoma	1	2,901	1,811				
Cotati School District, Sonoma	1	19,553	3,869	Congressional district total		5,358,656	2,790,286
Ferndale School District, Humboldt	1	4,037	329				
Liberty School District, Sonoma	1	1,892	165	Vallejo Unified School District, Solano	4	1,300,843	793,715
Cinnabar School District, Sonoma	1	2,271	247	Fairfield School District, Solano	4	448,842	265,044
Klamath Union School, Del Norte	1	20,436	8,067	Benicia Unified School District, Solano	4	72,807	46,368
Sonoma Valley Unified School District, Sonoma	1	72,331	17,721	Crystal Union School District, Solano	4	64,337	37,204
Wilmar Union School District, Sonoma	1	5,677	1,317	Vaca Valley Union School District, Solano	4	236,279	132,686
Marin Junior College District, Marin	1	82,155	26,066	Vacaville Union High School District, Solano	4	95,609	65,777
Round Valley Unified School District, Mendocino	1	27,441	16,122	Armijo Joint Union High School District, Solano	4	193,214	138,076
Napa Junior College District, Napa	1	107,081	57,687	Brophy School District, Yuba	4	1,766	741
Howell Mountain School District, Napa	1	1,766	576	Wheatland School District, Yuba	4	461,439	280,174
				Wheatland Union High School District, Yuba	4	194,097	152,421
Congressional district total		2,295,549	1,045,790	Ella School District, Yuba	4	36,331	14,981
				Marysville School District, Yuba	4	13,120	0
Herlong School District, Lassen	2	79,851	47,492	Marysville Union High School District, Yuba	4	24,179	0
Lassen Union High School District, Lassen	2	100,710	51,801	Linda School District, Yuba	4	32,547	12,923
Shasta Union High School District, Shasta	2	29,503	0	Winters School District, Yolo	4	11,101	3,622
Mariposa County Unified School District, Mariposa	2	79,786	49,832	Winters Joint Union High School District, Yolo	4	5,324	932
Penryn School District, Placer	2	4,415	1,482	Green Valley Union School District, Solano	4	5,551	2,387
Auburn Union School District, Placer	2	12,489	0	Suisun Valley Joint Unified School District, Solano	4	4,163	1,811
Loomis Union School District, Placer	2	24,473	9,548	Falls Elementary School District, Solano	4	3,911	1,729
Lincoln Union School District, Placer	2	19,553	6,749	Rio Vista School District, Solano	4	3,406	0
Tulelake Joint School District, Siskiyou	2	11,227	3,457	Middletown Unified School District, Lake	4	4,917	1,466
Eureka Union School District, Placer	2	12,741	5,185	West Sacramento Elementary School District, Yolo	4	2,901	0
Roseville City School District, Placer	2	44,026	12,183	East Lake School District, Lake	4	2,901	0
Lincoln Union High School District, Placer	2	13,975	5,404	Washington Unified School District, Yolo	4	60,593	2,932
Roseville Joint Union High School District, Placer	2	119,565	57,018	Dixon Unified School District, Solano	4	29,662	6,796
Rocklin School District, Placer	2	10,470	3,293	Elmira School District, Solano	4	1,766	741
Trinity County Joint High School District, Trinity	2	16,637	2,609	Rio Vista Joint Union High School District, Solano	4	3,549	0
Placer Joint Union High School District, Placer	2	48,359	9,689	Lincoln School District, Sutter	4	3,658	0
Janesville Union School District, Lassen	2	6,434	3,457	Yuba City School District, Sutter	4	14,381	0
Long Valley School District, Lassen	2	3,911	2,223	Yuba City Union High School District, Sutter	4	14,197	0
Newell Union School District, Modoc	2	6,434	2,305	Yuba County Junior College, Yuba	4	56,465	10,041
Grass Valley School District, Nevada	2	9,461	0	Travis Unified School District, Solano	4	1,057,520	854,607
Nevada Union High School District, Nevada	2	16,859	0	Lakeport Unified School District, Lake	4	12,214	266
Union Hill Elementary School District, Nevada	2	1,640	165	East Nicolaus Joint Union High School District, Sutter	4	3,549	373
Dry Creek Joint School District, Placer	2	30,028	1,070				
Newcastle Elementary School District, Placer	2	1,640	0	Congressional district total		4,477,392	2,828,636
Placer Hills Union School District, Placer	2	9,840	1,646				
Shasta Lake Union School District, Shasta	2	10,975	0	San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco	5	1,575,097	257,821
Round Valley School District, Inyo	2	14,759	7,984				
Lo Inyo Union School District, Inyo	2	9,966	2,305	Congressional district total		1,575,097	257,821
Bishop Union School District, Inyo	2	40,998	11,688				
Bishop Union High School District, Inyo	2	34,162	12,485	Albany Unified School District, Alameda	7	28,076	1,732
Coffee Creek School District, Trinity	2	1,514	906	Berkeley Unified School District, Alameda	7	338,019	125,513
Lewiston School District, Trinity	2	12,741	7,573	Oakland Unified School District, Alameda	7	1,230,098	451,953
Alturas School District, Modoc	2	7,947	247				
Mount Bidwell School District, Modoc	2	4,541	2,634	Congressional district total		1,596,193	579,198
Sierra Junior College District, Placer	2	54,685	20,734				
Antelope Union School District, Mono	2	6,055	2,963	Alameda Unified School District, Alameda	8	796,272	484,063
Mother Lode Union School District, El Dorado	2	7,191	823	San Leandro Unified School District, Alameda	8	173,689	47,167
Rescue Union School District, El Dorado	2	4,668	2,058	Castro Valley School District, Alameda	8	70,770	11,112
Gold Oak Union School District, El Dorado	2	4,415	741	Independent School District, Alameda	8	5,929	2,058
Shasta Union School District, Shasta	2	3,028	741	S County Joint Junior College District, Alameda	8	47,818	8,333
Buckeye Elementary School District, Shasta	2	3,406	0	Canyon Valley Union High School District, Alameda	8	65,440	16,211
Pleasant Ridge Union School District, Nevada	2	1,766	0	Hayward Unified School District, Alameda	8	440,329	118,984
Nevada City School District, Nevada	2	4,668	0	San Lorenzo Unified School District, Alameda	8	312,481	104,861
Ready Springs Union School District, Nevada	2	1,514	0	Peralta Junior College District of Alameda County, Alameda	8	94,364	0
Ophir Elementary School District, Placer	2	2,271	659	Fremont Unified School District, Alameda	8	373,550	91,003
Death Valley Unified School District, Inyo	2	15,212	10,116				
Tulelake Joint Union High School District, Siskiyou	2	10,870	4,845	Congressional district total		2,380,642	883,792
Camino Union School District, El Dorado	2	1,640	0				
Gold Trail Union School District, El Dorado	2	2,145	0	Livermore Joint Union High School District, Alameda	9	232,700	171,616
Buckeye Union School District, El Dorado	2	11,858	4,938	Livermore School District, Alameda	9	430,045	250,145
Valley View Elementary School District, Placer	2	1,892	906	Pleasanton Joint School District, Alameda	9	93,477	49,469
Ackerman Elementary School District, Placer	2	2,018	0				
Susanville School District, Lassen	2	18,292	4,774				



School districts affected by proposed amendments to Public Law 874 by State, and by congressional district, within State—Continued

## CALIFORNIA—Continued

Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget	Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget
Amador Valley Joint Union High School District, Alameda	9	\$51,021	\$28,510	Oxnard School District, Ventura	13	\$239,054	\$114,742
Decoto School District, Alameda	9	33,304	2,964	Oxnard Union High School District, Ventura	13	525,734	282,300
Washington Union High School District, Alameda	9	24,623	5,963	Orcutt Union School District, Santa Barbara	13	240,947	136,308
Sumo Glen School District, Alameda	9	3,406	1,482	Santa Paula School District, Ventura	13	19,553	0
Milpitas School District, Santa Clara	9	80,736	28,973	Ocean View School District, Ventura	13	186,821	110,127
East Side Union High School District, Santa Clara	9	58,785	0	Nordhoff Union School District, Ventura	13	15,769	0
Independent School District, Alameda	9	0	0	Rio School District, Ventura	13	62,949	27,986
Murray School District, Alameda	9	31,411	8,231	Moorepark Memorial Union High School District, Ventura	13	13,753	7,267
Green Joint School District, Alameda	9	6,560	3,457	Timber School District, Ventura	13	16,652	0
Alum Rock Union Elementary School District, Santa Clara	9	69,635	0	Pleasant Valley School District, Ventura	13	183,166	82,721
Mount Pleasant Elementary School District, Santa Clara	9	6,560	0	Moorepark Union School District, Ventura	13	22,202	8,725
Canyon Valley Union High School District, Alameda	9	0	0	Fillmore Union School District, Ventura	13	4,920	0
Hayward Unified School District, Alameda	9	0	0	Mesa Union School District, Ventura	13	4,037	1,152
Berryessa Union School District, Santa Clara	9	18,670	0	San Buenaventura School District, Ventura	13	75,816	11,359
Newark Unified School District, Alameda	9	92,317	21,186	College School District, Santa Barbara	13	17,469	7,902
Congressional district total		1,233,250	571,996	Santa Ynez Valley Union High School, Santa Barbara	13	26,398	12,671
Mount View Los Altos Union High School District, Santa Clara	10	77,197	5,590	Solvay Elementary School District, Santa Barbara	13	6,181	2,058
Sunnyvale School District, Santa Clara	10	141,919	39,180	Ventura Unified High School District, Ventura	13	74,979	10,994
Los Altos School District, Santa Clara	10	40,999	0	Santa Paula Union High School District, Ventura	13	16,194	0
Whisman School District, Santa Clara	10	51,720	6,009	Casmalia School District, Santa Barbara	13	1,766	988
Fremont Union High School District, Santa Clara	10	248,671	94,473	Somis Union School District, Ventura	13	6,181	2,387
Jefferson Union School District, Santa Clara	10	130,187	12,426	Simi Valley Unified School District, Ventura	13	339,764	180,275
Palo Alto Unified School District, Santa Clara	10	140,855	0	Mound School District, Ventura	13	10,470	823
Mountain View School District, Santa Clara	10	41,125	5,926	Avenue School District, Ventura	13	3,532	0
Moreland School District, Santa Clara	10	70,013	0	Mill Union School District, Ventura	13	3,532	0
Cupertino Union School District, Santa Clara	10	214,329	31,854	Nordhoff Union High School District, Ventura	13	9,761	0
Santa Clara City School District, Santa Clara	10	23,085	0	Los Alamos School District, Santa Barbara	13	6,686	3,622
Santa Clara Union High School District, Santa Clara	10	80,968	3,168	Santa Maria Joint Union High School District, Santa Barbara	13	275,735	185,779
Loma Prieta Joint Union School District, Santa Clara	10	7,064	2,140	Buellton Union School District, Santa Barbara	13	11,858	5,597
Campbell Union High School District, Santa Clara	10	102,707	0	Guadalupe Joint Union School District, Santa Barbara	13	16,778	6,255
Campbell Union School District, Santa Clara	10	56,641	0	Valley Oaks Union School District, Ventura	13	46,549	6,914
Saratoga Union School District, Santa Clara	10	14,633	0	Lompoc Unified School District, Santa Barbara	13	2,456,707	1,833,527
Los Gatos Joint Union High School District, Santa Clara	10	20,630	0	Allan Hancock Joint Junior College District, Santa Barbara	13	83,426	41,021
Berryessa Union School District, Santa Clara	10	0	0	Blochman Union School District, Santa Barbara	13	4,037	1,317
Franklin McKinley School District, Santa Clara	10	22,707	0	Ventura County Junior College District, Ventura	13	108,862	45,081
Congressional district total		1,485,450	207,766	Congressional district total		5,803,487	3,463,010
Brisbane School District, San Mateo	11	4,037	0	Pittsburg Unified School District, Contra Costa	14	63,289	0
South San Francisco Unified School District, San Mateo	11	114,206	0	Mountain Diablo Unified School District, Contra Costa	14	649,866	160,955
Bayshore School District, San Mateo	11	30,781	17,203	Richmond School District, Contra Costa	14	230,602	60,499
Millbrae School District, San Mateo	11	17,661	0	Richmond Union High School District, Contra Costa	14	235,583	54,225
Laguna Salada Union School District, San Mateo	11	75,438	6,832	San Pablo School District, Contra Costa	14	68,139	7,161
San Bruno Park School District, San Mateo	11	32,294	0	Rodeo School District, Contra Costa	14	6,686	0
Jefferson School District, San Mateo	11	75,816	0	Lafayette School District, Contra Costa	14	30,276	0
Ravenswood City School District, San Mateo	11	83,511	23,129	John Swett Union High School District, Contra Costa	14	11,535	1,677
Jefferson Union High School District, San Mateo	11	98,049	8,571	Danville Union School District, Contra Costa	14	37,719	13,005
San Mateo City School District, San Mateo	11	59,164	0	Walnut Creek School District, Contra Costa	14	40,368	2,140
San Mateo Union High School District, San Mateo	11	113,577	0	San Ramon Valley Unified High School District, Contra Costa	14	34,605	9,131
Belmont School District, San Mateo	11	17,156	0	Sheldon School District, Contra Costa	14	8,957	0
San Mateo Junior College District, San Mateo	11	67,657	0	Pinole Hercules Union School District, Contra Costa	14	39,737	0
Montara School District, San Mateo	11	4,037	412	Alamo School District, Contra Costa	14	18,166	4,938
Congressional district total		793,384	56,147	Orinda Union School District, Contra Costa	14	20,941	0
Monterey City School District, Monterey	12	1,325,672	746,126	Acalanes Union High School District, Contra Costa	14	86,736	0
Monterey Union High School District, Monterey	12	563,663	379,751	Martinez Unified School District, Contra Costa	14	34,103	0
Paso Robles Union School District, San Luis Obispo	12	31,664	11,853	Byron Union School District, Contra Costa	14	2,271	329
Paso Robles Joint Union High School District, San Luis Obispo	12	16,415	4,099	Congressional district total		1,620,570	314,060
Pacific Grove Unified School District, Monterey	12	135,303	81,277	Manteca Union High School, San Joaquin	15	64,109	39,373
Marina Elementary School District, Monterey	12	379,480	216,885	Lathrop School District, San Joaquin	15	7,821	1,317
Carmel Unified School District, Monterey	12	17,062	31,978	Tracy School District, San Joaquin	15	56,137	21,236
San Miguel Joint Union Elementary School District, San Luis Obispo	12	13,119	6,338	Tracy Joint Union High School District, San Joaquin	15	52,352	26,274
Atascadero Union High School District, San Luis Obispo	12	6,433	0	Stockton Unified School District, San Joaquin	15	317,240	0
Pismo School District, San Luis Obispo	12	17,409	3,869	Manteca School District, San Joaquin	15	53,614	20,002
Atascadero School District, San Luis Obispo	12	9,209	0	French Camp School District, San Joaquin	15	4,541	0
Arroyo Grande Union School District, San Luis Obispo	12	27,501	9,301	Jefferson School District, San Joaquin	15	1,388	0
Ocean School District, San Luis Obispo	12	9,461	2,387	Lincoln Unified School District, San Joaquin	15	28,862	0
Washington Union School District, Monterey	12	2,775	329	Nile Garden Union School District, San Joaquin	15	2,018	0
Santa Margarita Union School District, San Luis Obispo	12	1,892	0	Newman School District, Stanislaus	15	14,003	5,185
Cayucos Elementary School District, San Luis Obispo	12	2,649	906	Calla School District, San Joaquin	15	2,649	659
Cambria Union Elementary School District, San Luis Obispo	12	10,849	4,444	Congressional district total		614,734	105,046
Arroyo Grande Union High School District, San Luis Obispo	12	31,500	5,963	Merced City School District, Merced	16	136,747	55,231
San Antonio Union School District, Monterey	12	4,920	2,552	Atwater School District, Merced	16	435,587	245,693
Salinas City School District, Monterey	12	53,992	0	Merced Union High School District, Merced	16	223,381	106,026
Alisal School District, Monterey	12	15,012	0	Friant Union School District, Fresno	16	2,271	906
Nipomo Union School District, San Luis Obispo	12	20,941	8,560	Winton School District, Merced	16	49,829	27,901
Salinas Union High School District, Monterey	12	67,658	1,863	Livingston Union School District, Merced	16	14,760	4,034
North Monterey Unified School District, Monterey	12	39,107	4,009	McSwain Union School District, Merced	16	8,452	3,293
Monterey Peninsula Junior College District, Monterey	12	123,613	64,310	Weaver Union School District, Merced	16	6,560	0
San Luis Obispo County Junior College District, San Luis Obispo	12	3,815	2,564	Cressey School District, Merced	16	1,514	412
Congressional district total		2,985,084	1,589,964	Riverdale Joint Union School District, Fresno	16	15,643	5,432
Hueneme School District, Ventura	13	434,581	216,065	Volta School District, Merced	16	2,397	1,070
Santa Maria School District, Santa Barbara	13	230,728	117,047	Gustine Union School District, Merced	16	18,418	8,560

School districts affected by proposed amendments to Public Law 874 by State, and by congressional district, within State—Continued

## CALIFORNIA—Continued

Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget	Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget
Torrance Unified School District, Los Angeles	17	\$260,137	0	Long Beach Unified School District, Los Angeles	32	\$1,581,124	\$498,987
Lawndale School District, Los Angeles	17	22,707	0	Congressional district total		1,581,124	498,987
Enterprise City School District, Los Angeles	17	26,492	0	Barstow Union School District, San Bernardino	33	343,377	171,042
El Camino Junior College District, Los Angeles	17	51,633	0	Barstow Union High School District, San Bernardino	33	273,071	175,902
Congressional district total		360,969	0	Victor School District, San Bernardino	33	120,852	63,215
China Lake Joint Elementary School District, Kern	18	704,142	\$438,204	Yermo School District, San Bernardino	33	26,743	13,170
Indian Wells Valley Joint Union School District, Kern	18	90,576	51,116	Adelanto School District, San Bernardino	33	274,908	165,357
Kern County Joint Union High School District, Kern	18	452,746	163,601	Daggett School District, San Bernardino	33	176,351	106,259
Mojave Unified School District, Kern	18	31,248	16,522	Hinkley Union School District, San Bernardino	33	41,377	18,767
Muroc Unified School District, Kern	18	1,001,051	774,395	Victor Valley Union High School District, San Bernardino	33	156,610	78,820
Three Rivers Union School District, Tulare	18	13,876	7,161	Redlands Union High School District, San Bernardino	33	7,320	1,863
Woodlake Union High School District, Tulare	18	13,975	1,863	Needles School District, San Bernardino	33	20,057	1,564
Central Union School District, Kings	18	402,277	250,379	Terrace Union School District, San Bernardino	33	29,393	13,993
Lemoore Union High School District, Kings	18	141,969	89,440	Mission School District, San Bernardino	33	15,390	5,103
Lemoore Union School District, Kings	18	59,038	32,348	Wrightwood School District, San Bernardino	33	6,434	2,881
Hanford Elementary School District, Kings	18	50,334	17,039	Bloomington School District, San Bernardino	33	20,941	0
Island Union School District, Kings	18	4,415	1,317	Newberry School District, San Bernardino	33	2,018	823
Reef Sunset Union School District, Kings	18	3,658	0	Upland School District, San Bernardino	33	53,992	10,207
Hanford Joint Union High School District, Kings	18	26,398	0	Colton Joint Union High School District, San Bernardino	33	61,447	15,280
Armona Union Elementary School District, Kings	18	11,858	4,609	Ontario School District, San Bernardino	33	153,398	14,487
Kern Joint Junior College District, Kern	18	70,454	0	Colton Joint School District, San Bernardino	33	56,011	13,828
South Kern Unified School District, Kern	18	74,076	53,563	Chino Unified School District, San Bernardino	33	42,193	0
Congressional district total		3,152,091	1,841,557	Chaffey Union High School District, San Bernardino	33	142,415	17,329
Excelsior Union High School District, Los Angeles	19	61,447	0	Central School District, San Bernardino	33	6,560	0
Norwalk La Mirada City School District, Los Angeles	19	163,191	0	Apple Valley School District, San Bernardino	33	36,331	17,532
Bloomfield School District, Los Angeles	19	37,340	0	Fountain Unified School District, San Bernardino	33	91,682	0
Artesia School District, Los Angeles	19	28,888	0	Morongo Unified School District, San Bernardino	33	442,550	311,384
La Canada Unified School District, Los Angeles	19	84,862	26,382	Hesperia School District, San Bernardino	33	24,473	10,783
Congressional district total		315,728	26,382	Ora Grande School District, San Bernardino	33	2,271	329
La Canada Unified School District, Los Angeles	20	0	0	Alta Loma School District, San Bernardino	33	5,172	0
Congressional district total		0	0	Barstow Junior College District, San Bernardino	33	24,672	13,888
Willowbrook School District, Los Angeles	21	18,796	0	Cucamonga School District, San Bernardino	33	4,163	0
Enterprise City School District, Los Angeles	21	0	0	Victor Valley Joint Junior College District, San Bernardino	33	33,065	17,520
Congressional district total		18,796	0	Chaffey Union Junior College District, San Bernardino	33	39,424	0
Compton City School District, Los Angeles	23	151,758	0	San Bernardino Junior College District, San Bernardino	33	137,858	51,277
Compton Union High School District, Los Angeles	23	89,176	0	Redlands Unified School District, San Bernardino	33	333,578	196,263
Enterprise City School District, Los Angeles	23	0	0	Yucaipa Joint Unified School District, San Bernardino	33	43,145	7,994
Paramount Unified School District, Los Angeles	23	68,365	0	San Bernardino Unified School District, San Bernardino	33	1,142,540	642,620
Bellflower Unified School District, Los Angeles	23	118,806	0	Rialto Unified School District, San Bernardino	33	247,130	126,583
Downey Unified School District, Los Angeles	23	124,358	0	Congressional district total		4,639,002	2,280,063
Congressional district total		552,463	0	Seal Beach School District, Orange	34	18,670	4,601
Claremont Unified School District, Los Angeles	24	105,958	34,909	Alamitos School District, Orange	34	120,095	21,483
Pomona Unified School District, Los Angeles	24	295,350	82,876	Board of Trustees, Garden Grove Union High School District, Orange	34	142,637	0
Bonita Unified School District, Los Angeles	24	35,214	0	Los Alamitos School District, Orange	34	72,158	22,224
Congressional district total		436,522	117,785	Westminster School District, Orange	34	171,438	44,778
Covina Valley Unified School District, Los Angeles	25	86,607	0	Garden Grove School District, Orange	34	249,525	26,258
Glendora Unified School District, Los Angeles	25	55,041	0	Buena Park School District, Orange	34	23,842	0
Congressional district total		141,648	0	Marguerite School District, Orange	34	41,756	0
Palmdale School District, Los Angeles	27	231,738	129,064	Centralia School District, Orange	34	55,001	0
Lancaster School District, Los Angeles	27	468,647	267,266	Ocean View School District, Orange	34	106,344	25,681
Antelope Valley Union High School District, Los Angeles	27	484,033	342,860	Cypress School District, Orange	34	53,740	6,009
Keppel Union School District, Los Angeles	27	25,861	11,771	Huntington Beach Union High School District, Orange	34	159,274	38,758
Westside Union School District, Los Angeles	27	56,263	25,599	San Juan School District, Orange	34	3,280	0
Eastside Union School District, Los Angeles	27	31,538	16,627	Huntington Beach City School District, Orange	34	19,301	0
Hughes Elizabeth Lakes Union School District, Los Angeles	27	2,018	576	Savanna School District, Orange	34	25,104	0
Soledad Agua Dulce Union School District, Los Angeles	27	3,911	823	Fountain Valley School District, Orange	34	37,719	6,749
Wilsona School District, Los Angeles	27	3,154	1,645	Congressional district total		1,299,884	196,631
Sulphur Springs Union School District, Los Angeles	27	13,498	0	Carlsbad Union School District, San Diego	35	76,447	38,769
Antelope Valley Joint Junior College District, Los Angeles	27	115,983	77,556	Vista Unified School District, San Diego	35	486,853	347,358
Congressional district total		1,436,644	873,788	Fallbrook Union High School District, San Diego	35	114,019	72,111
Manhattan Beach City School District, Los Angeles	28	26,996	0	Oceanside Carlsbad Union High School District, San Diego	35	272,628	161,182
Torrance Unified School District, Los Angeles	28	0	0	San Diego Union High School District, San Diego	35	32,609	7,267
El Segundo Unified School District, Los Angeles	28	26,014	0	Encinitas Union School District, San Diego	35	22,076	12,676
South Bay Union High School District, Los Angeles	28	41,704	0	Alpine Union School District, San Diego	35	15,769	6,173
Redondo Beach City School District, Los Angeles	28	40,746	0	Cardiff School District, San Diego	35	14,886	4,362
Hermosa Beach City School District, Los Angeles	28	7,947	0	Grossmont Union High School District, San Diego	35	120,164	150,374
Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District, Los Angeles	28	121,027	0	Escondido Union School District, San Diego	35	122,366	49,799
Congressional district total		264,434	0	Escondido Union High School District, San Diego	35	83,852	31,864
Lennox School District, Los Angeles	31	6,181	0	Solana Beach School District, San Diego	35	5,268	0
Inglewood Unified School District, Los Angeles	31	49,172	0	Rich Mar Union School District, San Diego	35	42,068	20,002
Congressional district total		55,353	0	Costa Mesa Union School District, Orange	35	48,063	0
				San Clemente School District, Orange	35	32,168	13,416
				Vallejos School District, San Diego	35	3,532	1,564
				Valley Center Union School District, San Diego	35	7,064	1,811
				Del Mar Union School District, San Diego	35	6,686	1,399
				Tustin School District, Orange	35	118,455	36,382
				San Joaquin School District, Orange	35	277,646	167,331
				Santa Ana Junior College, Orange	35	38,152	0
				Capistrano Beach School District, Orange	35	12,489	2,881
				Bonsall Union School District, San Diego	35	9,713	3,951
				Tustin Union High School District, Orange	35	124,889	26,832
				Anaheim City School District, Orange	35	89,440	0
				Ramona Unified School District, San Diego	35	20,462	5,596
				Orange Coast Junior College District, Orange	35	47,818	0



School districts affected by proposed amendments to Public Law 874 by State, and by congressional district, within State—Continued

## CALIFORNIA—Continued

Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget	Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget
Mountain Empire Unified School District, San Diego...	35	\$29,503	\$13,058	Sweetwater Union High School District, San Diego....	37	\$681,684	\$508,701
Orange Glen School District, San Diego.....	35	14,633	5,021	Lemon Grove School District, San Diego.....	37	96,505	40,580
Palomar Junior College District, San Diego.....	35	31,285	18,161	La Mesa Spring Valley School District, San Diego.....	37	262,644	96,798
Capistrano Union High School District, Orange.....	35	12,422	0	San Ysidro School District, San Diego.....	37	9,335	494
Orange Unified School District, Orange.....	35	193,675	0	Sweetwater Junior College District, San Diego.....	37	81,646	44,868
Jamul Las Flores Union School District, San Diego.....	35	5,424	2,140				
Pauma School District, San Diego.....	35	2,775	329	Congressional district total.....		2,607,643	1,516,286
Julian Union High School District, San Diego.....	35	8,873	3,168				
Anaheim Union High School District, Orange.....	35	181,235	0	Seeley Union School District, Imperial.....	38	44,656	24,775
Warner Union School District, San Diego.....	35	6,181	3,046	Perris School District, Riverside.....	38	11,858	2,223
Santa Ana Unified School District, Orange.....	35	435,729	154,293	Perris Union High School District, Riverside.....	38	9,761	0
Oceanside Carlsbad Junior College District, San Diego.....	35	39,424	25,852	Val Verde Elementary School District, Riverside.....	38	4,163	741
Grossmont Junior College District, San Diego.....	35	49,853	11,110	Elsinore Union School District, Riverside.....	38	9,335	412
Julian Union School District, San Diego.....	35	2,523	247	Corona Unified School District, Riverside.....	38	90,413	0
Poway Unified School District, San Diego.....	35	164,648	110,057	Riverside Junior College District, Riverside.....	38	91,311	23,075
Congressional district total.....		3,712,735	1,509,582	Palm Springs Unified School District, Riverside.....	38	115,793	47,167
Coronado Unified School District, San Diego.....	36	548,191	390,129	Alvord Unified School District, Riverside.....	38	103,262	22,384
Fallbrook Union School District, San Diego.....	36	186,446	99,594	Elsinore Union High School District, Riverside.....	38	3,771	0
Oceanside Union School District, San Diego.....	36	601,222	326,360	El Centro School District, Imperial.....	38	37,971	3,128
Santee School District, San Diego.....	36	97,262	41,732	Beaumont Unified School District, Riverside.....	38	12,214	0
Cajon Valley Union School District, San Diego.....	36	172,826	55,231	San Jacinto Unified School District, Riverside.....	38	20,462	0
Lakeside Union School District, San Diego.....	36	50,586	15,557	Temecula Union School District, Riverside.....	38	3,406	1,564
Board of Education of San Diego Unified School District, San Diego.....	36	5,987,112	2,837,629	Central Union High School District, Imperial.....	38	32,387	2,795
Congressional district total.....		7,643,645	3,766,232	San Pasqual Valley Unified School District, Imperial.....	38	95,172	68,619
Chula Vista City School District, San Diego.....	37	672,380	365,793	Moreno Valley Unified School District, Riverside.....	38	664,935	480,866
National School District, San Diego.....	37	299,606	161,660	Banning Unified School District, Riverside.....	38	21,096	0
South Bay Union School District, San Diego.....	37	503,843	297,392	Jarupa Unified School District, Riverside.....	38	74,234	0
				Riverside Unified School District, Riverside.....	38	598,315	281,404
				Congressional district total.....		2,044,515	959,153
				Total, California.....		64,705,021	29,265,151

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, California's educational leaders and citizens have also vigorously protested the administration's proposal to reduce title III of the National Defense Education Act by \$25 million. Again, as was the case with the impacted-area proposal, the administration attempted to justify its recommendation on the premise that equipment could be purchased under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Dr. Max Rafferty, superintendent of public instruction and director of education in my State, has written to me and has stated that a cut in title III of the National Defense Education Act "would be a grave mistake not only for California schools but for the Nation as well." Refuting the administration's justification for the reduction, Dr. Rafferty states:

Even though some instructional items do qualify under certain conditions, there is still a tremendous vacuum of need for equipment and materials for California's children and schools, who do not qualify for assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Many of these needs are now being met through the efforts of the National Defense Education Act.

He goes on to say:

Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds are basically designed for underprivileged areas, tied to the family income. While this fills a definite need, there are still many school districts in California with average or better family incomes, that are basically poor districts because of a large student population and little or no industry or business for taxable funds. In order for this type of district to conduct a quality type of educational program, it must often turn to

the National Defense Education Act as a source for assistance in acquiring equipment and materials necessary to keep up with changing educational demands.

Mr. President, as my colleagues well know, the National Defense Education Act was enacted in 1958 in response to Sputnik. When former President Eisenhower signed the measure into law, he stated the bill "would do much to strengthen our American system of education so it can meet the broad and increasing demands imposed upon it by consideration of basic national security."

Only this week, Mr. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, spoke of a space gap and the Russian spaceship plunging into Venus should make us realize that this is not the time to curtail the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. President, the National Defense Education Act has been a very popular program in California and across the country. In addition to providing much needed equipment the National Defense Education Act spurred innovation has helped to upgrade our educational system. The need for funds has not diminished, but, in fact, has increased. The California State Department of Education, while having a budget of less than \$5 million for this purpose, received requests in excess of \$13 million. Thus, the funds previously granted were inadequate and now the administration proposes further reductions. Mr. President, the National Defense Education Act has been not only successful and popular in California, but it also has achieved this

outstanding record with the minimum of Federal control.

Mr. President, at this point in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from Dr. Rafferty be printed in full.

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

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  
Sacramento, Calif., February 15, 1966.  
Hon. GEORGE MURPHY,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: It has recently been brought to my attention that the administration's Federal budget, as submitted to the Congress, January 24, 1966, proposes a reduction in the appropriation for title III of the National Defense Education Act from the present \$88.2 million to \$63.2 million. This represents a 31.5 percent cutback in the funds for equipment acquisition.

The justification for such a drastic cut was based primarily on the erroneous premise that specialized equipment is now eligible for purchase under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Even though some instructional items do qualify under certain conditions, there is still a tremendous vacuum of need for equipment and materials for California's children and schools, who do not qualify for assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Many of these needs are now being met through the efforts of NDEA.

The California State Department of Education feels that such a drastic decrease would be a grave mistake, not only for California schools, but the Nation as well. We urge you to consider the following facts and vigorously oppose any attempt to dilute the quality type of educational program for

which the National Defense Education Act was designed:

1. The National Defense Education Act has been one of the most popular and successful federally financed programs in the history of California education. This was dramatically pointed out in 1964 by the independent management organization of Arthur D. Little, Inc., in a report entitled "The Emerging Requirements for Effective Leadership for California Education." In their publication they state:

"As measured by dramatic changeover a relatively short period of time, the National Defense Education Act has had an enormously significant effect upon educational programs in California schools. In California, the Department placed emphasis upon curriculum development as a basic objective of the program so that grants for equipment and materials were made in support of specific instructional improvements. Administrators tell us that this has lessened the tendency for National Defense Education Act funds to be used simply as a convenient way of acquiring 'hardware' which may or may not have instructional significance. Moreover, a number of district administrators indicated strong approval of provisions in the administration of the National Defense Education Act which permitted districts to obtain consulting services from sources other than the State Department of Education.

"In summary, the National Defense Education Act experience in California suggests that it is possible to have Federal money and a minimum of control, while stimulating dramatic change in the directions desired by the authors of the Federal program."

2. One of the major advantages of the National Defense Education Act is that of encouraging innovation and experimentation on the part of the local school district. This factor was clearly revealed in a study conducted in 1963, entitled "The Dynamics of Educational Change." It stated that the expenditure of the National Defense Education Act funds for instructional equipment and materials has resulted in significant improvement of the instructional facilities made available to teachers. It has resulted in improved instructional practices, better morale on the part of teachers, and the provision of a rich learning environment for the students.

Nine out of ten administrators reported that the teachers in their schools were more effective as directors of classroom learning after entering the National Defense Education Act program than they were before.

3. Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds are basically designed for underprivileged areas, tied to the family income. While this fills a definite need, there are still many school districts in California with average or better family incomes, that are basically poor districts because of a large student population and little or no industry or business for taxable funds. In order for this type of district to conduct a quality type of educational program, it must often turn to the National Defense Education Act as a source for assistance in acquiring equipment and materials necessary to keep up with changing educational demands.

4. The philosophy of matching funds for educational programs is a healthy one. It contains the concept of incentive aid which has strong appeal to the public and educators. It leaves the local district as an active participant in the program, as well as in the control of funds, while at the same time includes the State as a partner for the improvement of instruction by means of Federal funds.

In a current survey being conducted in California, many school administrators stated that, if given their choice, they would prefer categorical aid similar to National Defense Education Act as opposed to lump sum grants. The reason for this is that the lump sum grants often become an expansion of a basic type program with little or no thought for experimentation or innovation, whereas categorical aid designed to improve definite subject areas often results in the creation of new ideas in education.

5. There is tremendous demand by school districts for existing National Defense Education Act funds. During the first 4 years of the administration of National Defense Education Act funds in California, the State Department of Education reported that approximately \$10.9 million in Federal funds were granted to 887 school districts enrolling over 80 percent of the State's total average daily attendance. The demand for National Defense Education Act funds during the next 4 years increased at an even more appalling rate. The 1965-66 school year was an excellent example of this increased demand. While operating on a budget of less than \$5 million, the California State Department of Education received approvable requests exceeding \$13 million. It was impossible to even begin to meet these needs. This necessitated participants cutting back their original plans, thus suppressing some of the educational creativity and innovative ideas developed by local districts.

I urge that you actively resist any attempt to reduce the National Defense Education Act appropriation under title III for the 1966-67 fiscal year; and, if possible, take immediate steps to further increase National Defense Education Act funds.

Sincerely,

MAX RAFFERTY.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have received protests from Californians on the proposed reductions for land-grant institutions. The administration's proposals are drastic indeed. For example, presently the University of California receives \$573,580 for resident teaching funds. If the proposed recommendations are adopted, each State would receive only \$50,000 and where more than one institution is involved, as in the case of California, this meager amount would be allocated in the same ratio as the present funds are allocated in the State. In addition, the administration proposes to cut the Hatch funds for agricultural research, which will result in a \$170,852 loss for the State.

Mr. President, Dr. Clark Kerr, president of the University of California, has pointed out in a letter the effect of the administration's budget recommendations on land-grant institutions. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Kerr's letter, which he addressed to President Johnson, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
Berkeley, Calif., February 28, 1966.  
President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: The regents of the University of California requested me to

advise you of their opposition to the drastic reductions recommended in your budget for support of the land-grant institutions. The minutes of the regents' meeting on February 18, 1966, are quoted:

"That the president of the university be requested to inform the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and California's legislative Representatives to the U.S. Congress, of the regents' opposition to the drastic reductions recommended in the President's budget for the support of resident instruction at the land-grant institutions, to reductions in Federal support of research at the State agricultural experiment stations, and to the move toward Federal control of research and agricultural extension at the land-grant institutions."

The regents are concerned because the proposed cuts in Morrill teaching funds will seriously impair the training of scientists in the colleges of agriculture at Berkeley, Davis, and Riverside; the colleges of engineering at Berkeley and Santa Barbara; the college of chemistry at Berkeley; the school of forestry at Berkeley, and the school of veterinary medicine at Davis. This occurs at a time when our need for highly trained professionals, teachers, and scientists is greatly expanding. In agriculture, forestry, and veterinary medicine alone, the salaries of 180 instructors will be affected. This cut comes at the very time when the university is anticipating an overall enrollment of 88,391 in 1966-67; 120,520 in 1970-71; and 146,332 in 1975-76.

The regents also believe your proposed reduction of Hatch funds for agricultural research is not desirable at a time when all reports indicate that the food supply of the world is one of the greatest problems facing mankind and food produced in the United States has prevented mass starvation in friendly countries and promoted the political aims of the United States. It has been our experience that there are always urgently needed research problems waiting to be resolved.

We oppose the transfer of \$10 million for cooperative agricultural extension from formula distribution to special projects for rural resource development. We now spend far more than our proportionate share of the proposed transfer for work with low income groups. These expenditures are augmented by funds from local governments to support important community projects. The proposed transfer may not only jeopardize our local funds but will place control in the hands of the Federal Government instead of local communities.

We believe the spirit of what has become known as the land-grant system of a coordinated program of research, resident teaching, and extension within the colleges of agriculture, the agricultural experiment station, and the Agricultural Extension Service, in the United States is seriously violated by these budget changes.

Consequently, we will rigorously oppose any action that appears to turn away from one of the most successful cooperative research and educational programs in the history of mankind.

Sincerely yours,

CLARK KERR.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, because I am convinced that any benefits that might accrue to the taxpayers and the Federal Treasury due to these administration proposals would be clearly offset by the great financial hardship that will result in the many school districts in my



March 2, 1966

State and elsewhere, I find the administration's recommendations very disturbing.

Mr. President, I hope that the educators and the American public across the country will not be fooled by this and other administration budget maneuvers. The administration knew full well that the Congress would not accept these recommendations, but they proposed them in an effort to produce the low and possible unrealistic deficit of \$1.8 billion.

Surely, Mr. President, if the administration feels that our resources are sufficient to embark on a global great society, then the funds are available to permit us to continue with these proven programs for the American people.

## EXHIBIT I

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
February 18, 1966.

Subject: Emergency supplemental appropriation bill for Public Law 874.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I urge your favorable consideration of the emergency supplemental bill for Public Law 874 to be considered on Wednesday, February 23. The added \$40 million will insure the 100 percent payment to school districts impacted by Federal activity for all 1966 entitlements. The Los Angeles City School District has been notified that unless this appropriation is provided, its entitlement will be reduced approximately 12 percent. Large urban school districts qualifying for the first time under Public Law 89-313 urge now that full funding be provided by Congress.

I shall be glad to send additional information, if desired, and will appreciate your keeping me apprised of developments.

JACK P. CROWTHER,  
Superintendent, Los Angeles City  
School Districts.

FEBRUARY 8, 1966.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: Your advice and guidance is requested for representatives of the San Diego Unified School District in the preparation of its annual budget for 1966-67. Considerable uncertainty exists from Federal sources about the status of Public Law 874 funds. Here is a brief background for your reference:

Since 1950, the Federal Government through Public Laws 815 (construction) and 874 (operating) has provided \$22,828,946 for construction purposes and \$41,968,133 for maintenance and operation purposes. These funds are loosely described as in-lieu-of-tax payments for tax-exempt real property but really are payments for educational services rendered to children whose parents live or work on Federal tax-exempt real property. The Congress recognized such conditions as a Federal impact on the local school districts. These millions of dollars have been received by the San Diego Unified School District, without undue Federal control, to assist in providing proper educational opportunity to thousands of federally connected pupils. The current count substantiates the estimated A.D.A. of 28,668 (K-14) or approximately 22 percent of a total estimated enrollment of 127,440 (K-14).

A significant point of interest is that although 22 percent of the total pupils are federally connected, only about 7 to 8 per-

cent of the costs for educating these pupils is borne by the Federal Government. A loss in such revenue automatically increases the local tax rate or eliminates needed educational services.

San Diego city schools cannot absorb a loss of this Federal revenue totaling over \$5 million. Recent announcements from the Bureau of the Budget indicate possible drastic reductions.

Your support is urged of continued full appropriations under Public Law 874 without crippling amendments. Please advise me in this matter. I will gladly furnish whatever information you may desire.

Sincerely,

RALPH DAILARD,  
Superintendent.

CLAREMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
Claremont, Calif., February 10, 1966.

Senator GEORGE MURPHY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: It is my understanding that the Bureau of the Budget has recommended a major reduction in Public Law 874 funds for federally impacted areas. This is most distressing news. Any reduction in these allocated funds would cause serious stress in many areas and the Claremont school district is among them.

Claremont currently receives approximately \$90,000 under Public Law 874. It would require an increased tax rate of \$0.16 in order to match this amount. Claremont taxes are already among the highest in the State.

It has been suggested that the moneys available through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will supplement the depleted Public Law 874 funds. This is simply not so. All of the Public Law 89-10 funds must be identified with programs and projects that are over and above current district effort. Also, there are many districts not equally covered by Public Law 89-10 and Public Law 874. The reduction of one in no way guarantees appropriation from the other.

Claremont, for example, qualifies for \$69,989 under title I of Public Law 89-10, but it is quite likely that Claremont will never qualify again because of the poverty aspect of the legislation. Tax yield for school support does not come from upper-middle class families. The correlation between average income and assessed valuation is not necessarily high. Poor school districts do not always serve poor people.

Title II of Public Law 89-10 is distributed on a workable and reasonable formula modified by the ability of the district to support its program. However, the amount is not sufficient to replace Public Law 874, and the funds are earmarked exclusively for library books. These funds are appreciated but in no way do they relieve any budget category, as it is incumbent upon the district to maintain current expenses for library materials in order to qualify.

In short, any reduction in Public Law 874 funds will be reflected in the general fund, and will be replaced only through a higher tax burden, or by less spending. To Claremont less spending is equivalent to nearly 11 less teachers, which is 4.9 percent of the total teaching staff. It is quite unlikely that the Claremont staff would be reduced by such an amount, but this gives you some idea of the impact of Public Law 874.

Let me urge you to contact the Appropriations Committee members with this information. Supplemental appropriation to pay full entitlements for the current year is essential. Any information you could provide

me regarding the progress of the financing of Public Law 874 will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. BRINEGAR,  
Superintendent.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  
SAN DIEGO COUNTY,  
February 17, 1966.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: I appreciate opportunity to furnish you information from school districts in San Diego County indicating the need for a supplementary appropriation for Public Law 874, impact aid for federally affected school districts, and for legislation enacting Public Law 874 on a continuing basis.

You are aware of the history of the legislation. For the past 15 or 16 years the Congress has provided Federal funds through Public Law 874 to assure an adequate educational program for children who are federally connected through residence on Federal property and/or because their parents are in the Armed Forces or are employed on Federal property.

San Diego County is one of the areas carrying the heaviest load in the education of children whose parents' residence in the county is dictated by military service or the employment in defense industry. Forty-five out of the fifty school districts qualify for Federal aid under Public Law 874 and 95 percent of the pupils of the county attend school in these districts. Attached is a simplified analysis of the problem for our school districts showing the tax rate increase that would be required to offset the effect of the withdrawal of Public Law 874 funds. In the six unified districts shown this is a total for the property owner. In the rest of the county it is necessary to add the elementary and the high school increases in order to get the total effect.

I would emphasize that the need is the same this year, will be the same next year, and so far as we can tell, in the succeeding years as it has been in the past 15 years that the legislation has been in effect. Further, I would stress that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Public Law 89-10, is aimed at an entirely different problem. Funds must be spent on programs not now in operation, and the federally impacted districts will be in the same relationship to others in their ability to finance education with or without Public Law 89-10. Many of the school districts have a total property tax rate for school purposes in excess of \$4 per \$100 of assessed valuation. The school tax rate and school bond elections represent virtually the only opportunity that the taxpayer has to express his resistance to taxes in a yes or no vote. We can only estimate, therefore, that disapproval of tax rate increases would result in substantial reduction in financial support of the schools in the county, and thereby serious impairment of educational programs, if Public Law 874 were withdrawn.

In addition, it should be remembered that more than 35 percent of the land in San Diego County is nontaxable because it is either federally owned or in the (U.S.A.) public domain. This presents a very real problem in financing education since the school districts have a substantially reduced tax base due to such Federal ownership. Public Law 874 aid has helped to overcome the resulting loss of such tax revenue.

Very truly yours,

CECIL D. HARDESTY,  
Superintendent of Schools.

## Public Law 874 receipts in 1964-65 converted to estimated tax rate

	Public Law 874 receipts	90 percent secured assessed valuation	Tax rate		Public Law 874 receipts	90 percent secured assessed valuation	Tax rate
Elementary districts:				Elementary districts—Continued			
Alpine Union.....	\$10,080	\$4,731,534	\$.0213	South Bay Union.....	\$370,121	\$23,901,624	\$1.549
Bonsall Union.....	7,739	6,407,460	.121	Vallecitos.....	3,865	1,677,654	.230
Cajon Valley Union.....	138,420	78,345,873	.177	Valley Center Union.....	6,404	7,474,779	.086
Cardiff.....	11,949	7,203,915	.166	Warner Union.....	5,568	2,350,665	.237
Carlsbad Union.....	60,344	38,826,675	.155	Unified districts:			
Chula Vista City.....	901,766	109,189,089	.826	Coronado.....	384,056	23,871,456	1.608
Del Mar Union.....	6,011	14,574,177	.041	Mountain Empire.....	18,214	6,972,372	.261
De Luz.....	7,205	404,568	1.781	Poway.....	116,704	24,950,169	.468
Encinitas Union.....	17,876	21,769,956	.082	Ramona.....	30,802	9,053,766	.340
Escondido Union.....	95,703	53,137,593	.180	San Diego.....	4,795,607	818,658,846	.586
Fallbrook Union.....	221,760	19,404,180	1.143	Vista.....	375,805	41,781,285	.899
Jamul-Las Flores Union.....	4,393	2,936,601	.150	High school districts:			
Julian Union.....	2,199	5,264,604	.042	Escondido Union.....	82,193	85,638,150	.096
Lakeside Union.....	40,360	15,777,099	.256	Fallbrook Union.....	207,097	32,544,666	.636
La Mesa-Spring Valley.....	215,675	95,503,473	.225	Grossmont Union.....	567,738	243,919,467	.233
Lemon Grove.....	76,982	28,563,489	.270	Julian Union.....	8,436	8,168,940	.103
National.....	245,461	37,179,738	.660	Oceanside-Carlsbad Union.....	205,205	87,970,599	.233
Oceanside Union.....	479,059	49,238,712	.972	San Diego Union.....	31,925	71,064,234	.045
Orange Glen.....	8,181	6,460,947	.127	Sweetwater Union.....	395,973	175,827,510	.225
Pauma.....	4,162	4,659,147	.089	Junior college districts:			
Rich-Mar Union.....	29,612	16,652,727	.178	Grossmont.....	29,121	243,919,467	.012
Santee.....	82,081	15,820,758	.519	Oceanside-Carlsbad.....	36,784	87,970,599	.042
San Ysidro.....	7,866	5,557,059	.142	Palomar.....	32,079	184,014,234	.017
Solana Beach.....	4,203	14,086,377	.030	Sweetwater.....	72,372	175,827,510	.041

## STOCKTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

Stockton, Calif., February 11, 1966.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,  
U.S. Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Information received by this office indicates that there will be a 10-percent deficit in the funding of Public Law 874 for the current year, and that substantial changes in Public Law 874 will be proposed to Congress during the current session to take effect in the 1966-67 fiscal year. These changes would have a very serious effect upon the Stockton Unified School District.

Our school district educates approximately 32,000 students, of which 2,000 are federally connected within the meaning of the provisions of Public Law 874. For many years, the cost of educating federally connected students has been borne, in part, by the Federal Government through Public Law 874.

Our Public Law 874 entitlement for the current year has been estimated at \$300,000, and this should increase to \$320,000 in 1966-67. If our entitlement for next year were to be eliminated, as would be the case under the changes proposed in the President's budget for 1966-67, our district would be severely handicapped and cutbacks in the educational program would be necessary.

Stockton is a low-wealth, urban area, with large numbers of minority-group and low-income families. Our assessed valuation is low and our property taxes are high (approximately \$11 per \$100 of assessed valuation). The school district is presently levying all taxes available to it, and there are no untapped sources of revenue to make up for a loss of \$320,000 per year. If it were possible to raise local taxes to offset this loss, it would necessitate an increase of approximately 18 cents in the property tax rate.

The original intent of Public Law 874 was to lessen the financial burden placed upon local school districts by the attendance of large numbers of federally connected students. It was recognized at that time that Federal activities, which produced large numbers of new students but no new taxable wealth, created severe financial problems for all school districts except the wealthiest—and this condition has not changed.

It has been said by some critics of Public Law 874 that the passage of Public Law 89-10 has eliminated the need for special measures such as Public Law 874. This is not the case, since the money received by our district under Public Law 89-10 will be used in a limited number of schools for the

benefit of children whose parents are unemployed or underemployed, and very few, if any, of our federally connected pupils fall into this category.

The Board of Education of the Stockton Unified School District, being aware of the serious nature of the proposed changes in Public Law 874, has adopted a resolution requesting your assistance in this matter. A copy of the resolution is attached. This resolution includes an appeal for your support of legislation to provide a supplemental appropriation for Public Law 874 for the current fiscal year to cover an anticipated 10-percent deficit.

If there is further information which our district can provide, or if we can be of assistance in appearing before committees when this matter is being heard, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Very truly yours,

CARL E. WILSEY,  
Acting Superintendent.

## RESOLUTION 691

## Resolution financing of Public Law 874

Whereas the Stockton Unified School District presently has enrolled more than 2,000 students whose parents are federally connected within the meaning of the provisions of Public Law 874; and

Whereas these students place a financial burden upon the taxpayers of the district which is currently being offset by Federal reimbursement under Public Law 874; and

Whereas there is presently anticipated a 10-percent deficit in the funding of Public Law 874 for the 1965-66 fiscal year, which would result in a loss of approximately \$30,000 in anticipated revenue to the Stockton Unified School District; and

Whereas the President's budget for the 1966-67 fiscal year proposes a change in the provisions of Public Law 874 which would result in a loss of Federal revenue of approximately \$320,000 per year to the Stockton Unified School District; and

Whereas the Stockton Unified School District is currently levying all available local taxes to support the operation of its schools and does not have access to any additional sources of revenue to offset the possible loss of Federal revenue; and

Whereas the Stockton Unified School District is a low-wealth district that would be severely affected by a revenue loss of this magnitude; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of the Stockton Unified School District does

hereby request its representatives in Congress to approve a supplemental appropriation of funds to cover the anticipated 10-percent deficit in the funding of Public Law 874 for the current year, and to give all possible support to the continuation of Public Law 874, without change, during the 1966-67 fiscal year.

PETER C. GAINES,

President of the Board of Education of the Stockton Unified School District of San Joaquin County.

Attest:

CARL E. WILSON,

Acting Secretary of the Board of Education.

PALOS VERDES PENINSULA

UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
Rolling Hills, Calif., February 9, 1966.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,  
U.S. Senate,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have been unofficially informed that there are not sufficient funds appropriated to meet full entitlements under the provisions of Public Law 874 (Federal impact legislation) for the current year 1965-66. We strongly urge your support of a deficiency appropriation to meet the admitted obligations under the existing law.

Also, it has been noted that the President's budget request for fiscal 1966 for this program is considerably less than funds appropriated for current year and that legislation is proposed to modify the existing Federal impact legislation, resulting in a drastic curtailment of this program.

Conclusions and recommendations submitted by the Stanford Research Institute and passed on to Congress by the Commissioner of Education are based on inaccurate information in an attempt to divert funds away from the Federal impact program to the latest programs of Federal assistance to local school districts. However, the purposes are not the same, and many school districts experiencing financial hardship because of impact of federally connected pupils receive little or no funds under the economic opportunity program or the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. (To benefit from the latter programs recipient districts must have families whose annual income is less than \$2,000. Federal employees, or others employed on Federal property, earn more than this amount.)

This district has had an entitlement under Public Law 874 of approximately \$125,000 to



help relieve the property taxpayers of a burden increased by federally connected pupils. Under provisions of the so-called poverty legislation the school district will receive less than \$20,000. Also, Public Law 874 funds may be used to aid all of the pupils of the district whereas the poverty funds must be used for specific purposes, and, in most cases, for the benefit of specific pupils.

In absence of these properties being on local tax rolls, we urge your support in continuing, and even strengthening, the present Federal impact legislation to the end that the previously admitted obligation of the Federal Government in aiding those school districts financially distressed because of Federal activity will be continued on a permanent basis.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE L. BUTTERBAUGH, Ed. D.,  
Superintendent and Secretary of the  
Board of Education.

SAN BERNARDINO TEACHERS ASSOCIATION,  
San Bernardino, Calif., February 9, 1966.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: The San Bernardino Teachers Association, 1,150 members, understand that Public Law 874—Impacted Areas Act—is in jeopardy. We urgently ask your support to keep this bill in force. A million dollar loss of school funds in San Bernardino would be catastrophic.

I expect to be in Washington Friday and Saturday, February 11 and 12, and I will call your office.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT E. STAHL,  
Executive Secretary.

FREMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
Sunnyvale, Calif., February 8, 1966.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,  
New Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: Since 1959 the Fremont Union High School District in the Sunnyvale-Cupertino area has received more than \$600,000 under Public Law 874, and more than \$1,800,000 under Public Law 815 (received or pending) as a federally impacted area. For this we have been very grateful, and we hope that you will do everything possible to continue this very fair and equitable Federal assistance.

Last year we had some 900 students eligible for Public Law 874 aid because their parents worked for nontaxable Federal installations such as Moffett Field and Ames Research Center (NASA). We received about \$200 of the \$638 educational cost per student from Public Law 874 grants. We had 1,875 of our 1964-65 enrollment of 8,963 eligible for U.S. aid to build added classrooms under Public Law 815. So you can see that we are very much federally impacted.

These students' parents—highly educated and skilled themselves—demand top-level curriculums for their offspring, and we have been able to supply this, despite heavy tax burdens. We have been able to keep pace with school construction needs despite yearly increases of 900 to 1,100 students through a bonding program which is now depleted. In 1955, we had 1 high school with about 1,800 students; and in 1965-66 we have an enrollment of 10,000 in 5 high schools with a sixth school planned for a 1968 opening. All this has been done despite the fact that our "assessed valuation behind each student" has dropped to \$6,000 below the State average.

As a result of our already burdensome property taxes, and depletion of our bonding capacity, we are extremely sensitive to curtailment of Federal support. The new U.S. educational aid programs tied to poverty and equal education projects will not greatly

affect these highly skilled technical, research, and Federal service families.

Thus, please do everything you can to help us retain Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 grants, which are so vital toward educating nearly 3,000 of our students.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES D. POND,  
Vice President, Board of Trustees.

LOMPOC UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
Lompoc, Calif., February 15, 1966.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,  
U.S. Senator,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I would like to bring to your attention the 10-percent deficit in this year's allocation of Public Law 874 moneys which amounts to \$220,000 for our district, and ask if you can help restore the full entitlement. In addition, I have now learned that consideration is being given to reduce Public Law 874 funds by 25 percent. This will lower our entitlement by approximately \$500,000 because 10,000 of the 13,600 students in our district are federally connected, as our district serves the Vandenberg Air Force Base.

Besides the aforementioned, we are going to lose a million dollars of our assessed valuation this coming year due to the acquisition of the Sudden property for the Titan III program. When this program develops, we will have an even greater number of federally connected students in our district.

Any reduction of the approximately \$2 million of Public Law 874 moneys that we receive will have a drastic effect upon the operation of our district because our salary schedules, which affect 800 employees, and the fixed charges of operation would be impossible to meet with a reduced income. Being a low assessed valuation district, it would take \$1 per \$100 assessed valuation to raise the deficit.

If you think it would be advantageous, I could arrange my schedule to come back to Washington and make a personal plea for Public Law 874 moneys. Again, I sincerely solicit your help in restoring and keeping our vitally needed Public Law 874 moneys.

Sincerely,

GLEN F. WEGNER,  
Superintendent of Schools.

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
Oakland, Calif., February 14, 1966.

Senator GEORGE MURPHY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a copy of the resolution passed by our board of education concerning the subject of Public Law 874, both in regard to the status in the current fiscal year, and the status in the next fiscal year.

This law, as we have informed you before, has been an important piece of legislation enabling us to offer equal educational opportunity to all children whether their parents are employed in Federal activities or in private activities. The funds last year amounted to approximately \$1 billion, and in the current year the entitlement which is accumulating appears now to approximate a value of \$1,150,000.

The survey we have just completed indicates a slight increase over last year in the number of children in our schools whose parents are in the Armed Forces or in other Federal activities, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, veterans' hospitals, Naval Supply Center, and so on. There are three kinds of problems looming in the future as follows:

1. In the current fiscal year, we have been told, there are insufficient funds to pay off entitlements at the 100-percent level. It has been rumored that only something over 90 percent might be paid unless a deficiency appropriation is authorized in Congress. We ask your support in getting this supplemental appropriation.

2. In the President's budget message of last week, the item for continuing Public Law 874 into next year is carried at \$158 million for the Nation, compared to the current expenditure of some \$380 million, and compared to the U.S. Office of Education's estimate for next year of \$405 million. Thus, if the funds were to be as small as those carried in the President's budget, all schools receiving aid from Public Law 874 would suffer a major 60- to 70-percent cut. We ask your support in continuing Public Law 874 at its present level of operation.

3. The Senate Subcommittee on Education had the Stanford Research Institute make a rather extensive study of both Public Law 874 and 815. The study has several aspects to it, some of which are favorable to the continuance of some type of Federal assistance to impacted areas, and sometimes quite critical to certain provisions in these laws as currently being operated. They did say, however, that as they found the situation in California, they would not recommend any major changes. Some of the most damaging statements in the Stanford Research Institute study concern the reestablishment of the absorption feature which was in the original bill in 1952, but which was taken out very soon thereafter.

As suggested by the SRI, this absorption factor would cause many school districts to lose a major portion of their aid. In Oakland's case this loss would be something over \$300,000. Such a loss would require us to reduce our teaching force by 40 to 50 teachers, inasmuch as we are already at our tax ceiling with no additional financial income source available to us. We hope you will work toward the prevention of this type of crippling amendment to Public Law 874.

We would be eager to appear before the appropriate committees that will be hearing this bill this spring and would appreciate information from you concerning the best time and method of achieving this. Other school districts within your jurisdiction will also be equally hurt by the proposed changes. They, too, are at tax ceilings or at the new override tax ceilings which most of us have had to vote, and thus they have no additional source to which they can turn.

Yours very truly,

FORREST C. MICHELL,  
Assistant Superintendent.

#### RESOLUTION 21217

Whereas in 1952 the Federal Government recognized its obligation to local school districts where the location of Federal activities created a heavy impact of enrollment without the usual financial resources to support an adequate educational program; and

Whereas the resulting legislation in Public Law 874 has been in operation for the past 13 years assisting those school districts carrying heavy enrollment impacts;

Whereas this aid currently totals approximately \$1 billion which, if eliminated or reduced, would cause a major cutback in educational services, as Oakland like many urban school districts is levying the maximum tax rate; and

Whereas in the current fiscal year funds have not yet been appropriated to pay fully the entitlements being accumulated; and

Whereas in the proposed budget for the coming fiscal year funds for the support of Public Law 874 have been drastically reduced from the \$400 million estimated need to \$158 million; and

Whereas the Stanford Research Institute study makes certain recommendations that would greatly reduce our income from Public Law 874 through the changes recommended under the sections greatly increasing the entitlement to be absorbed by the local school district, and in other sections aimed at reducing the Public Law 874 expenditures by \$125 million or more; and

Whereas Federal activities continue at high and increasing levels in this vicinity, with more and more students in our schools whose parents are connected with these activities: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the board of education urge the Members of Congress to appropriate sufficient funds in the current fiscal year to fully pay the entitlements now being earned; further, that the board of education of the Oakland Unified School District urge our Members of Congress to continue Public Law 874 in operation as in effect at the present time; and that the superintendent or his representative, be authorized to work for the goals presented herein.

Attest:

STUART S. PHILLIPS,

Secretary of the Board of Education of the City of Oakland and of Oakland Unified School District of Alameda County, State of California.

LA CAÑADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,

La Cañada, Calif., February 17, 1966.

Hon. GEORGE MURPHY,

U.S. Senator,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MURPHY: May I convey briefly some of the concerns the La Cañada Unified School District administration has concerning the proposed cuts in Public Law 874 funds. You are perhaps aware that our local school district does not use Federal funds other than Public Law 874 and further that the location of a Jet Propulsion Laboratory in our school district has a very direct effect upon student population and assessed valuation. This past fiscal year, \$80,000 was anticipated from Public Law 874 funds. Any cut in this amount would severely affect our school district's operation.

We have begun building the 1966-67 school-year budget and are anticipating \$80,000 in income from Public Law 874. At this particular time, school funds in La Cañada

are critical. A significant increase in student population (much attributed to families of employees at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory—a nontaxable institution) is anticipated. To further complicate the fiscal concerns of this district, an interstate freeway is planned for this summer. It will remove 6 percent of taxable property from our school district.

I would encourage you and other Members of Congress to carefully consider the impact reduction of Public Law 874 funds would have on California's school districts and particularly on La Cañada Unified School District.

Sincerely,

DONALD C. ZIEHL,  
District Superintendent.

CENTER JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT,

North Highlands, Calif., February 8, 1966.

Hon. GEORGE MURPHY,

Beverly Hills, Calif.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: Because of the recommended changes in Public Law 874 funds for federally impacted school districts made by Stanford Research, Inc., and because some legislatures may feel that Public Law 89-10 money will take the place of Public Law 874 funds we fear for the financial future of the Center Joint School District.

More than 85 percent of our pupils are federally connected. I believe that none of this 85 percent could qualify for aid under a poverty program.

Should there be any reduction in Federal funds for these federally connected children our education programs would be seriously handicapped. If the funds for children whose parents work on but live off Federal property are further restricted we would still be in trouble.

Please consider our problem when you study any legislation which would eliminate or limit Public Law 874 money.

Sincerely yours,

AUSTIN G. HUNT.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the drastic cuts proposed in the budget to finance Public Law 874 represent an unconscionable case of misplaced emphasis and unwise judgment.

The reduction would hit particularly hard in my State of Arizona because of the Federal Government's long-standing position as the dominant landlord in the State.

Arizona has been one of the fastest growing States in the Union for more than a decade. This growth is partly explained by an increase in Federal activity—both directly by the expansion of defense installations near our population centers, and indirectly by increased employment in defense-oriented industries.

State tax resources to support public education have been strained to the breaking point by Federal preemption. Why make the schoolchildren of our country the innocent victims when so many other more legitimate targets are available if the administration is really concerned about economy?

I, like many of my colleagues, am firmly opposed to this unjustified budget reduction, and to illustrate the effect it would have in Arizona, I ask permission to have the following table appear at this point. This table printed for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, shows the effects of the proposed amendments to Public Law 874 upon participating school districts in the State of Arizona.

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

School districts affected by proposed amendments to Public Law 874 by State, and by congressional district, within State

ARIZONA

Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget	Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget
Isaac School District No. 5, Maricopa	1	\$25,277	0	Northern Yuma High School District, Yuma	2	\$63,004	\$45,289
Williams Air Force Base Accommodation School District, Maricopa	1	195,823	\$135,754	Amphitheater Elementary School District No. 10, Pima	2	20,681	0
Litchfield School District No. 79, Maricopa	1	16,085	5,018	Fort Huachuca Accommodation Schools, Cochise	2	449,601	311,650
Mesa High School District No. 207, Maricopa	1	92,750	17,005	Wellton Elementary School District No. 24, Yuma	2	10,340	4,014
Mesa Elementary School District No. 4, Maricopa	1	147,573	21,349	Yuma School District No. 1, Yuma	2	225,828	94,973
Glendale Elementary School District No. 40, Maricopa	1	62,936	13,776	Yuma Union High School District, Yuma	2	108,449	47,197
Agua Fria Union High School District, Maricopa	1	28,300	16,137	Crane School District No. 13, Yuma	2	25,787	11,952
Gila Bend School District No. 24, Maricopa	1	20,170	8,849	Buena Elementary School District No. 68, Cochise	2	120,383	78,551
Chandler High School District, Maricopa	1	59,056	25,469	Palominas School District No. 49, Cochise	2	3,957	1,916
Chandler Elementary School District No. 80, Maricopa	1	46,468	16,696	Tombstone School District No. 1, Cochise	2	32,043	19,797
Avondale School District No. 44, Maricopa	1	60,256	32,388	Bisbee School District No. 2, Cochise	2	14,681	0
Cartwright School District No. 83, Maricopa	1	126,894	40,142	Bisbee High School District, Cochise	2	13,014	2,776
Glendale Union High School District No. 205, Maricopa	1	71,267	0	Douglas School District No. 27, Cochise	2	25,149	1,278
Maricopa County Accommodation Schools, Maricopa	1	5,617	3,832	Benson Elementary School District No. 9, Cochise	2	10,468	3,558
Union School District No. 62, Maricopa	1	12,383	7,846	Sonoita School District No. 25, Santa Cruz	2	1,660	912
Gila Bend High School District, Maricopa	1	8,263	3,991	Patagonia Union High School District, Santa Cruz	2	4,501	1,562
Levee Elementary School District No. 59, Maricopa	1	9,829	0	Sunnyside High School District No. 12, Pima	2	40,488	16,311
Pendergast School District No. 92, Maricopa	1	4,979	2,281	Nogales School District No. 1, Santa Cruz	2	12,638	0
Fowler Elementary School District No. 45, Maricopa	1	2,809	92	Nogales High School District No. 1, Santa Cruz	2	9,296	1,218
Dysart School District No. 89 of Maricopa County, Maricopa	1	221,226	141,411	Benson Union High School District No. 9, Cochise	2	8,883	4,335
Alhambra School District No. 68, Maricopa	1	53,873	0	Naco School District No. 23, Cochise	2	3,319	821
Dysart High School District No. 218 of Maricopa County, Maricopa	1	61,764	44,768	Florence Elementary School District No. 1, Pinal	2	4,213	0
Littleton School District No. 65, Maricopa	1	4,085	0	Flowing Wells School District No. 8, Pima	2	21,958	1,916
Gilbert Elementary School District No. 41, Maricopa	1	7,277	548	Flowing Wells High School District No. 8, Pima	2	11,774	808
Congressional district total		1,344,850	537,352	Douglas High School District, Cochise	2	7,437	0
Sunnyside Elementary School District No. 12, Pima	2	81,191	32,570	Stanfield Elementary School District No. 24, Pinal	2	6,593	0
Antelope Union High School District, Yuma	2	2,272	174	Casa Grande Union High School District, Pinal	2	39,455	18,363
Yuma County School District No. 27, Yuma	2	154,974	100,082	Maricopa Elementary School District No. 20, Pinal	2	14,170	7,663
Indian Oasis School District No. 40, Pima	2	77,231	26,389	Buena High School District, Cochise	2	183,228	137,947
School District No. 1, Pima	2	1,006,535	449,508	Coolidge Elementary School District No. 21, Pinal	2	48,637	15,692
Tucson High School District, Pima	2	396,078	148,847	Sacaton Elementary School District No. 18, Pinal	2	45,318	30,198
Amphitheater High School District No. 4, Pima	2	20,864	0	Coolidge High School District No. 84, Pinal	2	34,084	15,270
				Tombstone High School District, Cochise	2	16,939	12,319
				Apache Junction Elementary School District, Pinal	2	3,702	912
				Florence Union High School District, Pinal	2	4,751	0
				Somerton School District No. 11, Yuma	2	8,553	1,186



School districts affected by proposed amendments to Public Law 874 by State, and by congressional district, within State—Continued

## ARIZONA

Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget	Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget
Eleven Mile Corner Accommodation School, Pinal.....	2	\$12,000	\$7,481	Tanque Verde School District No. 13, Pima.....	3	\$3,191	\$290
Ajo School District No. 15, Pima.....	2	8,553	0	Chinle Elementary School District No. 24, Apache.....	3	356,668	122,994
Mount Lemmon Accommodation School District, Pima.....	2	8,042	5,109	Tuba City High School District, Coconino.....	3	109,689	86,066
Congressional district total.....		3,423,272	1,660,634	Puerco School District No. 18, Apache.....	3	76,083	49,995
Bullhead City Elementary School District No. 15, Mohave.....	3	9,447	5,657	Payson School District No. 10, Gila.....	3	20,936	12,316
Window Rock School District No. 8, Apache.....	3	432,751	150,130	Young Elementary School District No. 5, Gila.....	3	41,360	14,547
Mohave County Union High School District, Mohave.....	3	14,873	2,082	Rice School District No. 20, Gila.....	3	180,887	121,248
Roosevelt School District No. 3, Gila.....	3	5,745	3,741	Camp Verde School District No. 28, Yavapai.....	3	14,170	6,843
Flagstaff School District No. 1, Coconino.....	3	94,977	13,138	Camp Verde High School District No. 28, Yavapai.....	3	6,197	2,429
Grand Canyon School District No. 4, Coconino.....	3	49,786	33,026	Show Low Elementary School District No. 10, Navajo.....	3	8,553	3,193
Tuba City Elementary School District No. 15, Coconino.....	3	230,545	154,183	Apache County High School District, Apache.....	3	77,464	52,749
Whitewater School District No. 20, Navajo.....	3	196,206	134,659	Fort Thomas Common School District No. 7, Graham.....	3	65,998	44,704
Holbrook Elementary School District No. 3, Navajo.....	3	13,404	1,642	Fort Thomas High School District No. 7, Graham.....	3	26,234	20,475
Holbrook High School District No. 3, Navajo.....	3	7,643	1,389	Safford School District No. 1, Graham.....	3	12,766	0
Kearns Canyon Elementary School District No. 25, Navajo.....	3	40,084	27,187	Overgaard School District No. 31, Navajo.....	3	8,043	4,927
Williams School District No. 2, Coconino.....	3	4,851	92	Alpine School District No. 7, Apache.....	3	2,808	1,642
Winslow High School District, Navajo.....	3	7,230	0	Peach Springs School District No. 8, Mohave.....	3	29,871	19,889
Williams High School District, Coconino.....	3	4,958	2,082	Moccasini School District No. 10, Mohave.....	3	3,702	2,281
Winslow Elementary School District No. 1, Navajo.....	3	15,447	0	Payson High School District, Gila.....	3	12,601	8,156
McNary School District No. 23, Apache.....	3	91,629	61,126	Monument Valley High School District No. 27, Navajo.....	3	59,285	48,238
Fredonia Public Elementary School District, Coconino.....	3	18,128	10,674	Springerville School District No. 2, Apache.....	3	7,404	4,014
Fredonia High School District, Coconino.....	3	10,742	6,941	Snowflake Union High School District, Navajo.....	3	9,296	1,908
Page Accommodation School, Coconino.....	3	139,528	46,718	St. Johns School District No. 1, Apache.....	3	3,447	0
Alchesay High School District, Navajo.....	3	65,276	52,403	Chevelon Butte School District No. 5, Coconino.....	3	9,064	6,113
Prescott High School District No. 1, Yavapai.....	3	29,540	10,932	Safford High School District, Graham.....	3	8,883	347
Yavapai County School District No. 1, Yavapai.....	3	35,362	7,481	Pinetop Lakeside Elementary School District No. 32, Navajo.....	3	21,702	12,772
Ganado School District No. 19, Apache.....	3	236,928	82,711	Pinetop Lakeside High School District No. 32, Navajo.....	3	14,047	10,064
Kayenta Elementary School District No. 27, Navajo.....	3	126,634	86,124	Klondyke School District No. 9, Graham.....	3	2,043	1,278
				Congressional district total.....		3,074,007	1,553,596
				Total, Arizona.....		7,842,129	3,751,572

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, because of a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee at which the Vice President appeared to report in some detail on his recent trip to the Far East, I was unable to participate with Senators on the Subcommittee on Education in the most interesting discussion which I understand they had on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

However, I would like to comment briefly on the educational proposals of the President, as incorporated in his message of March 1 on domestic health and education.

First, I regret the cutbacks in what we had hoped would be the request for authorization and appropriation for education from grade school through graduate school made by the President, the cuts being due to the economic situation in connection with our budget and the war in Vietnam.

Nevertheless, I certainly support the recommendations of the President in principle, if not in amount, dealing with the subject of expanding the Headstart program for preschool children, a program which has been conspicuously successful and I hope would grow and grow in years to come if we go ahead with the program.

I am in accord with his suggestion of strengthening the Secondary and Elementary Education Act of 1965 in the ways which he suggests in his message, with some qualification with respect to the necessity for raising from \$2,000 to \$3,000 the family income formula for allocating aid to education for the disadvantaged commencing in fiscal 1968.

On this subject I have a perfectly open mind but I would like to consider the matter further before stating in public my concurrence with the President's view.

Similarly, the President's concern with higher education is shared by me. I am a little worried about the recommended loan fund provision on the ground that if it is adopted, while we will save the Government some money we may have interest rates on loans to disadvantaged young people, who need to borrow money to go to college, being run up far beyond necessary since they will be financed by private banks, although guaranteed by the Government, and not made by the Government itself.

I am also of the view that we should be expanding our scholarship program.

I see in the Chamber the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] who was really responsible for the great assistance given to higher education which was finally incorporated in the education acts we passed last year.

Similarly, I strongly support the President's recommendations to improve the Nation's libraries.

Again, I regret that the vicissitudes of the budget and the war in Vietnam have resulted in some cutbacks in these programs, which I think we, in a more perfect world, should be moving ahead with far more rapidly.

There are, however, two areas in the education field where I would like to make comment. With respect to Public Law 874, the aid to impacted areas, under existing law, Pennsylvania would receive \$7.9 million under this provision;

with the proposed amendments, Pennsylvania's entitlement would drop to \$1.6 million, or a loss of \$6.3 million. Philadelphia would go from \$3.3 million to \$50,000, and Harrisburg from \$250,000 to \$80,000.

To me this is a gross inequity which no formula can justify. I shall do what I can to restore to the cities of my Commonwealth the authorization and appropriation that they received under the 1965 act.

Secondly, with respect to National Defense Education Act loans to students, the proposal would shift the National Defense Education Act student loan program to a subsidized loan guarantee program administered through banks.

I adverted to that a moment ago. It would cut new obligational authority \$180 million.

In spite of loan guarantees, banks will probably have difficulty assuring loans to all worthy students at present because of the tight money market. A tight money market means higher interest.

This may have been recognized by the President, who in his message said:

I am proposing an orderly transition to the new student loan program so that no eligible student will be deprived of the needed financial assistance, and I will ask for the necessary funds to accomplish this purpose.

This proposal means there will be a medium-sized cut. Pennsylvania was allocated \$10.6 million in the current fiscal year. In recent years it spent all of its allocation.

I shall do my best to see that that allocation is not cut.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD the form letter which I have been sending to constituents who are concerned about the cuts in Public Law 874; also a form letter, in this instance directed to the Very Reverend William F. Maloney, S.J., president, St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Pa., concerning the President's plan to shift the program into a new program of federally guaranteed private loans, about which I spoke a moment ago; and finally, a letter that I received from Eric A. Walker, president of the Pennsylvania State University, which is our Pennsylvania land-grant college, protesting some cuts proposed in the budget to the land-grant colleges, which again I will do my best to oppose.

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

DEAR —: Thank you for your communication regarding Public Law 874.

The cuts in Public Law 874 recommended in the President's Budget are causing great concern among many members of Congress. As a member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, my colleagues and I will give very careful scrutiny to the administration's justification for its actions. The initial response that the money saved is being channeled into title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act seems weak since there is no necessary correlation between the school districts receiving funds under these acts.

Until such time as we have developed general aid to education which will assist all school districts, there is need to give careful attention to see that no districts are severely handicapped by sudden and specific legislative changes.

Sincerely yours,

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

The Very Reverend WILLIAM F. MALONEY, S.J., President, St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR FATHER MALONEY: Thank you for your telegram of February 2.

The President's plan to shift the National Defense Education Act loan programs into a new program of federally guaranteed private loans is also causing great concern among many Members of Congress. As a member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I will be giving careful consideration to the administration's proposals in this area. I am sure that a new program will not be adopted by Congress unless we have assurance from both the administration and the private banking community that they are willing and able to provide the needed funds to assure loans to low-income students.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH S. CLARK.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY,

University Park, Pa., February 11, 1966.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: The Federal Government does some stupid things at times but I have one that takes real genius to perform. Do you know that the new budget as submitted by the administration cuts the funds available

to the land-grant colleges by some \$20 million?

Actually, the proposed legislation will cut the land-grant teaching funds by about \$12 million, the agricultural research funds by \$8½ million, and \$10 million of the extension service funds will be changed from the present basis to a new and more uncomfortable one. If the legislation goes through, it will cost Penn State about one-half million dollars. It will mean that we will cut back on the teaching of students, probably have to fire some faculty, and reduce the salaries of others. Obviously, I cannot go to the State and ask them to make up the deficiency at this late date, and I doubt if the State would do it anyway.

The irony of all this is that the administration seems to be pumping funds into education in many directions and is determined to put through a new Great Society program. Yet it chops the foundation from under one of the elements that the Federal Government has been supporting for almost a century.

I don't think that the administration can be this stupid. I must believe that it is an oversight or an error which the Congress will hasten to correct. I hope I can count on your support in getting the matter corrected.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC A. WALKER.

#### UNITED STATES SHOULD CLOSE "MLF" LOOPHOLE IN TREATY TO STOP SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in an item in yesterday morning's Washington Post it is reported that United Nations Ambassador Arthur Goldberg is to fly to London today for 3 or 4 days of talks, and that he may then possibly proceed to Geneva where the 17-nation disarmament talks are in progress.

No indication of the purpose of this trip to Geneva is given, but one may hope that it is to add his strength to the skillful and effective negotiating team headed by Mr. William Foster, Director of Arms Control and Disarmament, in an effort to break the deadlock which is attempting to block progress toward a treaty to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

If there is anyone who can help break that deadlock and help Mr. Foster, I am confident it is he. But we would be deluding ourselves to think that even Ambassador Goldberg, with all his skill and persuasiveness, could induce the Soviets to sign a treaty which leaves a gaping loophole for an "MLF" or some other nuclear sharing device which would permit the West Germans to get their finger nearer the nuclear trigger.

Until we sit down and rewrite our draft treaty to close this loophole, we will not have a prayer of getting an agreement with Russia.

As I said on the floor of the Senate during the debate on the Pastore resolution, this is the real issue. It is not just a matter of being against the spread of nuclear weapons. That is about as controversial as being against sin and in favor of motherhood.

I find it hard to understand why the zealots in the middle levels of the State Department, who have continually blocked a nonproliferation treaty by

their persistent advocacy of an "MLF," cling to this half-baked plan. I think there is fairly general agreement in the Senate that this is a "nutty idea"—to borrow the words used by Senator Pastore. No one seriously believes that any "MLF" will ever come into being. Why not kill it once and for all by re-writing our draft nonproliferation treaty to close this loophole, and then, hopefully, getting the Soviets to sign on the dotted line?

I have information from Geneva which convinces me that the Soviets are seriously interested in a nonproliferation treaty, and that the major obstacle to the consummation of such a treaty is the insistence by the Department of State on "MLF."

If Ambassador Goldberg's mission is to try to break the nonproliferation treaty deadlock, as I hope it is, the administration should give him the authority to resolve the key issue—the issue of "MLF"—in a way which would at least give us some ground to hope for a successful negotiation. I hope the Ambassador will be given the power to close the "MLF" loophole, so that we can move ahead on what, to my way of thinking, is one of the most important issues concerning the world today: How can we stop the further spread of nuclear weapons?

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, only because it is my understanding that the Senator from Indiana desires to speak before the Senate adjourns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on the education message sent to Congress by the President. I intend to comment on it at length at a later time.

I should like to say in the presence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that no Member of the Senate has contributed more than he to the education of young people and has consistently over the years supported efforts to make education not alone available to everyone but available in quantity and quality of the type necessary for the development of an educated United States of America.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Indiana for his kind words, but he has done much more than I have.

#### ADULT EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes about the Adult Education Act of 1966.

On May 10, 1965, I addressed the New York Association of Public School Adult



Educators, and in the course of my remarks I said:

We must, and we can, mount an increasing attack upon the lack of educational background among adults as well as our youth. The need is there, the response is waiting to be encouraged, and the tools are available for improving adult education. Therefore, I believe, as a step forward to supplement the lift we are giving by Federal action in both the elementary and the higher education fields, we must plan now to attack with equal vigor the task as soon as possible to offer a bill spelling out the means whereby the Federal Government can aid in developing such a pattern generally throughout the Nation.

Today I am happy to introduce, on behalf of myself, Senator RANDOLPH, Senator BAYH, Senator NEUBERGER, Senator McGEE, Senator YARBOROUGH, Senator MOSS, Senator METCALF, Senator INOUYE, Senator FONG, and Senator MONTANA, the bill that I promised then, the Adult Education Act of 1966.

Mr. President, I deeply regret that the President's message did not include such a program, but most of the provisions of this bill have been worked out in conjunction with the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We are all aware of the increased necessity for adequate education today. We are making forward strides in education through a variety of Federal efforts, combined with the improvement of education by States, communities, and private institutions. Increasingly we are seeing those who formerly would have been grade-school dropouts go on to high school, high school dropouts finishing their course, and many added thousands eagerly seeking college.

But while we have the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act, of which I was the original sponsor, and the enthusiastic support for which I see, at this time, at least, somewhat dampened, I hope we shall have an authorization of funds, followed by appropriations, because I think the difficulties can be worked out; and while we have Headstart for the toddler, and new graduate programs for the doctoral candidate, there is one area of need which remains a challenging frontier of education for our next attention. That is the field of adult education, and it is to that field that I direct my bill and invite your attention.

In the years 1953-63, jobs filled by high school graduates rose 30 percent, while jobs for those with only elementary education decreased by 25 percent. Other figures based on a 1963 report of the Office of Education show that persons 18 years and older who have not completed high school make up 46 percent of the labor force, but a disproportionate 64 percent of the unemployed. At the same time, 93 percent of professional and technical workers, have at least high school graduation, and 27 percent have more than a college degree. The unemployment rate of 1.7 percent can hardly be improved.

When the 1960 census was taken, 23 million adults over 25 had not completed 8 years of school, and 55 million had not completed high school. As the age level

increases, so do the proportionate number of those who are undereducated.

I need not belabor the point, since we are all quite conscious of the situation. But we are not so conscious of the challenge and opportunity for expanding our educational system to the Nation's adults as we have been of the need for upgrading our youth before they reach life as adults.

Actually, elementary, secondary, and adult education are interdependent. The growing extent of adult education through the public school system is not generally comprehended. But neither is the scope and magnitude of the adult education task generally recognized as yet, either.

I quote from the report of the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, of which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is the chairman, issued in April 1964.

Yet, of 15,200 school systems studied by the Office of Education, only 4,840 reported any type of adult education programs. Only 160, or 3.3 percent, offered any instruction whatsoever in adult basic education. Of 23 million educationally deprived adults, only 47,500 were being taught basic literacy skills and only 1.1 percent of the limited number of adult education courses offered such training. For the older worker who was deprived of educational opportunity in his youth, the Nation as a whole simply has no educational system.

It is the purpose of this bill to help develop and improve what should be a great national effort to provide through the public schools an educational supplement for all persons over the age of 18 years.

It can be done. Some school systems are doing it. The report to which I have referred cites as an example the fact that the city of Los Angeles operates 27 adult schools with 100 branches, and 66,000 enrolled students in 1964. These schools in 1963 issued 2,130 high school diplomas, nearly a thousand of them to persons who had previously been dropouts of the Los Angeles public school system.

To look on the extent of such activity, put the statistics cited in the subcommittee report in another light and we can see that the 4,840 schools with some type of adult education program comprise nearly a third of the 15,200 studied. In communities of more than 2,500 population there are adult education programs in 63.5 percent of the schools. Altogether, some 3,500,000 adults attend some sort of classes or program activities offered by public schools, so that 1 in 12 students attending public school is an adult.

What kind of work are these adults taking?

Nearly half a million—449,000—are finishing elementary or high school in public school adult classes.

Nearly twice as many—932,000—attend public school business, trade, industrial and technical courses; 171,000 are in Americanization classes, which have a long history going back to the genesis of adult education, preparing for the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

Another 73,400 adults are joining in civic and public affairs activities organized by the public schools—hearing talks on local, national, and international problems; reading about and discussing history, economics, and politics.

Parent education classes enroll about 132,000 men and women.

Attendance at homemaking and consumer education classes is 459,000.

Classes in personal development and group relationships reach 71,000.

These are obviously not always the same kinds of curriculums with which we teach the young in these same schools. Nor is it desirable that they should be, for adult education is not necessarily the same as education for children and youth.

The bill I am offering makes room for, and indeed invites, the educational upgrading of adults, the enrichment of their lives for the facing of life's problems, on both of the levels which are discernible in the figures I have given. There is provision for meeting the accepted standards of formal education which they have missed, and part of the support provided for public school adult education is directed toward the large group. But there is also specific opportunity afforded for other adults, as well as these, regardless of the level of formal educational attainment, to participate in "supplemental adult education" which is defined as: "a program of instruction and services for adults designed to enable them to overcome English language limitations, to improve their basic education in preparation for occupational training and more profitable employment, or to become more productive and responsible citizens, and such programs may include citizenship training, parent education, and consumer education."

In addition to "supplemental adult education" the bill is also designed: "to encourage and expand educational programs for adults who have not completed secondary school or otherwise achieved an equivalent level of education."

This goes beyond the current concept of basic adult education as confined to the elementary school level. There is no reason why, in today's world, we should not consider high school completion or its equivalent as the norm and, therefore, as properly included in adult basic education. For this reason, the bill makes such a definition, including within the term: "a program of instruction and services for adults who do not have a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education or who have not achieved an equivalent level of education."

Under the concept of this bill, these two—adult basic education and supplemental adult education—are not mutually exclusive. There is no requirement that in order to take a course in consumer education for instance, the adult who thus participates in the supplemental program must have first completed the basic education leading to a high school diploma or equivalency.

Neither does the bill specify more than broad authority for any specific curriculums. Authority for operating the programs which the bill encourages re-

mains with the local school systems, operating under State agencies which now furnish their coordination and guidelines.

In short, here we are retaining the same successful structure that we work through in the Federal relationship to elementary and secondary education, using the public schools to provide the mechanism—already largely in existence in many respects—for a great expansion of adult education.

I might add that to strengthen public school adult education in the way my bill will do does not in any sense take away from other agencies of adult education, or from broader or more specialized programs which they provide. After all, the comprehensive study of adult education of all kinds in the United States, reported in 1963 after a year's work and more by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago, showed that public school adult education is only a fraction of the total. That study said:

Twenty-five million adult Americans (better than 1 in 5) were active within some educational category between June 1961 and June 1962, and over 23 million were active other than as full time students. These numbers are roughly equivalent to the total number of paid attendances at major league baseball games during a season \* \* \* and constitute considerably more Americans than have their teeth cleaned by a dentist over a period of a year.

While the total number securing adult education through elementary and secondary schools was 1,920,000, other institutions outranking the public school system in numbers of adults served across the broad spectrum of adult education were: churches and synagogues, 3,460,000; colleges and universities, 3,440,000; community organizations, 2,450,000; business and industry, 2,040,000. Private schools furnished some adult education to another 1,220,000; government to 1,180,000; and the Armed Forces to 580,000.

I am not talking about these other agencies, but only about the greater use of our vast public school system, which perhaps should be close to the head of the list if not leading it. I say this because one showing of the NORC study is that the vast preponderance of those engaged in much adult education are those who are already among the better educated. I believe that a strengthened program through the public schools offers the best possibility of reaching those who are undereducated, where they are attracted by the opportunity to take supplemental adult education courses which will help them meet better the problems facing the adult in the adult world of home and community.

We need other agencies and programs in adult education. But for a first Federal effort to strengthen the Nation's resources here, the most promising and appropriate tool is the public school system.

One of the problems often facing public adult education is that of sufficient space. This is not so much a problem with an evening program, when the schools are available without conflict with the boys and girls who study there in school hours. But experience shows that as many as 20 percent of those who

would like to take adult education courses are faced with the need to do so in the daytime. These are housewives, whose children's absence leaves them free, as they are not in the evening; and great numbers of night shift workers. Consequently, there is a need for more space within the public school system for adult education daytime use.

My bill meets this chronic problem not by offering funds for new construction but by allowing the use of funds for leasing space. This might be in the educational buildings of churches, which are often idle during the week and yet are frequently well equipped for such work; or in union halls, or whatever other facilities may be available and suitable. As public school adult education expands, more buildings will doubtless occur, but the bill meets the immediate need here.

Funds authorized by the bill for a 3-year program would be available for any State, contingent upon approval of its proffered plan by the Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner would be assisted by the Advisory Council, but actual operational responsibility, of course, would be that of each local community through its own system.

The State plan, in order to be approved, must set out a program to assure "substantial progress with respect to all segments of the adult population and all areas of the State," under administration by the State educational agency. This bill is not intended to provide help for the big cities alone, but to create an integrated adult program throughout the entire public school system as equitably as possible, without regard to geography, economic, or other individual characteristics. The aim is to encourage extension of free public education for our children; to free continuing education for their parents; and to meet more adequately the basic educational deficiencies they hold as well.

In conclusion, I call attention to two other provisions of the bill which might escape notice. One changes the definition of "adult" for educational purposes from the 25 years used by the Census Bureau to the realistic figure of 18 years. The other change, through the provision of section 16, takes away from the Office of Economic Opportunity responsibility for its present basic adult education program and puts it under the Office of Education through this bill, a measure which is desirable and which I understand is quite agreeable to those agencies.

I emphasize that this bill is the result of a long-term effort and of a great deal of consultation. Those consulted in considerable detail include the National Education Association and especially one of its constituents, the National Association for Public School Adult Education; the Adult Education Association; and individual experts in the field of adult education both in and out of government. The National Education Association has made the following statement on this bill:

STATEMENT ON THE ADULT EDUCATION ACT OF 1966 BY THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The purpose of the Adult Education Act of 1966 is to encourage and expand educational

programs for adults who have not completed secondary school or otherwise achieved an equivalent level of education and to expand supplemental educational programs for adults to enable them to overcome English language limitations, to improve their basic education in preparation for occupational training and more profitable employment and to become more productive and responsible citizens.

The platform of the National Education Association sets forth the principles of the association. The platform then states:

"In order to give effect to these principles, the National Education Association seeks the following policies and goals:

"1. Educational opportunity for all:  
"(f) Provision for adults to participate in organized instructional programs."

The association is committed to the provision of Federal funds for education through the educational agencies of the States and for State determination of its programs. This proposal maintains this principle in its provisions.

The proposal also provides for the training of teachers for adult teaching with appropriate stipends and allowances, which is consistent with the policy of the association.

The prohibition of Federal control in the proposal is also in accord with the policy of the National Education Association.

Since the proposal in its purpose and provisions is in accord and consistent with the principles, policies and goals of the association, our wholehearted support of the measure is assured, and we will hope for its early enactment.

I would like further to point out that section 11, which I have not previously alluded to, is a very important section headed "Teacher Training Projects." Separate authorization is made for this purpose, in order that the Commissioner may provide training for persons engaged in, or preparing to engage in, teaching in adult educational programs provided for under the bill. There is a great need for such specialized training within the field of adult education.

The authorizations called for have been fixed in the bill, not capriciously, but after making the best judgment possible on the basis of the view of experts in the field. The basic adult education program will take more than triple the amount provided for the supplemental adult education program, as it properly should. Ideally, the basic program should make it possible for every adult with the desire to do so to meet the requirements of a high school diploma or its equivalency.

This, it should be noted, will depend on the procedures which the individual States determine. It allows them, as all but four States now do, to use such means as the general educational development test as a basis for awarding certificates of high school equivalency, and to continue the practice of some States of making no distinction between the two.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that it may be held at the desk for cosponsors until the close of business Friday, March 11.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 3012) to provide grants to the States for the strengthening of adult



educational programs, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3012

*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 "Adult Education Act of 1966".*

#### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to encourage and expand educational programs for adults who have not completed secondary school or otherwise achieved an equivalent level of education, and to encourage and expand supplemental educational programs for adults to enable them to overcome English language limitations, to improve their basic education in preparation for occupational training and more profitable employment and to become more productive and responsible citizens.

#### DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "adult" means any individual who has attained the age of eighteen.

(b) The term "adult basic education" means a program of instruction and services for adults who do not have a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education or who have not achieved an equivalent level of education.

(c) The term "supplemental adult education" means a program of instruction and services for adults designed to enable them to overcome English language limitations, to improve their basic education in preparation for occupational training and more profitable employment, or to become more productive and responsible citizens, and such program may include citizenship training, parent education, and consumer education.

(d) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(e) The term "local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools; except that if there is a separate board or other legally constituted local authority having administrative control and direction of adult basic education in public schools therein, such term means such other board or authority.

(f) The term "State" includes in addition to the several States of the Union the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(g) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or if there is a separate State agency or officer primarily responsible for supervision of adult basic education in public schools then such agency or officer may be designated for the purposes of this Act by the Governor or by State law. If no agency or officer qualifies under the preceding sentence, such term shall mean an appropriate agency or officer designated for the purposes of this Act by the Governor.

#### GRANTS TO THE STATE FOR ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

SEC. 4. From sums appropriated pursuant to section 15(a) the Commissioner is author-

ized to make grants to States, which have State plans approved by him under section 8 for the purposes of this section, to pay the Federal share of the cost of—

(1) the establishment or expansion of adult basic education programs to be carried out in public schools or other facilities by local educational agencies;

(2) leasing facilities where necessary for such programs; and

(3) the development or improvement of technical or supervisory services by the State educational agency relating to such programs.

#### GRANTS TO STATES FOR SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT EDUCATION

SEC. 5. From sums appropriated pursuant to section 15(b) the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to States, which have State plans approved by him under section 8 for the purposes of this section, to pay the Federal share of the cost of the establishment or expansion of supplemental adult educational programs to be carried out by local educational agencies.

#### ALLOTMENTS FOR ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

SEC. 6. (a) From sums appropriated pursuant to section 15(a) for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine, and shall allot such amount among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under such section. From the remainder of such sums he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of adults in the State who do not have a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education or its equivalent bears to the number of such adults in all States, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the best and most recent information available to him, including any relevant data furnished to him by the Department of Commerce.

(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is available, for carrying out the portion of the State plan relating to adult basic education (if any) approved under this Act shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such period for carrying out such portion of its State plan approved under this Act; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

#### ALLOTMENTS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT EDUCATION

SEC. 7. (a) From sums appropriated for grants to States pursuant to section 15(b) for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine, and shall allot such amount among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under such section. From the remainder of such sums he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the adult population of the State bears to the adult population of all States.

(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which

the Commissioner determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is available, for carrying out the portion of the State plan relating to supplemental adult education (if any) approved under this Act shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such period for carrying out such portion of its State plan approved under this Act; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

#### STATE PLANS

SEC. 8. (a) Any State desiring to receive its allotment of Federal funds for any grant under this Act shall submit through its State educational agency a State plan. A State plan shall be in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, and shall—

(1) set forth a program for the use of grants, in accordance with section 4 or section 5, or both, which affords assurance of substantial progress, with respect to all segments of the adult population and all areas of the State, toward carrying out the purposes of such section 4 or 5 or both;

(2) provides for the administration of such plan by the State educational agency;

(3) provides for cooperative arrangements between the State educational agency and the State health authority authorizing the use of such health information and services for adults as may be available from such agencies and as may reasonably be necessary to enable them to benefit from the instruction provided pursuant to this Act;

(4) provides that such agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this Act and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner finds necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

(5) provides such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this act (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies); and

(6) provides such further information and assurances as the Commissioner may by regulation require.

(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this act, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

#### PAYMENTS

SEC. 9. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the Federal share of expenditures to carry out a State plan shall be paid from a State's allotment available for grants to such State. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the two succeeding fiscal years the Federal share for each State shall be 50 per centum.

(b) No payments shall be made to any State from its allotment for any fiscal year unless the Commissioner finds that—

(1) in the case of grants under section 4 the amount available for expenditures by such State for adult basic education, and

(2) in the case of grants under section 5 the amount available for expenditure by such State for supplemental adult education,

from non-Federal sources for such year will be not less than the amount expended for such purposes from such sources during the preceding fiscal year.

(c) Payments to a State under this Act may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

#### OPERATION OF STATE PLANS; HEARINGS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 10. (a) Whenever the Commissioner after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a State plan approved under this Act, finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 8, or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this Act (or in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments may be made to such State under this Act (or payments shall be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(b) A State educational agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under section 8 or subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Commissioner may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

#### TEACHER TRAINING PROJECTS

SEC. 11. From sums appropriated pursuant to section 15(c) for any fiscal year, the Commissioner is authorized to provide, or to make grants to colleges and universities, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, or other appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations to provide, training to persons engaged or preparing to engage as instructors in adult educational programs designed to carry out the

purposes of this Act, with such stipends and allowances, if any (including travel and subsistence expenses), for persons undergoing such training and their dependents as the Commissioner may by regulation determine.

#### ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 12. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

#### FEDERAL CONTROL PROHIBITED

SEC. 13. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system.

#### LIMITATION

SEC. 14. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this Act for religious worship or instruction.

#### APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 15. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated \$\_\_\_\_\_ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$\_\_\_\_\_ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and \$\_\_\_\_\_ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969 to make grants to States for adult basic educational programs under section 4.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated \$\_\_\_\_\_ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$\_\_\_\_\_ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and \$\_\_\_\_\_ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969 to make grants to States for supplemental adult educational programs under section 5.

(c) There is authorized to be appropriated \$\_\_\_\_\_ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$\_\_\_\_\_ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and \$\_\_\_\_\_ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969 to provide for training projects under section 11.

#### THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ADULT EDUCATION

SEC. 16. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Adult Education consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and ten members appointed without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, from among persons knowledgeable in the field of adult education and representatives of the general public.

(b) The Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this Act and the effectiveness of the programs carried out pursuant to this Act. The Commissioner may appoint such advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Council.

(c) Members of the Council who are not otherwise full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized

by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

#### REPEALER

SEC. 17. Part B of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is repealed.

#### AMENDMENT OF SUBCHAPTERS S AND R OF CHAPTER I OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, these matters have been cleared with both sides. I am going to ask to call up two bills and ask that they appear at an appropriate place in the RECORD so as not to interfere with the debate on the subject of education.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 981, H.R. 9883.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9883) to amend subchapter S of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments on page 7, line 24, after the word "corporation", to strike out "to which this subsection applies"; on page 11, after line 10, to insert:

(5) Section 46(a)(3) of such Code (relating to liability for tax for purposes of the credit for investment in certain depreciable property) is amended by striking out "or by section 541 (relating to personal holding company tax)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 541 (relating to personal holding company tax), or section 1378 (relating to tax on certain capital gains of subchapter S corporations)".

And, on page 13, after line 21, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) Section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to unincorporated business enterprises electing to be taxed as domestic corporations) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new sentence: "No election (other than an election referred to in subsection (f)) may be made under this subsection after the date of the enactment of this sentence.";

(2) by striking out in subsection (c) "except as provided in subsection (m).";

(3) by striking out "subsection (f)" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (f) and (n).";

(4) by striking out subsection (m); and

(5) by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(n) REVOCATION AND TERMINATION OF ELECTIONS.—

"(1) REVOCATION.—An election under subsection (a) with respect to an unincorporated business enterprise may be revoked after the date of the enactment of this subsection by the proprietor of such enterprise or by all the partners owning an interest in such enterprise on the date on which the revocation is made. Such enterprise shall not be considered a domestic corporation for any period on or after the effective date of



such revocation. A revocation under this paragraph shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations.

"(2) **TERMINATION.**—If a revocation under paragraph (1) of an election under subsection (a) with respect to any unincorporated business enterprise is not effective on or before December 31, 1968, such election shall terminate on January 1, 1969, and such enterprise shall not be considered a domestic corporation for any period on or after January 1, 1969."

(b) Effective on January 1, 1969—

(1) subchapter R of chapter 1 of such Code (relating to election of certain partnerships and proprietorships as to taxable status) is repealed;

(2) the table of subchapters for chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out the item relating to subchapter R; and

(3) section 1504(b) of such Code (relating to definition of includible corporation) is amended by striking out paragraph (7).

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) (2) and (4) shall apply with respect to transactions occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

There being no objection, the committee amendments were considered and agreed to en bloc.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be passed.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be passed.

**The LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** It is proposed, on page 11, line 21, to strike out "Act" and insert "Act, but such amendments shall not apply with respect to sales or exchanges occurring before February 24, 1966".

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, the bill as passed by the House and as agreed to by the Finance Committee imposed a capital gains tax at the corporate level in certain instances where a subchapter S corporation realizes the gain from the sale of a capital asset in its first 3 years of operation. This tax was supposed to apply prospectively. It has come to the committee's attention that there may be instances in which this tax would have a retroactive effect. This amendment would make certain that the intent of the committee, that this provision apply prospectively only, is carried out. Under the amendment, the tax would not apply to a capital gain where the transaction involved was entered into before February 24, 1966. This is the date on which the bill was reported by the committee.

I ask that the amendment be approved and that the bill as amended be passed.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill from the report be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extracts (Rept. No. 1007) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### GENERAL EXPLANATION

##### A. Distributions after the end of the year (sec. 1 of the bill)

While the tax treatment accorded the small business corporations and their shareholders is similar to the Federal income tax treatment accorded partnerships and their partners, certain differences continue as a result of the corporate form of these organizations. For example, one of these small business corporations may have previously been taxed as a regular corporation with the result that when these earnings and profits previously earned are treated as distributed, they represent an ordinary dividend from a corporation.

The present small business corporation provision treats distributions of money made during the corporation's year as being made first out of the corporation's earnings and profits of that year. If the corporation's income for the year exceeds these actual distributions made during the year, then this remaining income is treated as if it were distributed to the shareholders on the last day of the corporation's year and taxed to the shareholders as if received by them at that time. On the other hand, if the small business corporation actually distributes more money than its income for the year, this excess amount would generally be considered as the income of the prior year or years. If the corporation had elected this "passthrough" option in the prior year, this excess amount would not be taxable to the shareholders but only if this amount had already been taken into the shareholders' income in a year prior to that in which they received the distribution.

While in most respects the rules described above as to the order of distributions have worked well, nevertheless, they have presented problems where distributions have been made shortly after the end of a year. As a practical matter, corporate officers frequently do not know the amount of the corporation's income until after its year has ended. Consequently, it is difficult to distribute the entire amount of the corporation's income within the year. (This problem has been met elsewhere in the internal revenue laws by allowing amounts distributed for a limited period after the end of a year to be treated as a distribution made during a year.) In addition, taxpayers who think of small business corporations as being taxed like partnerships fail to recognize the significance of the timing of a distribution by the corporation. In the case of a partnership, the income of the partnership is taxed to the partners, whether or not distributed, and the timing of the distribution of the partnership earnings as such makes little or no difference for tax purposes.

The effect of postponing a distribution until after the end of the year in the case of a small business corporation in some cases has little tax consequences, while in other cases it can work substantial hardships on the shareholders.

One type of situation where hardship may exist in the case of such a distribution made shortly after the end of a year arises where the shareholder is on a taxable year ending 1 month or more after that of the corporation. This can be illustrated by a corporation with the taxable year ending on November 30 and a shareholder with a taxable year ending on December 31. In such a case, if the corporation has made no distribution by November 30, each shareholder is taxed on his proportionate share of the taxable income of the corporation for that year. If the corporation then distributes this income to the shareholders during December, the share-

holder will be faced with a double inclusion of the corporation's earnings in 1 year since such a shareholder first is taxed on his share of the undistributed earnings as of November 30; then, when the actual distribution is made in the following December, it is treated as a distribution out of the earnings and profits of the corporation for that following year. Thus, this distribution, too, is taxable to the shareholder.

It is, of course, true that in the shareholder's next year he will not be taxed on the corporate earnings for that year (assuming the profits for the year do not exceed the distribution). However, because of the progressive structure of the individual income tax rates, such a shareholder may suffer a substantial detriment by having two inclusions made in 1 year with respect to what was intended to be the same corporate earnings even though he is not taxed on these corporate earnings in the following year.

Another problem has arisen because a distribution is treated as being paid out of the prior year's undistributed taxable income only when this income already has been taxed to the shareholders at the time of the actual distribution. The problem arises when the year of a shareholder, to which the undistributed taxable income is attributed for tax purposes, extends beyond that of the corporation and has not closed prior to the time of the actual distribution. (See regulations, secs. 1.1375-4(d) and 1.1375-4(g), example No. 2.) In such cases if there is no undistributed taxable income in prior years, the distribution may be treated as being paid out of earnings and profits of the corporation for years before it elected the "passthrough" treatment and therefore be treated as an ordinary dividend to the shareholder.

Problems have also arisen, whether or not the corporation and shareholders are on different years, where for one reason or another the "passthrough" election is terminated in the year in which the actual distribution is made. The problems become particularly severe where the corporation does not intend to distribute its profits of this second year. In such a case, despite this intent, the actual distribution made (which the corporation intended to be out of the earnings of the prior year) nevertheless, is treated as a dividend in the actual year of distribution. As a result, the shareholder is taxed on these amounts at this time and also is taxed on the earnings of the prior year which were undistributed at the end of that year. A number of problems of this type have occurred since 1958 in the operation of these provisions, working unintended hardships on shareholders.

Section 1 of this bill deals with this problem for the future and also provides a mechanism for the relief of those taxpayers who were misled in their understanding of the "passthrough" election in the past.

The bill provides, in the case of an electing small business corporation, that distributions of money to shareholders within 2½ months after the close of a taxable year are to be treated as distributions of the corporation's undistributed taxable income for the year just ended, to the extent that these distributions do not exceed this undistributed taxable income. This treatment is similar to that provided in the case of the accumulated earnings tax and in the case of personal holding companies. This rule is expected to afford corporations a reasonable time after the end of a year to determine how much their profit was and to distribute it to their shareholders. Yet, the period within which these distributions must be made is sufficiently short so that the shareholders can, in effect, elect to treat distributions (by waiting 2½ months) as having been made out of the current year's income

without unduly delaying the distribution in order to achieve that result.

Present law (sec. 1375(e)) already permits distributions of the proceeds of a sale of capital assets to be treated as having been made on the last day of the taxable year within which the sale occurred, if the distributions are made within 2½ months after the end of that taxable year and were made pursuant to a resolution of the board of directors adopted before the end of the year in question. This treatment is available only if each shareholder owns the same proportion of the corporation's stock on the distribution date as he did on the last days of the corporation's last taxable year.

In view of the significant overlap between this existing subsection and the new subsection added by this bill, your committee agrees with the House that the retention of the existing subsection (sec. 1375(e)) is unnecessary and therefore this bill repeals this subsection. However, because corporations already may have entered into transactions intending to use this subsection, the repeal is to affect only distributions made after the close of taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of this bill. Thereafter, corporations should be able to qualify such transactions to a substantial degree under the new provision.

As has been indicated, it appears that numerous persons have misunderstood the distribution rules under existing law, assuming that the profits of an electing small business corporation could be distributed after the end of the year without tax effect in the same way as the profits of a partnership. Because of this apparently widely held misunderstanding, the bill applies the new provision described above, on an elective basis, to distributions made under similar circumstances before the enactment of this bill. Because any such application of this provision might affect adversely the tax liabilities of some shareholders, and (depending upon the circumstances of the individual case) might affect the corporation's accumulated earnings and profits, the bill requires this election to be consented to by all persons who were shareholders at any time on or after the date of the first applicable distribution, unless the Treasury Department determines that the nonconsenting shareholder's potential, and actual, tax liabilities could not be affected by the election.

Your committee also agrees with the House that it was appropriate in these cases to allow up to the ordinary time for filing individual income tax returns after the end of the year in these cases—namely, 3½, rather than 2½, months after the end of the year for these past distributions—since some such distributions apparently were not made until needed to make income tax payments for shareholders.

Elections regarding these past distributions must be made within 1 year after final regulations are published in the Federal Register.

Interest on deficiencies or overpayments resulting from elections regarding past distributions is not to be required or allowed for any period prior to 2 years after the publication of final regulations.

The bill provides that an election regarding past distributions may normally be made only as to a year that is still open. However, a credit or refund may be made for a closed year where the qualifying distributions (or the first few qualifying distributions) substantially equaled the undistributed taxable income of the corporation for its prior year. In addition a closed year may be opened for refunds if the taxpayer can show to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the distributions were intended to be made out of the undistributed

taxable income. Pertinent information might, for example, include a showing that the shareholders treated the distributions on their personal income tax returns as having been made out of the electing small business corporation's prior year's undistributed taxable income, a showing that the distributions approximated the shareholders' taxes on the prior year's income from the corporation, or a showing that on the corporation's tax return (as a part of the information required on the return by sec. 6037 of the code) it had treated such distributions as being made out of the prior year's undistributed taxable income.

Although it is expected that an election will not be made to apply the new provision to past distributions unless a refund will be available for the year designated in the election, other changes caused by the election might result in deficiencies for some stockholders for some of the intervening years which also may have been "closed." In order to avoid manipulation of open overpayment years against closed deficiency years, the bill provides that the statute of limitations for deficiencies for any years involved is not to expire for 1 year after the late date for filing an election under this provision.<sup>1</sup>

If the deficiency year would otherwise have been closed, then the deficiency may not exceed the amount attributable to an election under this provision.

If a claim for refund would not have been barred on the date of enactment of this bill but the statute of limitations would normally expire before 2 years after the final regulations on this point are published, then the years would remain open for the refund until the end of the 2 years. In this situation, the refund may not exceed the overpayment attributable to an election under the proposed new provision.

#### *B. Avoidance of capital gains tax at corporate level (sec. 2 of the bill)*

It has come to your committee's attention that the "passthrough" election has on occasion been used by corporations as a device for the avoidance of capital gains tax: A corporation in such a case arranges to have a large amount of capital gains realized in 1 year, elects the "passthrough" treatment for that year, and distributes these realized capital gains, then deliberately causes its "passthrough" status to be terminated. This avoids a capital gains tax at the corporate level and substitutes capital gains tax for an ordinary (dividend) income tax at the shareholder level. Normally, this could be done where a corporation sold its assets and completely liquidated within a 12-month period (under the provisions of sec. 337). However, by using the "passthrough" treatment the shareholders can obtain the same results without liquidating the business.

Such use of the "passthrough" treatment is contrary to the intent of Congress when it enacted this provision. It was basically intended for an operating business which for business reasons desired the corporate structure yet preferred tax treatment similar to

<sup>1</sup> A deficiency assessment is not to be barred by the statute of limitations under these circumstances even if the statute has already run by the time the election is made and even if an assessment would normally be barred on account of a court decision as to the taxpayers' income tax liability for that year or because a binding closing agreement had been entered into for that year between the taxpayer and the Internal Revenue Service. Of course, the usual limitations in sec. 6213(a) on the Government's right to assess a deficiency will continue to apply and the running of the extended period of limitation will be suspended where sec. 6503 applies.

that accorded a partnership. It was intended for an organization desiring this tax treatment at least for a number of years and certainly not for a single year as a device to avoid capital gains tax to the corporation.

This bill provides for the problem described above by adding a new provision (sec. 1378) to the tax laws imposing a tax upon the capital gains of a corporation which has elected the "passthrough" treatment under certain limited conditions. This tax is imposed only when the electing corporation has an excess of net long-term capital gain over any net short-term capital loss which exceeds its other taxable income and also exceeds \$25,000.<sup>2</sup> In addition, where the corporation would have a loss for the year but for the excess of capital gain referred to above, the tax will apply only if the taxable income (taking into account this capital gain) is over \$25,000.

Since this provision is intended to apply only in those situations where the "passthrough" treatment was elected to avoid taxes on capital gains, the tax is not to be applied in the case of corporations which have been under a "passthrough" election for at least the 3 immediate prior years. Alternatively the tax will not apply in the case of new corporations which have been in existence for less than the 3 prior years but have made the "passthrough" election for the entire period of their existence.

Where the conditions set forth above exist, a tax is to be imposed upon the electing corporation, equal to 25 percent of the excess of the net long-term capital gain over net short-term capital loss, but only to the extent this exceeds \$25,000. However, the tax in no event is to exceed the tax which would have been imposed if the corporation had not elected the "passthrough."<sup>3</sup>

The tax imposed on an electing corporation by this provision will reduce the undistributed taxable income of the corporation and will therefore reduce the amount of income taxable to the shareholders by a like amount. As a result, the shareholders will not be required to pay a tax upon an amount which the corporation in fact paid out as its own tax. The income taxable to the shareholders, however, retains its character as capital gain.

The new provision (in sec. 1378(b)) which sets forth the tax rates, provides that credits generally are not to be allowed against the new capital gains tax imposed at the corporate level. This rule as to credits is designed to insure that the new provision will not extend to these "passthrough" corporations credits for which they would not be eligible in the absence of the special capital gains tax. This is consistent with the rule under present law, that if a corporation which has elected "passthrough" treatment would otherwise be entitled to an investment credit carryback or carryover from a year when the corporation was not subject to this "passthrough" treatment, then neither the corporation or the stockholders are permitted to receive this credit in a year when the corporation is subject to such treatment. The amount of the carryback or carryover available to be used in the next year would not be changed under present law. However, since a carryback or carryforward generally is reduced by a portion of the corporation's tax liability, and since the new provision added here would impose such a liability upon a

<sup>2</sup> Taxable income for this purpose is computed in the same manner as for corporations generally except that no deduction is allowed for a net operating loss carryover, for dividends received or for other deductions specified in secs. 241 to 247 of the code, inclusive.

<sup>3</sup> For this purpose the tax is computed on taxable income as defined in footnote No. 2.



"passthrough" corporation for the first time, it may be that the investment credit carry-back or carryover would be reduced (in the absence of a provision to the contrary) by a portion of the special capital gains tax even though neither the corporation nor the shareholders are permitted to use the credit. To avoid this result, your committee has added a technical amendment to provide that this tax is not to be treated as a tax for purposes of determining the amount by which the investment credit carryover or carryback is reduced.

The requirement previously described, to the effect that a corporation will be subject to this special 25-percent capital gains tax unless it has elected the "passthrough" treatment for the 3 prior years, could be avoided (were no limitation to be imposed) by having an existing corporation participate in a reorganization and having a new corporation which comes out of the reorganization elect the "passthrough" treatment immediately upon its creation, or by transferring property in a tax-free transaction to a corporation which previously has made this election. In order to prevent these results, the bill provides that the tax is to apply to gains and losses from the disposition of property by an electing corporation if (1) the property was acquired in the year in question or within the 3 prior years; (2) the property was acquired from a corporation which was not itself an electing corporation during any of this period up to the time of the acquisition; and (3) the property has a substituted basis in the hands of the electing corporation. Thus, the special 25-percent tax will apply in those cases where the property in question was acquired in a tax-free transaction (such as the various types of corporate reorganizations) and the corporation from which the property was acquired had not used the "passthrough" election during any of this period up to the time of the acquisition. Where that corporation had itself acquired the property in a tax-free transaction, then this test would apply to the corporation from which that corporation had acquired the property.

This provision would apply to corporate taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of the bill.

#### C. Passive investment test in the case of new businesses (sec. 3 of the bill)

When the "passthrough" type of tax treatment was provided for corporations, Congress decided to limit the availability of this treatment to small businesses actively engaged in trades or businesses. Therefore, it denied this treatment to corporations with large amounts of passive income. Accordingly, present law (sec. 1372(e)(5)) provides that a "passthrough" election is to terminate automatically where more than 20 percent of a corporation's gross receipts are derived from royalties, rents, dividends, interest, annuities, and sales or exchanges of stock or securities. To prevent a corporation from electing in and out of the "passthrough" status, present law (sec. 1372(f)) also provides that generally where a corporation terminates its "passthrough" election, it may not again elect this status until after the lapse of a 5-year period.

Attention has been called to a type of instance, which may well occur with some frequency, where the provisions described above work unintended hardships. New corporations, electing the "passthrough" treatment and intending to commence the operation of businesses, frequently have to improve real property and acquire tangible personal property before they can actually begin operations. Because of construction delays, or delays in obtaining the tangible personal property, the corporations may not produce the anticipated operating receipts in their first or second year of operation. Meanwhile, funds accumulated to pay the

costs of construction (or the purchase price for the tangible personal assets) normally remain in interest-bearing accounts awaiting the subsequently required payments. The interest thus produced may well amount to more than 20 percent of a corporation's gross receipts particularly since its operating income may not yet have really begun to come in. Where this happens a corporation's "passthrough" status may automatically terminate. This status then cannot generally be renewed for 5 years.\*

To meet this type of problem, the bill provides that a corporation is not to lose its "passthrough" status merely because its passive investment income exceeds 20 percent of its gross receipts during the first 2 taxable years in which it carried on the active conduct of a trade or business if its passive investment income for the year in question is less than \$3,000.

This provision is to apply to corporate taxable years ending after the date of the bill's enactment. It is also to apply to earlier years beginning after December 31, 1962, at the election of the corporation if all persons who were shareholders at any time during those years consent to the application of this provision.

#### D. Repeal of provisions permitting unincorporated businesses to be taxed as corporations; tax-free incorporations of such businesses (sec. 4 of the bill)

##### 1. Repeal of Provision

In 1954 the Congress enacted a provision (sec. 1361) to permit proprietorships and partnerships to elect to be taxed basically like corporations.

The latest available Internal Revenue Service statistics indicate that there are probably fewer than 1,000 business entities which have elected this corporate tax option. Your committee has concluded that a provision of this complexity which has proved to be of such limited usefulness should not be continued.

Accordingly your committee's amendment repeals this provision. However, to permit businesses subject to this provision to plan their affairs in light of this repeal, your committee's amendment makes this repeal effective January 1, 1969. In the meanwhile, no new elections under this provision are to be permitted, but (as further explained below) entities presently subject to this provision will be permitted to incorporate in a tax-free reorganization. They may also liquidate in this period without incorporation.

Under present law (sec. 1361(f)) where there is a change of 20 percent or more in profits or capital interests of a business which has made this election, a new election must be made. Under your committee's amendment, such an election to continue the corporate tax treatment will be permitted until December 31, 1968, despite the general prohibition referred to above with respect to new elections.

##### 2. Tax-Free Reorganizations

One of the major problems with this election for corporate tax treatment has been that where this election has been made and then subsequently the owners want to actually incorporate the business, this cannot be done in many cases without payment of substantial taxes. This occurs because it has

\*Under present law (sec. 1372(f)) a new election may be made in the 5-year period if the Commissioner of Internal Revenue gives his consent. However, in cases of this type the shareholders may not be aware of the fact that their election has been terminated until a revenue agent audits the corporation's return, some years later. Since a new election can have almost no retroactive effect (sec. 1372 (c)(1) and (d)), the shareholders in such cases usually cannot undo much of the effects of the termination.

been held that the incorporation of such a business must be treated first as a taxable liquidation of the business subject to the election and only then as the incorporation of the business. Two Tax Court decisions have agreed with the regulations (Regulations, sec. 1.1361-5(b)) in this respect.<sup>5</sup> This has proved to be a trap for the unwary and may well account for a substantial proportion of the less than 1,000 businesses under this option. They may not have been aware of this treatment initially and now cannot change their status without payment of heavy taxes. Action on situations of this type becomes especially important because repeal of this option would otherwise result in taxable liquidations, for Federal income tax purposes, of all of these businesses.

In view of the considerations set forth above your committee's amendment repeals the portions of this option resulting in this "liquidation-incorporation" concept in the regulations effective with the enactment of this act. Thus an incorporation of the business is to be treated under the provisions of present law relating to corporate organizations, reorganizations, etc. (pts. III and IV of subch. C. of ch. 1 of the code). This in such cases generally will result in the tax-free incorporation of one of these businesses. However, to the extent that money or other property is withdrawn from the business and does not go over to the corporation, tax will apply in the same way as in the case of "boot" in any other corporate reorganization which otherwise is tax free.

##### 3. Revocation of Elections

In view of your committee's amendment repealing this provision effective January 1, 1969, your committee sees no reason why an unincorporated business which has made an election to be taxed like a corporation should be required to remain in that status until that date, whether or not the owners of the business desire to form an actual corporation to continue the business. Accordingly, your committee has included an amendment to permit an election to be revoked on or before December 31, 1968. If an election is not revoked on or before this date, it will terminate on January 1, 1969. The revocation or termination of an election (without any transfer to an actual corporation) under your committee's amendment will be treated, for Federal income tax purposes, as a complete liquidation of a corporation.

##### TECHNICAL EXPLANATION

##### Section 1. Distributions of subchapter S corporations after close of taxable year

(a) Distributions within 2½-month period after close of taxable year: Under existing law, distributions of money by an electing small business corporation to its shareholders (other than distributions with respect to which an election is made under sec. 1375(e) of the code) are dividends out of earnings and profits of the taxable year in which the distributions are made to the extent of such earnings and profits. Further, under section 1375(d), such distributions in excess of earnings and profits of the year of distribution may be nondividend distributions of previously taxed income to a shareholder of such corporation only to the extent of amounts which have been included in his gross income under section 1373(b) for his taxable years ending before such distributions. Also, under existing law if an election under section 1372(a) is terminated under section 1372(e), the corporation may not, during the first taxable year to which the termination applies or during any subsequent

<sup>5</sup>One decision was affirmed per curiam by the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and the other has been on appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit for 17 months.

taxable year, make nondividend distributions of previously taxed income of taxable years prior to the termination.

#### *Distributions of undistributed taxable income*

Subsection (a)(1) of the first section of the bill amends subchapter S of chapter 1 of the code by adding a subsection (f) to section 1375. Paragraph (1) of new section 1375(f) provides that any distribution of money made by a corporation which was an electing small business corporation for the taxable year immediately preceding the year of distribution (including a corporation with respect to which an election was terminated under sec. 1372(e) for the year in which the distribution is made) shall be treated as a distribution of the corporation's undistributed taxable income for such immediately preceding year—

(1) if it is made after the close of such immediately preceding year and on or before the 15th day of the 3d month following the close of such year;

(2) if it is made to a person who was a shareholder of such corporation at the close of such year; but

(3) only to the extent that such distribution (when added to the sum of all prior distributions of money made to such person by such corporation following the close of such year) does not exceed such person's share of the corporation's undistributed taxable income for such year.

Any distribution so treated shall, for purposes of chapter 1 of the code, be considered a distribution which is not a dividend, and the earnings and profits of the corporation are not to be reduced by reason of such distribution.

#### *Share of undistributed taxable income*

Paragraph (2) of new section 1375(f) provides that, for purposes of paragraph (1), a person's share of a corporation's undistributed taxable income for a taxable year is the amount required to be included in his gross income under section 1373(b) as a shareholder of such corporation for his taxable year in which or with which the taxable year of the corporation ends.

Thus, the treatment of distributions provided in new section 1375(f) is applicable only to distributions of money made to persons who were shareholders of the corporation on the last day of the corporation's taxable year immediately preceding the corporation's taxable year in which the distributions are made. Such treatment is applicable to the amount each such shareholder receives only to the extent of the amount required to be included in his gross income under section 1373(b) as a shareholder of the corporation on the last day of such immediately preceding year.

#### *Election under section 1375(e)*

Paragraph (3) of new section 1375(f) provides that paragraph (1) shall not apply to any distribution with respect to which an election under section 1375(e) applies. Thus, if a corporation makes an election under section 1375(e) with respect to a distribution of money, the treatment provided by new section 1375(f) does not apply to such distribution.

Repeal of section 1375(e): Subsection (a)(2) of the first section of the bill repeals section 1375(e) of the code effective with respect to distributions made after the close of any taxable year beginning after the date of enactment of the bill. Thus, an election under section 1375(e) may be made only with respect to proceeds of sales which are made by an electing small business corporation before the close of its first taxable year ending after the date of enactment of the bill.

(b) Technical amendment: Subsection (b) of the first section of the bill amends section 1375(d)(2)(B)(ii) of the code to

provide that a shareholder's net share of undistributed taxable income for purposes of section 1375(d) (relating to distributions of undistributed taxable income previously taxed to shareholders) is reduced by distributions treated under new section 1375(f) as nondividend distributions.

The provisions of new section 1375(f) of the code are illustrated by the following examples:

Example (1): X corporation, an electing small business corporation which uses the fiscal year ending March 31 as its taxable year, has two shareholders, A and B, calendar year taxpayers each owning 50 percent of its outstanding stock. For its year ending March 31, 1967, X has made no distributions to its shareholders and has undistributed taxable income (as defined in sec. 1373(c)) of \$50,000. On May 1, 1967, X distributes \$25,000 in money to A and \$25,000 in money to B. X makes no further distributions to A and B during the calendar year 1967, even though it has earnings and profits of \$60,000 for its taxable year ending on March 31, 1968.

Under existing law, A and B would each include \$50,000 in gross income for the calendar year 1967; \$25,000 of this would be includible under section 1373(b) and the other \$25,000 would be includible by reason of the May 1, 1967, distribution. Pursuant to new section 1375(f), however, the May 1, 1967 distribution is treated as a distribution of X's undistributed taxable income for its year ending March 31, 1967, and will not increase A's and B's gross incomes.

Example (2): Y corporation, an electing small business corporation which uses the calendar year as its taxable year, has two shareholders, C and D, calendar year taxpayers each owning 50 percent of its outstanding stock. For its taxable year 1966, Y has \$20,000 of undistributed taxable income (as defined in sec. 1373(c)). At the beginning of 1967, C and D each have \$25,000 as their respective net shares of previously taxed income, including the \$10,000 which was required to be included in the gross income of C and D for 1966 as their respective shares of Y's undistributed taxable income for 1966. On February 1, 1967, Y distributed \$15,000 in money to C and \$15,000 in money to D. Y makes no other distributions during 1967 and has \$40,000 of taxable income for such year. Of the \$15,000 distributions made to C and D on February 1, 1967, \$10,000 of each such distribution is treated as a distribution of Y's undistributed taxable income for 1966, pursuant to new section 1375(f), and is not a dividend to each shareholder. Pursuant to section 1375(d)(2)(B)(ii) of the code, as amended by subsection (b) of the first section of the bill, however, C's and D's net shares of previously taxed income are reduced by the amounts so treated to \$15,000 each. The balance of each \$15,000 distribution, \$5,000, is a dividend to C and D out of Y's earnings and profits for 1967. At the end of 1967, Y has \$30,000 of undistributed taxable income, allocated one-half to C and one-half to D as their respective shares to be included in their gross incomes for 1967.

Example (3): Z corporation, which uses the calendar year as its taxable year, has two shareholders, E and F, calendar year taxpayers each owning 50 percent of its outstanding stock. Z has \$10,000 of undistributed taxable income for 1966, a year for which it was an electing small business corporation. On February 15, 1967, F sells all of his stock in Z to G, who does not consent to the election of Z to be an electing small business corporation. Thus, the election is terminated effective for 1967 and all succeeding taxable years of Z. On March 1, 1967, Z distributes \$5,000 in money to E and \$5,000 in money to G. Under new section 1375(f), the distribution to E is treated as a distribution of Z's undistributed taxable income for 1966 because E was a shareholder of Z on the last

day of 1966 and his share of such undistributed taxable income was \$5,000. However, the distribution to G, who was not a shareholder of Z on the last day of 1966, is a distribution under section 301 of the code, and thus a dividend to the extent provided in section 316 of the code.

(c) Effective date: Subsection (c) of the first section of the bill provides that the amendments made by subsections (a)(1) and (b) shall apply only with respect to distributions made after the date of enactment of the bill, except as provided in subsections (d) of the first section of the bill which is discussed below.

(d) Distributions made before date of enactment: Subsection (d) of the first section of the bill provides rules for the application of new section 1375(f) (and the amendment of sec. 1375(d)(2)(B)(ii)) of the code to distributions of money made on or before the date of enactment of the bill. However, new section 1375(f) is not to apply to any such distribution with respect to which an election under section 1375(e) of the code applies.

#### *Election and consents*

Subsection (d)(1) of the first section of the bill provides that new section 1375(f) will apply to distributions of money made during any taxable year designated by a corporation, if it elects to have new section 1375(f) apply to all such distributions during such year and to all such distributions during subsequent years. Thus, when a corporation makes an election to have new section 1375(f) apply to distributions of money made on or before the date of enactment of the bill, it must designate a taxable year. New section 1375(f) will then apply to all such distributions made during the prescribed periods following the close of the taxable year immediately preceding the year designated, and each subsequent taxable year. For example, if a corporation designates the taxable year 1959, and it makes an effective election, new section 1375(f) will apply to all distributions of money made by the corporation during the prescribed periods following the taxable year 1958 and all subsequent years of the corporation.

In order for such an election by a corporation to be effective, except as otherwise provided by subsection (d) of the first section of the bill, all persons (or their personal representatives) who were shareholders of the corporation at any time on or after the date of the first distribution with respect to which the election applies, and before the date on which the corporation files the election with the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate must consent to such election and to the application of the provisions of subsection (d) of the first section of the bill. The persons who must consent under these provisions include persons who are not shareholders of the corporation at the time of the election but who were shareholders at any time during the period described above. For example, if the taxable year 1959 is the year designated by a calendar year corporation in its election filed on February 15, 1967, and the corporation made its first distribution in 1959 on January 15, 1959, all persons who were shareholders of the corporation at any time on or after January 15, 1959, and before February 15, 1967, including those who were no longer shareholders on February 15, 1967, must consent in order to have an effective election.

Subsection (d)(2) of the first section of the bill provides that an election by a corporation under such subsection, and the consent thereto by persons who are or were shareholders of such corporation, shall be made in such manner and within such time as the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate prescribes by regulations. However, the period for making such election is not to expire before 1 year after the date on which



the regulations prescribed under subsection (d) are published in the Federal Register.

#### *Consents not required*

Subsection (d)(3) provides that the consent of a person to an election by a corporation under subsection (d)(1) and (2) of section 1 of the bill shall not be required if, under subsection (d), it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the liability for Federal income tax of such person cannot be affected by the election of the corporation of which he is or was a shareholder. It is possible that a person's liability for Federal income tax may be affected even though he was not a shareholder on the date of the distribution with respect to which new section 1375(f) applies. For example, a reduction in the corporation's earnings and profits made under existing law may be restored under the last sentence of section 1375(f)(1). This restoration could affect the amount of subsequent distributions to a shareholder which are considered dividends out of earnings and profits. In any such case, the consent of such shareholder would therefore be required.

#### *Three and one-half month period*

Subsection (d)(4) provides that if a corporation elects to have new section 1375(f) apply with respect to distributions made on or before the date of enactment of the bill, such distributions made on or before the 15th day of the 4th month following the close of taxable year are treated as distributions of the corporation's undistributed taxable income for such year to the extent otherwise provided in new section 1375(f).

#### *Deficiency assessment*

Subsection (d)(5) provides that the statutory period for the assessment of any deficiency for any taxable year, to the extent it is attributable to an election under subsection (d), against the corporation filing the election or any person consenting thereto, shall not expire before the last day of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the regulations prescribed under subsection (d) are published in the Federal Register. Thus, even though such assessment may otherwise be prevented by any law or rule of law, it may nevertheless be assessed against an electing corporation and the persons consenting thereto until the last day of such 2-year period.

#### *Credit or refund of overpayment*

Subsection (d)(6) extends the period within which credit or refund may be allowed or made of certain amounts with respect to which credit or refund is not prevented on the date of the enactment of the bill. If—

(A) credit or refund of the amount of any overpayment for any taxable year attributable to an election under subsection (d) is not prevented, on the date of enactment, by the operation of any law or rule of law, and

(B) credit or refund of the amount of such overpayment is prevented, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than ch. 74 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to closing agreements and compromises), at any time on or before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the regulations prescribed under subsection (d) are published in the Federal Register,

credit or refund of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be made, to the extent such overpayment is attributable to such election, if claim therefor is filed before the expiration of such 2-year period. Thus, subsection (d)(6) applies only to the extent of the amount with respect to which credit or refund is not prevented on the date of enactment of the bill, even though such amount may be less than the amount of any overpayment attributable to the election.

Subsection (d)(7) provides for the allowance of credit or refund of the amount of any overpayment attributable to an election under subsection (d) for any taxable year in which certain distributions were received, even though credit or refund of such overpayment is otherwise prevented on the date of enactment of the bill by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than ch. 74 of the code, relating to closing agreements and compromises). In such case, credit or refund may be allowed or made if claim therefor is filed before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the regulations prescribed under subsection (d) are published in the Federal Register.

These provisions apply to distributions of money which were, or were part of, one or more consecutive distributions made by a corporation after the close of a taxable year for which it was an electing small business corporation and on or before the 15th day of the 4th month following the close of such taxable year, if the total amount of such distributions was substantially the same in amount as the undistributed taxable income (as defined in sec. 1373(c) of the code) of such corporation for such year. In determining the consecutive distributions, the first distribution of money made after the close of such year must be included.

These provisions also apply to distributions of money made by a corporation after the close of a taxable year for which it was an electing small business corporation and on or before the 15th day of the 4th month following the close of such year, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that such distributions were intended to be distributions of the undistributed taxable income of such corporation for such year.

#### *No interest on deficiencies or overpayments*

Subsection (d)(8) of the first section of the bill provides that no interest shall be assessed or collected on any deficiency, or allowed or paid on any overpayment, attributable to an election under subsection (d), for any period before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the regulations prescribed under subsection (d) are published in the Federal Register. These provisions do not prevent the assessment, collection, payment, or allowance of interest which would otherwise be lawful in respect of adjustments which are not attributable to an election under subsection (d), even though such adjustments are for the same taxable year with respect to which there is a deficiency or overpayment attributable to an election under subsection (d). For example, if for a taxable year for which the statutory period for the assessment of a deficiency has not expired, a taxpayer has a deficiency which is attributable in part, to an election under subsection (d), and if he also has an additional amount of deficiency for such period attributable to an unrelated item, interest may be assessed and collected on the portion of the deficiency attributable to such unrelated item for the period prior to the expiration of such 2-year period.

#### **SECTION 2. TAX IMPOSED ON CERTAIN CAPITAL GAINS OF SUBCHAPTER S CORPORATIONS**

(a) General rule.—Under existing law, corporations which make an election under section 1372(a) of the code are not subject to the taxes imposed by chapter 1 of the code with respect to the taxable years of the corporation for which such election is in effect. Subsection (a) of section 2 of the bill amends subchapter S of chapter 1 of the code by adding a section 1378, which imposes a tax on such corporations under certain circumstances.

#### *Income requirements*

A tax is imposed on an electing small business corporation for a taxable year for which

subsection (a) of new section 1378 applies if—

(1) the excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss of such corporation exceeds \$25,000, and exceeds 50 percent of its taxable income (computed as provided in sec. 1373(d) of the code) for such year, and

(2) such taxable income for such year exceeds \$25,000.

#### *Amount of tax*

Subsection (b) of new section 1378 provides that the amount of the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be the lower of (1) an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount by which the excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss of the corporation for the taxable year exceeds \$25,000, or (2) an amount equal to the tax which would be imposed by section 11 of the code on the taxable income (computed as provided in sec. 1373(d) of the code) of the corporation for the taxable year if the corporation was not an electing small business corporation.

No credit shall be allowable under part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the code (other than under sec. 39, relating to certain uses of gasoline and lubricating oil) against the tax imposed by new section 1378(a).

The provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of new section 1378 of the code are illustrated by the following examples:

Example (1): X corporation, is an electing small business corporation with respect to which section 1378(a) applies for its taxable year 1967. X has an excess of net long-term capital gain over net short-term capital loss in the amount of \$30,000 for 1967. However, due to an excess of deductions over other income, X's taxable income (computed as provided in sec. 1373(d) of the code) is only \$15,000. Thus, although such excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss (\$30,000) exceeds \$25,000, and exceeds 50 percent of X's taxable income (\$7,500), a tax is not imposed by new section 1378(a) because X's taxable income does not exceed \$25,000.

Example (2): Assume that X in example (1) has taxable income of \$40,000. (This amount includes the excess of net long-term capital gain over net short-term capital loss because such gains and losses are included in the computation of taxable income under sec. 1373(d) of the code.) In such case there is a tax imposed by new section 1378(a) of the code. The excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss (\$30,000) exceeds \$25,000, and exceeds 50 percent of the taxable income (\$20,000); and taxable income exceeds \$25,000. The amount of the tax, computed under new section 1378(b)(1) of the code, is 25 percent of \$5,000 or \$1,250. This is lower than the amount computed under new section 1378(b)(2) of the code which is 22 percent of \$40,000 plus 26 percent of \$15,000, or \$12,700.

Example (3): Assume that X in example (1) has an excess of net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss of \$125,000 and taxable income of \$60,000. In such case there is a tax imposed by new section 1378(a) of the code. The amount of the tax, computed under new section 1378(b)(2) of the code, is 22 percent of \$60,000 plus 26 percent of \$35,000, or \$22,300. This is lower than the amount computed under new section 1378(b)(1) of the code which is 25 percent of \$100,000 or \$25,000.

#### *Exceptions*

Subsection (c) of new section 1378 of the code provides that new section 1378(a), and thus the tax imposed by such section, shall not apply to certain electing small business corporations.

Paragraph (1) of new section 1378(c) provides that new section 1378(a) shall not apply to an electing small business corporation for any taxable year if it was an electing

small business corporation for the three immediately preceding taxable years. Thus, if an election under section 1372(a) was in effect with respect to a corporation for its taxable years 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967, new section 1378(a) does not apply to such corporation for its taxable year 1967 (except to the extent new sec. 1378(c)(3) may apply).

Paragraph (2) of new section 1378(c) provides that new section 1378(a) shall not apply to an electing small business corporation for a taxable year if, at the end of such year (A) it has been in existence for less than 4 taxable years, and (B) it has been an electing small business corporation for each of its taxable years. Thus, new section 1378(a) does not apply to such corporation (except to the extent new sec. 1378(c)(3) may apply) even though it does not meet the tests of new section 1378(c)(1).

Paragraph (3) of new section 1378(c) provides that if the provisions of paragraph (1) or (2) would preclude the application of new section 1378(a) for a taxable year, new section 1378(a) will nevertheless apply for such year under certain circumstances. Under the provisions of paragraph (3), new section 1378(c) will apply for a taxable year if—

(A) there is any long-term capital gain of the electing small business corporation for such year which is attributable to property acquired by it during the period beginning 36 months before the first day of such year and ending on the last day of such year;

(B) such property has a basis in the hands of such corporation determined in whole or in part by reference to the basis of any property in the hands of another corporation; and

(C) such other corporation was not an electing small business corporation throughout that part of the period beginning 36 months before the first day of the taxable year and ending on the day of the transfer during which such other corporation was in existence.

"Transfer," as used in the preceding sentence, means a transfer by such other corporation of the property the basis of which is referred to for purposes of determining the basis of the property to which such long-term capital gain is attributable. The basis of property in the hands of an electing small business corporation may, for purposes of these provisions, be determined by reference to the basis of property in the hands of another corporation whether or not such other corporation transferred such property directly to the electing small business corporation. For example, if corporation X merges into corporation Y, an electing small business corporation, pursuant to a transaction in which the basis of an asset in the hands of Y after the merger is determined by reference to the basis of such asset in the hands of X before the merger, then the basis of such asset, or any other asset for which it may be exchanged in a transaction in which gain or loss is not recognized, would be determined, for purposes of paragraph (3) of the new section 1378(c), by reference to the basis of property in the hands of X.

If new section 1378(a) would not be applicable to an electing small business corporation for a taxable year but for the provisions of paragraph (3) of new section 1378(c), then the amount of the tax imposed by new section 1378(a), shall be the lower of—

(1) the amount determined under new section 1378(b), or

(2) 25 percent of the excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss attributable to property acquired as provided in subparagraph (B) and having a basis described in subparagraph (C) of new section 1378(c)(3).

The provisions of subsection (c) of new section 1378 of the code are illustrated by the following example:

Example: Corporation X, which uses the calendar year for its taxable year, has been an electing small business corporation continuously since its taxable year 1958. For 1967, X has an excess of \$100,000 of net long-term capital gain over its net short-term capital loss, and its taxable income is \$150,000. During 1967 X recognized \$10,000 of long-term capital gain from the sale of property which it acquired from corporation Y on March 31, 1964, pursuant to a statutory merger of corporation Y into X on that date. Such property had a basis in the hands of X determined by reference to its basis in the hands of Y. Thus, although X meets the requirements of paragraph (1) of new section 1378(c), the tax imposed by new section 1378(a) will apply to X for 1967 unless Y was an electing small business corporation throughout the period January 1, 1964, through March 31, 1964, during which Y was in existence. If Y was not an electing small business corporation throughout such period, and if X had no capital losses for 1967 attributable to property acquired as provided in subparagraph (B) and having a basis described in subparagraph (C) of new section 1378(c)(3), the amount of tax imposed on the income of X for 1967 by new section 1378(a) is equal to 25 percent of \$10,000, or \$2,500, because such amount is lower than the amount determined under new section 1378(b).

(b) Related amendments: Paragraph (1) of section 2(b) of the bill amends the table of sections for subchapter S of chapter 1 of the code.

Paragraph (2) of section 2(b) of the bill amends section 1372(b)(1) of the code to provide an exception, for purposes of new section 1378(a), to the rule that electing small business corporations shall not be subject to the taxes imposed by chapter 1 of the code.

Paragraph (3) of section 2(b) of the bill amends section 1373(c) of the code to provide for the subtraction of the amount of the tax imposed by section 1378(a) from taxable income in determining the corporation's undistributed taxable income for a taxable year.

Paragraph (4) of section 2(b) of the bill amends section 1375(a) of the code by adding a new paragraph (3) which provides for the reduction, for purposes of such section, of the amount of the excess of an electing small business corporation's net long-term capital gain over its net short-term capital loss for a taxable year by the amount of the tax imposed by section 1378(a) for such year.

Paragraph (5) of section 2(b) of the bill amends section 46(a)(3) of the code to provide that the tax imposed by section 1378(a) for a taxable year shall not be considered in determining the liability for tax for purposes of the credit for investment in certain depreciable property.

(c) Effective date: Subsection (c) of section 2 of the bill provides that the amendments made by section 2 of the bill shall apply with respect to taxable years of electing small business corporations beginning after the date of enactment of the bill.

#### SECTION 3. EXCEPTIONS TO TERMINATION OF SUBCHAPTER S ELECTION FOR CERTAIN PASSIVE INVESTMENT INCOME

(a) General rule: Under section 1372(e)(5) of existing law, an election under section 1372(a) of the code is terminated if, for any taxable year of the corporation for which the election is in effect, such corporation has gross receipts more than 20 percent of which is derived from royalties, rents, dividends, interest, annuities, and sales or exchanges of stock or securities (gross receipts from such sales or exchanges being taken into account for purposes of par. (5) only to the extent of gains therefrom).

Subsection (a) of section 3 of the bill amends section 1372(e)(5) of the code by

changing the heading of paragraph (5) to "passive investment income" and by dividing the paragraph into new subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C).

New subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 1372(e)(5) contain the same general rule as existing law. However, new subparagraph (B) contains an exception to the application of such general rule. Subparagraph (C) defines the term "passive investment income" to mean the same gross receipts as are taken into account under existing law.

New subparagraph (B) of section 1372(e)(5) provides that new subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a taxable year, and thus an election under section 1372(a) of the code shall not terminate for such year by reason of section 1372(e)(5)(A) if (i) such year is the first taxable year in which the corporation commenced the active conduct of any trade or business or the next succeeding taxable year, and (ii) the amount of passive investment income for such year is less than \$3,000. The taxable year in which a corporation commences the active conduct of a new trade or business is not necessarily the first year in which a corporation commences the active conduct of any trade or business. Thus, if a corporation was engaged in the active conduct of one trade or business in any prior taxable year, the taxable year in which such corporation commences the active conduct of a second or new trade or business is not the first taxable year in which such corporation commences the active conduct of any trade or business. Further, the first taxable year in which a corporation commences the active conduct of any trade or business is not necessarily the same year in which a corporation comes into existence.

(b) Effective dates: Subsection (b) of section 3 of the bill provides that the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years of electing small business corporations ending after the date of enactment of the bill. Further, such amendment shall also apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962, and ending on or before such date of enactment, if (1) the corporation elects to have such amendment so apply, and (2) all persons (or their personal representatives) who were shareholders of such corporation at any time during any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1962, and ending on or before the date of enactment of the bill consent to such election and to the application of the amendment made by subsection (a) of section 3 of the bill. Such persons who must consent include persons who are not shareholders on the date of enactment of the bill if they were shareholders during the prescribed period. The effect of an election under these provisions is that a corporation may be an electing small business corporation whose election would, but for these provisions, have terminated under section 1372(e)(5) of the code. If such a corporation has shareholders or former shareholders whose consent is necessary to prevent a termination under section 1372(e)(1), such shareholders may consent to such election under section 1372(a) of the code at such time as the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations. Further, the election by the corporation under subsection (b) of section 3 of the bill and the consents thereto shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate prescribes by regulations.

#### SECTION 4. REPEAL OF SUBCHAPTER R

This is a new section added to the bill by your committee. Under existing law (sec. 1361 of the code) unincorporated business enterprises may elect to be taxed as domestic corporations. Once an election has been made, it may not be revoked and the unincorporated business enterprise is thereafter subject to tax as a domestic corporation and



the owners are treated as its shareholders, unless the election is terminated under section 1361(f) of the code by reason of a change of ownership. However, under existing law, parts III and IV of subchapter C of chapter 1 of the code are generally not applicable to unincorporated business enterprises which have made an election.

(a) Status pending repeal, new elections: Paragraph (1) of section 4(a) of the bill amends section 1361(a) of the code to provide that no new elections under section 1361(a) may be made after the date of enactment of the bill. However, elections may be made after such date of enactment by unincorporated business enterprises which have a valid election in effect on the date of enactment but which, because of the subsequent application of the provisions of section 1361(f) (relating to change of ownership), would no longer be considered a domestic corporation but for another election under section 1361(a).

#### Transfer to an actual corporation

Paragraph (2) of section 4(a) of the bill amends section 1361(c) of the code by deleting a reference to section 1361(m); and paragraph (4) of section 4(a) of the bill deletes the provisions of section 1361(m). Section 4(c) of the bill provides that these amendments shall apply with respect to transactions occurring after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The effect of these amendments is to make all of the provisions of parts III and IV of subchapter C of chapter 1 of the code (relating to corporate organizations, and reorganizations, and insolvency reorganizations) applicable to a "section 1361 corporation" and its owners, in the same manner as these provisions are applicable to any true corporation and its shareholders. Thus, for example, if after the date of enactment and before January 1, 1969, the partners of an enterprise, which has a valid election, in effect under section 1361(a) transfer all of the assets of such enterprise to an actual corporation and receive stock in proportion to their interests there will be no tax on the transfer of property and on the issuance of stock, under sections 368(a)(1) and 354 of the code. On the other hand, if the partners retain money or property of the enterprise, this may be treated as "boot" for purposes of section 356 of the code.

#### Revocation and termination of elections

Paragraph (3) of section 4(a) of the bill amends section 1361(e) of the code (relating to irrevocability of elections under section 1361(a)) to provide a reference to new section 1361(n) of the code; paragraph (5) of section 4(a) of the bill adds section 1361(n).

Paragraph (1) of new section 1361(n) provides that an election under section 1361(a) with respect to an unincorporated business enterprise may be revoked after the date of the enactment of the bill by the proprietor of such enterprise or by all of the partners owning an interest in such enterprise on the date on which the revocation is made. The revocation shall be made in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate may prescribe by regulations. The revocation will be effective on the date on which it is made unless the revocation specifies a later effective date and such enterprise shall not be considered a domestic corporation for any period on or after the effective date of the revocation. The section 1361 corporation and its owners shall be treated as if the corporation had distributed its assets in a complete liquidation on the effective date of the revocation, unless such treatment is inappropriate because of the applicability of provisions of the code relating to corporate organizations and reorganizations. Such applicability can result, for example, from a subsequent transfer of assets to an actual corporation.

Paragraph (2) of new section 1361(n) provides that if a revocation under paragraph (1) of an election under section 1361(a) with respect to any unincorporated business enterprise is not effective on or before December 31, 1968, such election shall terminate on January 1, 1969, and such enterprise shall not be considered a domestic corporation for any period on or after January 1, 1969. Of course, if an election with respect to an enterprise terminates on or before December 31, 1968, as a result of the provisions of section 1361(f), and another election under section 1361(a) with respect to such enterprise is not made on or before such date, section 1361(n) is not applicable to such enterprise. If an election is terminated under the provisions of paragraph (2) of new section 1361(n), the section 1361 corporation and its owners shall be treated in the same manner as if a revocation had been made under paragraph (1) of section 1361(n), effective on January 1, 1969.

(b) Repeal of subchapter R: Section 4(b) of the bill repeals subchapter R of chapter 1 of the code, and all references thereto contained in the code, effective January 1, 1969.

#### TARIFF TREATMENT OF COPRA, PALM NUTS, AND PALM-NUT KERNELS, AND THE OILS CRUSHED THEREFROM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 983, H.R. 6568.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6568) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing tempo-

rory suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, on page 5, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 2. (a) The headnotes for schedule 1, part 14, subpart B of such Schedules are amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (c) and (d) of headnote 2 as subparagraphs (d) and (e), respectively;

(2) by striking out subparagraph (b) of headnote 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) 160,000 tons during calendar year 1965,

"(c) during calendar years 1966 through 1967—

"(1) if a proclamation has been issued pursuant to headnote 3 of this subpart, 160,000 tons, or

"(2) if such a proclamation has not been issued, 120,000 tons,"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new headnote:

"3. If, before May 1, 1966, the President determines that for the calendar years 1966 through 1967 the Republic of the Philippines has waived its rights with respect to copra under paragraph 5 of article IV of the revised trade agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, he shall so proclaim."

(b) The appendix to such Schedules is amended by inserting after item 903.21 the following new item:

[ " 903.25 ]	Copra provided for in item 175.10, if a proclamation has been issued pursuant to headnote 3 of part 14B of schedule 1.....	Free	1.25¢ per lb.	On or before 12/31/67	"]
--------------	--	------	---------------	-----------------------	----

SEC. 3. (a) The amendments and repeals made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) (1) The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2(a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1965. Upon request therefor filed with the collector of customs concerned on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any such article—

(A) which was made after December 31, 1964, and on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(B) the liquidation of which has been made without regard to such amendments, shall, if necessary to give effect to such amendments and notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

The amendment made by section 2(b) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after December 31, 1965.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 2. The amendments and repeals made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) The limitation for the calendar year 1965 contained in headnote 2(b) for schedule 1, part 14, subpart B of the Tariff Schedules of the United States is hereby increased by 28,308,955 pounds.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, entries during 1965 of coconut oil, which is a Philippine article (within the meaning of the Tariff Schedules of the United States), shall be liquidated or reliquidated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a), and appropriate refunds of duty shall be made, if request therefor is filed with the appropriate customs officer on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed at the end of the bill to add the following new section 4:

SEC. 4. For purposes of applying paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 256 (19 U.S.C. 1886) and section 351(b) (19 U.S.C. 1981(b)) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and section 350(c) (2) (A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1351(c) (2) (A))—

(1) The rates of duty in rate column numbered 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States as changed by this Act shall be treated as the rates of duty existing on July 1, 1962.

(2) The rates of duty in rate column numbered 2 of such Schedules as changed by this Act shall be treated as the rates of duty existing on July 1, 1934.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is a very technical amendment, but one which has little impact. Under existing law, the President is authorized to reduce tariffs to 50 percent of the amount which existed on July 1, 1962. In certain instances, he may increase tariffs by 50 percent of the duty which applied on July 1, 1934.

This bill, as passed by the House and approved by the committee, permanently reduces the tariff on copra, coconut oil, and related products. This amendment will make certain that the rates of duty provided by this act are the rates to be taken into account by the President in cutting or raising tariffs on these products.

I urge that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill from the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extract (Rept. No. 1009) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE OF BILL AS AMENDED

This bill would make permanent the duty-free treatment or lower rates of duty temporarily applicable to copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, their oils, and specified fatty acids, salts, and other chemical products derived from the oils. The temporary duty-free treatment or lower rates applicable to these products (presently scheduled to expire June 30, 1966) reflect the suspension of the 3-cent-per-pound processing tax formerly applicable to such commodities under section 4511 of the Internal Revenue Code. This tax was converted to an import duty in 1963, but its suspension, first provided in 1957, was continued.

In addition to repealing the duty equivalent of the former 3-cent-per-pound processing tax, H.R. 6568 would also provide relief with respect to certain coconut oil imported on or before June 11, 1965. This oil was released from customs custody as being within the duty-free quota provided for pursuant to the Philippine trade agreement. By increasing the quota for 1965, the House bill would have assured relief from the 1-cent-per-pound duty with respect to this oil. The Finance Committee bill similarly insures that this oil will not be considered overquota.

#### PROVISIONS OF HOUSE BILL DELETED

Except to the limited extent described in the preceding paragraph, the Committee on Finance deleted those provisions of the House bill which would have—

(a) Increased the 1965 duty-free quota for Philippine coconut oil from 120,000 tons to 160,000 tons, and

(b) Permitted a similar increase in the quota for 1966 and 1967 if the President determined that for these 2 years the Philippines had waived its right to preferential treatment on Philippine copra as provided for under the Philippine trade agreement. In such an event copra from all non-Communist countries (presently dutiable at 1.25 cents per pound) could have entered the United States free of duty during 1966 and 1967.

#### GENERAL STATEMENT

##### History of processing taxes and duties

The Revenue Act of 1934 imposed a tax of 3 cents per pound on the first domestic processing of coconut oil and combinations

or mixtures containing a substantial quantity of coconut oil, if the product of or produced from materials the product of the Philippines or any U.S. possession; otherwise, the tax was 5 cents per pound. A tax of 3 cents per pound was also imposed on the first domestic processing of palm-kernel oil and palm oil (except palm oil used in the manufacture of iron or steel products, tinplate or terne plate, or any subsequent use of palm oil residue resulting from the manufacture of iron or steel products, tinplate or terne plate), and on derivatives (fatty acids, salts, etc.) of palm oil and palm-kernel oil. The Philippine Trade Act of 1946 provided that the 3-cent-per-pound rate, rather than the 5-cent-per-pound rate, was to apply to non-Philippine coconut oil during any period as to which the President finds that adequate supplies of neither copra nor coconut oil, the product of the Philippines, are readily available for processing in the United States.

The processing tax provisions were carried over into the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as section 4511.

In the 1955 revised trade agreement with the Philippines, the United States undertook an obligation to maintain the 2-cent-per-pound preferential duty differential in the "internal" (processing) tax between Philippine coconut oil and non-Philippine oil. The proportionate differential on copra is 1.25 cents per pound.

Aside from the processing taxes, which were technically "internal" taxes, paragraph 54 of the original tariff schedules of the Tariff Act of 1930 imposed a duty of 2 cents per pound on coconut oil and a duty of 1 cent per pound on palm-kernel oil for human consumption. No duty was imposed on copra or on palm oil. Pursuant to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, effective January 1, 1948, the 2 cent per-pound tariff on coconut oil was reduced to 1 cent and the 1-cent-per-pound duty on palm-kernel oil was reduced to 0.5 cent.

Because the processing taxes above referred to operated economically as import duties (none of the raw materials, i.e., copra, palm nuts, or palm kernels, are produced in the United States), they were assimilated into the TSUS and consolidated with regular duties, where applicable. IRC section 4511 was repealed. However, though for all other purposes the processing taxes were converted into regular import duties, the U.S. obligation to the Philippines to maintain a 2-cent preferential differential in the "internal" tax on these products necessitated the continued treatment of those portions of the duties that were derived from the processing taxes as "internal taxes" for the purposes of the Philippine trade agreement (TSUS schedule 1, pt. 14, headnote 3).

The processing taxes were imposed in 1934 principally to protect domestically produced vegetable oils in their use in the production of edible products such as margarine. Because the major use in the United States of coconut oil (the principal oil involved) shifted to the indelible industrial sector (soaps, detergents, etc.) and because of the consequent decline in competition between coconut oil and domestic vegetable oils, the 3-cent-per-pound processing tax on coconut oil and its derivatives was suspended in 1957 until July 1, 1960 (Public Law 85-235, sec. 3). That legislation was followed by the suspension in 1959, also until July 1, 1960, of the processing taxes on palm oil and palm-kernel oil and their derivatives (Public Law 86-37). The suspension of all these taxes was continued until July 1, 1963 (Public Law 86-432), and further continued until July 1, 1966 (Public Law 87-859). The current suspension of the taxes is reflected in part 1 of the appendix to the TSUS (items 903.30-903.32, relating to copra; item 903.40, relating to palm-nut kernels and palm nuts; items 903.43-903.49, relating to coconut oil; items 903.60-903.61, relating to palm-kernel oil;

item 903.65, relating to palm oil; and items 907.70-907.75, item 907.77, and items 907.85-907.88, relating to various derivatives of coconut, palm-kernel, or palm oil).

The regular duty on coconut oil (1 cent per pound since 1948) has remained in effect throughout the period of the suspension of the processing taxes, except with respect to imports of Philippine coconut oil within specified quotas. Under the 1955 revision of the trade agreement with the Philippines, Philippine coconut oil has been subject to progressively declining duty-free quotas, overquota imports being subject to the 1-cent-per-pound duty. The basic quota was 200,000 long tons, which by 1962 had declined to 160,000 long tons. Until 1962 the 1-cent-per-pound duty on overquota imports was inoperative because the quotas on Philippine coconut oil exceeded the imports in each quota year. A sharp rise in U.S. consumption in 1963 caused the quota (160,000 long tons) to be filled by November 1, 1963. The 1964 quota (same quantity as 1963) was filled by August of that year. For the years 1965 through 1967 the quota is reduced to 120,000 long tons per annum. The 1965 quota was filled in May. In 1968 the duty-free quota will decline to 80,000 long tons and will remain at that quantity through 1970; for the years 1971-73 the annual quota will be 40,000 long tons; and on January 1, 1974, all preferential tariff treatment of Philippine coconut oil is scheduled to terminate. Thereafter coconut oil from any non-Communist source may be imported on a non-discriminatory basis upon payment of the 1-cent-per-pound duty.

#### Background of bill

Coconut oil, palm oil, and palm-kernel oil is produced from copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, respectively. There is no domestic production of the materials from which the oil is produced. The entire domestic supply of palm and palm-kernel oil is obtained from imports. The U.S. supply of coconut oil comes almost in equal shares from imported coconut oil or from oil crushed in the United States from imported copra. Virtually all of the imports (whether copra or oil) come from the Philippines. The virtual Philippine monopoly of the U.S. market for coconut oil and copra is attributed to the 2-cent-per-pound preferential duty differential between Philippine and non-Philippine coconut oil and the proportionate differential for copra of 1.25 cents per pound.

While there has been unanimous agreement among domestic consumers of coconut oil on the one hand and U.S. copra crushers on the other hand as to the desirability of repealing the duty equivalent of the original 3-cent-per-pound tax, there has been no similar consensus as to the merits of any other change in the tariff treatment of this oil or of the copra from which it is crushed.

The House bill attempted to resolve the differences between these two important segments of our economy. By providing an increased duty-free quota for Philippine coconut oil for 1965, and by providing for contingent increases in 1966 and 1967, the House bill accepted the argument that the 1-cent-per-pound tariff might cause a shift in the United States to synthetic oils for industrial purposes which could lead in time to increased shipments of Philippine coconut oil to Europe where it would compete directly with U.S.-produced soybean (and other) oil in the edible oil markets.

On the other hand, by linking the increased quota to suspension of the Philippine duty preference on copra (1.25 cents per pound) the House bill tried to provide a benefit for domestic crushers who seek additional sources of supply for their raw product, copra. Because of their preference under the trade agreement the Philippines is virtually our sole supplying country.



But these provisions were considered to be of little benefit by domestic copra crushers. The committee was advised that at least 7 years are needed to bring new coconut palms to producing age and the 2-year period provided by the House bill would be inadequate to enable them to develop new sources of supply for copra. Moreover, the House provisions, in effect, would have extended tariff concessions (in the form of higher duty-free quotas) to the Philippines without our receiving any comparable concession in return.

Domestic consumers similarly found little assurance in the contingent features of the House bill. The increased quota for 1966 and 1967 would have depended upon action of a foreign government which was at best uncertain, and which it might have found to be contrary to its own best long-term interests.

The committee was also advised that enlarging the duty-free quota for the Philippines would be inconsistent with the policy of the United States of stimulating world trade on a nondiscriminatory basis. The Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations reported:

"This Government has consistently supported nondiscrimination in international trade and the progressive dismantling of residual discriminatory measures. Accordingly, the trade agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines provides for the progressive reduction and eventual elimination of the duty-free quota on imports of Philippine coconut oil, as well as of the preferential tariff rates on imports of all Philippine products.

"The provision of H.R. 6568 for a 3-year expansion of the duty-free quota on imports of Philippine coconut oil would not only halt but would reverse this movement toward the elimination of discrimination and would expand the trade coverage subject to preferential tariff treatment. In addition, it could precipitate pressure for a further extension of broadening of the preferential treatment for Philippine coconut oil subsequent to 1967, when under the provisions of the trade agreement the duty-free quota for Philippine coconut oil would drop sharply from 160,000 to 80,000 tons."

The Commerce Department reported similar views to the committee, and it understands they are shared also by the Department of Agriculture.

For these reasons, the committee concluded that in the interest of assuring enactment of legislation to repeal that portion of the tariff attributable to the 3-cent-per-pound processing tax, it would be advisable to limit

the House bill to that objective. Accordingly, the committee bill deletes those features of the House bill which would have (1) increased the duty-free quota for 1965 and (2) provide for increased duty-free quotas for 1966 and 1967 along with suspension for those years of the 1.25-cent-per-pound preferential tariff on non-Philippine copra.

#### The 1965 quota

As already indicated, under the Philippine trade agreement, provision is made for duty-free entry for a progressively diminishing quantity of Philippine coconut oil. In 1963 and 1964 the duty-free quota amounted to 160,000 tons. Under present law for 1965 through 1967, the duty-free quota is 120,000 tons. Importers were advised that the quota for 1965 would be filled on or about June 11, and ports of entry were notified not to release Philippine coconut oil duty free after that date. Subsequently, in the fall, it was found that the 1965 quota actually had been filled on May 17, 1965. The Commissioner of Customs advised the committee by letter dated January 28, 1966, that—

"Between May 17 and June 11, there was a total of 28,308,955 pounds of coconut oil that had been released duty free on which duty at the rate of 1 cent per pound would have to be collected for a total of \$283,089.55. This involves shipments covered by 13 separate entries filed at various ports of entry and covering shipments consigned to 7 importing firms, which are subject to the payment of duty averaging from a low of \$6,550.90 to a high of \$141,574.12.

"In view of the financial burden that would be placed on these individual importers through no fault of their own, and in view of the pending legislation, H.R. 6568, the collection of these duties has been deferred administratively until June 30, 1966."

The House of Representatives, without knowing of this quota problem, and for completely different reason, would have provided an increased quota for 1965 sufficiently large to assure that oil imported in this period would be within-quota oil.

Generally, an importer of articles subject to a quota acts at his peril when he clears the article through customs. If it is an absolute quota the article may not be imported under any circumstances if the quota is filled. On the other hand, if a tariff quota is involved, higher duties may apply if the imported article should come in after the quota is filled.

The committee recognizes that no one can unfailingly foretell the day or the hour upon which a quantitative quota will fill. That event depends upon the individual

actions of numerous independent importers at many ports of entry. While the committee feels that the importers should act at their risk when operating against a quota, it also feels that the unusual circumstances involved in this coconut oil situation during the limited period referred to warrant relief.

Accordingly, the committee bill contains provisions which would increase the quota for 1965 by 28,308,955 pounds. In addition, the committee expects that the Bureau of Customs will continue to advise all inquirers of the status of a quota, based upon the latest available data. It also admonishes the Bureau to continue to point out that it is not possible to predict accurately when a quota will fill and there can be no guarantee that any future entry will come under the quota. Importers should be strongly cautioned that when they import against a quota they do so at their peril.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Friday, March 4, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Friday, March 4, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 2, 1966:

##### ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Frank M. Wozencraft, of Texas, to be an Assistant Attorney General vice Norbert A. Schlei, resigned.

Mitchell Rogovin, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General vice Louis Oberdorfer, resigned.

##### TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Lester R. Uretz, of Virginia, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service), vice Mitchell Rogovin.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Corncob Pipe Capitol

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that the corncob pipe capitol of the world is located in my district. The home of Buescher's Cob Pipes is in Washington, Mo., on the banks of the Missouri River where the corncob pipe had its beginning in 1869. From modest beginnings, Buescher's has expanded to a daily production of 12,000 pipes which

are distributed to some 7,000 sales outlets across the globe.

Buescher's recently donated 1,800 pipes to the Army for distribution in Vietnam. Arrangements for shipment of the pipes were handled through Lt. Col. John C. "Corncob" Hughes, a much-decorated Army officer who has smoked Washington corncob pipes for over 15 years. Colonel Hughes was recently made an honorary member of the Corncob Pipe Club of Washington while on a speaking engagement there shortly before he returned to Vietnam.

I am happy that many of our soldiers will now have the equipment to carry on the great pipe-smoking tradition established by such varied personalities as France's military hero, Marshal Foch, former mayor of New York, Fiorello La Guardia, Mark Twain, and Mrs. Andrew

Jackson who has been styled "The First Lady of the Corncob Pipe."

I know that many of my colleagues can also attest to the unique pleasure afforded by Missouri's fine cob meerschauts.

#### The Third Partner in Education

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, we in the 89th Congress have demonstrated, through numerous enactments,