crossroad of our destiny, a destiny involving the world's future.

The various problems bedeviling us today comprise a lengthy and fulsome list. Their broad recitation would include such soul-searching questions as:

How shall we exercise our traditional right to differ while we carry out our patriotic obligation of unity in purpose?

How can we effectuate the guarantees of civil rights while we fulfill our duty of civil obedience?

How shall we apply the restraint of recommended guidelines without suffocating the fruitful energy of personal effort and private enterprise?

How shall we extend our spending while we contain inflation?

How shall we share in the privations of our servicemen fighting overseas while we enjoy the extravagances of domestic plenty?

And finally—How can we negotiate an end of agonizing war without yielding to dishonorable peace terms?

These are a few of what we might term the umbrella challenges.

It would take a hundred mornings and a hundred nights to itemize all the problems that would come under them. And although I receive in my daily mail about 50 earnest and thoughtful suggestions for their settlement, I don't think anyone yet possesses the full answer to each different problem.

It is my opinion the proper answers and full solutions will have to come out of a nationally unified character and atmosphere of moral responsibility, patriotic sacrifice, and dedicated unselfishness that was urged by the voice, and personified in the life and death of Abraham Lincoln.

In this country today we have the great wealth and the highest standard of living of any people in the history of the earth and there is even more in sight on the nuclear energy horizon ahead.

If Lincoln were alive we fear that he would have to question the existence of that moral character and atmosphere in our country today. We fear Lincoln would join with many authorities today who express the deepest doubts that proper solutions to our problems will not be found until substantial turnabout changes are made in a great many current attitudes and practices that seem to be corrupting the core of our modern society.

But, as we look about us today, I think you might agree there are far too many regettable signs of widespread immorality in conduct, indifference to recognized ethical standards, defiance of legitimate authority, disrespect for hallowed traditions, disregard of our historical ideals, and even some thoughtless ridicule of the heroic sacrifices of our servicemen abroad.

These unhappy signs of dangerous weaknesses in our prosperous society emphasize the wisdom of the warning advice contained in the question President Lincoln asked of the people during a speech in Illinois back in 1858.

This was his question—"What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling sea coasts, our Army, and our Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of those may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors."

It would appear that this question by President Lincoln is even more pertinent to our affairs today than it was back in 1858.

Isn't it the strengths of this traditional belief and American spirit that we must help to place back into the hearts and minds of all Americans and into the basic structure of our national character if we are to find surviving solutions to the problems of ourselves and the world?

A few days ago, as I thought of this meeting this morning, I recalled a story of the father and of the little boy who wanted to be doing something.

The father was stretched out in his easy chair after a day's work to read his newspaper before dinner. He was interrupted by the normal complaint of children about having nothing to do—so he assigned a minor household chore to the youngster.

In no time the boy was back for another assignment. This was repeated several times and finally his father, in desperation, picked up a map of the United States from a table beside his chair, tore it into many dozens of pieces, and said: "Here, son, take this and put the country back together again."

The boy happily went to work on the homemade jigsaw puzzle. His father again settled back with the newspaper—but before he had read as far as the sports page the child tugged at his arm and proudly pointed to a perfectly put together United States of America.

Pleased and amazed by the lad's knowledge of geography and his speed in applying it, the father said: "That's really wonderful. But how did you do it?"

"I remembered," the boy explained, "that on the back side of that map was a picture of a man. And I figured that if I just put the man together right, the country would come out in pretty good shape."

Don't you think it is about time for you and for me and for each American to start putting ourselves to right and the country back in good shape?

Isn't it high time for us to get to work to restore proper reverence of our churches, decency in public conduct, ethical standards in business, recognized discipline in educational institutions, obedience to our laws, acceptance of parental authority in the home and a mature, moral example for the proper encouragement of our youth?

And while we proceed with the development of a Great Society let us wisely insure the construction of a good society.

This, I think, was what President Lincoln was urging when, speaking in Milwaukee, on September 30, 1859, he said: "Let us hope that by the best cultivation of the physical world beneath and around us, and the best intellectual and moral world within us, we shall secure an individual, social, and political prosperity, and happiness whose course shall be onward and upward and which, while the earth endures, shall not pass away."

Above all, then, let us remember the true mission of all mankind is not for nations to war with each other unto death but to live with each other in a brotherhood of good will and under a peace of honor forever lasting.

That, I believe, is the true significance and the true meaning of our meeting and ceremony here this morning in this hall, adjacent to your temple of prayer.

That is the true worth of Carl Wahlstrom's contribution of virtues and talents as a good man and a good neighbor.

That, I think, is the true value of your exercise here this morning, in the encouragement of fellow citizens to emulate the example of a good neighbor, for the betterment of their community, for the progress of their country, and for the peace of the world.

If then, we and our fellow Americans will unite in our faiths and consolidate our moral spirits in patriotic sacrifice to preserve our liberty and repel tyranny I am supremely confident we will not just survive—we will prevail.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, a Senator from the State of Oregon.

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

Almighty God, in whom our fathers trusted and were not dismayed, we turn to Thee for direction in this hour of the world's confusion.

Confronted with the complexities of our social disorder, discouraged by the futility of our good intentions, disheartened by the frustration of our best endeavors, we look to Thee, as did our fathers before us, for a renewal of hope.

Deliver us from despair, we pray, and make us to share the sustaining power of those whose hope is in the everlasting.

When it seems that things are in the saddle and ride mankind, help us to remember that this is not Thy will for mankind.

Help us to recall the words of the Psalmist of old, who recognized Thy concern for man, and cried aloud to Thee in grateful wonder:

"What is man? Thou art mindful of him. Thou visitest him. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands."

We dare pray, then, that we may achieve dominion over things—and not suffer domination by things.

Especially do we pray that Thou wilt so enlighten and strengthen Thy servants in this Chamber that, by Thy grace, they may help man gain control of things, that things may serve—and cease to menace—mankind. For this has been Thy purpose since creation's dawn. And again we pray: Thy will be done.

In the name of Christ. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, a Senator from the State of Oregon, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. NEUBERGER thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 7, 1966, was dispensed with.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

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 7, 1966, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 577. An act for the relief of Mary F. Morse;

S. 851. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Bernard L. LaMountain, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan; and

S. 1904. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes.

REPORT ON MANPOWER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on manpower. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and the message and report will be appropriately referred.

The message was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I report on a year of progress and fulfillment.

I report on a year of challenge and change.

February 1966 marked the 20th anniversary of this Nation's 1946 commitment to provide job opportunities for every person, able, willing, and seeking to work.

February 1966 also brought the fifth anniversary of our longest and soundest period of peacetime prosperity. It marked the 60th consecutive month of visible proof that the 1946 commitment can be met.

A RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

Five years of sustained economic growth have effectively demonstrated that this Nation can:

1. Pursue an economic policy which creates millions of new jobs and reduces the burdens of unemployment and poverty.

2. Provide the necessary job opportunities to convert a flood of teenagers into a valuable national resource instead of an urgent social problem.

3. Set in motion manpower programs to transform the deprived, the disadvantaged, and the despairing into effective and self-respecting members of the Great Society.

Last year was one of harvest—and of new planting.

The fruits of sustained economic growth were realized in terms of increased employment and earnings for the American worker.

In 1965: The advance of 2.4 million jobs exceeded by one-third the increase of the labor force. Private nonfarm payrolls swelled by 42,000 added jobs each week. More than a million young Americans entered the work force, but there was work for them to do. Unemployment was reduced to its lowest rate in almost 9 years. The American factory worker's weekly earnings reached $110.92. Although the cost of the things he bought went up 2 percent, there was 4.5 percent more money in his pocket to buy them after paying his Federal taxes.

Last year also saw the first combined effects of the new manpower, education, and poverty programs.

In 1965:

More than 100,000 persons completed training under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Three out of every four were placed in jobs within 90 days after their course ended.

More than 500,000 young men and women were approved for participation in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The Corps helps those in school to stay there, and helps dropouts to return to school or begin work.

About 200 area vocational-technical schools were approved for construction. Now 85,000 full-time students are receiving financial assistance to begin or continue vocational training.

About 115,000 full-time college students in more than 1,100 colleges participated in work-study programs, which helped them to meet the costs of a college education.

Work experience programs provided jobs, basic education, training—and hope and dignity—for 65,000 public welfare recipients with almost 200,000 dependents.

Almost 30,000 young men and women were enrolled in the Job Corps. For many of them, it was their first opportunity for realistic training to help them find and keep jobs.

Across the land, more and more men and women became productive members of a great and productive society. More and more boys and girls, in and out of school, received the work experience and training which helped to fit them for responsible places in society and to save them from lifetimes of chronic unemployment and degrading poverty.

A year ago 5.0 percent of our workers were unemployed.

Now only 3.7 percent are out of work.

A year ago many of our programs to provide better training and wider educational opportunities were only beginning.

Today they are supplying thousands of trained workers for our expanding economy.

But our very success in banishing the specter of mass unemployment from our land has brought new problems.

To sustain high employment, and continue our record of price stability, we must work harder than ever to match jobs and men.

Our success in reducing unemployment brings out more clearly than ever the fact that there is poverty in the midst of plenty. We cannot rest content: when employers seek skilled and experienced workers while thousands cannot find work because they lack proper training and education; when factories in some areas are unable to fill orders because they lack workers, while chronic unemployment endures in other areas.

This year we must make a special effort to see that our human resources are not wasted.

We must accelerate the growth of public and private training programs and make them available to all.

We must bring jobs to workers and workers to jobs.

We must eliminate the discrimination which wastes our manpower resources.

Our goal is not just a job for every worker. Our goal is to place every worker in a job where he utilizes his full productive potential, for his own and for society's benefit.

To achieve this goal, I have outlined below a new program to make full use of all our human resources.

Making the transition to an economy of sustained high employment is our immediate task. But we must not lose sight of the longer run.

We take pride in the growth of our economy, in the achievements of our scientists and engineers, and in the ability of our dynamic private enterprise economy to put new technology to practical use. But the requirements of new technology demand continuing adjustments in our work force. To make those adjustments as smoothly as possible, every worker needs a first-rate education and opportunities for continuing education and training.

A MANPOWER PROGRAM FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Earlier manpower reports proceeded from a central concern with excessive unemployment: 6 percent at the time of the first report, and still 5 percent 2 years later.

Now, with unemployment below 4 percent and falling, the attention of the Congress and the Nation must focus on the manpower prospects and problems which emerge as the products of unprecedented prosperity.

An unemployment rate of 3.7 percent in February marks another milestone along the country's course toward full realization of its economic potential.

It was in November 1953—more than 12 years ago—that the unemployment rate was last that low. A year ago it was still 5 percent.

Attaining an unemployment rate of 3.7 percent is a triumph for our Nation's economy. It is a tribute to the public and private policies that led to this achievement.

Because it does reflect an economy operating closer to the full use of its manpower resources, our celebration must be tempered with caution. We must be alert to assure that the pace of our advance does not become too rapid, endangering the healthy stability and sound balance of our expansion.

Yet to conclude that we must proceed cautiously does not mean that we should slam on the brakes or throw the economy into reverse.

We expect our labor force to expand by 1.6 million workers this year.

Thus, we must provide about 4,500 new jobs each day—31,000 new jobs each week—134,000 new jobs each month.

Moreover, we cannot rest on past accomplishments when the unemployment rate for Negroes was still 7 percent in February. It was down from 9.2 per-

cent a year earlier, and from nearly 13 percent in February 1961. But we cannot be satisfied when 1 out of every 14 Negro workers is without a job.

Nor can we be satisfied with a reduction of the unemployment rate for teenagers from 15½ percent in February 1961 and 14½ percent a year ago, to 10.9 percent last month. So high a rate for young workers still blocks far too many young men and women from beginning productive and rewarding careers.

Our achievement is worthy of celebration, but our task remains unfinished. We can and will move with appropriate caution to sustain our economic advance into even higher levels of manpower achievement.

The 3.7-percent rate is an average. It conceals the fact that some 3 million workers still lack jobs. It also conceals the fact that there are now more jobs in some areas and occupations than there are people to fill them.

In the Great Lakes region, there is already a tight supply of both skilled and unskilled labor.

There are shortages of machinists for the metalworking industry throughout the country, and shortages of building trades craftsmen in many areas.

The new education programs could be stunted for a lack of teachers, and the medicare program thwarted for a lack of medical and nursing personnel.

Yet, while these shortages exist:

There are pockets of chronic unemployment in many cities, in Appalachia, in the Mississippi Delta, and in other regions of economic distress.

There are teenagers who need jobs to stay in school or to help support their families. They need to know that society has a place for them and a need for their services.

There are millions employed in occupations and skills that do not fully utilize their capabilities.

There is no overall labor shortage. But the unemployed and underemployed are not fully matched with the jobs available.

Specific shortages of labor can slow up the expansion of the economy. They can put pressure on costs and prices.

We are determined to do whatever is necessary to keep the economy expanding and avoid inflationary bottlenecks.

PLANS TO HEAD OFF MANPOWER SHORTAGES

The time to deal with manpower shortages is before they develop.

Effective manpower policies can reduce unemployment and at the same time head off manpower shortages.

I am therefore:

1. Directing the Commissioner of Labor Statistics to include in the monthly employment reports, starting in March, the fullest possible information on existing or threatening labor shortage situations.

2. Establishing an Office of Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, to assist the Secretary of Labor in the discharge of his manpower responsibilities under existing legislation and as Chairman of the President's Committee on Manpower.

3. Instructing the Secretary of Labor to focus Manpower Development and Training Act programs to meet prospective manpower shortage situations, especially through on-the-job training.

4. Requesting the President's Committee on Manpower to submit to me by July 1, 1966, a report on the recently announced coordination plan for all manpower activities of the Federal Government.

5. Asking the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy to make appropriate recommendations to me on the manpower situation and related matters.

6. Referring the report of the National Commission on Automation, Technology and Economic Progress to the President's Manpower and Labor-Management Policy Committees for advice regarding the Commission's recommendations.

At my request, the Secretary of Labor yesterday submitted to the Congress legislation to improve the administration of the Federal-State Employment Service. This legislation emerged from the unanimous recommendations of a task force of distinguished businessmen, labor leaders, educators, and other manpower specialists.

I call at the same time on American management and American labor to take the affirmative action which is necessary to assure that inflation, resulting from the underuse of America's manpower potential, will not deprive us of the fruits of the most magnificent economic growth record in history.

A CALL FOR BOLD NEW APPROACHES

I am asking these agencies and groups to think boldly about new approaches.

What can we do to move the unemployed and the underemployed from places where jobs are scarce to places where workers are scarce? How do we move the jobs to the unemployed?

What can we do to encourage employers, who seek scarce skills, to redefine jobs in a way that employs more of the unskilled or semiskilled?

How can we enhance the mobility of workers in construction and similar occupations where demand shifts sharply among localities?

What can we do to mobilize the recently retired but still productive?

What can we do to make fuller use of our trained womanpower?

What can we do to break down artificial barriers against the entry of new workers into jobs that are hard to fill?

What can we do to insure that training and apprenticeship programs are open to all alike and are sufficiently extensive to meet our needs for skilled workers?

What can we do to help employers improve their own on-the-job training?

What can we do to encourage the employment of the physically and psychologically handicapped?

What can we do to facilitate the immigration of workers with scarce skills?

What more can we do to break down the barriers of discrimination that waste valuable manpower resources?

We already have many effective tools of an active manpower policy. In the year ahead we will expand and improve these programs.

Our most important new tool was provided by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, strengthened by the amendments of 1963 and 1965. Our manpower training programs must respond both to needs of people and the needs of the economy.

Our experience under the act has proved that: People can be helped through education and training; the economy will benefit from the availability of additional workers.

Training will make useful and productive citizens of people previously considered beyond even the most elementary kinds of help.

Mentally retarded individuals are being hired in increasing numbers by both Government and private employers, after successful training in various semiskilled office and service occupations.

Vocational rehabilitation and manpower development programs are being applied more extensively to inmates of correctional institutions. During their period of confinement, they can prepare for jobs when they are released.

Federal manpower training programs are conducted in close cooperation with private industry. During the past year, we have significantly increased the number of on-the-job training programs approved under the Manpower Development and Training Act. In occupations ranging from tool and die makers to nurses aids and shipfitters, people are being trained on the job. The employment rate of over 85 percent testifies to the effectiveness of these programs.

In the next fiscal year, we will train and retrain 250,000 persons under these Manpower Development and Training Act programs.

An expanding economy now presents both the opportunity and the necessity to upgrade the skills of the underemployed. This will meet the demand for workers. It will afford opportunity to people to move into higher skills and higher paying jobs—as high as their abilities permit.

The second major tool of our manpower policy is the Federal-State Employment Service. It must assume even greater responsibility not only in placing people, but in providing proper job and training information, guidance, and counseling to all who need it.

The administrative framework of the Service must be modernized.

The quality of those who provide its day-to-day services must be improved.

The methods of its operation need development.

More intensive research is needed to help guide our young people to occupations where they are most needed.

Vigorous manpower training and a revitalized job placement service are essential for a high-employment economy with price stability.

We will make the most of these tools in 1966.

THE SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF THE DISADVANTAGED

Certain groups in the Nation have not shared fully in the benefits of our unprecedented economic expansion. Much remains to be done to achieve full opportunity for these groups. As we expand

their opportunities, we expand our manpower resources.

Unskilled workers, with almost double the national rate of unemployment, lack the training to develop their potential skills.

Nonwhite workers, constitute 11 percent of our labor force, 20 percent of our unemployed, and nearly 25 percent of our long-term unemployed, they suffer the double disadvantages of lower educational attainment and lingering discrimination.

Young Americans, who will swell our work force for many years to come, still experience triple the national unemployment rate.

Farmworkers, both operators and hired workers, remain the victims of high unemployment and underemployment.

Workers in surplus labor areas, such as Appalachia, can benefit only from more vigorous economic development in their home areas or from migration to centers of employment growth.

No society can be truly great—and no economy can be truly prosperous—if high, long-duration unemployment for some exists side by side with low, short-term unemployment for others.

Special programs, suited to special groups, are needed to achieve full employment with price stability.

We must move again as we did last year to meet the impact of the more than 2 million young people—16 to 21 years of age—who will be looking for work next summer.

As we continue toward the Great Society, we will also bring increased employment opportunities to many groups.

The rehabilitation and rebuilding of large blighted sections in our central cities will bring new vistas to those parts of America where opportunities are needed most.

The work of the Rural Community Development Service will open up new opportunities for rural people, particularly in areas of greatest need. The new community development districts, when pending legislation is passed, will bring greater planning resources to rural areas. The result will be higher levels of social and economic development.

Our efforts under the 1965 Public Works and Economic Development Act will be stepped up.

Joint Federal-State efforts under the Appalachian Regional Commission are also being increased. I have recommended quadrupling the expenditures for special programs to reach the more than 17 million people residing in that area. Such an increase means increased resources for highway construction, development of natural resources, vocational education and health activities.

Our economy cannot be fully successful, or our society truly great, while differences in economic opportunity persist.

The programs and policies of this administration seek to reduce and ultimately to eliminate these differences. They are intolerable in a free and democratic society.

INVESTMENT IN HUMAN RESOURCES

In a prosperous economy, the root of most problems of unemployment and underemployment lies in deficiencies in education.

We must repair these deficiencies where we can.

We must prevent their recurrence in the next generation.

Fewer young people now drop out of school. But the number is still too high. If current trends continue, there will be over 8 million school dropouts between 1960 and 1970. The average American worker already has more than a high school education. The dropout will be at an ever-increasing disadvantage.

I am particularly concerned by the large numbers of young men who fail the Armed Forces qualification tests and must be rejected for military service. One-seventh of the young men examined cannot pass the equivalent of an elementary school examination.

Low educational attainment is a product, and in turn a producer, of poverty, unemployment, and discrimination.

This administration is determined to bring increased education and training opportunities to all Americans in the coming year. We intend to:

Improve vocational rehabilitation training for over 200,000 mentally retarded, severely disabled and handicapped individuals.

Train or retrain 250,000 persons under manpower development programs.

Have community action programs in 900 areas, urban and rural, throughout the United States.

Fund preschool classes for more than 200,000 children over the full academic year—and for another 500,000 youngsters during the summer. Almost 150,000 teachers, teacher aids, and neighborhood helpers will provide the needed service to these children.

Operate 124 Job Corps urban and rural training centers, able to enroll approximately 45,000 men and women at any one time.

Provide 125,000 part-time jobs during the entire school year and another 165,000 summer jobs in the Neighborhood Youth Corps to help poor young people stay in school. Another 64,000 positions will be available for boys and girls out of school.

Offer services, under the work experience program, to over 100,000 public welfare recipients who support 300,000 dependents.

Give basic education to 75,000 adults under grants to States for improving adult literacy.

Conduct 350 different projects involving 4,500 VISTA volunteers to provide educational training and related services to the poor.

These specific programs are in addition to the enormous expansion in aid to our elementary, secondary and higher education systems. For next year, I have proposed a total Federal investment in education of $10.2 billion—more than double the $4.75 billion effort when I became President. This will move us forward toward our goal of providing full education for every citizen to the limits of his capacity to absorb it.

Teaching methods and materials, no matter how excellent, are not enough. They must be kindled by ingenious, flexible and responsive teachers and administrators. I have urged that Congress provide the funds for a new Teacher Corps—to be made up initially of 3,700 men and women. Combined into teams of experienced and intern teachers, they will be sharing their skills and understanding this fall with the poor children who need them most.

I am also calling for increased activities which will provide this Nation with more high-quality teachers for the handicapped and to meet the impact of school desegregation.

Manpower demands for professional personnel are also increasing in many other fields. New research and teaching activities must be oriented to meet those demands. Grants, loans, and other forms of aid are being made available to States, localities, and educational institutions. They include:

A significant increase in National Science Foundation support of basic research and science education, critically important for the advanced training of scientists and engineers.

University grants for research and training of advanced degree students in the space sciences through the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Help through the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act and other legislation to increase, by 1975, the number of medical school graduates by 50 percent and the number of dental school graduates by 100 percent over 1960.

Training personnel to deal with the critical problems of water pollution under the Water Pollution Control Administration.

Training programs for developing skills of persons who are needed in community development activities.

Continued assistance in the development of high quality personnel for guidance and counseling—from elementary school to the university—under provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

We must provide full and free access to a first-rate education for all our youth, with later opportunities to develop their talents to the fullest measure of their ability.

The commitment of the administration is to expand education and training opportunities for every citizen.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND MINIMUM WAGE

Sound fiscal and monetary policies, effective training programs, and efficient employment service, and expanding educational services can steadily provide new hope for the unemployed.

Yet, even in a high-employment economy, the protection of unemployment compensation remains essential. The present period of prosperity is the appropriate time to modernize and strengthen our system of unemployment insurance.

I have recommended that legislation be enacted to improve our system's financing and administration, to prevent abuses, to provide more realistic benefits for more workers, for longer periods.

Special protection is needed for those in our labor force who are still employed at substandard earnings. The minimum

wage for American workers has been an essential part of national policy for almost 30 years. But both the level of the minimum and the number of workers covered have recently fallen behind the pace set by the rest of the economy.

I recommend that the minimum wage be increased and that the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act be extended to additional workers.

We must provide all possible assistance to those who seek work, and decent living conditions for those who do work.

The programs and policies of this administration will be directed at these goals.

OUR OPPORTUNITY FOR THE FUTURE

This report has been of programs and policies, of legislation and appropriations. These are the means by which manpower policy is carried out.

The real basis of manpower policy is more fundamental.

It is the very essence of a free and democratic society.

It is our shared belief in the dignity of every human being.

This report has been of the gains of the past year.

To mark these gains is only to take new measure of the future. We are a people who draw confidence from the certainty of change. We are restless unless we can mold change to the highest human purpose.

With all that we have accomplished so far, with all that we are doing now, it is time to ask again: What of the future?

The future can be and ought to be a time of opportunity.

I see a future where the first two decades of people's lives are spent growing up, physically and mentally fit—training for citizenship and effective participation in their country's affairs—attaining the education for service, for a craft, for a profession—getting ready for their roles as workers, consumers, producers, and contributors to a free society.

I see a future in which education and training will be a permanent bridge between learning, employment and human development. Even as we develop new uses of technology, we recognize that people grow stale unless there is a continuous renewal of their knowledge, enrichment of their skills and development of their talents.

I see a future in which help to those seeking a station in life—whether it be the young dropout, the first offender, the older man with an outdated skill, the military rejectee—will have an opportunity to fulfill their hopes and expectations.

A manpower policy must be based on belief in the value of the individual and in the promise of welcome change.

A manpower policy should lead us to a society in which every person has full opportunity to develop his—or her—earning powers, where no willing worker lacks a job, and where no useful talent lacks an opportunity.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 8, 1966.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10451. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain lands in the State of Colorado to the Department of Agriculture for recreation development, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10721. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to improve its benefits, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11509. An act to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12762. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 1484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loneta Hackney;

H.R. 1918. An act for the relief of Eligio Ciardiello;

H.R. 3076. An act for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased;

H.R. 3236. An act for the relief of Louis Shchuchinski;

H.R. 4928. An act for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki;

H.R. 4995. An act for the relief of Muhammad Sarwar;

H.R. 5231. An act for the relief of Jack Ralph Walker;

H.R. 5530. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert A. Ethridge;

H.R. 5973. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Hower;

H.R. 7667. An act for the relief of Donald F. Farrell; and

H.R. 10338. An act for the relief of Joseph B. Stevens.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 10451. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain lands in the State of Colorado to the Department of Agriculture for recreation development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10721. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to improve its benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 11509. An act to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12762. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE 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 MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request by Mr. NELSON, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

TRANSFER TO SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION OF TITLE TO CERTAIN OBJECTS OF ART

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1023, S. 2266.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2266) to authorize the Attorney General to transfer to the Smithsonian Institution certain objects of art.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to transfer to the Smithsonian Institution title to the jade, stone, and bronze objects of art consisting of forty-four pieces which were vested in or transferred to the Attorney General pursuant to the provisions of vesting order 18344, dated August 21, 1951.

SEC. 2. After the transfer of title by the Attorney General, the Smithsonian Institution shall have complete discretion to retain, exchange, sell, or otherwise dispose of the objects of art referred to in section 1 in promotion of the purposes for which that Institution was founded.

TIJUANA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1024, S. 2540.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2540) to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of an international flood control project for the Tijuana River in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2540

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State, acting through the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is hereby authorized to conclude with the appropriate official or officials of the Government of Mexico an agreement for the joint construction, operation, and maintenance by the United States and Mexico, in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, of an international flood control project for the Tijuana River, which shall be located and have substantially the characteristics described in "Report on an International Flood Control Project, Tijuana River Basin," prepared by the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

SEC. 2. If agreement is concluded pursuant to section 1 of this Act, the said United States Commissioner is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the portion of such project assigned to the United States, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for use of the United States Section, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of any appropriation made shall be expended for construction on any land, site, or easement, except such as has been acquired by donation and the title thereto has been approved by the Attorney General of the United States.

SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1026, S. 2729.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2729) to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended by striking out "$1,841,000,000" and "$1,375,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,966,000,000" and "$1,500,000,000", respectively.

SEC. 2. Effective on July 1, 1966, section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) There are hereby established in the Treasury the following revolving funds: (A) a disaster loan fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under sections 7(b)(1), 7(b)(2), 7(b)(4), and 7(c)(2) of this Act, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions; and (B) a business loan and investment fund which shall be available for financing functions performed under sections 7(a), 7(b)(3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this Act, titles III and V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, including administrative expenses in connection with such functions.

"(2) All repayments of loans and debentures, payments of interest and other receipts arising out of transactions heretofore or hereafter entered into by the Administration (A) pursuant to sections 7(b)(1), 7(b)(2), 7(b)(4), and 7(c)(2) of this Act shall be paid into the disaster loan funds; and (B) pursuant to sections 7(a), 7(b)(3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this Act, titles III and V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall be paid into the business loan and investment fund.

"(3) Unexpended balances of appropriations made to the fund pursuant to this subsection, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this paragraph, shall be allocated, together with related assets and liabilities, to the funds established by paragraph (1) in such amounts as the Administrator shall determine. In addition to any sums so allocated, appropriations are hereby authorized to be made to such funds, as capital thereof, in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Administration, which appropriations shall remain available until expended.

"(4) The total amount of loans, guarantees, and other obligations or commitments, heretofore or hereafter entered into by the Administration, which are outstanding at any one time (A) under section 7(a), 7(b)(3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this Act, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall not exceed $1,364,100,000; (B) under title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, shall not exceed $366,500,000; and (C) under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, shall not exceed $156,700,000.

"(5) The Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and House of Representatives, as soon as possible after the beginning of each calendar quarter, a full and complete report on the status of each of the funds established by paragraph (1), including its projection of the future needs of such funds, and its recommendations for such additional appropriations as it deems appropriate. If at the close of the preceding calendar quarter the aggregate amount outstanding or committed by the Administration in carrying out its functions under any of the sections or titles referred to in paragraph (4) exceeded 75 per centum of the total amount authorized to be outstanding or committed under such sections or titles, the Administration's report shall include its recommendations for such additional authority as it deems appropriate.

"(6) The Administration shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, following the close of each fiscal year, interest on the outstanding cash disbursements from each of the funds established by paragraph (1) at rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields on outstanding interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as calculated for the month of June preceding such fiscal year."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 7 of the Small Business Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Administration also is empowered to make loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lenders through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) to assist any firm to adjust to changed economic conditions resulting from increased competition from imported articles, but only if (1) an adjustment proposal of such firm has been certified by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, (2) the Secretary has referred such proposal to the Administration under that Act and the loan would provide part or all of the financial assistance necessary to carry out such proposal, and (3) the Secretary's certification is in force at the time the Administration makes the loan. With respect to loans made under this subsection the Administration shall apply the provisions of sections 314, 315, 316, 318, 319, and 320 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 as though such loans had been made under section 314 of that Act."

(b) Section 2 of Public Law 87-550, approved July 25, 1962 (76 Stat. 220), is hereby repealed. Any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore appropriated for the purposes of such section are hereby transferred to the business loan and investment fund established by section 4(c)(1) of the Small Business Act.

(c) This section shall take effect on July 1, 1966.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, during 1964 and 1965 this country suffered a series of unprecedented disasters: the Alaska earthquake; floods in California, Oregon, Washington; Mississippi floods in the Midwest; and finally Hurricane Betsy in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Florida. These disasters caused great suffering and property loss in the areas affected. In order to meet its statutory responsibility to make disaster loans, SBA was forced to divert money and personnel to handle the loan applications resulting from these and other disasters. Because of this demand, SBA was forced to stop the acceptance of direct regular business loan applications on October 11, 1965. It has, however, continued to accept business loan applications under its loan guarantee plan. This curtailment has caused severe strain on those small businesses all over the country whose only source of capital funds was the SBA. Legislation is clearly needed to avoid such curtailment in the future. SBA has also almost reached the ceiling for loans outstanding in its regular business, disaster, and poverty loan programs.

Section 1 of this bill, S. 2729, would increase by $125 million the ceiling for the amount of loans and commitments that may be outstanding in SBA's regular business loan program, disaster loan program, prime contract authority, and title IV loans under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It would also increase the total amount which may be appropriated to SBA's present revolving fund by $125 million. This increase, recommended by the administration, is the amount estimated by SBA to be needed to continue these lending functions through June 30 of this year. This portion of the bill is a temporary measure designed to aid SBA for the balance of this fiscal year.

Section 2 of the bill is an amended version of the bill I introduced, along with Senators McINTYRE, JAVITS, and RANDOLPH, to assure, as nearly as possible, the continuation of SBA's lending programs during the periods when SBA has a severe drain on its resources caused by great natural disasters.

This section would rewrite section 4(c) of the Small Business Act to establish two revolving funds for financing SBA's lending functions effective July 1, 1966. One fund would be available for financing SBA's physical disaster loan program. No authorization ceiling is placed on this fund. It was the opinion of the committee that since it is impossible to predict the extent of the need for funds to meet physical disaster requirements, no authorization ceiling was necessary for the disaster loan funds. If a ceiling were placed on disaster loans, it is possible that the ceiling might be reached at a time when Congress was not in session. Therefore, even with funds available, disaster loans could not be made until Congress returned to raise the ceiling. Funds for use by SBA in its disaster loan program would still be subject to restrictions placed on the program by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

A second fund would be available for the other lending programs of SBA. Three ceilings are placed on activities financed from this fund. The ceilings reflect SBA's estimated activities under this fund through fiscal year 1967.

A ceiling of $366,500,000 is placed on functions under sections 302 and 303 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. These functions pertain to the purchase by SBA of the subordinated debentures of SBIC's and the making of long-term loans to SBIC's.

A ceiling of $156,700,000 is placed on loans under sections 501 and 502 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. These sections pertain to loans to State and local development companies.

A ceiling of $1,364,100,000 is placed on the remaining functions financed under the fund; that is, the regular business loan program, displaced business disaster loans, trade adjustment loans, prime contract authority, and loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The bill would require SBA to make quarterly reports to the Senate and House Committees on Banking and Currency and Appropriations on the status of the two revolving funds, including its recommendations whenever 75 percent of any ceiling on outstanding obligations has been reached.

The bill would also transfer relevant portions of Public Law 87-550, authorizing SBA to make trade adjustment loans, to the Small Business Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes."

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, March 8, 1966, the Vice President had signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 12563) to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON EXTRAORDINARY CONTRACTUAL ADJUSTMENTS

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on extraordinary contractual adjustments made by that Administration, during the calendar year 1965; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assure to our Nation's children access to this country's abundance of food; to improve the nutrition level for children and thus to serve their health and well-being and their incentive to learn through cooperative Federal-State efforts in a nationwide child nutrition program; and to provide for the conduct of this comprehensive effort by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a part of its basic food and nutrition responsibilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Civil Service Commission for "Salaries and expenses," for the fiscal year 1966, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF CHAPTER 55 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to increase health benefits for dependents of members of the uniformed services (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS FLIGHT TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the Reserve Officer Training Corps flight training program, for the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AWARD OF TROPHIES FOR RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS RELATED TO THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of trophies for the recognition of special accomplishments related to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED ON OTHER THAN A COMPETITIVE BID BASIS

A letter from the Executive Assistant to Assistant Chief for Construction, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded on other than a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompany report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN ITEMS FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of crocidolite asbestos (harsh) from the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of cordage fiber (sisal) from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of opium from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of celestite from the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

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

REPORT OF COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

A letter from the chairman of the board, Communications Satellite Corp., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that corporation, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

EXTENSION OF TIME MAKING GRANTS UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

REAPPOINTMENT OF NEVILLE MILLER AS A MEMBER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the nomination of Neville Miller for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financial condition and results of the operations of the highway trust fund as of June 30, 1965 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on advisory committees assisting him in carrying out his functions under the Social Security Act, for the calendar year 1965 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the 6-month period ended December 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF ACTING COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on audit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, for the year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings to be realized by providing Government quarters in lieu of payment of quarters allowances to U.S. military personnel in Taiwan, Department of Defense, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1964, Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of self-employment tax payment and collection practices, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department, dated March 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements of Public Housing Administration, fiscal years 1965 and 1964, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1965, Virgin Islands Corporation, Department of the Interior, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of Oct. 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON COMPILATION OF VOTING AND REGISTRATION STATISTICS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, that he had directed the Bureau of the Census to take no further action at this time to compile the voting and registration statistics contemplated in the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

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

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS

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

REPORTS ON VISA PETITIONS ACCORDING THE BENEFICIARIES THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION

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

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ACT OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Employment Service Act of 1966" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation 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 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL FACILITIES MODERNIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation 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 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, trans-

mitting a draft of proposed legislation to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS PERSONNEL TRAINING ACT OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, to improve the educational quality of the schools training such allied health professions personnel, and to strengthen and improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric, and nursing students, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to strengthen and improve public and private programs of assistance for institutions of higher education and students attending them (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Mediation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ON CIVILIAN POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of Defense on civilian positions allocated or placed in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 during the calendar year 1965, and on positions established to carry out research and development activities requiring the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

RESOLUTION OF CONSERVATIVE CLUB OF YONKERS, N.Y.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Conservative Club of Yonkers, N.Y., relating to reapportionment of State legislatures, which was ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF ARIZONA LEGISLATURE

Mr. FANNIN. Madam President, the House and Senate of the 27th Arizona Legislature last month adopted several memorials dealing with matters of national concern.

One of these is the complicated question of community antenna television systems and how they should be regulated by the Federal Communications Commission.

CATV, as it has come to be known, is especially important in my State of Arizona. It provides many isolated communities with television reception which they otherwise could not enjoy. In addition, an important industry for the manufacture of components used in CATV systems has developed in Arizona and provides employment for hundreds of our citizens.

The concern expressed by the memorial of the Arizona House of Representatives is most legitimate and deserves a wider audience.

On another matter, both the House of Representatives and the Senate of Arizona have unanimously adopted memorials in opposition to S. 1592.

As I have previously indicated in testimony and in other public statements, I share the fears of those who believe S. 1592 as originally introduced would infringe upon the constitutional right of citizens to acquire and maintain firearms.

It would, in addition, impose unreasonable penalties and economic hardship on many small independent businessmen who sell guns and ammunition for the legitimate use of sportsmen, ranchers, and hunters.

All of us are concerned about the rising crime rate, but I sincerely believe S. 1592 would not be an effective weapon against crime. Even without additional legislation, there is much that governmental agencies could do to more effectively control this situation.

As the Arizona memorial points out, the State Department could do far more than it has to restrict the import of cheap foreign military surplus weapons and pistols.

I ask consent that these three resolutions adopted by the legislature of my State be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

The resolutions, presented by Mr. FANNIN, were received and referred, as indicated:

To the Committee on Commerce:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 6 OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 27TH LEGISLATURE, 2D REGULAR SESSION

"Memorial urging the Federal Communications Commission to withhold issuing its second report and order concerning the regulation of community antenna systems

"To the members of the Federal Communications Commission:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas many citizens of the State of Arizona are unable to receive adequate off-the-air television signals; and

"Whereas as a result of this condition numerous community antenna systems have been constructed to render more adequate television service to their customers; and

"Whereas a large and growing industry has developed in Arizona, which industry manufactures components used in community antenna systems; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission previously indicated to the Congress of the United States that unless the Congress adopted legislation concerning community antenna systems that the Federal Communications Commission would exercise control over community antenna systems; and

"Whereas it is understood that the Federal Communications Commission now proposes to issue its second report and order concerning its regulation of microwave companies serving community antenna systems as well as its regulation of community antenna systems directly; and

"Whereas your memorialist believes that it is the proper function of the Congress of the United States to determine what control the Federal Communications Commission shall have over community antenna systems, if any; and

"Whereas any additional restrictions placed upon the right of citizens to receive television signals by means of community antenna systems would adversely affect many citizens of the State of Arizona and would materially adversely affect an important segment of Arizona industry: Wherefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Federal Communications Commission desist from issuing its proposed second report and order concerning the regulation of community antenna systems until the Congress of the United States sets forth what the national television policy is to be.

"2. That the Honorable Wesley Bolin, Secretary of State of Arizona, transmit copies of this memorial to the members of the Federal Communications Commission and to each member of the Arizona congressional delegation.

"Approved by the Governor, February 9, 1966.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state, February 9, 1966."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 3 OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 27TH LEGISLATURE, 2D REGULAR SESSION

"Memorial urging the Congress of the United States to oppose the Dodd bill or any other Federal legislation relating to regulation and registration of mail order firearms sales

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas since the unfortunate and untimely death of President John F. Kennedy, considerable impetus has occurred for the

passage of the Dodd bill relating to regulation and registration of mail order firearms sales; and

"Whereas the Dodd bill (S. 1592), if enacted, will prohibit citizens from purchasing a firearm by mail, and give the U.S. Treasury Department such broad regulatory powers it could subject such citizens to police investigation and harassment and lead to registration of said firearms; and

"Whereas such requirements will cause an inconvenience and an undue burden on law abiding people of this country, particularly in rural areas, and such legislation will open the door for the Treasury Department to regulate who may buy firearms; and

"Whereas the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States and article 2, section 26 of the constitution of the State of Arizona guarantee to its citizens the right to keep and bear arms, and the Dodd bill, if enacted, will be in direct violation of such guaranteed rights; and

"Whereas responsible organizations such as the National Rifle Association, National Wildlife Federation and others have no objection to workable laws that will prevent the misuse of firearms by increasing penalties for crimes committed with firearms; and

"Whereas the Dodd bill, if enacted, will seriously hamper small industries that build fine custom rifles for mail order trade throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas any restrictive legislation should be directed to merely requiring that shipments of firearms in interstate commerce be made in compliance with the laws of the State of destination; and

"Whereas since practically all States have laws regulating sale of firearms to juveniles, convicted felons, and incompetents and against carrying concealed weapons, and since there are already Federal laws which make it a crime for a convicted felon to transport firearms across State lines, no Federal law for regulation and registration of mail order sales of firearms is necessary: Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States take positive action leading to the defeat of the Dodd bill (S. 1592).

"2. That the Congress of the United States carefully examine and oppose any other Federal legislation relating to registration and regulation of firearms which restricts the rights of law abiding citizens and usurps the police power of the States to control firearms, and that it urge the State Department to exercise more control under the Munitions Control Act of imports of cheap foreign pistols and military surplus.

"3. The secretary of state is directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Arizona congressional delegation.

"Approved by the Governor of Arizona, February 9, 1966.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state, February 9, 1966."

"SENATE MEMORIAL 1 OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA, SENATE, 27TH LEGISLATURE, 2D REGULAR SESSION

"Memorial urging the Congress of the United States to oppose the Dodd bill or any other Federal legislation relating to regulation and registration of mail order firearms sales

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas since the unfortunate and untimely death of President John F. Kennedy, considerable impetus has occurred for the passage of the Dodd bill relating to regulation and registration of mail-order firearms sales; and

"Whereas the Dodd bill (S. 1592), if enacted, will prohibit citizens from purchasing a firearm by mail, and give the U.S. Treasury Department such broad regulatory powers it could subject such citizens to police investigation and harassment and lead to registration of said firearms; and

"Whereas such requirements will cause an inconvenience, and an undue burden on, law abiding people of this country, particularly in rural areas, and such legislation will open the door for the Treasury Department to regulate who may buy firearms; and

"Whereas the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States and article 2, section 26 of the constitution of the State of Arizona guarantee to its citizens the right to keep and bear arms, and the Dodd bill, if enacted, will be in direct violation of such guaranteed rights; and

"Whereas responsible organizations such as the National Rifle Association, National Wildlife Federation and others have no objection to workable laws that will prevent the misuse of firearms by increasing penalties for crimes committed with firearms; and

"Whereas the Dodd bill, if enacted, will seriously hamper small industries that build fine custom rifles for mail-order trade throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas any restrictive legislation should be directed to merely requiring that shipments of firearms in interstate commerce be made in compliance with the laws of the State of destination; and

"Whereas, since practically all States have laws regulating sale of firearms to juveniles, convicted felons, and incompetents and against carrying concealed weapons, and since there are already Federal laws which make it a crime for a convicted felon to transport firearms across State lines, no Federal law for regulation and registration of mail-order sales of firearms is necessary: Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States take positive action leading to the defeat of the Dodd bill (S. 1592).

"2. That the Congress of the United States carefully examine and oppose any other Federal legislation relating to registration and regulation of firearms which restricts the rights of law abiding citizens and usurps the police power of the States to control firearms, and that it urge the State Department to exercise more control under the Munitions Control Act of imports of cheap foreign pistols and military surplus.

"3. The secretary of state is directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Arizona congressional delegation.

"Approved by the Governor, February 7, 1966."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3048. A bill for the relief of Andrew White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3049. A bill to amend the Social Security Act in order to provide for a Talented American Senior Corps; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3050. A bill for the relief of Marina Panagiotis Restos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. PEARSON):

S. 3051. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the compact between Missouri and Kansas creating the Kansas City Area Transportation District and the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

S. 3052. A bill to provide for a coordinated national highway safety program through financial assistance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 3053. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of Panama Canal ship pilots; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3054. A bill providing for a study of serious interruptions of certain essential services; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 3055. A bill for the relief of Paul L., Margaret, and Josephine Kirsteatter; and

S. 3056. A bill for the relief of William D. Pender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3057. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to reduce the premiums charged for the insurance of certain cooperative housing mortgages; and

S. 3058. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to permit the more effective operation of the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3059. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. BURDICK:

S.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution proposing a nationwide popular vote for election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, on behalf of the Joint Economic Committee, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 additional copies of its hearings entitled "Recent Federal Reserve Actions and Economic Policy Coordination."

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee five thousand additional copies of Parts 1 and 2 of its hearings of the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "Recent Federal Reserve Actions and Economic Policy Coordination."

PROPOSED TALENTED AMERICAN SENIOR CORPS ACT

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a Talented American Senior Corps, the short name of which would be TASC.

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

The bill (S. 3049) to amend the Social Security Act in order to provide for a Talented American Senior Corps, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, this proposed legislation would make two meaningful contributions toward better lives for America's elderly.

First. It would make it possible for those in this age group to earn money by providing services needed in their own communities, and thus to improve themselves economically.

Second. It would satisfy the desire of many senior citizens to continue as active members of society and to engage in useful and satisfying pursuits.

Third. Needed services would be provided for all age groups, including the elderly.

For too many of our fellow Americans, reaching old age presently results in a slump into dire poverty. For some of them, grinding poverty is all they have ever known. Others may have lived in moderate circumstances while working, but find it impossible to make ends meet when forced into retirement by advancing years. It would be difficult to determine which is worse: to be poor in the later years, after having been poor all one's life; or to be poor in old age after having seen better days. They are both bad.

The most widely accepted standard used for measuring adequacy of income is that set up by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1960. Under that standard, it is estimated that the minimum annual income needed by an elderly couple to achieve a "modest but adequate living" is $3,000 in a large city and $2,500 in a smaller community. For an elderly single person, it is estimated at about $1,800. In 1962, half of the 5,400,000 couples headed by a person aged 65 or more had incomes of less than $2,875, and 30 percent had less than $2,000. Two-thirds of the 8,700,000 retired individuals had less than $1,800 of income. Establishment of the Talented American Senior Corps would make it possible for many of these older Americans to bring their incomes up to the level of adequacy.

However, this program would go far beyond meeting the financial needs of the elderly. It would also meet their psychological needs and benefit their physical and mental health. Psychologically, it would meet the need of interesting and satisfying activities, the need to earn the respect of others, and the need to be worthy of one's own self-respect. It is difficult for younger people who are preoccupied with earning a living and raising families to appreciate what many of our elders go through during the long, empty days of retirement. One dramatic example of this was given by a witness at a hearing of one of the subcommittees of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, Dr. Robert F. Powers, president of the Saginaw County, Mich., Medical Society. He told of a 72-year-old uncle of his who had nothing to do and who was so hungry for something to do that he counted the bricks in a wall facing his window. He quoted his uncle as saying:

> Robert, do you know how many bricks are in that wall on that house next door? There are 1,645. I've counted exactly that number a thousand times.

From information reaching the Committee on Aging, this is by no means an isolated example of the difficulty senior citizens have in finding something—anything—to do. You could multiply this example by the thousands. The Talented American Senior Corps would give the elderly of our Nation something to do—something considerably more than a make-work program.

It would give them a means of earning and maintaining the respect of the younger people in their communities, and of keeping their own self-respect. Some observers have referred to the United States as a work-centered culture. The traditional American point of view is that only he who works and makes a contribution is entitled to the respect of others. In the early days of this country, when all hands were needed to clear and till the land, as well as to ward off Indians and other hostile forces, there was no such thing as enforced idleness of the elderly. Thus, this attitude did not work to the disadvantage of our seniors. However, in recent years, as compulsory retirement has become general, this old lack of respect for nonworkers has carried over. Too many younger persons look upon the retired as a burden upon society, as drones. As they in turn become old, this attitude eventually works to their own disadvantage.

Because the elderly themselves have spent a lifetime developing lack of respect for nonworkers, enforced idleness in old age can be devastating to their self-respect and self-image. In fact, since their attitudes toward nonworkers were formulated many years ago, when scorn for nonworkers was stronger than it is today, their judgment of themselves may be much harsher than that of their younger compatriots.

The Talented American Senior Corps will give older persons the opportunity they need to engage in service to others and thereby to earn the respect of younger members of society and to maintain their own self-respect, no matter how strong may be their scorn and that of others for the nonworker.

Besides improving the psychological well-being of the elderly, their service in the Talented American Senior Corps will benefit their physical and mental health as well. An authority in the field of geriatrics, Dr. Edward F. Bortz, has said:

> Older citizens who are actively employed will be more healthy and better adjusted and consequently a less likely drain on the Public Treasury. Instead of being consumers they will be producers and taxpayers. They will take pride in being self-supporting and in being able to provide for their own needs. It can be predicted that healthy and alert senior citizens, well utilized by the community, will make far fewer demands for medical services.

In this connection, I should like to quote again from the testimony of Dr. Robert F. Powers, who expressed the consensus among physicians as follows:

> We feel that the key to positive health lies in struggle rather than retreat, in enjoyment rather than avoidance of stress of living. It might be said that the "wounds of combat" are definitely preferable to the decay of idleness, both from a biological and moral standpoint.

In a study of 352 aged applicants for public housing in San Antonio, Tex., in 1960, Dr. Frances M. Carp, of the University of Texas found that there was a significant correlation between having a paid job responsibility on the one hand and health, happiness, and general morale on the other. Dr. Carp is now on the staff of the aging program of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

The Talented American Senior Corps could contribute not only to the physical health of elderly participants but also to their mental health. Dr. R. H. Felix, a leader in the field of mental health and former Director of the National Institute of Mental Health has said:

> From the point of view of mental health, the central problem is to give the older people a sense of participation and continued purpose in life.

In 1956, there was published the results of a study conducted by four sociologists for the Russell Sage Foundation, entitled "Five Hundred Over Sixty." Those who conducted the study were Bernard Kutner, David Fanschel, Alice M. Togo, and Thomas S. Langner. They found in their study of the relationship of employment to adjustment of older people that, when coupled with good health:

> Employment lifts the spirit, mobilizes energy, and brightens the individual's perspectives.

The Talented American Senior Corps would not only provide needed income supplementation for the elderly and benefit their physical, mental, and psychological health, it would enrich our society in a third important way by providing services needed in every community in our Nation which are not now being provided. The failures of our communities to provide these services is due

to no shortage of manpower to provide them, but rather to a lack of any effective mechanism to utilize the vast store of manpower to meet these needs which we have in our Nation's elderly. Enactment of my bill will provide such a mechanism.

Under the war on poverty, the Office of Economic Opportunity has already put into operation programs to utilize the elderly to meet some needs. Its foster grandparent program hires needy seniors to provide individual love, attention, and guidance to children in institutions who desperately need sustained contact with an adult on a 1-to-1 basis, of the type provided most children by their natural parents or grandparents. The Committee on Aging has received glowing reports of the emotional benefits of this program to both the children served and to those who serve.

More recently, the Office of Economic Opportunity has put into effect two programs called medicare alert and green thumb. Medicare alert is employing low-income seniors to take the message of medicare to other older individuals who might not otherwise hear of this program and who might otherwise fail to sign up before the March 31 deadline. Green thumb hires low-income retired farmers and others experienced in making plants grow and thrive, to plant and tend trees and shrubs along highways as a means of highway beautification.

While these are extremely worthwhile programs, they merely scratch the surface of jobs which need to be done, and which can be done by America's elderly, but which will not be done unless the Talented American Senior Corps or something like it is created.

The authorization proposed for this new program is a comparatively modest one, being $15 million for each of the first 2 years. With this small investment, we can help our Nation's elderly to improve their economic position, we can benefit this age group psychologically, we can improve their physical and mental health, and we can meet needs in every community of the Nation which would otherwise go unmet. As a matter of fact, it is not too much to hope that this small expenditure will pay for itself, at least partially, by improving the health of the elderly and reducing their need for health care under medicare, Kerr-Mills, and other public programs.

If we give our Nation's elderly the opportunities represented by the Talented American Senior Corps, Madam President, we will be able to say with the Poet Longfellow:

> Age is opportunity no less than youth itself, though in another dress.

Mr. HART subsequently said: Madam President, earlier today the able Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] introduced a bill to establish the Talented American Senior Corps Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill will be held at the desk until March 15 for cosponsors.

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

COMPACT BETWEEN THE STATES OF MISSOURI AND KANSAS RELATING TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Madam President, public transportation continues to be one of the most vexing problems facing our urban communities. Difficulties in finding solutions are often multiplied where the urban community is situated in more than one State. Recently, the Legislatures of Missouri and Kansas took steps to eliminate some of these difficulties in the Greater Kansas City area by authorizing a bistate compact to create the Kansas City Area Transportation District and the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority. Under this authority, the two States have entered into a compact and in accordance with the Constitution request the consent of Congress.

The Kansas City Transportation District includes the counties of Cass, Clay, Jackson, and Platte in Missouri and the counties of Johnson, Leavenworth, and Wyandotte in Kansas. The establishment of this Transportation Authority should help the Greater Kansas City community immeasurably in providing satisfactory and adequate public transportation for all citizens of the area.

Therefore, Madam President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Missouri and the senior and junior Senators from Kansas, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to grant the consent of Congress to the Missouri-Kansas compact.

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

The bill (S. 3051) granting the consent of Congress to the compact between Missouri and Kansas creating the Kansas City Area Transportation District and the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, notwithstanding the 3-minute rule, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to address the Senate for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled the "Highway Safety Act of 1966." This measure is title III of the administration proposal—S. 3005—introduced by the chairman of the Commerce Committee [Mr. MAGNUSON] on March 2. By agreement between the members of the Commerce Committee and the Committee on Public Works, it has been determined that the most expeditious manner of handling the President's traffic safety program is for the Committee on Public Works to conduct hearings and report on that portion of the legislation dealing with Federal-aid highways over which this committee exercises jurisdiction.

The proposal in which the ranking minority member [Mr. COOPER] joins, would implement an important part of the broad and far-reaching transportation message transmitted to the Congress by President Johnson last week. We refer to the United States as a nation on wheels. But few of us realize the full extent to which the automobile has come to dominate much of the character of American life. Two decades ago there were 31 million motor vehicles in the United States; today there are 90 million. By 1975 there will be 120 million, and it is estimated that by the year 2000 our annual production will be 20 million.

In the immediate future—by 1968 or 1969—Americans will be traveling 1 trillion vehicle miles a year on almost 3 million miles of paved highways and streets.

Madam President, this degree of mobility has not been achieved without a dreadful annual cost in lives, maimed bodies, and billions of dollars in property damage. Last year, almost 50,000 persons lost their lives on American highways, and an additional 1.5 million persons were injured.

Since the introduction of the automobile in the United States, 1½ million persons have lost their lives in traffic accidents—more than the combat deaths suffered in all of America's wars.

We know, for example, that the superior design of the Interstate System—of which more than 21,000 miles are now open to traffic—has reduced the fatality rate to 2.8 per 100 million vehicle miles, compared with a rate of 9.7 on other roads.

But much remains to be done, and even more needs to be learned about the causes and prevention of highway accidents. The measure proposed by President Johnson is the first coordinated effort to close the gaps in our knowledge and to establish a program of action to lessen death on American highways. The Subcommittee on Public Roads, of which I am the chairman, of the Committee on Public Works, will give prompt attention to this measure.

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

The bill (S. 3052) to provide for a coordinated national highway safety program through financial assistance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. COOPER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, in introducing this bill, the proposed "Highway Safety Act of 1966." I believe it covers a subject of great importance, and I believe these proposals should be brought before the Public Works Committee for its consideration.

I know that changes may be required to perfect the bill, either in its substantive provisions, or in the amounts of

funds, which appear large and are proposed to be authorized. I would reserve the right to propose in the committee, or on the floor, any amendments which may appear necessary after hearings have been held and facts have been given to the committee.

I have been privileged to work on many bills with Senator RANDOLPH, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, and as the ranking minority member of the committee, I join him in this effort because of the great importance of considering these safety proposals and the necessity of legislative action in this Congress.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, as the original Senate sponsor of the National Driver Register Service, I am delighted that the highway safety legislation introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] provides for expansion of the Service.

In the last session of Congress, I introduced my own bill—S. 1379—to expand the scope of the Driver Register Service. That bill is presently before the Senate Commerce Committee.

While my bill differs from the Randolph measure in a few technical details, both have the same important objective—to broaden the work of the Driver Register Service so that it can play an even greater role in reducing the carnage on our highways.

We have been told that a record 49,000 Americans died in traffic accidents last year, and that millions more were injured. The President has pointed out that the death toll on our streets and highways since the automobile was introduced is 1,500,000—"more than all the combat deaths suffered in all of our wars."

It is clear that our efforts to improve traffic safety have been inadequate and that action on a national scale is now required.

It is also clear, I think, that the improvement of highway safety goes beyond upgrading the design and construction of automobiles and their components, though this is important, too.

Much also needs to be done to rid our highways of the reckless driver.

The National Driver Register Service is a key weapon in the battle against carelessness on our roads. The Service presently is a clearinghouse which provides the States with information about drivers who have been denied licenses for either of two reasons—driving while intoxicated or conviction of a traffic violation involving a fatality.

If any of these motorists attempt to obtain a driver's license in another State, it is possible for the motor vehicle agency in that State to check overnight on their past records through the Driver Register Service.

Since 1961, when the Service was established in the Commerce Department largely through my efforts, the DRS has checked millions of names and identified 110,750 individuals whose applications for driver's licenses the States might want to deny on the basis of their records.

While the record of the Service indicates progress in the drive against reckless motorists, the mounting slaughter on our highways makes it clear than the campaign must be intensified.

My bill would help bring this about by expanding the present National Driver Register to include information on all revocations or suspensions of 30 days or more, regardless of the reason for taking away an individual's permission to drive a motor vehicle.

While Congress ponders long-range programs for combatting the soaring highway fatality rate, this is one step for greater safety that can be taken at once.

We can help the States to crack down even harder on the reckless driver—a relatively small expansion of the National Driver Registration Service will enable it to do a far more effective job.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, I know of the intense interest of the Senator from New Jersey. I assure him that the measure he has introduced will have full consideration by the subcommittee.

We are grateful for the interest that he expressed today in his very pertinent remarks.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from West Virginia is most generous in the kind assurance he has just given. All of us in the Senate have found that we are able to rely upon his assurances with complete confidence, and I am happy indeed to have it.

I thank the Senator.

STUDY OF MAJOR POWER FAILURES

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill directing the Office of Emergency Planning to undertake a thorough study of the effects of serious interruptions of communications, transportation, and other essential public services resulting from major disruptions such as storms, strikes, and blackouts. Under my bill, the Director of OEP would be required to submit the results of the study to Congress by December 1, 1966, together with any recommendations for measures to minimize the adverse effects of such disruptions.

My bill is prompted by two recent events of concern to the American people: the Northeast power failure of last November, and the now legendary blizzard of 1966 which hit the eastern seaboard at the end of January. Our economy and indeed the Nation's security cannot risk the jeopardy of future occurrences, involving natural or human-caused calamities. Ways and means must be developed to avert such interruptions as the power failure and to minimize the consequence of natural events such as the recent blizzard.

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

The bill (S. 3054) providing for a study of serious interruptions of certain essential services, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO HOUSING

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, proposed legislation which is sorely needed to correct inequities in the law governing cooperative housing. In 1961, legislation was enacted to authorize a reduction in premium rates for mortgage insurance for management-type cooperatives. Last year, I strongly supported a bill to provide mutuality for cooperative housing, and this was incorporated in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. Yet, I am informed that the premiums have not been reduced, and the new mutual fund has not been fully put into effect.

The proposed legislation which I introduce today will make the premium reduction mandatory, and will also settle the confusion which exists with regard to some aspects of the mutuality program so that the latter may soon be effectively implemented. The management cooperatives have made an enviable record which is demonstrated by the fact that they have contributed well over $27 million to the FHA housing fund, while their defaults have amounted to less than $700,000. Their record deserves our immediate attention.

Since the inception of the insurance program in 1950, the management-type co-ops have been paying the standard premium rate for FHA mortgage insurance—one-half of 1 percent—and have thus contributed over $27 million. On the theory that good insurance experience deserves a reduction in premiums, the Congress in 1961 authorized the FHA to reduce the premium to one-fourth of 1 percent. The FHA has thus far failed to carry out the will of the Congress even though the fund is sound beyond any doubt. My first proposal would require the FHA to reduce the premium to one-fourth of 1 percent as it should have done long ago.

Last year, the Housing Act established a separate mutual fund for the management type co-ops so that their premium payments, administrative costs, and any losses, would be segregated from the general fund. It was also stipulated that when the fund was sufficiently strong, the FHA would distribute shares of rebates to the co-op owners whose premiums had provided this strength. It was also stipulated that no such disbursements may be paid out until any funds which might be transferred to the management fund from the general fund were repaid. My second proposal would clear up the doubt which has arisen as to whether all initial transfers from the general to the management fund or only subsequent loans made to the management fund must be repaid to the general fund. The bill makes it clear that the intention is that only the subsequent loans need be repaid. Further, in order that the management fund reflect the full strength of the co-op program, the bill provides that an amount equal to the premiums already paid by the co-ops minus the administrative expenses will be transferred to the management fund. This amount is over $15.5 million at the present time.

Finally the second proposal is designed to overcome a key obstacle to the implementation of this mutuality provision. Under the present law, the mortgagee or lender has to consent to any transfer of funds from the general fund to the management fund. There is no legal basis for this requirement, and in fact it was not required in the case of other funds which were consolidated into the general fund. Seventy-eight mortgagees have refused to allow such a transfer due to a restriction on the use of FHA debentures. The debenture restriction appears an unintended effect of present law and my proposal would remove it. With the restriction removed, the requirement of consent is no longer appropriate and would therefore also be removed under my proposal. Thus all accounts of management-type co-ops will be transferred into the management fund, which the Congress established for that purpose.

The sole objective of these proposals is to provide equitable treatment for owners of management-type co-ops. Where a class of property owners has demonstrated over the years its determination and ability to meet its obligations, they should not be called upon to bear the brunt of the defaults of other classes of propertyholders less heedful of their responsibilities. I ask my colleagues to join with me in securing the early enactment of these two bills.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

S. 3057. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to reduce the premiums charged for the insurance of certain cooperative housing mortgages.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 203(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "*Provided,* That any reduced premium charge so fixed and computed" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided,* That the premium charge fixed for the insurance under section 213 mortgages which are the obligation of the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund (or which are insured under subsection (a)(1), (a)(3) (if the project is acquired by a cooperative corporation), (i), or (j) of such section and remain the obligation of the General Insurance Fund) shall not exceed an amount equivalent to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum: *Provided further,* That any reduced premium charge fixed and computed under the preceding provisions of this subsection".

S. 3058. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to permit the more effective operation of the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fourth sentence of section 213(k) of the National Housing Act is amended to read as follows: "The Commissioner is directed to transfer to the Management Fund from the General Insurance Fund an amount equal to the total of the premium payments theretofore made with respect to the insurance of mortgages and loans transferred to the Management Fund pursuant to subsection (m) minus the total of any administrative expenses theretofore incurred in connection with such mortgages and loans, plus such other amounts as the Commissioner determines to be necessary and appropriate."

SEC. 2. The second proviso in section 213 (l) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "pursuant to subsection (k) or (o)" and inserting in lieu thereof "pursuant to subsection (o)".

SEC. 3. Section 213(m) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out ", but only in cases where the consent of the mortgagee or lender to the transfer is obtained or a request by the mortgagee or lender for the transfer is received by the Commissioner within such period of time after the date of the enactment of this subsection as the Commissioner shall prescribe."

SEC. 4. Section 213(n) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "issued in connection with mortgages" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "issued in connection with mortgages which are the obligation of either the Management Fund or the General Insurance Fund."

REGULATION OF TRANSPORTATION, SALE, AND HANDLING OF ANIMALS INTENDED FOR PURPOSES OF RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research and experimentation.

My bill is designed to put the cruel and inhumane "dognapers" out of business. It would outlaw the purchase or transport of dogs, cats, or other animals in interstate commerce by research facilities unless these facilities were licensed by the Secretary of Agriculture for this purpose. It would also outlaw the sale or transport of these animals in interstate commerce by unlicensed dealers to research facilities. Administration and implementation of this legislation would be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture.

This proposed legislation would in no way impede the legitimate use of animals in medical research. It is designed to stop the "dognapers."

Americans are rightly shocked and indignant at the gruesome stories of dognaping which have been brought to their attention recently. This racket is lucrative. Dognapers buy these innocent animals at low prices, or in many cases steal them outright. Then they sell the dogs to medical research institutions which have a continuing need for animals for experimental and research purposes. In the process of being held and later transferred to their new owners, the medical research institutions, these dogs and cats are often subjected to brutal and inhumane conditions.

This shocking situation must be ended, Madam President. It can be, by the enactment of legislation to outlaw the dognaping racket.

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

The bill (S. 3059) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 501

Mr. TOWER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, 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.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 502, 503, AND 504

Mr. HARTKE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 12752, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Madam President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph L. Ward, of Nevada, to be U.S. attorney, district of Nevada, term of 4 years, vice John W. Bonner, retiring.

Harry D. Mansfield, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Tennessee, term of 4 years (reappointment).

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, March 15, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

"GOD IS MY JUMPMASTER"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I walked up and down the wards of the U.S. naval hospital at Great Lakes, among the wounded who had been brought in from Vietnam. There were splintered arms and legs and, in fact, every variety of wound that can be caused by a landmine, a mortar shell, a grenade, or by small arms ammunition. I went from one bed to another to visit and get their reactions.

At the end of the line was a young paratrooper. His name is Eddie L. Armstrong. Strangely enough he was not shot or wounded in the air. It came when he touched the terrain. Now he was in a hospital waiting for the healing forces to make him fit again so that he could return to Vietnam and help finish the job.

One of his intellectual recreations was to write poetry. One of his latest poems was entitled "God Is My Jumpmaster." He looked so young, so appealing, and so artistic. He suggested that perhaps I could read it aloud to those who were a part of the entourage that followed me to the hospital. I did. It is a tender thing, and I believe it merits inclusion in the permanent RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

GOD IS MY JUMPMASTER

(By Eddie L. Armstrong, specialist, fourth class, U.S. Army, paratrooper)

As I fly over his war-stricken land,
I think of the jungles, the mountains, and the sand.

I think of the hell, the terror, and sin
Spread upon these people where the free must win.

I think of my family, and the girl I love,
And pray that someone's watching me up above.

Now we're all hooked up, waiting for the word,
From the pilot flying this great silver bird.

There's a young man watching me from across the way,
Then he turns to the rear and begins to pray.

As the doors are opened, what do I see
The image of an angel looking over me.

As I move to the door, before I start down
I wonder if death is waiting us upon the ground.

The word is passed and we're starting to go
To a no man's land, waiting down below.

The first man is gone, then a second and third,
Falling like feathers from this big silver bird.

Nobody knows what will happen this day,
But before I go to all I must say

Every man in this plan has only one goal,
To fight for our father's freedom, no matter the toll.

PROPOSED SCHOOL MILK SLASH WILL NOT REDUCE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, the Department of Agriculture's proposal to slash the special milk program for schoolchildren by 80 percent came under heavy fire in the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee last week.

One of the facts that emerged from a hearing on the costs of the proposed program was that despite the fact the program was being reduced to one-fifth its former size the costs of the administrative staff here in Washington would actually go up by $5,000 due to last year's pay raise. This means that the cost of administration as a percentage of overall program costs would go up fivefold. In other words the new proposal to direct the milk program to schools without a lunch program and to the needy would cost five times as much to administer per dollar spent on the milk itself as the present program.

The Department says there is a good reason for this great increase in administrative costs. The new program will apparently be much more difficult to implement. I certainly do not disagree with this statement, Mr. President. In fact I would go one step further and say that the program will be next to impossible to implement effectively.

It is interesting to note that no Federal funds are now used by State agencies for administering the school milk program in the States. One can only speculate on the increased State costs that will be the inevitable outcome of the need to administer means tests to 50 percent of the children receiving milk under the proposed program. These costs will be an additional strain to States which already are facing extraordinary educational expenses.

RIBICOFF ASKS JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TO INVESTIGATE SAFETY WITNESS HARASSMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Madam President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, I feel compelled to draw the attention of the Senate to a situation of grave concern; namely, an apparent attempt to harass and intimidate a subcommittee witness.

On February 10, Mr. Ralph Nader, a Connecticut attorney and author of a recent book entitled, "Unsafe At Any Speed," testified during the course of the subcommitee's inquiry into the Federal role in traffic safety. His testimony was helpful to the subcommittee and represents a valuable addition to the record.

Now, in the past few days, a number of articles have been published in the press which state that Mr. Nader has been the subject of intensive investigation by detective agencies hired by unknown persons, that he has been followed and subjected to harassing telephone calls. The implication of the press stories is that there is some connection between Mr. Nader's testimony and the alleged harassment—that someone wants either to discredit Mr. Nader or to induce him not to testify further.

Madam President, this is an extremely serious matter. As I said publicly at the time of his testimony, I had never seen Mr. Nader until he came before the subcommittee to testify. I knew that he had been in contact with the subcommittee staff about the problem of traffic safety, just as representatives of auto manufacturers and safety organizations had come to the staff to offer information and suggestions. The subcommittee is always receptive to any constructive effort to assist its work.

I am sure my fellow Senators would agree that the operations of Congress will suffer acutely should any citizen feel himself restrained from coming forward to offer his opinions and counsel on matters of public policy. But more than that, no citizen of this country should be forced to endure the kind of clumsy harassment to which Mr. Nader has apparently been subjected since the publication of his book. Anonymous phone calls in the night have no place in a free society.

What concerns me most immediately is that a witness before a Senate subcommittee feels that he has been exposed to potential intimidation as a result of his testimony. Section 1505, title 18 of the U.S. Criminal Code is very explicit on matters of this nature:

> Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, endeavors to influence, intimidate, or impede any witness in any proceeding pending before any department or agency of the United States, or in connection with any inquiry or investigation being had by either House, or any committee of either House, or joint committee of the Congress; or
>
> Whoever injures any party or witness in his person or property on account of his attending or having attended such proceeding, inquiry or investigation, or on account of his testifying or having testified to any matter pending therein. * * *
>
> Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

I am asking the Department of Justice to investigate this matter to determine whether there has been a violation of the law. One would hope that public disclosure of this situation will assure Mr. Nader and any other witness before any legislative body that their rights as citizens are not to be trifled with.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that four recent articles relating to Mr. Nader be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New Republic, Mar. 12, 1966]

THE DICK

(By James Ridgeway)

Ralph Nader is a lanky Washington attorney of 32 who recently has been getting publicity because he went after the automobile makers for not designing safer cars. He wrote a book, "Unsafe at Any Speed," which told what was wrong with cars; he was a major witness before Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF's Subcommittee on Traffic Safety; and most likely he will testify before the Senate Commerce Committee when it holds hearings on the administration's highway safety bill.

The automakers, who first ignored Nader, have now turned on their most vigorous critic. This is precisely the sort of knockdown public fight Nader was hoping for, but instead of open battle, he finds himself suddenly distracted from the task at hand and locked in a subterranean struggle against an uncertain enemy.

Nader first felt someone was watching him January 10 in the Kirkwood Hotel at Des Moines, where he had gone to testify before the State attorney general's inquiry into traffic safety. He remembers seeing a man, two or perhaps three times in the hotel, once on his floor; for reasons Nader can't explain, the man made him feel uneasy.

Nader was to testify before the Ribicoff subcommittee February 10. In the days before he was to appear, he received several odd phone calls that increased in their frequency until on the evening of February 9, when he was trying to put the finishing touches on a prepared statement, Nader got half a dozen phone calls. A voice would say, "Mr. Nader, this is Pan American," and then hang up. Or, "Mr. Nader, please pick up the parcel at Railway Express." And finally, "Why don't you go back to Connecticut, buddy-boy." (Nader's home is at Winsted, Conn.) Nader's appearance before the committee was marked by a sharp clash between Senator CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, and Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, of New York. CURTIS kept pretending he could not understand what Nader was saying and finally KENNEDY, in short temper, said this was a deliberate

attempt to keep Nader from completing his statement, and to let him alone. The next day, a Friday, Nader went to the New Senate Office Building for a television interview. As he was coming out, one of the building guards told him two men had been tailing him. The men asked the guard which room Nader had gone into, and then volunteered they had been following Nader around the country. The guard reported the incident to his superior, who asked the men to leave the building.

WHAT JOB?

During the next week, Nader's landlady got a call from a man checking to see whether her tenant paid his bills on time. Nader's stockbroker received a visit from a man who said he worked for "Allied Investigations." His client wanted to hire Nader. He wanted to know about Nader's credit and his habits. In Cambridge, Mass., Harold Berman, a professor at Harvard Law School who taught Nader, got a call from a man who as Berman remembers it, said he worked for a research organization. He said Nader had given Berman as a reference for a job. In Boston, Thomas Lambert, Jr., the editor in chief of the American Trial Lawyers Association Journal, a publication that had carried a number of articles by Nader, was visited by a man who looked very Ivy League. He said his name was "Mr. Dwyer" and he worked for a management consultants or management associates at 53 State Street in Boston. He also represented a client who wanted to hire Nader. He asked about his drinking habits and his technical capabilities. Lambert was pleased to recommend Nader; he sent Nader off a note telling of the visitor and wishing the young attorney well in whatever the new job might be. But Nader had not applied for any job.

Sunday evening, February 20, Nader left his room in northwest Washington and went up the street a couple of blocks to a drugstore. He was standing at the magazine rack when a young, attractive brunette he had never seen before approached and said, "Pardon me. I know this sounds a little forward. I hope you don't mind, but can I talk to you?" She said a few of her friends often got together to discuss various problems of foreign affairs. They wanted to get all viewpoints. Would he join them? Nader was dumbfounded. Trying to get rid of her politely, he said he was from out of town. But the girl persisted. Oh, she said, that's all right; there was a meeting that night. Nader said he wasn't interested and turned his back. The girl left.

Monday morning Nader took a plane to Philadelphia, where he was to appear on ABC's "Mike Douglas Show."

That same day at a little after noon, Frederick Hughes Condon, a lawyer for a life insurance company in Concord, N.H., to whom Nader had dedicated his book, got a call from a "Mr. Warren," who said he wanted to come by the office and ask Condon a few questions about his friend, Ralph Nader. He said he had a client who wanted to hire Nader to do some research and writing, and in this connection he was looking into Nader's background, partly to make sure he led a normal sex life and was not involved in leftwing politics, and also because he needed to know whether Nader was capable of doing work in fields other than car design. Condon asked Warren who the client was, but Warren said he could not disclose that. So Condon asked him who he was. Warren said he worked with an attorney, a Mr. Gillen of New York City, who specialized in investigations. His suspicions already aroused, Condon told Warren to come by the office later that afternoon.

Nader had finished the "Mike Douglas Show" in Philadelphia, he was late for a 3:30 United Air Lines flight back to Washington. The other passengers had boarded when he hurried up to the gate at 3:25. Suddenly, he was aware that two men who had been sitting on a bench nearby had risen and boarded the plane after him. They took seats near his. They seemed to be especially interested in Nader.

It was midafternoon that day when the telephone rang in the New York City apartment of Dexter Masters. Masters had written a complimentary review of the Nader book that appeared a few weeks before as the lead article in "Book Week." Masters remembers picking up the phone. A smooth-talking fellow said he understood I had reviewed the book for "Book Week" and could I tell him anything about Nader. I said I didn't know him and what did he want to know for. The man said he represented the Gillian Agency or something, that sounded like that. He said one of the operators was a former FBI agent. They were investigating for a client who was interested in hiring Nader to write some articles. Did I think it really was a good book? I said I thought it was an excellent book and so had written. The man thanked Masters and hung up. Masters, thinking this one of the silliest pieces of detective work he ever had encountered, called Nader's publisher, Richard Grossman, to tell him the story.

At about 4:15 the United flight with Nader aboard was in its landing approach at Washington's National Airport; the two men seated near him looked like smalltime salesmen. The plane came to a stop and Nader went down the ramp, then ducked in and out of a number of doors at the airport to shake the men. He got into a cab, and as it headed for downtown Washington, Nader looked through the back window for the men. They had disappeared.

Condon, meanwhile, was closeted with a vice president of his company for much of the afternoon and it wasn't until 4:30 that he got free to see Mr. Warren, who now was calling himself Mr. Gillen. As the secretary ushered Mr. Gillen into Condon's office, the lawyer remembered he wore heavy black-rimmed glasses, was of medium height with a barrel chest, and gray hair combed straight back. Gillen had a nervous manner when he asked leading questions, and he insisted on holding an attaché case in his lap. By now Condon was sure the man was a detective, and he was ready to believe the attaché case held recording equipment. But Condon was playing dumb.

Gillen came right to the point. He asked repeatedly whether Nader had a driver's license and from what State. Had he owned a car at Harvard? Had Condon ever seen him drive a car? What make car did he own? Had he ever had any automobile accidents? Condon could not remember Nader driving and didn't know whether he had a license or not. (Actually Nader has a Connecticut driver's license.)

Gillen said he heard Nader traveled a lot. Did Condon know where he had gone? Why wasn't Nader married? Did he get financial help with his book? Did he have any leftwing political affiliations? Gillen said Nader was of Syrian ancestry. Was he anti-Semitic? Condon assured Gillen that Nader's personal life was normal; he didn't, to Condon's knowledge, belong to any political groups on one side or the other, that he had traveled to Mexico, and perhaps he had gone to see relatives in Lebanon, where his parents came from (not Syria), and that he was decidedly not anti-Semitic. Then Gillen sought to discover when Nader had met Senator RIBICOFF and what his connections with the Senator were. Condon said he didn't know, and wasn't at all sure that Nader even knew RIBICOFF.

SOMEBODY MIGHT YELL

Finally, Gillen asked Condon a few questions about himself. Condon is a paraplegic. Some years ago he fell asleep at the wheel of his car, which went off the road and crashed. The doors opened as it rolled over, and Condon, half in and half out, had his spine twisted. Gillen wanted to know if Nader had dedicated his book to Condon because of this accident. Did Condon think his injury was caused by unsafe design? What was the make of the car he was driving? Where had the accident taken place?

Having in this manner discovered the depths of Nader's intellectual abilities from his friend, Gillen said he really didn't know what job his client had in mind for Nader but he was sure it would be a good one, and picking up his attaché case, he bid Condon goodby. Condon immediately wrote up the conversation, sent Nader a wire, and later that evening phoned him in Washington.

Now Nader was sure he was being investigated and probably followed. The girl in the drugstore had been a lure; he reasoned that the auto companies would like to get anything they could to discredit him as a future witness before congressional committees considering auto safety legislation. His suspicions were further aroused 2 days later, on Wednesday, February 23, when on the way to meet a friend in the afternoon, he stopped off to buy a package of cookies at a Safeway store near his boarding house. There were perhaps 30 people in the store, the usual raft of children, some women and a few single men. As he was looking about for the cookies, a girl, blonde and wearing slacks, came up to him and said, "Excuse me, but I need some help. I've got to move something heavy into my apartment. There's no one to help me. I wonder if I can get you to give me a hand. It won't take much time. Will you help?" Nader said he was sorry but he had a meeting and was late already. The girl persisted. "Please," she said. "It won't take long." Nader refused. Then, although there were a number of other people in the store who might have helped her, the girl turned straight around and left the store.

Neither Allied Investigating Service in Washington nor Management Consultants in Boston cared to discuss this matter. Both are private detective firms. After some prodding a spokesman for Allied said there was no investigation of Nader; John Dwyer, of Management Consultants, at 53 State Street said, "I am not at liberty to discuss any of these matters." But a reporter was successful when he reached Vincent Gillen, of Vincent Gillen Associates, the detective firm in Garden City, N.Y. Mr. Gillen seemed flustered. "We've made inquiries about Nader," he said. "I spoke with Condon myself; another of our men contacted Masters." Gillen said he could not disclose the name of his client, but he said, "A lot of people were mentioned adversely in that book." Recovering his composure, he told the reporter: "I am a private investigator. We have hundreds of clients; we write thousands of reports, primarily on employment matters. I was asked by a client to make an investigation of Ralph Nader. I understand that he is an intelligent, articulate fellow. And my client told me he was considering him for an important job, to do research on something, I don't know what."

"I knew Nader was a writer," Gillen said, "and I went out and bought 'Unsafe at Any Speed.'" Gillen read the book and "felt like staying in bed. I was afraid to drive a car," he said. "I thought at the time, he'd better know what he's talking about or somebody might yell."

"Is somebody yelling?" the reporter asked. There was a pause before Gillen said once more that Nader was being considered for a job. The investigation was not yet complete, the detective said, and then added, "All I can say is, it is good for Nader."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1966]

CAR INDUSTRY CRITIC SAYS HE'S TRAILED, INVESTIGATED, AND HARASSED

(By Walter Rugaber)

DETROIT, March 5.—A leading independent critic of the automobile industry has under-

gone an investigation of his affairs by private detectives.

The critic, Ralph Nader, of Washington, has repeatedly charged that the car manufacturers are guilty of unsafe design. His attacks have helped generate a controversy over auto safety.

The investigators, working for unidentified clients, appear to have trailed Mr. Nader at different times in the last month and questioned a number of his friends.

In addition, Mr. Nader complained that he had received a series of harassing telephone calls and that women had sought to lure him into apparently compromising situations.

One of the men who conducted an inquiry said that while it was taking place, he found himself "tumbling over investigators all over the place."

This report was supported by Vincent Gillen, of New York, an attorney and detective, who said he had investigated Mr. Nader for an employment agency. Mr. Gillen said in a telephone interview:

"I've had reason to believe from what we saw and what we heard that other people were investigating Nader."

The detective said he had finished his inquiry.

Mr. Gillen called the employment agency he had worked for a "headhunter" but would not disclose its name. The detective maintains offices in Manhattan and Garden City.

Mr. Nader, the author of a scathing book entitled "Unsafe at Any Speed," has put the blame on industry for the inquiry. There have been no job discussions with anyone, he said.

Spokesmen for the major manufacturers in Detroit dismissed Mr. Nader's charge as ridiculous. Several indicated a belief that the investigation wouldn't be worth the trouble.

Mr. Nader said he believed the industry would order the investigation either to harass him or to impugn his standing before Congress and other opinion centers.

The critic, a 31-year-old bachelor who lives in Northwest Washington, testified last month as a major witness before a Senate subcommittee investigating auto safety.

Mr. Nader lashed out at car design before the panel, headed by Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut. Mr. Nader is expected to make another appearance before Congress when hearings begin on President Johnson's measure to set nationwide safety standards for vehicles.

Many industry leaders deeply fear Federal standards because they feel Government regulation would lead to intolerable limitations on styling and performance.

Mr. Nader, an intense man, became interested in vehicle safety as a student and shows no signs of slacking off on what he considers a crusade.

ATTENDED PRINCETON

He was born in Winstead, Conn., where his father, a Lebanese immigrant, had established a restaurant and bakery. He attended Princeton University and the Harvard University Law School.

At Harvard, Mr. Nader was president of the Harvard Law Record and wrote a lengthy paper on unsafe auto design and its legal aspects.

For a short time after graduation, he worked as a research assistant to Harold J. Berman, a law professor at Harvard. He then spent 6 months in the Army.

Mr. Nader then traveled widely in Latin America, Europe and Africa, writing articles on a variety of subjects. He finally returned to Connecticut and started law practice.

Convinced of the national importance of safe design, Mr. Nader devoted more and more of his time to research on the subject and started getting in touch with Government officials.

"Unsafe At Any Speed" was published last November 30 by Grossman Publishers of New York. A spokesman there said about 20,000 copies had been sold.

Most of Mr. Nader's friends pictured him as a rather austere young man who leads a Spartan life and spends most of his time working on various problems that interest him.

TELEPHONE CALLS BEGIN

In late January, he said, he began receiving bothersome telephone calls at home despite his unlisted number. The callers were never obscene or abusive, he said.

"Mr. Nader?" a voice would inquire.

"Yes."

Then, suddenly, as if to a child:

"Cut it out now. Cut it out. You're going to cut me off I tell you. Cut it out."

Then the connection would be broken. The other calls involved similar incidents. Mr. Nader believes they were made to harass him or to establish his whereabouts.

The telephone began to ring with increasing frequency, and on February 9, the night before his testimony before Senator RIBICOFF's committee, Mr. Nader said he received six calls.

They came as he was working on a statement to be read the next morning. The calls continued until 4 a.m., he said, and as a result he overslept that morning.

On February 11, the day following his appearance, Mr. Nader went to the National Broadcasting Co.'s television studios in the New Senate Office Building for an interview.

Two men followed him. They asked a guard for directions to the studio, described Mr. Nader and inquired whether he had gone in. The men waited outside the door.

Subsequent reports indicate they mistook a reporter for the Washington Post, Bryce Nelson, for Mr. Nader and began following him.

POLICE ENTER THE SCENE

The mixup was discovered, but the Capitol Police came into the picture and an unidentified lieutenant ordered the two investigators to leave the building.

On February 21, Mr. Nader flew to Philadelphia for another television interview and is positive he was shadowed, at least on the plane back.

He said he was late arriving at the plane but that men were in the waiting room though the craft was about ready to leave for Washington.

When he dashed for the ramp, Mr. Nader said, the two men got up and followed him aboard. He said he managed to evade them at National Airport.

On the same day, Mr. Gillen conducted what appears to be the most extensive interview of Mr. Nader's acquaintances. The detective called on Frederick Hughes Condon.

Mr. Condon is assistant counsel and assistant secretary of the United Life & Accident Co., of Concord, N.H. He was paralyzed in an auto crash, and Mr. Nader's book is dedicated to him.

Mr. Condon was reached at his home in East Andover, N.H., and said he had made notes and written a detailed memorandum of Mr. Gillen's visit.

The detective wore a sports coat and slacks and glasses with heavy, black frames, Mr. Condon said, and kept a tan attaché case on his knees during the interview. The insurance company official said the investigator had asked about Mr. Nader's political beliefs and whether his ancestry had made him anti-Semitic.

Mr. Condon said Mr. Gillen had asked if there was any reason why Mr. Nader was not married. The insurance company official replied:

"Are you asking me if he is a homosexual?"

"Well, we have to inquire about these things," Mr. Gillen was quoted as having said. "I've seen him on TV and he certainly doesn't look like * * * but we have to be sure."

Mr. Gillen confirmed in a telephone interview that he had asked the question and explained that an employer would want to know about such matters.

Despite such intimate questioning, Mr. Condon said he got the impression Mr. Gillen was most interested in a series of questions about Mr. Nader's driving record.

The insurance company official said the detective had asked three or four times whether Mr. Nader had a driver's license or whether he had ever seen Mr. Nader driving a car.

AN IMPORTANT JOB

The same question was raised on the same day in Lansing, Mich., by Frank Winchell, chief engineer for research and development at the Chevrolet division of the General Motors Corp.

Mr. Winchell, answering questions before a committee of the Michigan Senate, took a slap or two at Mr. Nader's biting criticism of General Motors in "Unsafe at Any Speed."

The engineer informed the Senators that Mr. Nader did not own an automobile and added that "I don't even know if he has a (driver's) license."

Mr. Condon, who said he had been told Mr. Nader was being considered for an important job assignment, said later he had been suspicious about the investigation.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1966]

INVESTIGATORS DOG CAR SAFETY WITNESS

(By Richard Harwood)

A few months after the publication of Ralph Nader's critical book on American automobiles, "Unsafe at Any Speed," detective agencies in Washington, Boston and New York began an investigation into his background and habits.

Did he have a normal sex life? Was he anti-Semitic? Did he belong to leftwing political groups? Was he a licensed driver? Was he professionally competent?

Other curious things began happening, according to an article by James Ridgeway in the current issue of the New Republic.

Nader was bothered by pointless telephone calls on the eve of his testimony on auto safety before a congressional committee. People began following him.

An attractive brunette solicited his company at a casual meeting in a drug store on February 20. Three days later he was approached by a blond in a supermarket who invited him to her apartment to move furniture around.

Investigators questioned his friends, his college professors, and a writer who had reviewed his book. They claimed Nader had applied for a job and were checking him out. It was a plausible excuse but it was untrue. Nader was not job hunting.

He was, instead, pursuing his interest in what is wrong with American cars—preparing testimony for Congress and preparing for a meeting with the auto makers in Detroit.

Was it the auto makers who had developed this unusual interest in a 32-year-old Connecticut lawyer?

Neither Nader nor Reporter Ridgeway could find out.

One investigating firm, Allied Investigating Service of Washington, refused to discuss the matter with Ridgeway initially and then denied it had any interest in Nader.

The Boston detective firm, Management Consultants, brushed off the reporter with: "I am not at liberty to discuss these matters."

The New York firm, Vincent Gillen Associates of Garden City, admitted asking about Nader for a "client * * * considering him for an important job, to do research or something."

Gillen told Ridgeway the investigation is incomplete and "all I can say is, it is good for Nader."

Nader, however, does not feel good about it. "They can't hurt me," he said "asking about my sex life, my drinking habits and things like that. I'm not vulnerable. But it's a strange thing. Suppose I were married and had several children and someone turned up something embarrassing. It would be an intimidation for a writer.

"I think it's wrong, if anyone disagrees with my book or what I've had to say, to turn it into something personal like this. Let them debate the issues, instead of this kind of thing."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 6, 1966]

SAFETY CRUSADE OF AN AUTOMOBILE BUFF

(By Dick Schaap)

Ralph Nader thinks "they" are following him, which is only fair, because for years now he has been following "them." They are not from SPECTRE, or UNCLE, or even the CIA. They are from Detroit.

They are the automobile industry.

And Ralph Nader is a lawyer, a tall, slender bachelor in his early thirties, whose recent book, "Unsafe at Any Speed," subtitled "The Designed-in Dangers of the American Automobile," is a thoroughly documented indictment of the automobile industry. Nader argues so strongly that the American car is deliberately uncrashworthy, that the car itself is responsible for an overwhelming majority of auto injuries, he could have called his book, "The Bier That Made Detroit Famous."

Nader is a crusader, a zealot. He believes that, until now, the automobile has been outside the law, that the manufacturers have been almost criminally negligent in failing to provide safety design and safety equipment, that a combination of private lobbying and Federal indifference has resulted in an automobile that is, by safety standards, totally obsolete. His views and conclusions are not terribly surprising; what is surprising is that, finally, after long silence, they are being publicly aired.

"There are men in the automobile industry," he writes, "who know both the technical capability (for safety) and appreciate the moral imperatives. But their timidity and conformity to the rigidities of the corporate bureaucracies have prevailed. When and if the automobile is designed to free millions of human beings from unnecessary mutilation, these men * * * will look back with shame on the time when common candor was considered courage."

Nader's crusade began a decade ago, shortly after he graduated from Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School, entered Harvard Law School and gave up the last car he owned. "I used to travel on the highways a great deal," he said the other day, "and I saw several accidents. My natural curiosity led me to start asking questions. And then in law school, I began to see how the system was rigged."

His first article on the subject appeared in the Harvard Law Record in 1958. It was called: "American Cars: Designed for Death." After law school, Nader went into legal practice in Hartford, Conn., and, surrounded by insurance companies and working on negligence cases, his interest in the automobile flourished. He campaigned, on his own time, for increased safety regulations in Connecticut, then, as he realized that only Federal legislation could solve the problem, broadened his target. Through the former Governor of Connecticut, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Nader served as an unpaid adviser to a Senate subcommittee investigating automotive hazards.

Eventually, Grossman Publishers, Inc., heard of Nader's compulsive interest and asked him to write a book. "Unsafe at Any Speed" came out less than 3 months ago, and already more than 25,000 copies are in print.

"It's had a phenomenal impact on the industry," Nader said. "In Detroit, they just call it 'The Book'."

Since publication, since Nader has testified before a recent Senate hearing and since Senator ROBERT KENNEDY began supporting his views, Nader has, as he says, been "under surveillance" by the industry. "They follow me into the new Senate Office Building," Nader said, "and they check to see which offices I go into. And, it's funny, but at the same time they're tailing me, they're also wooing me. I keep getting invitations to go out to Detroit and look at the industry and at their executive suites."

General Motors has even invited Nader to test-drive the latest model of the Corvair, a special target in the book. So far, he has not had the time to accept any of the test-driving invitations from Detroit. He probably will, and when he does, he should press down on the accelerator very carefully.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I have read the New York Times report on the story to which the Senator from Connecticut makes reference. I have also read the New Republic article very carefully. I do not believe that anyone is certain who hired this large number of detectives to harass Mr. Nader, but is it not correct that the clear implication of every one of these articles is that the automobile industry is involved; in other words, the articles have been written so as to leave that implication with the reader?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Of course, that implication is there, but frankly, I do not know who hired the detectives. I cannot imagine why anyone should try to personally discredit Mr. Nader. I do not know anything about Mr. Nader except that he is a member of the Connecticut bar. I know that as a member of the Connecticut bar no member is admitted without a character investigation and a rigid examination. To my knowledge, he is a man of reputation and probity. It certainly seems to me a clumsy case of intimidation. I believe that no man or woman who comes to Washington to give testimony before any Senate committee should be placed in that position.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to make it clear that there is no way for me to make any determination as to who did hire the detectives, but any reader of the articles would come to the conclusion that this whole matter is somehow associated with Nader's activities in the automobile industry. The point is that the matter should be cleared up at once and if it has any relationship to his testimony before the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from Connecticut, it raises a grave public policy question as to whether a witness coming to Washington to furnish information to Congress may be harassed and intimidated by someone who is opposed to his position. Therefore, it raises an important question about this particular issue which should be clarified.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes in my own right.

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

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, the press has thoroughly documented the shadowy but widespread attempts to intimidate Ralph Nader and to gather information which could be used against him. Certainly, everyone involved in this situation should welcome a responsible investigation in order to clear the air.

I am sending a request to the Justice Department asking that they investigate this matter immediately.

The facts are clear. From the moment Mr. Nader's comments on automobile safety achieved widespread public notice, he has been under various forms of surveillance and harassment.

On the day he testified before a U.S. Senate committee, he was followed right into the Senate Office Building by two investigators. This sinister business was first brought to light by one of our own employees; a Capitol policeman asked the men shadowing Nader to leave the Senate Office Building.

Since then, the press tells us, his landlady has been asked about his rent payments. His stockbroker has been questioned. His law school professor and an editor who worked with him have been contacted.

An officer of a firm for which Nader worked was questioned at great length by a flashily dressed private detective who conducted a scandalous quest for possibly lurid material.

This filthy business has been reported by the New York Times, the Washington Post, New Republic magazine, and many others.

The clear implication of everything reported so far is that the automobile industry has hired at least three different firms of private detectives to shadow and investigate a man who appeared as a witness before a congressional committee.

Both Congress and the automobile industry should want to have the facts made known. If the industry was not involved, it should be able to establish that fact by submitting sworn statements. The Justice Department should be able to establish who in fact did hire the private detectives who have been shadowing Mr. Nader.

The public—which has such a great stake both in automobile safety and in freedom of expression—and Congress should insist that this mystery be cleared up promptly.

THE DOCTOR-MERCHANTS

Mr. HART. Madam President, over the weekend 300 doctors met, and one gets the impression they agreed that if you ignore an ailment it might go away. The doctors were delegates to the American Medical Association's first national congress on ethics.

The ailment which was not—to all appearances—the object of very intensive treatment was the growing practice of doctors setting themselves up as merchants—selling the products they prescribe.

Members of this body may recall that the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee studied the doctor-merchants during hearings in 1964 and 1965. At the conclusion of the hearings I introduced S. 2568, the Medical Restraint of Trade Act, which would give the force of law to what until 1955 was the AMA's ethical position. The bill would bar a doctor from profiting from the sale of any product he prescribes. It would not forbid holding shares of a major company where stock ownership is widely dispersed.

When I introduced it, I pointed out that I did not feel that Congress was the appropriate organization to be setting ethical rules for a professional group. However, financial harm worked by some doctor-merchants on consumers and competition was such—and the AMA had been so reluctant to act—that I saw Congress as the court of last resort.

I must confess that I did entertain hopeful thoughts when I read of the calling of this first ethical congress. Reports on the conference from Morton Mintz—a competent and outstanding reporter—which were published in the Sunday and Monday issues of the Washington Post, dimmed that hope.

For not only did the ethical congress fail to alter the code of ethics, they also did not seem to consider ways of enforcing the existing code.

The AMA code today clearly outlaws doctor ownership of small drug repackaging companies.

Apparently, while the AMA and I disagree on other points, the association does not concur that repackaging companies are undesirable.

The small repackaging companies buy generic name drugs, package them or have them packaged under the company trade name, and sell them for as much as 10 times the price of the generic name drug. Doctor-owners of these companies, of course, have a distinct advantage over normal stockholders of a company. They have a legal monopoly over prescriptions so they can—and the subcommittee hearings showed many do—prescribe on their own company. Thus, a patient inexorably ends up paying the grossly inflated price.

As I said, the AMA code of ethics clearly bars doctors from owning drug repackaging companies. Yet, in 1964, the Antitrust Subcommittee located approximately 150 companies involving more than 5,000 doctors. The AMA was given that list and they promised something would be done. The best I can ascertain today is that the companies are all still flourishing—with their doctor-owners.

I know, as does the AMA, that the doctor-merchants are a minority of the doctors in this country. However, I am once again confounded as to why the AMA lets them continue to blacken the name of an honored profession.

The only answer then, apparently, still lies with Congress.

In the spring, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee plans to hold hearings on S. 2568 as another step toward that answer.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post articles to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 7, 1966]

ETHICAL ISSUE UNRESOLVED AT AMA PARLEY

(By Morton Mintz)

CHICAGO, March 6.—The keynoter for the first national congress on medical ethics made an unusual slip of the tongue at the start of the 2-day meeting yesterday.

Ethical principles, said Dr. James H. Berge, chairman of the judicial council of the American Medical Association, "ideally are not observed."

The Seattle physician recovered in midsentence. He had intended to say, and did say on his second try, that ethics "ideally are to be observed rather than enforced."

So far as the approximately 350 delegates to the AMA-sponsored meeting were concerned, the trouble was—"ideally" aside—Dr. Berge had a point both times.

HART SPONSORS BILL

They left here today more painfully aware than ever that a minority has not observed the professional ideals of medicine, and that because of this there is an unprecedented threat of enforcement by Congress—in the form of a bill sponsored by Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan.

The speakers they heard made it clear repeatedly that some of the AMA's mechanisms to assure observance are creaky and ineffective, and that some of the ethical principles as now stated have loopholes that invite abuse.

The Hart bill, for example, would forbid physicians from profiting from their prescriptions—through ownership of pharmacies and small drug repackaging firms they control—and from dispensing eyeglasses or therapeutic devices.

Not once in the open sessions, however, was the Hart bill mentioned by name. Its provisions were not outlined. The abuses that led to it were merely alluded to.

IT IS UNETHICAL

Reporting today on a closed workshop session on medicine and pharmacy, the moderator said "there was no question that it is unethical for a physician to have an interest in a drug repackaging company."

The moderator, Dr. Marvin Johnson, of Denver, did not point out, however, that thousands of physicians own stock in such companies, that some have shrugged off denunciations by their own State medical societies, that the companies are growing and prospering, and that the AMA assured HART in August 1964 that they would swiftly become extinct.

Dr. Johnson was content to say that workshop participants "seemed to agree without exception that the existing problems could and should be worked out by discussion."

The delegates were concerned with an almost bewildering variety of ethical questions. Some were old, for example, how to protect the public against the incompetent physician. Some are changing constantly because of new medical technology, such as the use of extraordinary means to prolong life. Some are new, including those posed by certain provisions of the medicare law. And all are complex.

LEGISLATORS CONCERNED

But some problems serious enough to have deeply concerned congressional subcommittees received no attention.

One is the question of ownership by doctors of stocks in large drug firms that they do not control, but whose products they test or can favor in prescribing. The present position of the judicial council is that such stockownership creates no conflict of interest.

Another ethical question, wholly ignored, is the acceptance by the AMA Journal, with no apologies, of drug advertisements later found by the Food and Drug Administration and others to have contained false representations to the AMA's own members.

In the new issue of the AMA News, distributed today, there is an item about FDA's seizure last Monday of a drug promoted with ads the FDA termed false and misleading. But the item does not say where the ad was published, an omission, an AMA News spokesman said was attributable wholly to publication deadline pressures.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 6, 1966]

DOCTOR TELLS AMA IT MUST REVIEW ETHICS EXCEPTIONS

(By Morton Mintz)

CHICAGO, March 5.—The medical profession was warned today that it must review the exceptions to its ethics that for 11 years have permitted several thousand physicians to profit from their drug, eyeglass, and appliance prescriptions.

The warning came at the American Medical Association's first national congress on medical ethics from Dr. Walter H. Judd, of Washington. Medical ethics are in the purview of the council of which Dr. Judd is a member. He is a former Republican Congressman from Minnesota.

LEGISLATION SEEN

He said the profession faces a threat of legislation of its ethics that cannot be ignored. And he said that if the profession does not act it will be haunted by some continuing, unsavory examples of exploitation of the patient.

Several such examples were developed in 1964 and 1965 in hearings held by Senator PHILIP A. HART'S Senate Antitrust Subcommittee. Despairing that the AMA would reform a proportionately small minority of its members, the Michigan Democrat introduced a bill to forbid doctors from owning pharmacies or small drug companies and from selling eyeglasses or therapeutic devices.

In effect, HART would implement by law the AMA's own ethical ban on dispensing by a physician for the purpose of supplementing his income. Medical ethics direct doctors to limit the sources of their professional income to the services they or those they supervise render to patients. Starting in 1955, this was diluted to permit dispensing by physicians if that is in the best interest of the patient, and provided there is no exploitation of the patient.

The AMA condemns as unethical those doctor ownerships in which small firms package or relabel drugs under their own brand names. The association assured HART 19 months ago that such firms would swiftly disappear, but they appeared to be flourishing.

Until Dr. Judd met the challenge of legislation head-on the first warning of the meeting had gone by with only oblique or passing references to it.

CLOSED SESSIONS

Eight afternoon workshops—including one on medicine and pharmacy—were closed. "Our good friends from the press will absent themselves," the delegates were told by Dr. James H. Berge, of Seattle, chairman of the judicial council, "in order to give you full opportunity to speak without fear of being quoted."

On Sunday, however, the workshop moderators plan to summarize their sessions. The meeting will end later in the day.

Dr. Judd said that some critics of the profession actually seek to stimulate it "to rededicate itself to those principles which have made it peerless."

Merely refraining from unethical behavior is not enough, he said. "The profession needs a new pride," Judd said, "a new enthusiasm for excellence at the high duties entrusted to us."

CHANGES IN OUR IMMIGRATION POLICY

Mr. HART. Madam President, last week the Michigan Committee on Immigration, together with the United Community Services of Metropolitan Detroit, held a day-long conference on the Immigration Act of 1965.

All of us who sponsored and worked for this change in our basic immigration policy are interested in the details of how this major revision of the law is actually working.

The opening speech at the conference was delivered by Mr. James J. Hines, of the Department of State. It contained statistics on visa issuance which give us a first view of the operations under the new quota system.

It would seem to me that the transition made by the Department of State under the new act has been well planned and has resulted in very little disruption. In fact, the reunion of families as a result of visa allocations being made under the pooling arrangement is most heartening.

There are problems, however, which are arising in terms of delays in visa issuance resulting from the provisions of section 212(a)(14) which require special labor certification for potential immigrants other than relatives.

The procedures for obtaining these labor certifications and clearing them through the regional and Washington offices of the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor apparently have resulted in many weeks of delay. At this time, we do not have a clear enough analysis of the situation to determine whether these delays result from the specific provisions of the act and regulations or whether they are primarily the result of administrative difficulties, including lack of adequate staff to undertake this responsibility. Recently, I wrote to Secretary Wirtz urging him to review the situation very carefully. It is my understanding that the Department of Labor is requesting additional personnel to carry out the requirements for labor certification under the new act. Hopefully, we will find that the delays are not inherent in the law but can be overcome by both more efficient administration and modification of unnecessary hurdles in the regulations.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Mr. Hines to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1965

(Statement of James J. Hines, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State, before a regional conference held in Detroit on February 28, 1966, and sponsored by the Michigan Committee on Immigration and the United Community Services of Metropolitan Detroit)

I think it is fitting that we meet today in the State of Michigan for a discussion of the Immigration Act of 1965. History will record the names of many distinguished legislators who formed the vanguard of a long and constant struggle to achieve a more equitable immigration law, but no name will deserve more acclaim than that of your able and thoughtful Senator HART. When he addressed the Senate on September 17, 1965, during the debate on H.R. 2580, he was not unmindful of the many friends of the immigrant, outside of Congress, who had successfully welded public opinion in support of immigration reform, particularly the abolition of the national origins quota system which President Kennedy once described as a system without basis in logic or reason. Senator HART said on that occasion:

"The heroes, Mr. President, of this long and historic struggle to achieve the abolition of the national origins system of selectivity, are properly tens of thousands of Americans. They have organized through community, religious, and fraternal groups to achieve the victory now being consummated in the Congress. It is these Americans, who in years past opened their homes, their communities, their businesses to welcome the refugee, the relative and the homeless of the world. These citizens conducted community conferences and urged their national organizations to press for immigration reform. Today is their victory."

I feel sure that the Michigan Committee on Immigration was uppermost in Senator HART's thoughts when he spoke these generous words.

During the past 2 weeks I have been thinking seriously about an appropriate subject for discussion at this conference. There are many aspects of the new immigration law which I am sure you would find timely and interesting. However, a recent article published in a national magazine gave me an idea. It conveyed the impression that the administration's immigration bill, S. 500, which the President sent to Congress on January 13, 1965, was rejected by the Congress and that H.R. 2580 as passed by the House of Representatives represented a completely new approach to immigration reform. I would like to take this occasion to examine each bill in a general way, to compare those provisions which were common to both bills and to point out the disparities. The following provisions were contained in the administration's bill, S. 500, and in H.R. 2580 as passed by the House of Representatives:

1. Repeal of the national origins quota system;

2. Elimination of the Asia-Pacific triangle restriction;

3. Nonquota status for Jamaica and Trinidad, thus providing equal treatment for natives of all independent countries in the Western Hemisphere;

4. Nonquota status for the parents of U.S. citizens (S. 500 stipulated no age limit for the citizen relative whereas H.R. 2580 fixed the age limit at 21 years);

5. Elimination of the requirement of prearranged employment for professionals and others of exceptional ability in the arts and sciences; i.e., those aliens who formerly comprised the first-preference class;

6. Preference status for labor in short supply;

7. Discretionary authority granted consular officers to require departure bonds in visitor and student cases;

8. Discretionary authority granted the Attorney General to waive the inadmissibility of certain aliens found excludable on medical grounds (S. 500 was more inclusive in this regard);

9. Discretionary authority granted the Secretary of State to reregister aliens on the waiting lists, and to regulate the time and manner of the payment of visa fees;

10. Elimination of "epilepsy," and substitution of mental retardation for feeblemindedness as grounds of exclusion;

11. Prohibition on issuance of quota visas to immediate relatives of U.S. citizens;

12. Authority conferred on consular officers to retrieve visa numbers for allocation to other qualified immigrants;

13. Relief for refugees included in the permanent law for the first time although the manner of giving relief to refugees differed considerably in each bill;

14. Absence of any numerical restriction on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. (The 120,000 ceiling was added by the Senate and adopted in conference.)

The two bills were dissimilar in the following major respects:

1. H.R. 2580 did not include the administration's proposal to establish an advisory Immigration Board consisting of Members of Congress and other members appointed by the President.

2. H.R. 2580 rearranged the order of the preference classes giving priority to family unity, added a sixth preference for labor in short supply and a seventh preference for refugees; it also modified the percentage limitations on allocation of visas within each preference class.

3. H.R. 2580 increased but retained a ceiling on immigration from colonial and other dependent areas. (S. 500 would have removed this ceiling over a 5-year period.)

4. H.R. 2580 restricted adjustments of status in the United States by denying the benefits of section 245 to all natives of the Western Hemisphere.

5. H.R. 2580 strengthened the labor safeguard.

I think it is fair to conclude from this comparative review of the major provisions of the two measures that except for two or three proposals which would have attained the same objectives by different means, the similarities outweighed the disparities.

The principal reform contained in the Immigration Act of October 3, 1965, concerned the national origins quota system. It will be phased out over the next 2½ years. In the meantime, the Department will be allocating visa numbers from two sources; namely, the national quotas which continue in effect until June 30, 1968, and the immigration pool which consists of the quota numbers unused during the previous fiscal year. The numbers in the pool for this fiscal year total about 55,000, and they are being made available regardless of the alien's country of birth, for visa issuance, for adjustments of status in the United States, and for the conditional entry of refugees. One of the principal differences between the quota reserve under S. 500, and the immigration pool under H.R. 2580 is that the numbers constituting the pool may be used only for preference immigrants whereas the numbers in the quota reserve would have been available to both preference and nonpreference immigrants. We had estimated that the immigration pool for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, would contain about 62,000 numbers, that is, the total quota numbers remaining unused at the end of this fiscal year. It now appears that our estimate was too conservative. Nonpreference visa issuance in previous years accounted for 80 percent of all quota immigrant visas issued. This is not likely to be the case in the future. With 4 months of the fiscal year remaining, it is safe to assume that all of the 55,000 numbers in the immigration pool will be allocated and used but as concerns the available numbers under the national quotas (158,000 in the aggregate), it is quite apparent that the allocations for this year, inclusive of visa issuances and adjustments in the United States, will be appreciably below last year's total of 102,892. The immigration pool for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, may reach a total of 70,000 numbers, and next year's estimated qualified demand in the preference categories will fall far short of the 70,000 num-

bers. Consequently, a sizable portion of these numbers in the pool will not be used. This prospect lends some merit to Congressman CONTE's bill which would give nonpreference immigrants access to the immigration pool, but the unknown factor in any projection of nonpreference qualified demand is the labor certification. It cannot be stated with any certainty that all of the 70,000 numbers would be absorbed if nonpreference applicants are given access to the immigration pool. We recognize that it is too early to assess the real impact of the new labor restriction and that it takes time to set the machinery in motion. However, if the trend of visa issuance as reflected in the statistics covering the first 2 months of operation under the new law continues, a significant change in the character of our immigration is forecast. A few examples will illustrate what the initial impact of the strengthened labor safeguard has been:

Nonquota visa issuances

	December 1964	December 1965	January 1965	January 1966
Montreal	874	303	906	216
Toronto	875	187	836	120
Quebec	258	85	232	44
Vancouver	329	71	352	60

Quota visa issuances

	December 1964	December 1965	January 1965	January 1966
London	988	326	963	427
Paris	182	65	170	29
Frankfurt	656	38	675	87
Hamburg	219	5	178	27
Dublin	219	2	306	12
Rotterdam	196	54	162	66
Naples	360	2,446	249	1,767
Palermo	136	564	129	965
Vienna	85	11	77	12
Warsaw	392	976	395	591
Hong Kong	26	328	22	435
Manila		132	1	251
Athens	52	341	48	353

An analysis of these figures shows that at those posts where we had a heavy preference backlog of relatives of U.S. citizens or permanent-resident aliens, such as Naples, Palermo, Lisbon, Hong Kong, Manila, and Athens, visa issuance for the months of December 1965 and January 1966 has shown a substantial increase. These relatives, as you know, are not subject to the labor certification. On the other hand, a substantial decrease in visa issuance has occurred at posts such as London, Paris, Vienna, Dublin, Frankfurt, Hamburg, and Rotterdam, where traditionally we have had no preference backlogs in the relative categories, and where visa issuance in the past has been heavily nonpreference. It is too early, in my opinion, to measure the full import of the above figures which cover the first 2 months of operation under the new law.

With the exception of those provisions of Public Law 89-236 which will ultimately abolish the national origins quota system, it is generally agreed that the labor provision is the most significant aspect of the new law. We had no indication in the Department of State of any dissatisfaction with the labor safeguard which the committee reports accompanying the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 described as adequate. The labor certifications under section 212(a)(14) had steadily increased in recent years. During the period from June 3, 1957, when the first certification issued, to May 22, 1964, the Secretary of Labor issued 60 nonagricultural certifications against specifically named employers and 8 area certifications. Twenty-four of both types were issued during the first 5 months of 1964. Some of these certifications resulted from an administrative arrangement between the Department of State and the Department of Labor whereby visa cases involving 25 or more workers destined to the same employer in this country were reported to the Department of Labor for investigation. Effective July 1, 1963, we instituted a special procedure with respect to immigration from Mexico because of a widespread practice of falsifying job offers. This procedure required prospective employers of Mexican workers to submit their job offers to the U.S. Employment Service for approval prior to the issuance of a visa. Under this program 6,740 certifications barring the entry of the immigrant were issued by the Secretary of Labor during the period from July 1, 1963 to August 1, 1964. They accounted in large measure for a 41-percent decline in immigration from Mexico during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963. It was for these reasons that we assumed the labor safeguard contained in the 1952 act was fulfilling its intended purpose.

What is the essential difference between the labor provision enacted in 1952 and the more restrictive provision contained in Public Law 89-236? Prior to December 1, 1965, the responsibility for taking the initiative to establish displacement of American workers or adverse effect on wages and working conditions devolved upon the Secretary of Labor. The labor restriction had no force in the absence of a certification and, as a matter of fact, the provisions of section 212(a)(14) were completely dormant for 4½ years after the McCarran-Walter Act came into force. The preamendment certifications of the Secretary of Labor had the effect of excluding any intending immigrant whom the consular officer found to be within the scope of the certification. Now under the amended provisions of section 212(a)(14) a labor certification has the effect of admitting the particular immigrant or immigrants for whom it is granted, and the burden of proving nondisplacement of American workers and no adverse effect has been transferred to the American employer. There are other important differences. The labor certifications under the former law were directed against specific employers in this country or against designated geographical areas and were issued on a selective basis. They were, in other words, limited in scope as contrasted with the recently published schedule B (occupations in oversupply) which has a nationwide application. We appreciate the problem inherent in any listing of the schedule B occupations on an area-by-area basis, since this tends to invite evasion, but the language of section 212(a)(14) clearly contemplates a determination (shortage of able, willing, and qualified workers) with respect to "the place to which the alien is destined." Congressman FEIGHAN emphasized this point during the debate on H.R. 2580 when he said the following: "New labor controls are established to govern the admission of all immigrant worker classes.

"These new controls require the Secretary of Labor to make an affirmative finding on an individual case basis that, with respect to the job the immigrant worker is to fill in the locality to which he is destined, there is no able, willing, qualified and available American worker to fill that job."

In conclusion, I can assure you that the administrative officials who share responsibility for enforcement of the immigration law have been remarkably flexible in their construction and application of the new labor safeguard. Particularly commendable was the action of the Secretary of Labor in giving a blanket certification for some 150 Polish immigrants who, short of processing passports, had qualified for visas in all respects when the new law came into force. Equally commendable was his ruling that Cuban parolees in the United States are not subject to the labor certification when they apply for immigrant visas abroad. A blanket certification has been granted for persons in the service of religious denominations. There is general agreement that the labor provision applies only to the head of the family and not to his spouse and children; also, that it does not apply to the self-employed, or to those who will not be gainfully employed in this country. Doubtless there will be other rulings of a like nature. I think they reflect a disposition on the part of Government to be fair and reasonable as we strive to carry out the will of Congress. The Secretary of State in the last 2 years made four appearances before the congressional committees in support of immigration reform. Each time he accented three features of the former law which were adversely affecting our foreign relations; namely, the national origins quota system, the Asia-Pacific triangle restriction, and the denial of equal status to immigrants born in two of our American Republics. These irritants were removed by the act of October 3, 1965, and this is one reason why, when we appraise that act in terms of all its provisions, the conclusion is inescapable that the immigration law today is infinitely more equitable than at any time in our history.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I ask for recognition.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

UNITED STATES ACTS TO STOP FREE WORLD TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I call the attention of the Senate to one of the most nettling problems that faces us in North Vietnam. It is a fact that a great deal of the supplies to North Vietnam is coming by sea. Though, of course, the Soviet Union or other Communist states are shipping supplies into Vietnam, I again call attention to the fact that goods are being shipped to North Vietnam from countries in the free world, by some of our stoutest allies, including Japan and France.

It is true that ships engaged in this traffic flying the flags of Great Britain, Cyprus, Greece, Liberia, and Norway, are not always under the direct control of their governments. Nevertheless, governments can deny registration, and can persuade the owners of these ships to withdraw their vessels from the trade. It would help us if they would stop supplying that country with those supplies.

In addition, one of the countries with the most ships flying its flag, Great Britain, is a great friend of ours. I say that with no sarcasm, but with the greatest conviction. We should do all we can to get the British to call off these ships.

It is a fact that the trade is small and does not involve strategic goods. It

seems to me our people should recognize the fact that it is small. Nevertheless, it is nettling to us while we expend great amounts of human and material resources in Vietnam, and it seems to me we should do all we can to get Great Britain, as well as other countries, to cut that trade materially.

On February 14 I wrote Secretary Rusk and asked him to state the administration's position on this question and to describe U.S. actions currently underway to eliminate this trade.

On March 4 I received a reply from the Department. The key points in this letter are as follows:

First. We have approached several countries involved in shipping these goods to North Vietnam. As a result, the number of ships involved in the trade has declined sharply. For the last 6 months, the monthly average of calls by free world vessels to the port of Haiphong has dropped to 14 as compared with 34 per month in 1964.

Second. Among the countries with ships calling on North Vietnam ports, four are U.S. aid recipients: Cyprus, Greece, Liberia, and Norway. All of the four aid recipient countries are taking steps to remove their ships from the trade in order to continue to qualify for U.S. aid.

Third. Great Britain, which has by far the largest number of free world vessels in North Vietnam trade is not an aid recipient. Secretary Rusk and Under Secretary Mann are in touch with the Government of the United Kingdom to deal with the rather complex problems involved in removing British-flag vessels from this trade. Many of these ships are small coastal vessels owned and registered in Hong Kong by Chinese Communist operators, yet by virtue of their registry are entitled to fly the British flag. There is no indication in the letter of the progress being made in our talks with the United Kingdom.

Fourth. On February 12 the Maritime Administration announced in the Federal Register that the President has approved a policy of barring U.S. Government financed cargoes from foreign-flag ships calling at North Vietnam on or after January 26. Five free world ships were involved in this first announcement—three British, one Cypriot, and one Greek—and they will be barred from carrying U.S. financed cargoes from U.S. ports. These ships will be able to visit U.S. ports, however, and carry privately financed cargo.

It is my understanding that as a result of these actions, there was a sharp drop in free world trade with North Vietnam during the second half of 1965.

During the first half of 1965, free world exports to North Vietnam totaled $7.2 million, with Japan, Malaysia, France, and the Benelux being principal exporters. Free world imports from North Vietnam in this same period totaled $13.3 million with Japan, France, Hong Kong, and Cambodia being the principal importers. Imports from North Vietnam involved principally anthracite coal; while exports involved mostly textiles, foodstuffs, and fertilizers.

The State Department's actions to date have been effective and I hope that its further efforts will result in the elimination of this trade in the near future.

Once the Vietnam conflict has been terminated, with a just solution, it has already been made clear that we would be willing to reconsider our policy toward trade with North Vietnam and to consider seriously the inclusion of a trade agreement between the United States and North Vietnam as part of the overall settlement in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter sent to me by the State Department, together with my letter to the Secretary of State, and tables indicating the value and countries involved in this trade, may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1966.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: We appreciate having a copy of your speech to the Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association in New York, on January 26, which you enclosed with your letter of February 14 to the Secretary.

You said you would be interested in the administration's position concerning your proposal that we vigorously press our allies and other nations to eliminate their trading with North Vietnam.

We have been giving continuing attention to the problem of both trade and shipping by the free world with North Vietnam. As you noted in your speech, the volume of the trade is small. It amounts to only 15 percent of North Vietnam's total trade, and is nonstrategic in nature. It is, furthermore, subject to the strategic embargo restrictions of the Coordinating Committee (Cocom) countries. Free world exports to North Vietnam consist mostly of textiles, foodstuffs, and fertilizer. Imports from North Vietnam are mainly anthracite, apatite, rattanware, fruits, and vegetables. Enclosed are lists of free world imports and exports to North Vietnam for 1963, 1964, and the first 6 months of 1965 that were prepared by the Department of Commerce. Although we do not yet have data on free world trade with North Vietnam for the last half of 1965, we believe that there will be a decrease in that trade in view of the sharp drop in free world shipping to North Vietnam during the last half of 1965.

Since free world trade moves almost entirely by sea, we have approached other countries on this problem in terms of controlling this shipping. (Such an approach is consistent with relevant legislation and has been remarkably successful.) Furthermore, it is a more constructive approach to countries which would find it difficult to support our Vietnam policy if we attempted to persuade them to impose an embargo on all trade with North Vietnam.

As the Secretary indicated in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee on February 18, we have made vigorous representations to those free world countries whose nationals have been engaged in shipping with North Vietnam.

As a result of these representations and continued followup efforts, the number of ships involved in the trade has declined sharply. For the last 6 months the monthly average of calls by free world vessels at Haiphong has dropped to 14 as compared with 34 per month in 1964. We are still working hard on the problem of bringing these voyages down as far as possible, and we hope very much that there will be further reductions.

During 1965 free world countries having ships in the North Vietnam trade were: Cyprus, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, and Panama. During the last 6 months of 1965, no Italian, Japanese, Lebanese, Netherlands, or Panamanian ships called at North Vietnamese ports. During this latter period France and Liberia each had a ship making one call.

With respect to the question of existing or proposed legislation to terminate aid to countries still engaged in trade and shipping with North Vietnam, I should like to point out that only four aid-recipient countries had ships calling at North Vietnam ports during the last 6 months of 1965; namely, Cyprus. Greece, Liberia, and Norway. Some of the ships of these countries were under long-term charters to Communist countries and not under control of their owners. However, we have already had assurances in some cases that once these charters expire, the ships will be removed from the North Vietnam trade. All of the four aid-recipient countries are taking steps to remove their ships from the trade in order to continue to qualify for United States aid. For example in the case of Liberia the Government has issued regulations making it unlawful for its ships to carry cargo to or from North Vietnam. We will, of course, keep the effectiveness of these measures under continuing review. It should be pointed out that Great Britain, which has by far the largest number of free world vessels in the North Vietnam trade, is not an aid recipient.

The problem is particularly complex with respect to ships under British registry. The majority of these vessels in the North Vietnam trade are small coastal vessels owned and registered in Hong Kong by Chinese Communist operators, yet by virtue of their registry are entitled to fly the British flag. They are on time charters to Communist China and normally ply in trade only between mainland China and North Vietnam.

Secretary Rusk took up the problem of British-flag shipping in the North Vietnam trade with Foreign Secretary Stewart in January. Under Secretary Mann discussed the problem with British Ambassador Dean in December and again in January. Subsequently, during the week of February 1, Assistant Secretary Solomon discussed the problem with the Foreign Secretary and other responsible British officials in London. If British-flag vessels could be removed from the North Vietnam trade, we would have arrived at the virtually irreducible minimum of free world involvement in North Vietnam shipping. There still might be an occasional free world ship calling in North Vietnam as there will also remain the possibility of an occasional voyage that results from an unexpired time charter contract held by a Communist country and that the owner is not able to prevent.

With respect to your suggestion that the ships of those nations continuing in trade with North Vietnam be blacklisted, I would call your attention to the announcement by the Maritime Administration on February 12 in the Federal Register that the President had approved a policy of barring U.S. Government financed cargoes shipped from the United States from foreign-flag ships calling at North Vietnam on or after January 25, 1966. This announcement contained a list of five free world ships which have recently visited North Vietnam and which are therefore barred from the carriage of U.S.-financed goods from U.S. ports. Further lists will be published at frequent intervals.

The policy directive barring U.S. Government financed cargoes to ships calling at North Vietnam was calculated to supplement

our diplomatic approaches and the action taken against recipients of U.S. aid. It is believed that these measures will be adequate to remove practically all the remaining free world shipping from the North Vietnam trade. If, however, these measures are not successful further action will have to be considered.

I hope that this information will be helpful to you, and I trust that you will let me know if there are further questions.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

FEBRUARY 14, 1966.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DEAN: On January 26 I made a speech to the Freight Forwarders Association in New York City on the subject of East-West trade.

In that speech, among others, I recommended that the United States vigorously press our allies and other nations trading with North Vietnam to eliminate this trade in view of the situation in that part of southeast Asia. I also recommended that, should this effort fail, we should cut off economic and military assistance to countries continuing this trade and that at some point put the ships of these nations on a blacklist. A copy of this speech is enclosed for your information.

I would be interested to know what the administration's position is on this issue, what have we done to eliminate this trade, and what this trade amounts to currently including the countries, number of vessels, and products involved in this trade.

Your earliest response will be appreciated.

With warm regards.

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS.

Free world countries trading with North Vietnam, 1963 and 1964

[Value in thousands of U.S. dollars]

Countries	1964 exports to North Vietnam	1964 imports from North Vietnam	1963 exports to North Vietnam	1963 imports from North Vietnam
Austria		58		28
Belgium-Luxembourg	2	767	2	1,514
Denmark	12	10	41	5
France	2,551	3,740	2,542	3,600
Federal Republic of Germany	1,108	236	322	191
Ireland				3
Italy	1,274	278	2,207	593
Netherlands	144	1,312	167	2,276
Sweden		7	167	2
Switzerland	79	69	72	70
United Kingdom	101	165	102	73
Finland	6			
Jordan		4		27
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	200	386	140	9
Morocco	12		11	3
Ivory Coast		[1] 105		1
Cambodia	1,188	1,266	580	1,409
Ceylon	59			
Tunisia		1		
Hong Kong	88	3,729	162	3,304
India	12		81	
Japan	3,372	9,842	4,316	10,255
Malaya and Singapore	1,288	1,434	1,296	1,434
Pakistan			163	
New Zealand	24		27	
Senegal			3	
Argentina	606			
Mexico	95			3
Australia			350	
Total	12,221	23,409	12,751	24,800

[1] January-October.

Source: Department of Commerce.

Imports of free world countries from North Vietnam, January-June 1965

[Value in thousands of U.S. dollars]

Importing country	Total from world	Total from Sino-Soviet bloc	Percent of total value	North Vietnam
Total of listed countries		3,165,128		13,270
United States	10,102,593	65,942	0.7	(1)
Canada	3,773,324	21,146	.6	(1)
European OECD countries, total	42,309,052	1,687,498	4.0	3,384
Austria	979,528	101,996	10.4	24
Belgium-Luxembourg	3,080,767	62,023	2.0	423
Denmark	1,431,149	60,488	4.2	
France	4,884,462	150,035	3.1	2,261
Germany, Federal Republic of	8,496,468	405,922	4.8	97
Greece	542,862	49,197	9.1	(1)
Iceland	65,655	9,073	13.8	
Ireland	538,915	9,044	1.7	(1)
Italy	3,552,270	228,906	6.4	134
Netherlands	3,556,547	81,768	2.3	352
Norway	1,097,327	32,820	3.0	
Portugal	408,303	6,825	1.7	(1)
Spain	1,415,401	29,430	2.1	
Sweden	2,165,115	94,504	4.4	(1)
Switzerland	1,817,157	38,207	2.1	6
Turkey	281,020	26,000	9.3	(1)
United Kingdom	7,996,086	301,460	3.8	87
EUROPE, OTHER				
Finland	826,264	151,645	18.4	
Yugoslavia	620,968	168,423	27.1	(1)
MIDDLE EAST				
Cyprus	66,703	4,189	6.3	
Iran	439,121	20,736	4.7	
Israel	414,587	7,000	1.7	(1)
Jordan	72,829	7,190	9.9	
Libya	144,399	9,276	6.4	(1)
Malta (January-March)	22,966	1,380	6.0	(1)
Sudan (January-April)	61,254	6,218	10.2	
Syria	100,800	14,900	14.7	(1)
United Arab Republic (Egypt) (January-March)	198,474	39,323	19.8	(1)
AFRICA				
Angola	78,221	230	.3	(1)
Ghana	183,765	41,532	22.6	(1)
Kenya	121,755	2,915	2.4	(1)
Malagasy Republic	66,295	1,267	1.9	(1)
Mali	19,297	7,782	40.3	(1)
Morocco	209,558	12,229	5.8	(1)
Niger	18,480	1,154	6.2	(1)
Nigeria	381,300	16,000	4.2	(1)
Rhodesia (Southern)	164,716	456	.3	(1)
Senegal	89,276	1,604	1.8	(1)
Sierra Leone	52,200	2,800	5.4	(1)
South Africa, Republic of (January-April)	826,800	2,800	.3	(1)
Tanzania	63,531	2,268	3.6	(1)
Togo	23,622	973	4.1	
Tunisia	129,620	5,033	3.9	(1)
Uganda	58,256	1,605	2.8	(1)
Zambia	140,244	232	.2	(1)
FAR EAST				
Burma	126,800	25,000	19.7	
Cambodia	48,100	13,200	27.4	1,200
Ceylon	166,830	41,162	24.6	(1)
Hong Kong	786,159	202,930	25.8	1,311
India	1,351,582	139,361	10.3	
Japan	4,145,455	252,844	6.1	6,466
Malaya and Singapore	758,006	54,395	7.2	909
Pakistan	578,280	28,957	5.0	
Taiwan	257,781	349	.1	(1)
Thailand	339,300	3,900	1.1	(1)
OCEANIA				
Australia	1,664,396	31,168	1.9	(1)
New Zealand	440,983	2,841	.6	
LATIN AMERICA				
Argentina	583,164	18,541	3.2	
Brazil	514,091	34,544	6.7	(1)
British Guiana (January-February)	14,083	366	2.6	(1)
Chile	247,775	617	.3	(1)
Colombia	237,314	4,552	1.9	(1)
Jamaica	147,544	49		(1)
Mexico	741,162	2,551	.3	(1)
Peru (January-February)	93,720	281	.3	(1)
Trinidad and Tobago	240,253	353	.1	(1)
Uruguay	93,700	1,421	1.5	
Cocom countries, total	53,348,633	1,745,176	3.3	9,820
European Cocom countries, total	35,327,261	1,405,244	4.0	3,354

[1] Not a vailable.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Exports of free world countries to North Vietnam, January–June 1965

[Value in thousands of U.S. dollars]

Exporting country	Total to world	Total to Sino-Soviet bloc	Percent of total value	North Vietnam
Total of listed countries		3,107,310		7,168
United States	13,195,932	64,313	0.5	(1)
Canada	3,724,778	95,305	2.6	(1)
European OECD countries, total	37,325,682	1,499,179	4.0	2,604
Austria	755,148	113,356	15.0	1
Belgium-Luxembourg	3,117,248	50,973	1.6	881
Denmark	1,099,456	49,785	4.5	68
France	4,884,462	174,590	3.6	1,268
Germany, Federal Republic of	8,806,425	433,395	4.9	45
Greece	158,193	45,304	28.6	(1)
Iceland	57,029	7,957	14.0	
Ireland	275,916	1,765	.6	(1)
Italy	3,456,699	187,083	5.4	65
Netherlands	3,057,098	52,010	1.7	68
Norway	703,004	30,011	4.3	
Portugal	247,384	2,483	1.0	(1)
Spain	436,532	9,684	2.2	2
Sweden	1,915,371	83,446	4.4	
Switzerland	1,401,959	42,410	3.0	69
Turkey	205,540	34,670	16.9	(1)
United Kingdom	6,748,218	180,257	2.7	137
EUROPE, OTHER				
Finland	644,956	132,256	20.5	
Yugoslavia	480,837	197,051	41.0	(1)
MIDDLE EAST				
Cyprus	34,529	4,392	12.7	
Iran	642,000	23,810	3.7	
Israel	243,951	8,332	3.4	(1)
Jordan	9,633	752	7.8	
Libya	359,849	215	.1	(1)
Sudan (January–April)	64,413	8,770	13.6	(1)
Syria	86,400	35,100	40.6	(1)
United Arab Republic (Egypt) (January–March)	178,926	71,066	39.7	(1)
AFRICA				
Angola	95,642	983	1.0	(1)
Ghana	179,830	36,657	20.4	(1)
Kenya	76,771	2,811	3.7	(1)
AFRICA—continued				
Malagasy Republic	39,225	718	1.8	(1)
Mali	9,411	595	6.3	(1)
Morocco	236,477	23,425	9.9	(1)
Nigeria	377,500	17,400	4.6	(1)
Rhodesia (Southern)	168,409	1,498	.9	(1)
South Africa, Republic of (January–April)	484,400	300	.1	(1)
Tanzania	83,679	5,127	6.1	(1)
Togo	14,933	600	4.0	
Tunisia	63,259	4,182	6.6	(1)
Uganda	95,467	11,098	11.6	(1)
Zambia	248,822	5,452	2.2	(1)
FAR EAST				
Afghanistan	35,300	11,500	32.6	(1)
Burma	114,100	20,800	18.2	
Cambodia	56,500	6,400	9.6	800
Ceylon	195,382	36,701	18.8	(1)
Hong Kong	419,421	1,972	.5	64
India	817,258	147,929	18.1	
Japan	3,923,584	211,562	5.4	2,027
Malaya and Singapore	668,232	64,379	9.6	1,659
Pakistan	262,839	34,616	13.2	(1)
Thailand	297,600	2,900	1.0	(1)
OCEANIA				
Australia	1,499,613	159,051	10.6	(1)
New Zealand	576,318	9,523	1.7	14
LATIN AMERICA				
Argentina	731,295	60,168	8.2	(1)
Brazil	648,000	37,947	5.9	(1)
Chile	352,009	329	0.1	(1)
Colombia	257,983	5,119	2.0	(1)
Jamaica	119,228	1		(1)
Mexico	555,200	38,559	6.9	(1)
Peru (January–February)	96,136	1,079	1.1	(1)
Uruguay	91,400	5,388	5.9	
Cocom countries, total	53,328,021	1,611,739	3.0	4,559
European Cocom countries, total	32,483,727	1,240,559	3.8	2,532

[1] Not available.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

EDUCATORS OPPOSE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL TO CUT BACK NDEA STUDENT LOANS

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, on February 23 I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—page 3861—the objections registered by the banking community through the American Bankers Association to the administration proposals to shift the National Defense Education Act student loan program to the newly authorized subsidized loan guarantee program enacted as title IV, part B, of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

As I indicated in my remarks, bankers and educators stand together in their opposition to this proposal. Opposition was also most recently voiced by a number of my colleagues on the Senate Education Committee who on March 2 joined in a colloquy on the Senate floor in which we expressed our reservations to this and other parts of the administration's fiscal year 1967 education program.

I have received many letters from New York and other educators expressing their views. Most recently, Dr. Clifford Lord, president of Hofstra University, Hempstead, N.Y., wrote me setting forth his views and detailing how the administration's proposal would adversely affect both students and the college.

I ask unanimous consent to include President Lord's letter with my remarks in the RECORD.

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

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY,
Hempstead, N.Y., March 3, 1966.

Hon. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Serving on the Education Subcommittee of the Senate, I know you are aware of some of the problems being encountered by colleges and universities as a result of proposed cutbacks in the National Defense Education Act loan fund program. Permit me to describe the situation as it affects this university.

During the current academic year we have received and distributed approximately $500,000 in national defense loan funds to 561 students. More than half of this money ($289,000) has been directed toward students who are preparing for teaching careers. As you know, the National Defense Education Act program provides that if these students teach for 5 years after graduation, up to 50 percent of the sum borrowed would be forgiven. Therefore, many of the Hofstra students intending to enter teaching, view the National Defense Education Act loans as equivalent to a half scholarship.

Our request for the academic year 1966–67, submitted on January 17, 1966, called for an increase to $600,000 in National Defense Education Act funds. This was based on an expanding student population and a growing tendency among students to regard education as an investment justifying borrowing.

Information now at hand indicates that President Johnson has asked the Congress to reduce the budget for these loans from $180 million to $30 million. This is a drastic cut especially when growing college enrollments would argue for greater sums to be made available. In place of these Federal funds the President has recommended the creation of State-sponsored federally guaranteed loans which would duplicate the program already in existence in New York, under the New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. Many Hofstra students, where their financial need is great, already have both National Defense Education Act and New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. loans.

The consequence of this change in policy would in our judgment be disastrous. Hofstra's financial aid officer estimates a loss of over 80 percent of the National Defense Education Act funds received in 1965–66, and an inability on our part to meet more than a handful of the requests to renew National Defense Education Act loans for our students who are using them to meet educational expenses. This would compel many undergraduates currently receiving national defense student loans, and other students planning to attend Hofstra who require financial assistance, to turn to the New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. for aid. However, loans from this agency, though they carry the same interest rate, lack several advantages of the National Defense Education loans:

1. They are not available to out-of-State residents;

2. They have no provision for forgiveness; hence the full amount would have to be repaid by those preparing to teach;

3. The university has no control over these loans, as they must be forwarded to Albany for clearance; the normal time for processing is 4 to 6 weeks. With National Defense Education Act loan assistance can be immediately provided;

4. Time for processing the loans will be considerably increased since they will have to be approved in Albany and then funded by a local bank;

5. The university has no control over the New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. loans, and cannot offer the student a financial aid package to meet his needs, or to attract students to our campus, as was possible when working with the National Defense Education Act loans for both in- and out-of-State students.

In short, the change in the national student loan funds largely cancels out a valuable program of financial assistance which the Congress and administration have evolved, and will adversely affect the educational opportunity of hundreds of our students especially those preparing for teaching careers.

We ask your help in restoring the national defense loan funds available to students with due recognition of the increased needs of students for this type of assistance.

May I take this opportunity to refer to a second aspect of Federal aid to education which has created some concern; namely, the delay in formulating and announcing guidelines to govern applications under the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Congress and administration deserve much credit for designing this act intended to benefit colleges and universities throughout the Nation. Title II of the act covering libraries is still unfounded, and I hope that the Congress will appropriate funds for this title during the present session.

However, my chief concern is with the considerable delay on the part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in furnishing guidelines to colleges and universities for the funded portions of the act. Only 4 months of fiscal 1966 remain, but we do not yet have the criteria and format for titles I, III, and VI. Briefing sessions on the guidelines were held last October by HEW, the State of New York has had committees formulating in-State policy for the various titles, various programs have been submitted to Albany, but no Federal guidelines are available. The State of New York and its institutions have settled down to exasperated waiting. A recent report on title VI prepared by the New York State Education Department calling for the State's colleges and universities to bear with us.

Title IV guidelines have been issued and Hofstra applied for economic opportunity loans on January 17, 1966. However, no word has been received. This is distressing because commitments must be made to bright but needy students in the spring for the following academic year. Until we hear from HEW, we cannot make these commitments.

I recognize that the Federal Government fears that rising expenditures for the Vietnam war, coming at a time of high spending by consumers and business, may create a dangerously inflationary situation. Under the circumstances the Federal Government may indeed wish to slow down many of the Great Society programs so recently enacted by the Congress. This may account for the delays in processing applications, the delays in issuing guidelines, the cutbacks in programs.

But education is not the logical field to slow down. I know that you, Senator, are mindful of the great dependence of this Nation upon its colleges and universities and the men and women they educate, and I hope that you will not allow the needed stream of Federal aid to education to be dammed or diverted.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD LORD,
President.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST HIGHLY URBANIZED STATES UNDER FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I have undertaken a study in detail of a number of Federal programs of grants-in-aid to State and local governments, in order to determine whether and to what extent such programs fairly allocate Federal resources among the States, particularly those such as New York, which have enormous new needs because of the massive flow of population into densely populated urban centers. It is estimated that by 1970 some 75 percent of our Nation's population will live in urban areas.

This study has now been completed and it concludes that there are serious disproportions in the patterns of aid in what should be urban-directed programs, matched against the needs for, and costs of, basic governmental services in New York State as compared with other less urban-centered States. The report identifies the interstate allocation factors in each of some 20 programs which result in disproportions of Federal aid, and recommends legislative amendments to overcome the unfair effect of those factors.

This is not to say that we ought to cut down on aid to States with sparser populations, but the formulas should be revised so that programs directed primarily at urban problems do what they were intended to do. Congress should face realistically what is needed to do the job, rather than stand by while the major urban centers and the States in which they are located continue to be discriminated against. In a number of significant cases those cities and States are adversely treated and starved because of the changes which have occurred in our society—particularly the massive change which is occurring in the location of the population—since the allocation factors were built into the law.

I am submitting the report to the New York congressional delegation and believe it should also be of concern and great interest to Members from other urbanized States. We should, with all urgency, get together and discuss the problems of the big cities, which are aggravated by the fact that the taxing power is effectively in the hands of the Federal Government but the interstate allocations of Federal funds are loaded against the big cities and the States in which they are located. I know that my colleagues from the urban areas will join with me in efforts to bring about a greater element of justice than now exists.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST HIGHLY URBANIZED STATES UNDER FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

(A report to the New York State congressional delegation)

For many years, we in the New York congressional delegation have been deeply concerned about the relative proportion of Federal grant-in-aid assistance which our State is and has been receiving. On many occasions I have stated in Senate debate that for every dollar of Federal taxes contributed by our State's citizens, we have received a disproportionately low amount in return. In 1963, for example, we received only 54 cents in return. In 1964, on a per capita, or population basis, New York ranked 46th, and on the basis of percentage of personal income, it ranked 49th in Federal aid to State and local governments.

This is not to say that the States should receive from the Federal Government precisely what they contribute to it in Federal taxes. But it does raise a grave question as to whether the allocation of Federal funds among the States is fair in the light of today's needs, particularly in the major urban centers with their vastly aggravated problems and soaring costs.

In this report I have analyzed the most significant urban programs and have found a great many discriminatory features affecting distribution among the States. In each case I have sought to measure the degree of discrimination and its adverse impact on New York State. I have also proposed amendments to each law to help correct the imbalance, and I urge the delegation to study and support these proposals.

There are more than 125 different grant-in-aid programs and each has its own unique impact on the States. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—the body established by the Congress to consider on a long-term basis the relationships between the Federal Government and the States—published a detailed study in January 1964, entitled "The Role of Equalization in Federal Grants." This study analyzed in detail the impact of various legislative provisions on the allocation of Federal funds among the States. The Commission called these provisions equalization features, which seek to level out the differences in the capacity of the State and local governments to raise funds from taxes in order to finance joint Federal, State, and local programs.

The Commission identified the common equalization features as allocation formulas among the States and matching requirements, either or both of which often include a factor of inverse relationship between per capita income and the size of each State's own share of Federal funds. The theory of such provisions, which was developed in the 1930's, was that per capita income was a useful index of relative State fiscal capacity and that by building it into the Federal programs, it would reflect the greater need for Federal assistance to the poorer States. Another theory behind such provisions was the desire of the Congress to assure that a basic minimum level of the needed services was achieved in all the States.

The Commission found, however, that in reality a confusing variety of technical formulas has grown up with the growth of the Federal grant-in-aid programs, some in the statutes themselves and some administratively. It also found that little or nothing has been done to determine in any rational way whether the provisions are in fact doing what they were supposed to do or whether

they are really operating fairly in the light of considerably changed circumstances.

One major change in the circumstances is that the poorer States are no longer relatively as poor as they were when these equalization provisions were introduced into the law.

The Commission found that—

"The rich States have ben growing but the poor States have been moving up the scale at a faster pace. In 1929 the per capita income of the highest income States was 4.3 times that of the lowest. By 1950 the per capita income of the highest income States was 2.9 times that of the lowest and in 1962 the ratio was 2.6."

On the face of it one might expect the per capita income factor in present equalization formulas to reflect this narrowing of the income gap. The analyses which are the basis for this report indicate that this is not the case because another and even more explosive change has been taking place at the same time.

That change is the enormous shift of population into the major urban centers, most of which are in high per capita income States. This shift is occurring at an ever-accelerating pace. It has brought with it tremendous strain on the capacity of the major cities and the States in which they are located, even with maximum taxing efforts, to meet the vastly increased demands for governmental services and the sharply increased costs of such services. The fiscal plight of these urban centers demonstrates that the per capita income basis for distributing Federal funds among the States is no longer fair or sound, because the extraordinary growth of the cities has multiplied the cities' needs for those funds far more sharply than the income gap between the States has narrowed. What has happened is that we have perpetuated a benefit for the less populated States without considering whether it is still relevant. Rather than being in a poorer position to offer a basic national minimum standard of govermental services many of these States are even in a better position than are the densely populated cities and States.

Where in 1930 only 56.2 percent of the Nation's population lived in urban areas, in 1960 69.9 percent lived in urban areas, and it is estimated that in 1970 more than 75 percent will live in urban areas. In number of people this means a progression from 68.9 million people living in urban areas in 1930, to 125.2 million in 1960, to a projected 154.4 million in 1970. In concentration of population this has already caused an increase in population in the existing 222 metropolitan areas (standard metropolitan statistical areas) of 26.5 percent in the decade between 1950 and 1960 alone.

What this means is that, as the attention of Congress finally turns to the vast problems raised by this new factor of sheer size and density of population in the urban centers, it must be concerned also with whether its programs will really reach those problems. So far there has been little effort to evaluate in this light the equalization provisions, which the Commission notes have been even more frequently enacted in recent years than before.

As the Commission put it:

"The growing urbanization of the country is concentrating increasingly larger proportions of the less privileged and less prosperous components of the population in central cities. This is producing in some city centers an unhappy combination of disproportionately heavy service loads (school age children, unemployed, sick and aged), a special need for services linked to urban living, relatively high unit costs for governmental services, and disproportionately low local taxpaying capabilities."

The Commission, in considering this factor, quite properly discussed the capacity of State and local government to develop tax resources to meet their responsibilities in these areas. This is a point which I believe is a crucial adjunct to this subject, and I urge support for a proposal which I have already introduced with Senator HARTKE (S. 2619), to channel a part of increased Federal revenues from the progressive income tax to the States with a minimum of strings attached, in order to strengthen the capacity of local governments to serve their citizens effectively.

However, even with a tax-sharing plan such as I and others have proposed, the Federal grant-in-aid programs will continue to exist and will have to be supplemented to meet the special national policy objectives for which they were enacted. Thus their capacity to meet those objectives under present formulas in the light of changing conditions must be reevaluated.

To this end the Commission has repeatedly recommended that there be periodic congressional review of grants-in-aid to evaluate their adequacy. This proposal is embodied in S. 561, introduced by Senator MUSKIE, which would impose this requirement upon subsequently enacted programs. This bill was passed by the Senate unanimously in August of last year and has been pending since then in the House Government Operations Committee. I urge the delegation to support early consideration and enactment of this measure, which I believe would go a long way toward preventing the continual recurrence of the kind of morass into which the equalization features of grant-in-aid programs are now floundering.

This, again, leaves the question of how to deal with those provisions which are already in the law. On this point I have sought to analyze the equalization factors in a broad range of existing grant-in-aid programs which are of particular concern to highly urbanized States such as New York. The Commission report, which of course could not and did not seek to take any particular area's point of view made pointed recommendations about the limited value of equalization formulas, urged that they be made more uniform and more responsive to real fiscal capacity of the States and localities. It also recommended that they be continually reviewed as to their effects by the executive branch as well as by the Congress.

My own view is that, matched against any standard, many of the current equalization formulas, are out of date, arbitrary, grossly unfair to large urban States and should be amended.

For many years, members of the New York delegation, including myself, and members of other urban-State delegations, have been willing to support giving some advantages to the less urban States, and it is very likely that some type of equalization may still be necessary in certain programs. But the time has come to mount a campaign to review and revise these formulas and redirect their impact toward the urban centers and urban areas, where the most pressing needs exist today.

For too long, the degree of advantage to the less urban States has been altogether too arbitrarily determined and too freely perpetuated, ignoring the fact that the face of the Nation has been changing at an extremely rapid rate, and that the Nation's most critical problems are now in our large urban areas.

To document the above thesis, there follows a detailed analysis of major programs affecting urban States, based on five principal issues.

I. What are the equalization factors which appear to be a problem for urban States?

These factors are (1) allocation formulas, which usually combine population with the inverse ratio of per capita income; (2) maximum and/or minimum amounts for each State; and (3) matching requirements.

Often two or more of these factors are combined in the same program, so that it is difficult to determine readily whether only one is responsible for limiting aid. Thus, it is superficially appealing to zero in on an especially discriminatory allocation formula, but amendment of this alone may bring little or no additional aid, because of another factor in that program. For example, the matching requirement may be too high for the State to meet in full, in view of the priorities it has established in matching its available resources against the whole variety of Federal programs. In these cases, additional factors will have to be considered.

II. How much has New York received under this program in one or both of the most recent fiscal years (fiscal year 1964 and 1965) in comparison with New York's percentage of the Nation's total population?

New York's share of the Nation's population in 1964 was estimated at 9.4 percent. Obviously, there are defects in treating population as a perfect measure of the need of all States for all programs. But, as indicated above, it is surely a better measure—however imperfect—than the present admixture of population with the inverse ratio of per capita income. And it is a useful gage in determining need where a program is designed to meet a problem greatly aggravated by the density of population, such as water and air pollution, low-rent public housing, and urban renewal.

III. What has been the experience of one or more other States under the same provisions as compared with their percentage of the national population?

This comparison is not intended as an attack on any other State, but only to show that the equalization provisions are not rationally related to the goals of the Federal program.

IV. What are the relevant New York State agency estimates as to the need for Federal funding under the given program, over and above current assistance?

It is recognized that similar estimates could be obtained from other States as well, whether or not they believe they are being fairly treated by the equalization provisions. But the order of magnitude of these additional estimates, beyond what in fact has been granted, is at least some guide, especially when considered in conjunction with the population ratio, to the degree to which the equalization provisions are inadequate.

V. Finally, the most difficult question: What changes should be made in the law to achieve a fairer apportionment of funds to the highly urbanized States?

There are a certain number of obviously very highly discriminatory factors, many of which—like the 15-percent limitation for each State on low-rent public housing—have already been attacked by me and by others in the delegation and in the Congress.

In that particular case I succeeded last year in broadening the limitation at least to permit the agency to pool and reallocate to needy States funds left unused by other States. But in many cases there is no easy answer, and it may be necessary in the first instance simply to seek to eliminate any per capita equalization, at least as a way of obtaining congressional consideration of the entire problem. The Intergovernmental Relations Advisory Commission report indicated that personal income "has some limitations as an index of the relative capabilities of the State and local governments to raise revenues."

The report mentions that there are some other indexes still unevaluated, and the delegation should explore the impact of these other indexes. One index which clearly requires urgent consideration in the light of the population density problem is that of State-by-State differences in costs and prices for a given level of governmental services. The Commission notes that such

figures have not yet been developed. Clearly every effort should be made to do so and to weigh this factor into more realistic formulas. Perhaps the density of population itself should be a factor in new formulas.

A further complicating aspect is the uneven impact of any statewide formula upon programs—such as the war on poverty and the Economic Development Act—which do not pass funds from the Federal Government to the States and thence to the localities, but which generally pass them directly from the Federal Government to the localities. In the former case it is assumed that the States are responsible to the variation in need, costs, and taxing power of the localities. In fact it is this assumption which in part underlies the conviction of many Members of Congress, including myself, that more programs should be channeled through the States than not, since the same sensitivity to local needs cannot be expected at the Federal level. But the fact remains that some programs do involve direct Federal outlays to the localities, and in some of these programs the use of a statewide formula of the per capita income type may be wholly inappropriate since a poor locality in a wealthy State may be penalized because of the relative prosperity of other parts of the State.

This feature is of even greater significance when private non-profit organizations receive funds directly from the Federal Government, either along with, or instead of, governmental units. An entirely separate study could and should be made of the extent to which existing law imposes statewide equalization factors on such recipients and of the undesirability of imposing them in these cases.

In evaluating what follows it should also be kept in mind that New York, like other highly populated States, receives extremely small proportions of large sums of Federal money appropriated under a long series of agricultural grant-in-aid programs. For example, in 1965 it received only 3 percent of the $45,449,120 spent for agricultural experiment stations, only 2 percent of $80,371,512 spent for agricultural extension education, only 3 percent of $15,283,821 spent for forestry cooperation programs, only 4 percent of $3,043,784 spent for agricultural marketing research and services, only seven-tenths of 1 percent of $58,440,952 spent for watershed protection and flood prevention. It is not contended that these proportions are unfairly related to rural needs as distributed throughout the Nation. But these proportions and the amounts involved do strengthen the point made here, that where programs are directed toward urban needs, or needs which are vastly aggravated by metropolitan density, the interestate allocation should reflect those needs more fairly than they now do.

(The program-by-program analysis follows: In all cases the roman numerals correspond to the outline explained above.)

HILL-BURTON HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION

I. All three factors are present:

1. An allocation formula which weights the population of each State with the inverse ratio, not of per capita income alone, but the square of per capita income. This is achieved through a complex computation which also limits the per capita income variations to a range of between 75 and 33⅓ percent. The net effect is a gross distortion of the per capita income standard, even assuming the validity of that standard, at the expense of the heavily urban States.

2. Minimum allotments per State set a floor, again at the expense of the heavily urban States: for hospitals and public health centers, $200,000; for chronic disease hospitals, $200,000; for diagnostic or treatment centers, $100,000; for rehabilitation facilities, $50,000; and $100,000 for nursing homes.

3. Variable matching from one-third to two-thirds based on the inverse ratio of per capita income.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 5 percent in 1964, or $8,912,574 out of a nationwide $188,760,682; in 1965 New York received 5.5 percent, or $10,686,788 out of $195,266,393.

III. This compares with:

North Carolina, which with 2.5 percent of total population received 4.5 percent in 1964, or $8,535,950, and 3.6 percent in 1965, or $7,007,326;

Alabama, which with 1.8 percent of total population received 4.7 percent in 1964, or $8,953,105; and

Georgia, which with 2.2 percent of total population received 4.6 percent in 1965, or $9,713,755.

IV. As a measure of the additional need in New York State, State authorities estimate that an additional $48,540,340 could have been used for planned hospital construction in 1964; an additional $43,943,820 in 1965. Projections of additional need in 1967 and 1968 soar to $105,099,529 and $132,788,993, respectively.

V. The enormous disproportions in distribution in this program in the light of the excess need in areas of very great population density clearly call for changes in all three allocation factors:

1. At the very least, the delegation should support legislation eliminating the squaring of the per capita income factor in the allocation formula and substituting the usual per capita income factor (i.e. the higher the average per capita income in the State, the lower its share of funds). During the last session of Congress I pledged, in conjunction with the pending Vocational Rehabilitation Act, which borrowed the same allocation formula as in Hill-Burton, to seek revision of this aspect of Hill-Burton. However, I believe even the straight-forward per capita income formula may be grossly inadequate, as has been discussed above, and, particularly in this area of governmental service, in which density of population brings special communicable disease and other health problems, a straight population or density of population factor should be substituted. Certainly with the gross disproportion which the law has carried since its enactment in 1946, there should be careful examination as to whether the need for additional hospital space in the less densely populated areas matches the enormous needs in the heavily populated areas.

2. The minimum allotments per State should be repealed at this point, for the same reasons set out in (1) and for the additional reason that the specification of particular types of facility is unnecessary and creates its own distortion within the States.

3. Variable matching, while on its face complementary to the purpose of a per capita income allocation formula, serves actually to multiply its effect. Not only is a State with higher per capita income reduced to a smaller share of the Federal funds, but to utilize that share it must raise an even larger percentage of State funds to match the Federal money. Again, for the reasons stated in (1), the delegation should support legislation at the least substituting a flat matching requirement.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS CONSTRUCTION

I. All three factors are present:

1. The act specifies only the criteria of population, the extent of need for community mental health centers, and the financial need of the respective States. Administratively this has been enforced by allotting two-thirds of the funds on the basis of population weighted by per capita income, one-third on the basis of population alone, which is taken to represent the need for community mental health centers.

2. A minimum of $100,000 to each State.

3. Matching is variable between 33⅓ percent and 66⅔ percent, with the State permitted to apply either a flat rate across the State or a variety of rates for the various localities depending upon economic status of the areas and other relevant factors.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received in the first year under the act 7.7 percent, or $2,711,019 out of $35 million.

III. This compares with:

Arkansas, which with 1 percent of total population, received 1.3 percent or $454,470; Alabama, which with 1.8 percent of total population, received 2.2 percent, or $787,622; Louisiana, which with 1.8 percent of total population, received 2.1 percent, or $751,603; Mississippi, which with 1.2 percent of total population, received 1.8 percent, or $628,233; in 1965.

IV. As a measure of the additional need, New York State authorities estimate that for New York City alone there are pending projects which are eligible for more than five times the amount of the total State allocation. For 1965 this would have amounted to approximately $13.6 million.

V. All three factors should be amended to minimize this disproportion:

1. The act should eliminate financial need as a criterion or at the least should reverse the proportion of funds weighted by per capita income, so that only one-third of the funds, rather than two-thirds, is so weighted. The reverse proportion would reflect the administrative determination under the Mental Health Community Services Act, which contains the same statutory criteria. However, it is noteworthy that the Department of HEW itself recognizes in its description of the administrative formula that population is the best index of need for this program.

2. The $100,000 minimum should be repealed.

3. Variable matching, which only compounds the distortion of need, should be eliminated and a flat matching rate substituted.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

I. Two factors are present: Beginning in 1967, the allotment formula will follow the Hill-Burton formula, squaring the per capita income factor which weights population. Prior to the 1965 amendments the formula used a straight per capita income factor weighing population.

3. Also beginning in 1967, the matching will be 75-percent Federal—25-percent State; prior law required 50–50-percent matching.

II. New York's experience to date is not relevant in view of the drastic change in the allotment formula beginning in 1967. But in 1967, compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, it is estimated that its allotment will be 5.1 percent, or $17,782,628 out of $350 million; and in 1968 will be 5.1 percent or $20,323,003 out of $400 million.

III. This with compare with:

North Carolina's, which with 2.5 percent of total population, will be 3.8 percent or $13,402,941, in 1967; and in 1968 will be 3.8 percent or $15,317,647.

Mississippi's, which with 1.2 percent of total population, will be 2.4 percent, or $8,239,913, in 1967; and in 1968 will be 2.4 percent, or $9,417,043;

Texas, which with 5.4 percent of total population, will be 6.7 percent, or $23,422,680; and in 1968 will be 6.7 percent, or $26,768,777.

IV. New York State authorities estimate that, with the change in matching requirements in 1967, New York would be able to obtain $18,041,676 in Federal funds if the allotment formula had not been made so disadvantageous. They estimate that New York's entitlement under the new formula will be only $14,871,612 and that New York

will thus lose a needed additional $3,170,064, or 17.6 percent of its need.

V. For all the reasons presented in the case of the Hill-Burton Act, the allotment formula should be amended and at least the straight per capita income factor restored. The House version of the 1965 act retained the latter; the Senate version, which I opposed, inserted the former.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

I. Two factors are present:

1. Project grants in any one State may not exceed 12½ percent of the aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated.

2. There is a matching requirement in that up to two-thirds of net project cost may be met from Federal funds.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York will be eligible for no more than 12½ percent of the authorization for fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1967, which totals $375 million. New York's maximum share will be $46,875,000.

III. This cannot be compared with other States' experiences as yet because the applications are still in the process of being submitted. It is estimated, however, that at least three States, New York, Pennsylvania, and California, will be limited by the 12½ percent limitation.

IV. As a measure of the additional need in New York State, State authorities estimate that New York City alone will use $23 million of the State's share for its subway and $10 million for its commuter railroads. The total need is for $1 billion additional for the subway in the next 10 years and $400 million additional for commuter railroad rolling stock in the next 5 years.

V. The same considerations apply in this case as in the cases of Urban Renewal and Low-Rent Public Housing: the upper limitation should be eliminated. The adequacy of inserting a reallocation provision should be considered. The adequacy of the amount of the Federal matching share should be evaluated.

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

I. Three factors are present:

1. Contracts for additional units for any one State may not exceed 15 percent of the aggregate amount not already guaranteed under contracts on June 30, 1961. However, under an amendment I offered in 1965 which was adopted, unused funds may be pooled and reallocated to States which have used their maximum of 15 percent.

2. There is an administrative upper limit (on allowable cost of construction) of $20,000 per unit (consisting of 4.2 rooms).

3. Administratively there is a form of matching in that the Federal contribution cannot exceed a sum equal to the annual yield, at the applicable going Federal rate plus 2 percent, upon the development or acquisition cost of the project involved, and is for a maximum period of 40 years.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 15 percent in 1964, or $52,421,921 out of $333,812,696; and 15 percent in 1965, or $51,904,082 out of $346,027,213.

III. This compares with:

Alabama, which with 1.8 percent of total population, received 3.7 percent or $12,511,654 in 1964;

New Jersey, which with 3.5 percent of total population, received 6.3 percent or $21,058,635 in 1964;

Illinois, which with 5.5 percent of total population, received 8.3 percent or $28,853,891 in 1965.

IV. As a measure of the additional need in New York State, State authorities estimate that in New York City alone 200,000 families live in substandard dwellings. At present 7,000 new units are being constructed in New York City annually. The need is estimated at 18,000 additional units per year, which would amount to an additional $360 million per year, more than the amount expended for the entire Nation at present.

V. The same considerations apply in this case as in the case of urban renewal; the upper limitation should be eliminated and the adequacy of the reallocation provision evaluated. The $20,000 limit per unit on cost of construction should be carefully reviewed to determine its adequacy in high construction cost urban centers, toward which this program was intended to be directed. In addition, the Federal share of costs should be evaluated to determine whether the major urban centers are being discriminated against because of considerably higher costs of both borrowing and construction.

URBAN RENEWAL

I. All three factors are present:

1. An apportionment formula giving the Administrator authority to assess urgency of need and feasibility.

2. A maximum limitation of not more than 12½ percent of the funds expended in any one State. However, the Administrator may expend additional $100 million in States where more than two-thirds of the maximum has been obligated.

3. Variable matching: generally, two-thirds Federal, but three-fourths Federal in communities with population under 50,000 or in communities with population under 150,000 which are designated as redevelopment areas.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 12½ percent or $27,489,178 out of $211,912,510; in 1965, New York received 12½ percent or $34,844,687 out of $291,653,771.

III. This compares with:

Arkansas, which with 1 percent of total population, received 2.5 percent, or $5,352,308, in 1964;

Pennsylvania, which with 6 percent of total population, received 12.7 percent, or $26,972,974, in 1964;

Connecticut, which with 1.4 percent of total population, received 7.4 percent, or $21,785,192, in 1965.

Massachusetts, which with 2.8 percent of total population, received 9.2 percent, or $26,779,168, in 1965.

IV. New York authorities estimate that the entire allocation for the State would not even be adequate for New York City alone, much less for the entire State. In fiscal year 1964, New York City received $10 million and in fiscal year 1965, $16 million. For fiscal year 1966 through 1969, New York City is seeking 10 percent of the $2.9 billion authorized, or $290 million and needs $200 million more.

V. Clearly the 12½-percent maximum limitation is unrealistic and should be repealed. The authority to exceed the limitation now in the act should be evaluated to determine why it has not been effective in reflecting New York's obviously disproportionate need. The limitation now built into the act reflects congressional acceptance of the fact that urban centers have needs for renewal which exceed any one State's population share. But the amount of the limitation fails to reflect the degree to which this is true. It must be considered that, as of the 1960 census, only 9 States have 5 or more cities with populations of more than 100,000: one has 14; one, 11; two, 8; two, 6; and three, 5. In these 68 cities are crowded some 15.8 percent of the Nation's population. Consideration should also be given to eliminating the discrepancy in matching for smaller cities.

AIR POLLUTION

I. All three factors are present regarding control program grants, which were inaugurated in fiscal year 1965:

1. An allocation formula listing as criteria, population, the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem, and financial need. Administratively the funds are allocated on a project, not a State-by-State basis.

2. A maximum statutory limitation on each State of 12½ percent of available funds.

3. Federal matching up to two-thirds, except up to three-fourths in the case of intermunicipal or interstate agencies. Administratively the full two-thirds or three-fourths is granted unless it is not requested.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 12½ percent in 1965, or $522,500 out of a nationwide $4,180,000.

III. This compares with:

Alabama, which with 1.8 percent of total population, received 3.8 percent, or $160,000, in 1965;

New Jersey, which with 3.5 percent of total population, received 6 percent, or $250,000, in 1965;

Arizona, which with 0.8 percent of total population, received 3.1 percent, or $130,000, in 1965.

IV. As a measure of additional need, New York State authorities estimate that an amount two to three times greater than that granted would have been applied for, had the 12½-percent limitation not been in effect. In dollar terms this would have amounted to an additional $522,500 to $1,045,000.

V. In view of the disproportion of New York's metropolitan needs, at least the 12½-percent limitation should be repealed.

WATER POLLUTION (WASTE TREATMENT WORKS CONSTRUCTION)

I. All three factors are present:

1. An allocation formula beginning in fiscal year 1966 which allots the first $100 million appropriated 50 percent on a population basis and 50 percent on the basis of the inverse ratio of per capita income; the balance ($50 million each for fiscal year 1966 and 1967) on the basis of population alone. There is a reallocation provision for unused funds; and a provision increasing grants by 10 percent if certified as conforming to a comprehensive plan for a metropolitan area.

2. A type of minimum distribution to smaller communities, which requires that at least half the first $100 million appropriated annually must be used for municipalities of 125,000 or less population;

3. A matching requirement, the Federal share not exceeding 30 percent of a project or $1.2 million, whichever is smaller, except in the case of a project which serves more than one municipality, where the fixed limit is $4.8 million.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 7 percent in 1964, or $4,685,034 out of a nationwide $66,432,402; in 1965 New York received 5.4 percent, or $3,769,284 out of $69,755,014.

III. This compares with:

Georgia, which with 2.2 percent of total population, received 3.3 percent or $2,186,349 in 1964;

Arkansas, which with 1 percent of total population, received 1.8 percent, or $1,171,573 in 1964; and

Louisiana, which with 1.8 percent of total population, received 2.6 percent, or $1,816,333 in 1965.

IV. As a measure of additional need in New York State, State authorities estimate that $65.8 million was actually spent in 1964 for this purpose, within the State, more than $60 million of it from non-Federal sources. $50.8 million was spent in 1965, more than $47 million from non-Federal sources. In addition, New York State has committed itself to a $1.7 billion program for 1967 through 1972, involving a projected State and local effort of $1.1 billion; yet the Federal 30 percent cannot be met under the present allocation factors.

V. At least two of the three factors are distorted and should be amended:

1. The allocation formula slightly reduces the negative effect of the per capita income factor by applying the latter only to 50 percent of the Federal funds, and, as amended in 1965, only to 50 percent of the first $100 million. What has been said above about substituting for the per capita income factor remains basically valid, however, particularly in view of the discrepancy in percentage of funds related to population in a program which clearly is affected by density of population. In addition, the fact that so much more than the 70 percent expected to be spent by the States is spent by New York State, is an index to the need, which will clearly be severely aggravated in the next 5-year period.

2. For the reasons stated in (1), the minimum distribution factor should be repealed.

3. For the reasons stated in (1), the $1.2 million limitation should be repealed, since it discriminates against larger cities with need for larger facilities; and the 30 to 70 percent matching requirements should be reevaluated.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION

I. All three factors are present:

1. An allotment formula based on population.

2. A minimum allotment to each State of $100,000 under title I, library services; a minimum of $80,000 under title II, library construction.

3. A variable matching requirement between 33⅓ and 66⅔ percent based on the inverse of per capita income.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 3 percent in 1964, or $279,948 out of $7,442,537; and 6 percent in 1965, or $1,555,013 out of $26,110,985.

III. This compares with:

North Carolina, which with 2.5 percent of total population, received 4.2 percent or $309,703 in 1964;

Kentucky which with 1.7 percent of total population, received 2.7 percent, or $204,994 in 1964;

Maryland which with 1.8 percent of total population, received 2.3 percent, or $603,628 in 1965;

Rhode Island, which with 0.5 percent of total population, received 1.1 percent or $293,807 in 1965.

IV. As a measure of the additional need in New York State, State authorities estimate that at present rates of planning the State could use an additional Federal payment of at least $9 million, consisting of $4 million for services and $5 million for construction.

V. The disproportion should be reduced by:

2. Reducing or eliminating the minimum allotment to each State under both titles, since this factor immediately withdraws from the possibility of allotment to New York on any basis approximately one-third of the total amount of funds, or approximately $8.8 million out of $26.1 million in 1965.

3. The variable matching requirement should be repealed and a fixed matching requirement substituted.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

I. Title I, aid to local school districts for special educational programs in areas having high concentration of children of low-income families, contains only one factor, an allocation formula using the population of 5- to 17-year-old children in families with incomes of less than $2,000 per year (1960 census) and those in families with incomes above $2,000 from the aid to dependent children program under title IV of the Social Security Act (1962 data).

Title II, school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials, contains an allocation formula based upon the population of children enrolled in public and private elementary and secondary schools.

Title III, supplementary educational centers and services, contains an allocation formula, one-half based upon the population of children aged 5 to 17 on July 1, 1963, and one-half based upon the total population on that date. But it also contains a minimum amount of $200,000 for each State.

Title V, strengthening State departments of education, contains an allocation formula based upon school population in the fall of 1964. But it also contains a minimum amount of $100,000 for each State and, beginning in fiscal year 1968 there will be a variable matching requirement of between 50 and 66⅔ percent, depending upon the inverse of per capita income.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York was allocated out of authorizations for fiscal year 1966:

Title I: 9.4 percent or $109,639,348 out of $1,163,940,540;

Title II: 8.3 percent or $8.3 million out of $100 million;

Title III: 5.8 percent, or $5.8 million out of $100 million;

Title V: 3.1 percent, or $784,668 out of $25 million.

III. The title I share compares with:

North Carolina, which with 2.5 percent of total population, was allocated 4.5 percent on $52,826,063;

Arkansas, which with 1 percent of total population, was allocated 1.9 percent on $22,600,021;

Louisiana, which with 1.8 percent of total population, was allocated 3.3 percent on $38,344,221.

IV. As a measure of need, New York State authorities estimate additional requirements, based upon applications received to date, as follows for each of these titles:

Title I: 50 percent more, or $54.5 million;

Title II: $15 to $20 million;

Title III: at least $7 million.

V. While allocation under this act is more closely related to population than under most others, its allocation provisions nonetheless should be amended:

Title I: I sought a higher income figure than $2,000, which is substantially below the poverty line of $3,000 established for the antipoverty program and which clearly discriminates against the major urban centers. Although New York's allocation equals its total population share, this is a prime example in which the problems of density of population and the increased burden imposed upon the disadvantaged as a result of density should result in a higher percentage for such areas than population alone would warrant. In view of the disproportion of need, the delegation should support amendment of title I to achieve a higher standard than $2,000 of income. It should also implement Commissioner Allen's request in his letter to the delegation dated December 27, 1965, for amendments (1) requiring more recent data than the 1960 census and (2) authorizing the reallocation of funds not used in some school districts to those whose needs have not been met fully. Reallocation provisions already exist in titles II and V. Commissioner Allen suggested that the reallocation be based upon the proportion of each district's students from families receiving aid to dependent children.

Title II: The State authorities contend that even a pure population standard is unfair to New York because of the critical need in large cities. The delegation should consider an alternative which would stress those areas, perhaps a title I-type formula, amended as recommended above. Since a reallocation provision already exists in this title, its adequacy for meeting New York's needs should be evaluated.

Title III: The $200,000 minimum should be reduced or eliminated.

Title V: The $100,000 minimum should be reduced or eliminated, and the variable matching should be replaced with a fixed matching requirement.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION CONSTRUCTION

I. There is no statutory allocation formula, but the act imposes a $1 million maximum on the aggregate funds granted within a State over the 5-year period of the program. There is also a matching requirement, the Federal share totaling 50 percent of project cost plus 25 percent of the cost of any educational TV broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant. Administratively these two factors have been combined into an allocation formula which considers population relative to area, but with an upper limit of $1 million and a lower limit of $300,000, which is taken to represent the approximate Federal share of a major broadcast facility.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York will receive over the 5-year period 3.3 percent, or $1 million out of $30,001,120.

III. This compares with:

Maine, which with 0.5 percent of total population, will receive over the 5-year period 1 percent, on $300,000;

Montana, which with 0.4 percent of total population, will receive over the 5-year period 2.5 percent, on $765,460.

IV. As a measure of additional need, the New York authorities used their maximum allocation in the first half of the first fiscal year under the program and estimate the need for first an additional $600,000 by the end of fiscal year 1966.

V. In view of the strain on classroom space in urban areas and the resulting need for other techniques such as educational TV, the $1 million maximum should be repealed, or at least a reallocation provision for unused allotments should be provided and the $300,000 minimum should be eliminated.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

I. All three factors are present in title III, public school laboratory equipment and materials for science, math, and modern foreign languages:

1. An allocation formula under which 86 percent of the funds are distributed according to school-age population and the inverse ratio of income per school-age child; the latter is limited to a range of 66⅔ to 33⅓.

2. Grants for supervision and administration are a minimum of $20,000 per State.

3. 50–50 matching requirement.

All three factors are present in title V–A, guidance, counseling, and testing:

1. School-age population.

2. But a minimum allotment of $50,000 to each State.

3. And 50–50 matching.

Two factors are present in title X, improvement of statistical services:

2. No State may receive more than $50,000.

3. 50–50 matching.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 7 percent in 1964 under all NDEA titles, or $6,017,962 out of a nationwide $84,214,013; in 1965 New York received 5 percent, or $3,828,957 out of $80,703,642. In 1965 New York received 5.8 percent under title III alone, or $2,863,820 out of $50,185,668; 3.3 percent under title V–A alone, or $577,900 out of $17,259,978; and 2.9 percent under title X, or the maximum, $50,000, out of $1,712,416.

III. This compares with overall National Defense Education Act allocations:

Colorado, which with 1 percent of total population, received 2.2 percent or $1,779,376, in 1965;

Georgia, which with 2.2 percent of total population, received 3.8 percent, or $3,055,827, in 1965;

North Carolina, which with 2.5 percent of total population, received 4.2 percent, or $3,396,226, in 1965.

IV. As a measure of the additional need, New York State authorities estimate that for title III in 1966 some $1.5 million will be necessary above the Federal share to match the requests of New York schools; an additional $1,438,000 could be utilized under title V–A; and an additional $140,000 is needed under title X.

V. In view of the disproportions, the following amendments should be made:

Title III:

1. The factor of income per school-age child should be eliminated;

2. Consideration should be given to eliminating the $20,000 minimum;

3. The adequacy of the matching requirement should be studied.

Title V–A:

2. The minimum allotment of $50,000 should be eliminated;

3. The adequacy of the matching requirement should be studied.

Title X:

2. The $50,000 maximum should be increased to $200,000;

3. The matching requirement should be eliminated.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

I. Three factors are present:

1 and 2. An allocation formula which splits the funds into two equal parts, fund A and fund B. From fund A each State receives $70,000 plus a portion of the remainder based upon the ratio of live births in the State to those in the Nation. From fund B, 25 percent is for regional or national special projects on a project basis. The remainder is apportioned on a per capita income and live birth basis, with a minimum of $35,000 to each State. Here the live birth criterion is weighted so that each rural birth is given twice the weight of an urban birth.

3. Grants from fund A require equal matching; matching is not required for formula grants from fund B.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 6 percent in 1964, or $1,374,033 out of a nationwide $27,249,553; in 1965 New York received 5 percent, or $1,604,163, out of $31,948,969.

III. This compares with:

North Carolina, which with 2.5 percent of total population, received 3.6 percent, or $993,930, in 1964;

Virginia, which with 2.3 percent of total population, received 3.4 percent, or $920,072, in 1964;

Alabama, which with 1.8 percent of total population, received 2.5 percent, or $890,076, in 1965.

IV. As a measure of additional need, New York State authorities estimate that an additional $1,139,926 could have been used, on a straight population basis, in 1964, and an additional $1,021,199 in 1965.

V. In view of the disproportions and magnitude of additional need, the allocation formula should be amended for both fund A and fund B so that the minimum amounts of $70,000 and $35,000, respectively, for each State are eliminated. And even more important, the weighting of rural births at twice urban births should be repealed.

MENTAL HEALTH COMMUNITY SERVICES

I. All three factors are present:

1. By administrative determination, an allocation formula for 30 percent of the funds weights population with per capita income; the balance of the funds are distributed on a straight population basis;

2. A minimum grant for each State, administratively set at $65,000 for 1962, and at $115,000 for 1963;

3. 50–50 matching required.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 7 percent in 1964, or $705,115 out of $9,667,561; and 7 percent in 1965, or $773,582 out of $11,063,781.

III. This compares with:

Rhode Island, which with 0.5 percent of total population, received 1.1 percent or $106,422 in 1964;

New Mexico, which with 0.5 percent of total population, received 1 percent or $116,414 in 1965;

Mississippi, which with 1.2 percent of total population, received 1.4 percent, or $137,768 in 1964;

Nevada, which with 0.2 percent of total population, received 0.8 percent or $88,755 in 1965.

IV. As a measure of the State's need, New York authorities estimate that they receive annually applications for more than four times the amount of the State's allocation, most of which would be approved if the funds were available. For 1964 this would have amounted to approximately $2.8 million; for 1965 approximately $3.1 million.

V. 1. Given the disproportions and the measure of need, the per capita income factor should be eliminated. The act itself requires the Suregon General to consider population, the extent of the mental health problem, and the financial need of the respective States. Administratively he has applied per capita income to 30 percent of the funds to satisfy the financial need criterion. Thus the act should be amended to remove financial needs as a criterion in order to eliminate the per capita income factor.

2. The minimum grant per State should be eliminated in view of its relatively high amount in proportion to the total funds available under this program.

3. The adequacy of the matching requirement should be considered.

COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES, PARTICULARLY FOR THE CHRONICALLY ILL AND AGED

I. All three factors are present in grants to States:

1. A discretionary allocation formula basing program need on the criteria of population and fiscal capacity as reflected by per capita income. Administratively 40 percent of the funds is allotted on the basis of population, weighted by the reciprocal of State per capita income.

2. Administratively a minimum allotment has been established, for fiscal year 1962 it was $40,000 per State.

3. Matching of 66⅔ percent Federal, 33⅓ percent State obtained through fiscal year 1965; thereafter it became 50–50. None of the factors apply to grants to nonprofit agencies.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 10 percent in 1964, or $2,449,464 out of $23,066,604; and 8.4 percent in 1965, or $2,698,935 out of $32,087,096.

III. This compares with:

Mississippi, which with 1.2 percent of total population, received 1.4 percent, or $329,812 in 1964;

West Virginia, which with 0.9 percent of total population, received 1.5 percent, or $348,819 in 1964;

Oklahoma, which with 1.3 percent of total population, received 1.6 percent or $520,409 in 1965.

IV. As a measure of additional need, New York State authorities estimate that on a population basis New York needed an additional $256,800 in 1964, an additional $222,350 in 1965, and needs an additional $227,600 in 1966.

V. In view of the disproportions, the per capita income factor should be eliminated from the allocation formula, the desirability of the minimum allotment should be evaluated, and the adequacy of the matching requirement should be considered.

CANCER DEMONSTRATION AND CONTROL

I. All three factors are present:

1. The statutory allocation formula specifies population, cancer mortality and per capita income. Administratively 60 percent of the fund is allotted on the basis of the extent of the cancer problem as measured by mortality from cancer (using a 3-year average) and the inverse of population density.

2. Administratively each State receives a minimum grant of $25,000 or 25 cents per capita, whichever is less.

3. Matching 50–50 percent, except for demonstration grants, which require no matching.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 8 percent in 1964, or $267,890 out of $3,391,568; and 8 percent in 1965; or $270,900 out of $3,366,394.

III. This compares with:

South Carolina, which with 1.3 percent of total population, received 1.7 percent, or $57,591 in 1964;

Mississippi, which with 1.2 percent of total population, received 1.9 percent, or $64,195 in 1964;

Arkansas, which with 1 percent of total population, received 1.4 percent, or $47,203.

IV. As a measure of the additional need, New York State authorities estimate that on a population basis New York required an additional $50,100 in 1964, an additional $47,600 in 1965, and requires an additional $49,400 in 1966.

V. In view of the disproportion, the per capita factor should be eliminated; the minimum should be eliminated; and the adequacy of the matching requirement should be reconsidered.

HEART DISEASE CONTROL

I. Two factors are present:

1. An allocation by statute listing as criteria population and per capita income. Administratively 38 percent of the funds is allocated on the basis of 50 cents per capita for the first 100,000 population, or fraction thereof, and 62 percent is allocated on the basis of population weighted by per capita income.

2. Fifty-fifty matching.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 6 percent in 1964, or $396,606 out of $6,109,723; and 5.6 percent in 1965, or $364,100 out of $6,276,529.

III. This compares with:

Colorado, which with 1 percent of total population, received 1.9 percent or $114,985 in 1964;

Mississippi, which with 1.2 percent of total population, received 2.4 percent or $148,926 in 1964;

South Carolina, which with 1.3 percent of total population, received 2.2 percent or $133,400.

IV. As a measure of additional need, New York State authorities estimate that on a population basis New York required an additional $282,200 in 1964, an additional $272,900 in 1965, and requires an additional $376,500 in 1966.

V. In view of the disproportion, the allocation formula should be amended to eliminate the per capita income factor; and the adequacy of the matching requirement should be reevaluated.

GENERAL HEALTH (COMMUNITY HEALTH PRACTICE AND RESEARCH)

I. Two factors are present:

1. The statute specifies as criteria of general health need, population, financial need, and extent of the health problem in the various States. Administratively, 95 percent of the funds are allotted on the basis of population weighted by the inverse per capita income; and 5 percent on the basis of the ex-

tent of the health problem as measured by the weighted inverse of population density.

2. Equal matching is required.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 6 percent in 1964, or $892,619 out of $15,233,821; and 4 percent in 1965, or $670,700 out of $11,142,001.

III. This compares with:

Texas, which with 5.4 percent of total population, received 5.2 percent, or $797,911 in 1964;

Mississippi, which with 1.2 percent of total population, received 2.1 percent or $315,548 in 1964; and 1.9 percent, or $211,479 in 1965;

South Carolina, which with 1.3 percent of total population, received 1.8 percent, or $197,159 in 1965.

IV. In view of the disproportion, the allocation formula should be amended to eliminate the per capita income factor. It is noteworthy that, as a measure of special health problems, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has itself selected density of population as the index, but has used it in exactly the reverse of its significance by giving the largest shares to the States with the lowest density and the smallest to those with the highest.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

I. In the greatly expanded act of 1963, all three factors are present:

1. An allocation formula which weights population of certain age brackets with the inverse ratio of per capita income;

2. A minimum amount to each State of $10,000;

3. A 50–50 matching except for research and training programs.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 6 percent, or $2,490,146 out of $41,076,168; in 1965 New York received 4 percent, or $5,870,584 out of $131,524,980.[1]

III. This compares with:

Alabama, which with 1.8 percent of total population, received 2.3 percent, or $936,007, in 1964;

Kentucky, which with 1.7 percent of total population, received 2.4 percent, or $994,050, in 1964;

Georgia, which with 2.2 percent of total population, received 3 percent, or $4,311,053, in 1965;

North Carolina, which with 2.5 percent total population, received 4.1 percent or $5,423,408, in 1965.

IV. As a measure of additional need, New York State authorities estimate that for fiscal year 1966 an additional $3,400,000 is needed beyond the allotment of Federal funds, consisting of $600,000 for the George-Barden programs, $1 million under the work-study program of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and $1,800,000 for the other programs under the act.

V. 1. The extremely low percentage of participation of New York State as compared with the need demonstrates that the allocation formula in the Vocational Education Act of 1963 should be amended to eliminate the per capita income factor. This is very strongly supported by the straight population factor used in the preceding George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Acts (see note below).

2. The minimum amount is prejudicial to the urban States but the amount is so small as compared with total outlays that is probably negligible.

3. The delegation should consider amending the matching provision to increase the Federal share from 50 to 75 percent. The State Vocational Education authorities recommend this increase for specific classes of persons who have entered the labor market: those who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment; and those who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps which prevent them from succeeding in regular education programs. These are goals which are of greater significance in an urban, industrial setting and therefore support the reasoning in 1 above as well.

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES

I. Title I. Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Facilities: Two factors are present for public community colleges and public technical institutes, which receive 22 percent of the funds allotted to each State:

1. An allocation formula weighting the population of high school graduates in the State by the inverse of per capita income. The range of the latter factor is limited to between 33⅓ and 66⅔ percent. A special allotment ratio of 50 percent is fixed for any State with exceptionally high construction costs.

2. Matching of 40 percent Federal—60 percent State.

Two factors are present for other undergraduate facilities, which receive 78 percent of the funds allotted to each State:

1. One-half on the basis of enrollment in institutions of higher education; one-half on the basis of enrollment in grades 9 through 12.

2. Matching of not more than 33⅓ percent Federal.

Title II. Grants for Construction of Graduate Facilities: One factor is present: no State may receive more than 12½ percent of the total appropriation for any fiscal year.

Title III. Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities: One factor is present: no State may receive more than 12½ percent of the total appropriation for any fiscal year.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York received 8.4 percent in 1965, or $19,303,194 out of $230,900,000.

III. This compares with:

California, which with 9.5 percent of the total population, received 10.2 percent or $23,647,473;

Minnesota, which with 1.8 percent of total population, received 2.2 percent or $5,019,166.

IV. As a measure of additional need, New York State authorities estimate that title I community college applications for fiscal year 1966 will total $10,258,346, or $3,300,065 more than the allocation; and that title I other than community college applications for fiscal year 1966 will total $44,593,548, or $13,129,411 more than the allocation.

V. In view of the disproportionate need, the following amendments should be sought:

Title I: Per capita income should be eliminated as a factor in the community college grants. It is noteworthy that the existing formula makes a gesture toward a fairer approach by stipulating a special 50 percent per capita income rate for States with exceptionally high school construction costs.

The adequacy of the matching requirements should be evaluated for both the community college and other undergraduate grants.

Titles II and III: The 12½-percent maximum limitations in both titles should be eliminated.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

I. The presence of allocation factors varied widely from program to program.

Work training (Neighborhood Youth Corps):

1. Allocation formula specifies as criteria: population, unemployment, and family income levels.

2. Maximum limitation of 12½ percent to any 1 State out of amount appropriated for any fiscal year.

3. Matching 90 percent Federal, 10 percent State until June 30, 1967; 50–50 thereafter. Matching may be in kind.

Work study (now administered by Office of Education, HEW):

1. Allocation formula specifies one-third of the funds in proportion to a full-time enrollment in institutions of higher education; one-third in proportion to the number of high school graduates; and one-third in proportion to the number of children under 18 years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000. Reallotment provided for unused funds.

2. Matching 90 percent Federal, 10 percent State until June 30, 1967; 75–25 thereafter. Matching may be in kind.

Community action programs:

1. Allocation formula for 80 percent of funds appropriated specifies one-third in proportion to the number of public assistance recipients; one-third in proportion to the number of unemployed persons; and one-third in proportion to the number of children under 18 years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $1,000. Reallotment provided for unused funds; 20 percent of funds appropriated allotted at the discretion of the Director. Criteria specified for allocation within States by Director as between urban and rural areas.

2. Matching 90 percent Federal, 10 percent State, until June 30, 1967; 50–50 thereafter. Director authorized to reduce 90 percent prior to June 30, 1967 for programs which have received assistance under the act.

Adult basic education:

1. Allocation formula: in proportion to the number of individuals who have attained 18 years of age and have no more than a fifth-grade education. Reallotment of unused funds provided for.

2. Minimum allotment to each State of $50,000.

3. Matching 90 percent Federal, 10 percent State until June 30, 1967; 50–50 thereafter.

II. Compared to its population share in 1964 of 9.4 percent, New York in fiscal year 1965 received:

Work training: $11,838,796, or 9 percent of $127,675,880.

Work study: $2,035,000, or 4 percent of $55,077,000.

Community action: $23,089,259, or 14 percent of $237,157,000.

Adult basic education: $1,696,057, or 38 percent of $4,448,000 (only a handful of States participated in the first year of the program.)

For fiscal year 1966 New York is allocated:

Community action programs: $33,743,000 or 8 percent of $412,002,000.

III. At this point full comparative figures for fiscal year 1965 are not available. However:

1. For fiscal year 1966 under work training (Neighborhood Youth Corps):

Arizona, which, with 0.8 percent of total population, received 5 percent, or $7,371,549;

Arkansas, which, with 1 percent of population, received 5 percent or $6,448,819;

Missouri, which, with 2.3 percent of population, received 6 percent or $8,410,179.

2. For fiscal year 1966 under Community action programs:

Kentucky, which, with 1.7 percent of total population, is allocated 2.4 percent, or $10,259,000;

North Carolina, which, with 2.5 percent of total population, is allocated 3.6 percent, or $15,120,000.

IV. As a measure of additional need, New York authorities indicate that requests for

[1] All the dollar amounts in this discussion include amounts appropriated under the George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Acts, which, interestingly enough, apportioned funds related to agricultural education on a straight rural population basis and those related to industrial training on a straight urban population. The funds for 1964 for these two programs totaled $56,076,168 and for 1965 totaled $56,592,828.

work training (Neighborhood Youth Corps) exceeded approved grants by $16,422,776 in fiscal year 1965; and that requests for community action programs exceeded approved grants by $15,657,083.

V. The following should be considered:

1. Work training (Neighborhood Youth Corps): the 12½ percent limitation be eliminated in view of the volume of requests (which, if granted in fiscal year 1965, would have far exceeded that limitation), and the administrative application of the formula should be evaluated in the light of the relatively low percentage of funds in fact granted in fiscal year 1965 compared to need and other States' shares.

2. Community action programs: the administrative application of the allocation formula should be evaluated in view of the percentage of funds allocated for fiscal year 1966 in relation to population and need; and the $1,000 annual income figure in the allocation formula should be raised as unrealistic in the major urban centers.

3. Adult basic education; the $50,000 minimum should be evaluated in the light of budgetary cuts which severely hampered a number of States whose plans had progressed further than others in the first year, including New York State.

CONCLUSION

This is the age of the cities. The Nation and the Congress are recognizing this fact and all that it implies. With similar realizations of national movements, our public and private institutions have responded magnificently. When the decline of the farm population loomed as a danger to our ability to feed our people, we reacted with multibillion-dollar rural aid programs which have boosted our agricultural production so vastly that it is now the wonder of, and a major source of supply for, the world. When the roads of our Nation were found to be grossly inadequate to the great rush into the automotive age, we reacted with a multibillion-dollar interstate highway construction program, which is planned to end in 1972.

Now the city must be the focus of our attention, for the huge concentrations of population in major urban centers have created conditions entirely beyond the proportions ever experienced before. These are conditions which threaten the basic livability of the dwelling-place of almost 75 percent of our Nation's people. And they are conditions which the cities and the States in which they are located are incapable of handling with their available resources. Only the Federal Government can help to do this job. Without the Federal Government the cities are strangling.

This is not because the cities and urban States have not been trying. Between 1946 and 1964 local debt rose from $13.6 billion to $68.4 billion while Federal debt increased from $269 billion to $312 billion. On a per capita basis, local debt in that period rose from $97 to $357 while the Federal debt per capita actually decreased by about $300. At the same time the sources of revenue for the cities have been drying up. In 1932 the municipalities were collecting 52 percent of all taxes, more than the Federal and State Governments combined. By 1962 the cities' share of revenues had dropped to 7.3 percent.

What this means is that the Federal commitment to aid the cities needs to be greatly increased and intensified. It is almost unthinkable that as recently as 1963 Federal aid to cities for housing and community development was only $400 million compared to $7.7 billion spent by the Department of Agriculture and $1.9 billion for interstate highways. It has been estimated that, even with the war on poverty, total expenditures for urban aid are less than 1 percent of the entire Federal budget.

Clearly there needs to be a massive reevaluation of our Federal Government's expenditures, other than those for defense, international affairs, space, veterans, and interest costs. These civilian expenditures account for between 20 and 26 percent of the total budget. A major question is whether there should not be some reallocation of our civilian expenditures as between urban and nonurban purposes. A second major question is whether there should not be massive new programs designed specifically for aid to the cities, for example, in housing, schools, recreation, parks, policing, social services. A third major question is whether out of its expected increase in tax revenuses the Federal Government should not share some percentage of its revenue with the States, as I have proposed in S. 2619.

Finally, as this report documents, there is much that could and should be done to make many of the urban-related programs already in operation more equitably geared to the needs of the urban centers:

1. Allocation formulas should be amended to eliminate the per capita income feature, which distorts the shares received by the urban States, and in the absence of a more equitable and sensitive measure, population alone or the density of population should be the basis for allocation.

2. Maximum and minimum limitations on amounts for each State, which also distort the allocations, should be repealed.

3. Matching requirements which vary according to per capita income should be amended, and matching requirements should be reevaluated to determine their adequacy, particularly in relation to each other as competing demands for available State and local funds.

4. Legislators from urban States should seek alternative methods to determine the need in urban States, such as, for example, measures which effectively incorporate differences in the cost of providing governmental services in the most densely populated urban centers.

Clearly the highest priorities should go to amending those allocation formulas and matching requirements which not only use a per capita income factor but intensify that factor by squaring it, such as those in the Hill-Burton hospital and medical facilities and the vocational rehabilitation programs, and those, such as the urban renewal, low-income housing, urban mass transportation, and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs, which impose maximum limitations on each State's share. But as the analyses show, there are many other programs which do not have such obvious distorting factors on their face but which nonetheless result in disproportionately low amounts for the urban centers, and priorities among these should be established.

5. We should also support early enactment of S. 561, pending before the House Government Operations Committee, which calls for periodic congressional review of further grant-in-aid programs, so that allocation features are not endlessly perpetuated without any conscious reevaluation from time to time as conditions change.

In short, it is high time that the legislators from urban States became as sensitive to the significance of allocation patterns for Federal funds as those from nonurban States obviously have been for many years.

TRIBUTES TO FORMER SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, on November 11 of last year, Senator Harry F. Byrd resigned the seat he had held in the Senate since 1933. On that day the Senate lost one of the great statesmen of all time, and the Committee on Finance lost a great chairman.

During the nearly 33 years he served in the Senate, Harry F. Byrd's career was marked by the highest degree of personal integrity attainable. I recall two instances which epitomize this fine trait. Several years ago, the Finance Committee had before it legislation which reduced tax burdens on shareholders of one of our better known corporations. Senator Byrd held some of the stock of this corporation. Feeling he could not conscientiously vote a tax amendment which would benefit himself, Harry Byrd, at considerable personal sacrifice, sold those securities before the Finance Committee acted on that bill, thus eliminating what he perceived to be a conflict of personal and public interests.

Again in 1962, during Finance Committee consideration of the revenue bill of that year, an amendment was discussed to provide a 7-percent tax credit for certain investments in depreciable property. One of the chairman's apple plants had burned and he had rebuilt it. The tax credit would have applied to much of his investment. In his mind, this tax credit raised another conflict between private interests and public duty. Characteristically, he solved this conflict by voting to authorize an amendment to make the credit inapplicable in his situation.

Congress' and the Nation's high regard for his convictions on Federal financial policies is well-mirrored in the fact that Harry F. Byrd is the only person ever to serve as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. This important congressional committee was created in 1941 and Senator Byrd was its chairman continuously through both Democratic and Republican control of the Congress until his retirement in November of last year.

Harry F. Byrd served his State in high public office longer than any other Virginian. This could not have happened unless the voters of Virginia held the same high esteem for him as those of us who worked with him in the Senate, particularly those fortunate enough to serve under his leadership on the Committee on Finance.

Harry F. Byrd was the 27th Senator to serve as chairman of the Committee on Finance since its creation 150 years ago. He was the second Virginian to achieve this high honor, and his name will rank among the notable Senators, such as Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and Walter F. George, who headed the committee in years gone by.

Harry F. Byrd was assigned to the Committee on Finance at the time he entered the Senate in 1933. His tenure as chairman began in 1955 and covered many difficult years—years of great change in the affairs of our Nation. His service as chairman will be long remembered for the unceasing sense of fairness and impartiality with which he presided and for his great courtesy in working with other members of the committee.

I want to stress these characteristics because they reveal more than any other

the true measure of the man. These are the characteristics the committee insisted be inscribed on the resolution of appreciation for his many years of service and leadership. This resolution was unanimously agreed to by the committee at its first meeting following his retirement. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this resolution be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION, COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, U.S. SENATE

Whereas Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia, served honorably and faithfully as a member of the Committee on Finance from March 9, 1933, until he retired from the U.S. Senate on November 10, 1965; and

Whereas Harry Flood Byrd served with highest distinction as chairman of the Committee on Finance from January 11, 1955, until November 10, 1965; and

Whereas during the entire period of his membership and chairmanship of the Committee on Finance, Harry Flood Byrd continuously manifested the highest principles of government and exercised the highest qualities of leadership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance hereby expresses its profound gratitude to Harry Flood Byrd for his outstanding service to the committee during his long and fruitful membership on the committee and particularly during his chairmanship of the committee, its deep appreciation for the gentlemanly and impartial manner in which he served as chairman of the committee, and its humble thanks for the countless courtesies extended by him while chairman to all members of the committee.

RUSSELL B. LONG, GEORGE A. SMATHERS, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, ALBERT GORE, HERMAN E. TALMADGE, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, VANCE HARTKE, J. W. FULBRIGHT, ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, FRANK CARLSON, WALLACE F. BENNETT, CARL T. CURTIS, THRUSTON B. MORTON, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN.

(Given at Washington, District of Columbia, this 19th day of January 1966.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, we all know the great pain Harry Byrd endured the last several months—pain which made it difficult for him to perform his duties as well as he would have liked. It is a tribute to him that he chose to retire from the Senate when he felt his health no longer permitted him to serve his State with the vigor of other years.

His retirement is well-earned and richly deserved. I wish him many years of peaceful relaxation in the hills of Virginia he loves so well. I leave him with this thought: The Committee on Finance will be a better committee because of Harry Byrd's dedicated leadership.

One of the marks of a great chairman, which was so typical of Harry Byrd was that when he found himself in opposition to the position of a majority of his committee he never took advantage of his chairmanship to prevent the committee from acting on a measure. He made his position clear and voted as his conscience dictated, but I never knew him to cast an irresponsible vote.

In his service in the Senate, if he found himself opposed to a measure, never would he vote to make it a still worse measure. He only wanted to see it improved.

Harry Byrd was a magnificent example for all of us. I believe that the courtesy and consideration he showed to every member of the committee probably exceeded that of anybody who ever served in the Senate or in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I am very happy to join the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] in the tribute which he has paid to Senator Byrd.

I served for approximately 10 years on the Finance Committee with Senator Byrd during the period of his chairmanship.

I suppose that no two men on the Finance Committee differed more than I did with the Senator from Virginia because our theories of taxation differed very sharply. Also, our belief in what the procedure of the committee should be was in sharp disagreement.

But I wish to say that no man could have treated me with greater consideration and courtesy than the Senator from Virginia. He was a model of fairness. Whatever may have been his private opinions they were carefully concealed. He was always courteous and gentlemanly, and, with me, an example of how to behave on any issue.

I join my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, in paying tribute to Senator Byrd for this feature of his character.

We all wish him a very happy life, and I hope that the graciousness of his spirit may spread, even though the economic soundness of his ideas may not be fully accepted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, last November the senior Senator from Virginia, Harry Flood Byrd, resigned from the U.S. Senate.

Since his resignation, scores of editorials and columns have been written extolling his outstanding record as a public official, but none more accurately describes the characteristics of this great American than the article by William S. White entitled "Byrd Leaves the Senate."

I read the article:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 15, 1965]

BYRD LEAVES THE SENATE

(By William S. White)

Harry Flood Byrd of Virginia is leaving the Senate of the United States and in his departure the Nation at large should sense the tolling of a nostalgic bell in its public life.

For more than Byrd is leaving. Going with him are irreplaceable qualities rarer and bigger than all manner of ideological and partisan jawings. His retirement to the worn beauty of his country place, Rosemont, in the 79th year of his life and the 33d year of his service to the Senate, is like a parting of the rope of time and tradition.

For Byrd the great conservative will be missed as no Senator has been missed since Robert A. Taft of Ohio left both the Senate and this life in 1953. This is not because of the views of Byrd of Virginia, nor because Byrd of Virginia has been among the right-minded and the winners. It is because however wrong he has been—and even to this unashamedly friendly columnist he has been rather often wrong—he has been so gallantly wrong, so bravely among the losers.

The kind of world Harry Byrd loves has not for a long time been the real world. But he has been unterrified all the same. To the end, against all the odds, he has fought with skill and valor, without hatred or intolerance or malice or littleness, to restore a world that once was but will never be again.

For Harry Byrd's true contribution to our national affairs has not been what he has done, but rather how he has done it. Since the war at any rate, that is, since 1946, when this writer first began intimately to observe the Senate, no man there has so embodied absolute honesty, absolute honor, absolute integrity.

Endlessly, the liberals and the moderates despaired of him—and equally endlessly they respected and valued him in ways that no other was quite respected and valued in his time. When for example, the notably liberal President Johnson kissed the hand of this patriarch on the occasion of Mrs. Byrd's death the compulsive gesture of affection was not for what Byrd thought. It was for what Byrd was.

Endlessly, the far rightists sought to capture him; but endlessly they mistook their man. Though most of our public policies for 30 years had shaken him to the heart and he was their tireless opponent, he never for a moment embraced a politics of mere bitterness, a politics of spite and destruction.

Whenever and wherever he fought, sometimes alone, sometimes in a diminishing company of other Old Guard conservatives, he fought as a gentleman fights, knowing he would lose but determined to play the decent game to the last. Many who know only the Byrd of this prolonged resistance to change did not know the other side of Harry Byrd.

To them he was, for illustration, only an opponent of school integration. But this same Byrd as Governor of Virginia put through the first tough antilynching law in the Nation. This same Byrd a generation ago brought the Ku Klux Klan to its knees in Virginia.

This same Byrd smashed the power of a dreadfully wrong politico-clerical movement, associated with prohibition extremism and whispered anti-Catholicism, which once threatened to seize the whole of the Protestant South. It is one of the many ironies about this undemanding and totally unsnobbish aristocrat that the well-known "Byrd machine" arose from the necessity to beat the political parsons, to halt a new wave of know-nothingism.

Harry Flood Byrd never burned a witch nor put a dissenter to the rack, not even in the fiercest of all his battles. He is a man who goes far back, far beyond that Confederate South of which many suppose him to be an automatic champion. He goes back to the British colonial Cavaliers, men gayly untroubled in the full exercise of their privileges but bound by hoops of iron to the Spartan discharge of their responsibilities as they saw them.

It was my privilege to serve 19 years in the Senate with this great American, and during that period I came to respect him as a man of high principles, a man of impeccable integrity, a man of courage, and a man who never forgot that his office was a public trust. As a public official he was a dedicated servant of the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia and of the United States of America.

The Commonwealth of Virginia has an enviable record of producing great men, including many of our early Presidents, and Senator Byrd's name will go down in history as one of Virginia's great. His departure from the Senate is a loss to his State and to our country.

I join his host of friends, both in the Senate and throughout America, in

wishing him many years of good health and a well-earned retirement.

In recognition of the outstanding services of Senator Byrd both as a Senator and for 10 years as chairman of the Committee on Finance, our committee at its first executive session, on January 19, unanimously adopted a resolution expressing our appreciation and respect.

The text of this resolution was inscribed on a bronze plaque to be presented to Senator Byrd.

I read the inscription which appears thereon:

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION, COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, U.S. SENATE

Whereas Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia, served honorably and faithfully as a member of the Committee on Finance from March 9, 1933, until he retired from the U.S. Senate on November 10, 1965; and

Whereas Harry Flood Byrd served with highest distinction as chairman of the Committee on Finance from January 11, 1955, until November 10, 1965; and

Whereas during the entire period of his membership and chairmanship of the Committee on Finance, Harry Flood Byrd continuously manifested the highest principles of Government and exercised the highest qualities of leadership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance hereby expresses its profound gratitude to Harry Flood Byrd for his outstanding service to the committee during his long and fruitful membership on the committee and particularly during his chairmanship of the committee, its deep appreciation for the gentlemanly and impartial manner in which he served as chairman of the committee, and its humble thanks for the countless courtesies extended by him while chairman to all members of the committee.

RUSSELL B. LONG, GEORGE A. SMATHERS, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, ALBERT GORE, HERMAN E. TALMADGE, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, VANCE HARTKE, J. W. FULBRIGHT, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, FRANK CARLSON, WALLACE F. BENNETT, CARL T. CURTIS, THRUSTON B. MORTON, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

(Given at Washington, District of Columbia, this 19th day of January 1966.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, former Senator Harry F. Byrd served in the U.S. Senate longer than any Senator from Virginia, and with a distinction surpassed by no Virginia Senator in the past 100 years.

It was my good fortune to have been closely associated with Senator Byrd, Senior, in Virginia politics for the past 50 years. By a singular coincidence we were born in the same town, and the same doctor brought us both into the world, I preceding him by 13 days.

At the age of 28 we were elected to the State senate in 1915, and were associated in the political life of the State for the next half century. We were deskmates in the State senate for 6 years. I served in his cabinet when he was Governor, and we both entered Congress in 1933, he in the Senate and I in the House.

Having known the record of Virginia Governors for a long period, and having studied the record of those before I entered public life, I am definitely of the opinion that the accomplishments of Byrd as Governor of Virginia are on a par with his accomplishments as a U.S. Senator; namely, they have not been surpassed in 100 years.

Senator Byrd, Senior, like George Washington, read and studied widely. Washington became the richest man in the United States. Harry Byrd is far from being the richest man even in Virginia, but you can count on the fingers of your hand men who started in business while still in their teens and without financial backing got rich out of farming. That was exactly what Harry F. Byrd accomplished in the apple orchard business, having been for some years the largest apple grower in the United States.

But it was as a U.S. Senator that Byrd won national recognition and fame. Year after year as a member of the Committee on Finance, and later as its chairman, he worked on an ever-increasing program of Federal taxation. During 10 of my years in the House I was privileged to help write 12 tax bills, which then came to the Committee on Finance. So even before I joined him as his colleague in the Senate I was quite familiar with the fine work he was doing in the field of taxation.

Senator Byrd, Senior, had qualities I have always regarded as essential to success in business or politics—character, courage, integrity, commonsense, and a willingness to sacrifice in order to reach an objective.

His work in the Senate for more than 30 years in behalf of sound fiscal policies will long be remembered. It gives me great satisfaction to hear those who served in the Senate with him voice those same sentiments.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, service in the Senate brings many privileges, not the least of which is the privilege to associate and develop friendships with other fine men and women who also serve. I have counted myself most fortunate because in 1953 I was given a place on the Committee on Finance, of which Senator Harry Byrd was then a ranking member and later the chairman. This was the basis of an association and friendship which has grown over all the years between. With the friendship there also grew a tremendous and profound respect for this quiet Virginia gentleman so devoted to the fundamental and traditional principles of our Government, whose establishment was influenced so much by other great Virginians in the beginning of our history. Senator Harry Byrd was a worthy modern representative of these men and brought into all of his Senate activities the spirit that they represented.

I certainly had no quarrel with his determination to resign because in every way this seemed to be the wise thing for him to do, but by this action he left a real void in the committee, in the Senate, and in the image of our Government that exists in the minds and hearts of most Americans. He is the personal embodiment of all the desirable attributes of fine character and, in addition, became the personal symbol of the need for prudence and thrift in the operation of our national affairs.

In spite of the fact that he is at present in a hospital, we have every hope that his health will again improve so that he can enjoy many more active and happy years surrounded by a fine family and the great business that he built up.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Madam President, I am proud to add a few words to the volumes that could be written about Senator Harry Byrd. I was privileged to serve on the Committee on Finance under his able leadership for only a few years; yet those years have left an indelible impression. He is a gentleman in the true sense of the word—courteous, responsible, and a man of integrity.

The distinguished chairman represents a great family with a long and honorable history. He epitomizes the best of a tradition of service carried on over many generations.

Whether one agreed with his social and economic philosophy or not, Chairman Byrd never varied in his courteous and attentive manner. Many pieces of legislation were passed by this body, with which he did not agree; yet he never blocked the will of a majority of his committee.

The Senate will miss Harry Byrd, and his long and distinguished career will always grace the history of this Nation and the Commonwealth of Virginia. I join my colleagues in wishing him much happiness and health among his beloved apple orchards of Virginia.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, I join my colleagues, especially those who are members of the Committee on Finance, in expressing appreciation for the person, character, and service of Senator Byrd. He is one of the most gracious individuals I have ever known.

He and I, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] spoke earlier with respect to himself, differed deeply on many subjects, but certainly not concerning the great decencies of our civilization or of our democratic processes.

I wish to express to Senator Byrd and to his family my own warm and affectionate greetings and appreciation for his many kindnesses to a much younger man in service, kindnesses always rendered without any condescension but with real affection and a friendliness which made it possible to accept the kind of help he gave to so many of us.

We shall miss him greatly. We shall never forget him. We are happy that we had the privilege of serving in the Senate when he was serving.

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, Harry Flood Byrd became a Member of the U.S. Senate on March 4, 1933, and retired late last year, after having served over 30 years in this body.

During his service he was nationally recognized as the "watchdog" of the U.S. Treasury. I know personally of his active interest in preserving the solvency of the U.S. Government, as I was privileged to serve with him for a number of years on the Senate Finance Committee, of which he was chairman.

He was truly a dedicated public servant and held many positions of honor and trust in the great Commonwealth of Virginia.

He always had the courage to stand by his convictions on matters affecting his State or the Nation, regardless of whether they were the popular position of the times.

He is a kindly man and those of us who served under him as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee had an opportunity to observe this quality and also his forbearance and patience as he dealt with the problems confronting the committee.

Harry Byrd truly typifies the virtues of a perfect gentleman, among which are patience, generosity, humility, courtesy, unselfishness, sincerity, and honesty. He is a true representative of southern aristocracy.

I am grateful that I had the opportunity of knowing and serving with Senator Byrd and I wish for him many years of well-earned and well-deserved rest.

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, the resignation of Senator Harry F. Byrd from this body has left a vacancy which no one else is likely to fill. His long service in the Senate was one in which his position was a consistent one, based on the same principles which he applied to his State as Governor and in his later concern with the operations of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

As a member of the Finance Committee, I served under his chairmanship. I did not always agree with the views of the chairman, and there were times when the committee as a whole did not agree with him. But when we did disagree, Senator Byrd remained always the kindly and courteous gentleman. He was a firm believer in the democratic process, and he exercised that belief without rancor even when the workings of democracy seemed to defeat his own views.

There is no doubt that there is a continuing need for scrutiny of the operations of government in order to maintain wisdom in our spending. Senator Byrd was a watchdog of expenditures, an embodiment of what some might call the old-fashioned virtues of thrift and care, and his motive was that of concern for the best welfare of the Nation.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, Senator Byrd and I often disagreed on legislation, but there was no man in the Senate for whom all of us—and that includes myself—had greater respect, for his sincerity, his integrity, his deep interest in a subject, and his strong convictions. Nor has there been a more charming gentleman in the Senate.

I join with my fellow Senators, Madam President, in saying that we shall miss him greatly, in the amalgam of what we hope is vitally important thought to our Nation and the world which constitutes the judgment of the Senate, and wish him many continued years of happiness, health, and a voice in the affairs of our Nation.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, Senator Harry Byrd, who served in this body for so long and with such distinction, possessed unusual personal characteristics. He was a very gentle man, a very generous gentleman in his relationships with fellow Senators.

He was a very considerate committee chairman. His consideration applied to new members on the committee as well as to its senior members.

His gentleness and consideration for his fellow man was demonstrated time after time, not only in the equation between himself and other members of the Finance Committee but also in his attitude toward witnesses before the committee. He was anxious that on every issue on which a hearing was requested, the people be heard. He was anxious that every witness who wished to be heard have the opportunity to voice his views. Many days he occupied the chair as chairman of that committee for many hours, tiresome hours sometimes, in order to hear out spokesmen and interested citizens with respect to the issues before the committee.

With respect to suggestions, amendments, views, the right to be heard, the right to have suggestions considered, his attitude as chairman was exemplary. It was a pleasure to serve on the committee with this gentle gentleman, and under his chairmanship of that very important committee.

My gratitude, my respect, my esteem, my friendship, and my affection are possessed by him in full measure.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, as a newcomer to the Senate Finance Committee, I did not have the opportunity to serve under the chairmanship of Senator Byrd. But I did observe and respect him even before I came to Congress 14 years ago. He was one of the first men I met after my election in 1952. His leadership and his integrity has been an inspiration to hundreds of Members of Congress. A dedicated and devoted Senator in the finest tradition of the U.S. Senate he will be long remembered as a fine citizen, a faithful and conscientious Member of Congress and a just and hard working chairman of a great committee of the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I would like to join and concur in the remarks made by the present chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the able and distinguished Senator from Louisiana, Senator LONG, and other members of the Finance Committee, in paying tribute to our former chairman, Senator Harry F. Byrd.

The public record of Senator Harry Flood Byrd, Madam President, is one in the finest traditions of the State of Virginia and the United States. Integrity and selfless public service have been the hallmarks of this fine American, Harry Byrd.

For the better part of this century, the name of Harry Byrd has been a valued one in the field of public service. He was first of service to his beloved Shenandoah Valley of Virginia and was president of the Valley Turnpike Co. in 1908–18. From 1915 to 1925 he served in the State Senate of Virginia. In 1918, he was fuel commissioner for the Commonwealth of Virginia. In 1922, he was elected chairman of the Democratic State Committee. From 1926 to 1930, Harry Flood Byrd was Governor of Virginia, where he wrote a magnificent record of public administration.

Appointed to the U.S. Senate to fill an unexpired term, Senator Byrd came to these historic chambers on March 4, 1933, and served thereafter for 32 years, before submitting his resignation—announced on November 11, 1965.

The esteem and respect which he has enjoyed from his colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the Congress for performing great service to this Nation has never been equaled. As chairman of the Finance Committee he was always fair, objective, and patient. At no time did he ever delay or discriminate against proposed legislation, even though he was opposed to some measures that came before our committee. He is a man of sterling character and superb ability. Despite his many responsibilities and nagging troubles he always was courteous, thoughtful and kind. In addition to being a great Senator from Virginia, he was a great friend and great man. We in the Congress miss Senator Harry Flood Byrd. I am sure that the people of Virginia and the Nation miss his courageous voice almost as much as we do. But he has left for us all a great legacy—one to inspire us to greater selflessness, more arduous labors, and a higher sense of duty. I happily and eagerly join my colleagues in expressing my sincere hope that he will have a very speedy recovery and enjoy many, many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, I want to add my voice in praise of Senator Harry Flood Byrd who served so long and so well as a Senator from the State of Virginia.

Senator Harry F. Byrd is the most consistent public official that I have ever met in my life. He is Mr. Sound Fiscal Policy. He has never waivered. He has never yielded to pressure. He has never changed his views when they were unpopular. Senator Byrd's position on spending has not often prevailed. Our country would have been much better off if his ideas on spending had prevailed.

Senator Byrd is a very kind man. He is a gentleman in the truest sense of the word. He is always extremely courteous. He is always considerate of the views of his colleagues and has never been critical of those who disagreed with him. He has written a record in the U.S. Senate that will stand for all time. He is truly one of the Republic's great men. I hope that he enjoys many happy years in his retirement.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Madam President, I wish to join with my colleagues in the Senate in paying tribute to one of the all-time great Members of the Senate, our good friend Harry F. Byrd, Sr.

Harry Byrd is known throughout the length and breadth of this land for many phases of his outstanding work in the Senate. The one field in which he has no peer is in his long and effective efforts for a sound and stable Federal Government. He believed in economy first, last, and always.

Above all, he always believed in constitutional government and all that it stands for. No one was a more effective advocate of States rights and he fought

with all his heart in the rearguard action to maintain those principles of government that he held so dear.

Senator Byrd is a southern gentleman of the old school—always courteous, considerate, and friendly. He was a proud and stately representative of his beloved Old Dominion of Virginia continuing the proud tradition of the Byrd family dating back even beyond the founding of our Republic.

I am honored and privileged to have been able to serve with him during his last 21 years in the Senate. May his *retirement be* long and pleasant.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Madam President, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our good friend, Harry Flood Byrd.

The Senate has not been the same since Senator Byrd retired, and it will take a long time for us to get used to the fact that he is not in the Chamber and is not at work in the Senate Finance Committee.

We know how much he looked forward to retirement, but still we wish he had remained with us. We can only hope that he is enjoying his leisure days and wish the very best for him always.

No American has given more dedicated service to his Nation than Harry Byrd. Even though there were many who disagreed with the positions he took and his philosophy of government, all who knew him admired him and respected him for being the gentleman he always is, no matter what the situation might be.

Even though we miss his friendly and always courteous manner, he has left in the record he made a challenge to all of us—respect and work for sound fiscal management of the Federal Government.

I am sure that as time goes on we will call upon him to give us the benefit of his advice and wisdom even though he no longer serves as a Member of this body.

Mr. MORTON. Madam President, all I can say is that Harry Flood Byrd is the greatest statesman I have ever known and certainly the greatest gentleman.

Mr. Harry, I salute you.

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, the presence of Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., is sorely missed in the Senate. No man I have known since coming to the Senate have I regarded more highly than Senator Harry Byrd. One of the greatest pleasures of my service in the Senate was my personal association with Senator Byrd; and I am particularly reminded today, as the Senate undertakes consideration of the first major tax measure since Senator Byrd's resignation from the Senate, of the absence of Senator Byrd's counsel and experience in Government fiscal matters. He was one of the soundest men in Government, and the Nation benefited tremendously from his long and dedicated service. I would hope that the Senate in its consideration of the tax measure which is before it, and in the future, particularly when it is considering fiscal matters, will recall the example and sage advice of Senator Harry Byrd, who never swerved from his dedication to principles of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, when that great gentleman of the U.S. Senate, Harry F. Byrd, retired, he was termed by the Washington Star the man "who in 33 years in the Senate has become the Nation's leading symbol of fiscal economy and conservatism." And predating the retirement by some 2 years was the comment by columnist William S. White that "all of the U.S. Senators think of Harry Byrd as a man of absolute integrity, absolute honesty, absolute courage."

These two observations I believe, Madam President, summarize the feeling of the Senate and the Nation for the retired senior Senator from Virginia.

Since my first day in the Senate, this grand gentleman had been ever present to offer me advice, to give me assistance, and to guide and counsel me. Although of different parties, we were of like mind and philosophy and I came to regard Harry F. Byrd as a gentleman, a statesman, a man of tremendous stature who was big enough to chart the fiscal course of this great Nation and humble enough to help a junior Senator with any problem, large or small.

Seldom does it come to anyone to do as much for his country as Harry Byrd did for the United States.

I think it well to look very briefly at the Senator's career. He entered the publishing business at the tender age of 15 and began to grow apples before he was 20. Before his 21st birthday he was elected to the Winchester City Council and to the State senate at 27. At 33 this precocious and phenomenal gentleman from Virginia was the Governor of his State and as all of us know, he has been U.S. Senator from Virginia since 1933.

Madam President, I was in Wyoming when Senator Byrd announced his retirement from the Senate of the United States. Like my colleagues, and the people of Wyoming to whom Senator Byrd was a symbol of Americanism and dollar-and-cents commonsense, I was shocked and grieved, for I knew that with that announcement there was created a vacuum in the U.S. Senate.

I join today with my colleagues in a tribute to a man richly deserving of accolades. I wish the gentleman from Virginia a long, happy, and productive life because his counsel and advice and his influence on our Government has not ended with the termination of his Senate career.

Madam President, I ask that an article by Mr. William S. White, printed from the April 1933 Reader's Digest, be printed in the RECORD in the context of my remarks.

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

[A Reader's Digest reprint, April 1963]

MEET THE HONORABLE HARRY (THE RARE) BYRD

(By William S. White)

(NOTE.—Even those who disagree with his policies cannot help liking and admiring the patriarch from Virginia as a man of integrity and courage.)

A veteran Congressman said recently, "There are three parties in the U.S. Senate—the Democratic Party, the Republican Party and the party of Harry Byrd. Harry is far too fond of the old Democratic Party ever to leave it, and he is too oldfashioned a southern gentleman ever to join the Republican Party. So, he has his own party—the Byrd-Democratic Party."

Harry Flood Byrd of Virginia is the Senate's southern conservative patriarch. Some of his colleagues think of him as a force of "reaction" and pennypinching; others think of him as the last, best guard over the Federal Treasury, the last, best hope against Federal intervention in State and local affairs. But all of them think of Harry Byrd as a man of absolute integrity, absolute honesty, absolute courage.

Why absolute integrity? Because he votes as he believes. Why absolute honesty? Because he says what he believes, and only what he believes. Why absolute courage? Because no mere part-time valor can arm any man to vote invariably, and to speak invariably, only upon his own convictions.

Two years ago when the Senate voted on the Kennedy administration's proposals to extend unemployment insurance, Byrd lost, by only two votes, his fight to preserve the principle of State responsibility for the administration and distribution of the funds. But he did not, as a lesser man might, take the narrow defeat as a personal rebuke and go off sulking. Byrd, confident that his convictions were right, stayed on the floor. When the Senate clerk had called the last name and it was apparent how the vote had gone, Senators who had opposed him went to Byrd's front-row desk to congratulate him for his fortitude.

This respect for Byrd is bipartisan. When, after years of Democratic Party rule in Congress, the Republicans won a majority and the right to name committee chairmen in 1947 and 1953, they asked Byrd to remain as chairman of the House-Senate Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which he had been instrumental in setting up in 1941. "That's Byrd's committee and he should keep on running it," one Republican explained. Today, the committee is one of the best sources of information about Government spending. Byrd, with 21 years as chairman, has been head of a congressional committee for a longer unbroken time than any other man in history.

Byrd is a true aristocrat, perhaps the last in the Senate and one of a nostalgic few remaining on the U.S. political scene. The name Byrd has been written across all the pages of Virginia's history since 1674. Yet, like many aristocrats, Byrd seems unconscious of his status. A thrifty man who has a horror of any kind of "show," he could be picked as the least well-dressed member on the Senate floor. He drives only low-priced automobiles. He buckets around his vast apple orchards in the Shenandoah Valley (he is the largest individual grower in the world) and around his hometown of Berryville in khaki pants and shirt like a farmer on the way to the general store.

Byrd's sole visible symbol of status is his white-pillared country house, "Rosemont," which surmounts Berryville like a manor house over an English village. When, and very rarely, Byrd entertains at Rosemont (always in the spring, when the apple blossoms cover the hills), "H. F. Byrd," the apple-grower, and Harry Flood Byrd, the U.S. Senator, become simply Byrd of Rosemont. In these moments Byrd is dressed for the role of southern squire, usually in white linen gleaming against his reddish, apple-cheeked face and his blue, amused eyes.

But Byrd's public life is his real life, and has been for 55 of his 75 years. His father,

Richard Evelyn Byrd (the late admiral and explorer of the same name was Harry Byrd's younger brother), had sat with such absorption as speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates that he had neglected both his law practice and the small family fortune bound up in the Winchester Star. The Star had become so debt ridden that the elder Byrd had about decided to liquidate it. But Harry Byrd, although only 15, asked permission to quit high school and have a go at the paper.

His first problem was a heavy indebtedness to the firm that supplied the newsprint. He persuaded that firm to send newsprint c.o.d.—one day's supply at a time. By day-and-night collection of bills owed the Star and by working as manager of the local Bell Telephone office, young Harry managed to pay for each shipment of paper as it arrived. And, finally, through his managerial skill, all back bills, too, were paid, and the newspaper became solvent.

But from early boyhood Harry Byrd had meant to be a public man. He was elected to the Winchester city council before he was 21, to the State senate at 27, and was Governor of Virginia at 38. He has been a U.S. Senator since 1933, the year in which Franklin D. Roosevelt entered the White House.

In the years since he left Virginia statehouse, Byrd has "had some little hand," as he puts it, in the election of nine Governors of Virginia. Eight have been "Byrd men"—men who in general have shared his philosophy of fiscal prudence and belief in the maintenance of worthwhile traditions.

The "Byrd organization" is no Tammany Hall, no machine like the one the Republicans once had in Pennsylvania. It is variously described as "an association of like-minded men" (by its friends) and as "Harry Byrd's steamroller" (by his enemies). In the organization there are no direct ukases from on high; Byrd does not personally pick who is to run for what office. Still, when election time comes around, everybody in Virginia knows how "the Senator" feels. Byrd himself says, "For the success that I have had and the organization has had, there is, I think, one very simple explanation: I have always been conservative and it has always been conservative."

The catalyst that formed "the organization" came in 1923, when Virginia was torn by a debate over how to pay for badly needed highways. Byrd, as a State senator, advocated building modern roads; but unlike his opponents he felt the $50 million cost should be paid as the roads were built rather than by floating a bond issue. Resolving to carry the decision to the people, he slogged through the muddy roads to nearly every city and village in the State. Byrd's proposal was simple: "Pull the farmers out of the mud, but do it sanely through a pay-as-you-go gasoline tax." The voters were convinced; the proposal for a bond issue was defeated, and Byrd became the logical choice for Governor.

As chief executive, Byrd streamlined the State constitution until it became a model studied throughout the United States. He changed a $1,900,000 budget deficit into a $5,700,000 surplus. He persuaded the legislature to pass a tough law that ended lynching in Virginia. He lured new industry, and put Virginia on such a sound financial basis that, while it now ranks well above the national average in growth, expenditures for education, and percentage of surfaced highways, it has virtually no State debt.

Never has "the organization" been remotely accused of corruption. One of Byrd's few orders (decisions he calls them) to "the organization" was to resist the slightest touch of influence peddling. Indeed, Byrd's own antagonism to influence peddling is so marked as to seem to more relaxed politicians almost an obsession. For example, when President Eisenhower named Charles E. Wilson of General Motors as Secretary of Defense in 1952, nearly all of Washington assumed that Wilson would have no trouble in being confirmed by the Senate. But Byrd, though a strongly probusiness politician, read the conflict-of-interest laws to say that Wilson must sell his stock in General Motors, which held large contracts with the Defense Department.

There was a hard deadlock between these two hard-minded men. Other Senators wanted a compromise; Byrd would have none of it. Wilson threatened to "go over the Senate's head" with a television appeal to the country. (What he meant was to "go over Byrd's head.") Byrd told him, "Mr. Wilson, I do hope you won't do that. It would be very bad—for you." Wilson finally sold his stock.

Byrd's insistence on budget balancing, on pay as you go, and his hostility to the spread of Federal powers often irritate his colleagues, but they could hardly imagine the Senate without him. In 1958 he announced that he was retiring. Mrs. Byrd had been ill, and he had promised her that he would not run again. There was an outpouring of genuine regret in the U.S. Senate, but the general assembly of Virginia did more than regret. It passed a resolution, the first of its kind, calling on him to reconsider. "The general welfare of the entire United States and Virginia demands his continued service," the resolution concluded.

Byrd, bearing his promise in mind, went to Mrs. Byrd with the assembly's request. She herself wrote a letter to the assembly: "I have looked forward to my husband's retirement, but I do not feel that my hope should obstruct the judgment of those better informed than I who think he can render a public service in these trying days."

So Byrd ran again for the U.S. Senate. His favorite corner there is the finance committee, of which he is chairman. He fights a cheerful but endless rearguard action against too much spending, too much foreign economic aid, too much intrusion by the Federal power. His arguments, in brief, almost offhand speeches, are never stilled.

Hundreds of major legislative actions in the fiscal field over the years have borne the imprint of Byrd's thrifty hand. The soundness of the social security system, for one, represents an enduring Byrd victory. From the enactment of the law in 1935, Byrd was dissatisfied with it, because it promised billions of dollars in pensions but offered no guaranteed means for paying the bill. He wanted nothing less than a pay-as-you-go plan—and 4 years later, in 1939, Congress accepted a Byrd amendment for pay as you go.

Seventeen years later, when the Eisenhower administration proposed the vast multibillion-dollar highway program now in the process of lacing this country, Byrd returned to the same principle. Eisenhower and George M. Humphrey, then Secretary of the Treasury, wanted to finance the system with a bond issue which would augment the already mountainous Federal debt. Byrd told them, "Roads, yes, gentlemen. Bonds, no, gentlemen." When the Federal Highway Act of 1956 was finally adopted, it carried Byrd's pay-as-you-go financing plan.

He fights doggedly even on small items. When in 1945 the time came for President Franklin D. Roosevelt's fourth inauguration, Byrd was chairman of the inaugural committee. Congress appropriated for the occasion $25,000, to Byrd an ample sum. F.D.R., who had conducted polite but relentless warfare for years with the Senator, observed one night to friends: "Old Harry is so worried about money, I think I shall simply announce that I want nothing from him for the inauguration—not even his precious $25,000."

Byrd calmly took the President at his word. He issued orders to the inaugural committee to return the $25,000 to the Federal Treasury. Roosevelt paid for the chicken a la king inaugural luncheon out of regular White House funds.

Byrd has always assumed that because he means a thing when he says it, other public men mean what they say. Demagoguery is utterly foreign to him; he never hides his motives or apologizes for his actions. "I just go on my regular course," Byrd was quoted by Time. "I don't claim to have any special virtues at all. I just vote for what I think is right."

Truman once said that there were "too many Byrds" in the Senate. But there is only one Harry Flood Byrd of Virginia; and there will not soon, if ever, be another. Issues are endlessly debatable; but character is not. And Harry Byrd symbolizes a vanishing era of public men who stood to the end in awareness that their true and ultimate responsibility was to country and history.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Madam President, on behalf of the former senior Senator from Virginia, as well as on behalf of the present junior Senator from Virginia, I express my deep appreciation to the former colleagues of Senator Byrd for the beautiful tributes that have been paid to him this morning, and for the magnificent plaque which was worded and approved by the Committee on Finance, on which he served so long as chairman.

Those Senators who served with him know how deeply he revered the Senate of the United States. I believe that all Senators know how much he misses the many wonderful and warm friendships he enjoyed for so many years with his colleagues in the Senate.

Speaking from my own point of view, it was an inspiring, wonderful thing today to sit in the Senate Chamber that he loved so much and to hear so many distinguished U.S. Senators pay to my father such wonderful tributes.

Madam President, on behalf of my father and myself, I express my deep appreciation.

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, on February 23, when I introduced amendment 487 to S. 2962, to establish a Redwood National Park, I listed the following organizations which support amendment 487: Sierra Club, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Wilderness Society, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the National Parks Association, the Federation of Western Outdoors Clubs, the Izaak Walton League, the Public Affairs Institute, Trout Unlimited, the Audubon Society, and Citizens for a Redwood Park. Amendment 487 is also supported by the Garden Club of America. The Garden Club of America went on record at a hearing before the Department of the Interior last November. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the statement at that November 22, 1965, hearing by Mrs. Thomas M. Waller, president of the Garden Club of America.

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

(For presentation at a meeting to review and discuss proposals for a Redwoods National Park in California—U.S. Department

of the Interior, Washington, D.C., November 22, 1965.)

I am Mrs. Thomas Waller of Bedford Hills, N.Y., president of the Garden Club of America, a national organization with member clubs from coast to coast and in Hawaii. I greatly appreciate this opportunity to present our views on this important issue.

The concern of the Garden Club of America for the Sequoia Sempervirens is a long serial which commenced in the 1920's. In 1931 we presented 2,552 acres on the south fork of the Eel River to the California State Park system and since then have added 1,565 acres to our grove. Our interest and concern for the preservation of the Redwoods has never lessened.

We strongly advocate the establishment now of a Redwoods National Park of approximately 90,000 acres, a park which would include about 45,000 acres of virgin trees, the most significant area of primeval redwoods, and other related natural features. In considering the total acreage to be encompassed in a Redwoods National Park we are mindful of the fact that the entire area was once a virgin forest of close to 2 million acres. We believe that Prairie Creek-Lost Man Creek-Redwood Creek Valley is the most important and suitable area for inclusion in the National Park System. This contains the magnificent Gold Bluff's Seashore, with numerous waterfalls dropping down the face of Gold Bluff from the forest above, the unbelievably beautiful Fern Canyon, the world's tallest trees, and a far greater variety of scenic features than are found in any of the other proposed areas. The greatest variety of wildlife species, including the Roosevelt elk are to be found in this proposal and the area is especially important for its ecological value. Its recreational facilities are far better than those in the Del Norte County, for the magnificent Gold Bluff Beach would afford unequalled opportunities to the public for the enjoyment and use of a seashore area. In addition, the Prairie and Redwood Creek areas are better suited to absorb an increasing visitor load, without impairment, than are any of the other possible national park proposals.

Of greatest importance is the fact that the Prairie Creek-Lost Man Creek-Redwood Creek Valley contains a wider sweep of primeval redwood forest than is to be found in any other section of the redwood region; this sweep of forest extends from the near rain forest grooves in the present Prairie Creek State Park southeastward across the width of the redwood belt. Within this proposal there are also a number of unaltered tributary streams to Redwood Creek. These are practically the only streams in the redwood region today, the watersheds of which are still untouched by man.

With some 12,000 to 15,000 acres of the redwoods being logged each year it is the understatement of the century to say that time is of the essence. We urge establishment of a Redwood National Park of approximatly 90,000 acres, believe the Prairie Creek-Lost Man Creek-Redwood Creek Valley to be the most desirable area for such a park, and pray that the first act of the next session of Congress will be to pass legislation creating a Redwoods National Park of this magnitude in northwest California.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, regarding the situation in Vietnam and the reasoned, careful escalation of American military activity there, I have said on several occasions that these are steps we must take, realizing the risk of provoking mainland China. Some critics of the Government's policies seem sure that we are bound to provoke China into massive intervention in Indochina. This, they say, is a risk we cannot take.

It is, however, a risk we must take. Today's Washington Post, Madam President, treats this question with an editorial which gives little weight to the apocalyptic view of the critics I have mentioned. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1966]

WAR WITH CHINA?

Many recent critics of American policy in Vietnam fear that this policy is increasing the risk of war with China. They expect early Chinese intervention in the Vietnamese war. There is reason to believe that their expectation is ill founded.

Some American specialists on China—familiar with her conduct in past crises—have long believed that she would intervene massively in the Vietnam war only if she were attacked or if American troops invaded North Vietnam with the intention of overthrowing the Communist regime there. As one such expert has put it: "All the indications are that Peiping will only decide on direct military involvement if it believes that the United States has mounted a Yalu River-type escalation directly threatening the security of China itself." In a word, China's actual military posture in Vietnam remains essentially defensive. China's goal is to see the United States defeated by the Vietcong and to avoid itself being drawn directly into the conflict.

What in the past was based largely on educated guesswork can now be supported by an extremely significant, and largely unnoted, recent statement of China's Premier Chou En-lai. Chou, in a December 20 speech in Peiping celebrating the fifth anniversary of the founding of the National Liberation Front, outlined a number of actions the United States is preparing to take in Vietnam including the following: Bombing Haiphong and Hanoi; harassing and blockading the Bac Bo Gulf to cut the sea communications to Hanoi; bombing the Communist-held central and southern parts of Laos; dispatching United States, Thai, and Loatian Government troops to occupy this area; and instigating the Thai and South Vietnamese Governments to seal the border between Cambodia and South Vietnam.

Chou said nothing about possible Chinese responses to such action. Rather he said that if all these actions failed to save the United States from defeat in Vietnam, as he predicted they would, it is possible that the United States would "go a step further and extend its war of aggression to the whole of Indochina and to China." He strongly suggested that only at this point would China enter the war. Similarly, Foreign Minister Chen Yi, in a December 30 interview with a Japanese Communist correspondent, said in reply to a question about how China would cope with American escalation in Indochina: "If U.S. imperialism insists on extending the war to China, we cannot but resolutely take up the challenge and we will not call off the battle until complete victory."

Why should the Chinese tip their hand in this fashion? One reason might be a desire to draw the line sharply between what the United States can and cannot do in Vietnam so as to deter a premature U.S. attack on Chinese territory. Another might be to prepare the NLF for the failure of the Chinese to respond should the United States undertake the lower level actions mentioned by Chou. These actions, Chou implied, could be dealt with by the Vietnamese people themselves.

Obviously no one can be absolutely sure what U.S. actions in Vietnam might trigger a war with China. But available evidence suggests that Peiping is just as anxious to avoid a larger war as is the United States. Such a war, in which China would be extremely vulnerable to American air power, would serve no rational purpose either for China or the United States. This is not to say it could not happen. Nations have blundered into war before. The point is that both China and the United States have very strong reasons to avoid a direct confrontation in Vietnam and there is a reasonable chance that they can do so.

This does not mean that escalation carries no risk or is desirable. But it does suggest that the apocalyptic view taken by some administration critics is not appropriate to the situation. Moreover, this view hampers realistic consideration of American options.

THE MERRIMACK II STORY

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, it is an unhappy fact of life that every hair-brained scheme bearing the blessing of Government planners and bureaucrats receives front page attention, regardless of merit or return to the taxpayer, while the contributions of private investment to the growth of our economy are accepted as a matter of course, with little notice and faint praise.

We are confronted with a classic example of this in northern New England where much has been made of a proposed hydroelectric project on the St. John River. In the midst of all the clamor attending this determined effort to bring public power to my section of the country, wanted or not, needed or not, economical or not, the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire is quietly proceeding with the construction of a $37 million extension of its Bow, N.H., plant, designed to bring needed power to our State, at reduced cost to the consumer, without expense to the rest of the Nation, and with the payment of additional taxes to community and State.

As is pointed out in an excellent editorial appearing in the Manchester Union Leader for Friday, February 25, this provides a textbook lesson in the benefits of free enterprise as opposed to Government control, and I ask that the full editorial be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

I, for one, am delighted to help tell the "Merrimack II Story" and invite to the attention of the Senate that private initiative has not yet been stifled by big Government, at least in New Hampshire.

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

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Feb. 25, 1966]

WHO WILL TELL THE MERRIMACK II STORY?

Construction of a $35 million addition to the Public Service Co.'s generating plant in Bow, with an anticipated drop of between 30 and 40 percent in electricity bills, not only will provide a textbook lesson in the benefits of free enterprise as opposed to Government control, but also it will bring that lesson home with dramatic impact.

William C. Tallman, president of the firm, described this dramatic success story without need to resort to overstatement during his remarks at the recent ground-breaking ceremony. When the new addition—to be known as Merrimack II—becomes operational in

the spring of 1968, Tallman said, New Hampshire will have the lowest electric power cost of any thermal unit in the six New England States. The 350,000-kilowatt unit at Bow will cause power costs to drop from 7½ to 4.9 mills per kilowatt-hour. Thus, in the short space of one decade, the cost will have dropped from more than a cent per kilowatt-hour to less than one-half a cent.

The addition to the existing plant, 6-year-old Merrimack I, will produce a total generating capacity of 476,000 kilowatts and also will result in the employment of hundreds of New Hampshire men at the construction site.

The company's investment is a commitment not only in terms of dollars and cents, it is also an affirmation of the Public Service Co.'s confidence in the future of the Granite State. To illustrate that confidence the firm is spending $37 million on Merrimack II, the largest investment in a single factory ever made by a New Hampshire industry, and $8 million for new transmission lines. Vice President Eliot Priest estimates that some $11 million will be spent in New Hampshire for wages and materials for the construction project.

Out-of-State readers of this newspaper can breathe a sigh of relief. This is not a TVA-type project. The lowering of electricity costs here is not being accomplished at the expense of the rest of the Nation.

Since all private utilities are watched closely by the Internal Revenue Service and are forbidden to deduct the cost of certain institutional advertisements from their taxable incomes—i.e., they may not indicate a preference for investor-owned utility companies as against Government-owned plants which are the beneficiaries of tax favoritism and vast public appropriations—it is to be hoped that New Hampshire's congressional delegation will use their positions to lavish the kind of praise on Merrimack II that is lavished on public power projects.

There's no law against that—so far.

FIRST LADY'S SPEECH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, on February 25, 1966, our First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, addressed the University of Alabama and American Association of University Women Leadership Conference at Tuscaloosa, Ala.

In returning to her native Alabama to speak at the university which she once attended, Mrs. Johnson alluded to the early history of the university and emphasized the role of women in the university's development.

Mrs. Johnson indicated several areas in national life in which women are making an outstanding contribution and correctly opined "when women get behind a project, things happen."

The First Lady did not confine her praise to the ladies. Indeed, she rightfully lauded Alabama's two distinguished U.S. Senators. No one knows better than their Senate colleagues how right Mrs. Lyndon Johnson was when she said "there are two men who stand tall in the Nation's Capital." I would like to identify myself with Mrs. Johnson's tribute to two of the Senate's most able Members.

The First Lady discussed, in an engaging manner, a number of the administration's programs. I call to my colleagues' attention this very interesting and charming speech of a very lovely lady.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Johnson's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AND AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, TUSCALOOSA, ALA., FEBRUARY 25, 1966

Dr. Rose, friends, coming home is always a nostalgic experience and Alabama is second home to me. But my nostalgia is mixed with pride today as we gather at this great university. Back in the summer of 1931, I was enrolled here for 6 short weeks. Over the years, this campus has lived in my mind as the perfect setting for a college. It seemed to come right out of a novel, with all the romance and beauty that implies. I remember the patrician president's mansion and the quadrangle with its great old trees, offering welcomed shade and that comfortable feeling of deep roots. There was a marvelous swimming hole off the campus that must by now be lost to the forces of progress. But the center of life was the Union Building. We all gathered there at the Post Office. This, I am sure, is changeless.

Today on this campus we see the signs of wise planning—the careful preservation of the old and the orderly development of the new. The University of Alabama is fortunate to have a man with the stature and vision of Dr. Frank Rose to guide it through these changing and demanding times.

You have gathered here because you know that Alabama, like the rest of our country, is in transition. Your conference theme recognizes that the decade of the sixties offers both responsibility and opportunity for citizens.

In your workshops and through your speakers, you are going to examine many avenues of possible service. But I sense from the speech topics that you are also searching for the answer to a deeper question: What is the real role today of women in our type of culture, in our period in world history, in this particular part of our country? This is a never-ending search. I wish you a fruitful journey.

How can I be useful to you in this important quest? The answer lies, I believe, not in cataloging for you the problems we face or the programs and policies that need your backing. Instead, I would like to set before you an attitude of mind that I believe holds the key to all that we attempt to do.

First, let us do what all southerners love doing—let us find out who we are—identify ourselves.

You have an enviable heritage of outstanding Alabama women doers behind you. There was Julia Tutwiler in the late 1800's, who established schools for women all over Alabama and brought coeducation to this university. The officials solemnly assured her that grave consequences would follow if girls were admitted to the university. Finally, in 1896, 10 women were admitted. "Aunt Julia" remembered not to smile too widely when the girls walked away with four of the six honors awarded at graduation. The first women's dormitory was named in her honor. Her prison reforms brought about the establishment of Julia Tutwiler Prison for Women. My own cousin, Edwina Mitchell, has for many years been its director.

Who doesn't thrill over the miracle of Helen Keller, of Tuscumbia, whose indomitable spirit has given hope and encouragement to handicapped people throughout the world.

In your State capital you have a great archives, thanks to the determined efforts of Marie Bankhead Owen.

Harper Lee, a brilliant novelist who attended the university in the forties, has brought alive the warmth and humanity of a southern family in a small southern town.

And, may I add, Libby Anderson Cater, who was the only girl to be elected president of the University of Alabama student body and whose husband, Douglass Cater, is a special assistant to my husband. In raising a family and being an alert, active citizen, she is a good example of a point I want to make today.

One of the most wasted of our natural resources today is the idleness of the educated woman. Some of us never survive the battle fatigue of launching a family. Others become accustomed to being homebodies and find the old rut too comfortable, or too deep, to climb out. Or we may simply lose our self-confidence about the worth of our talents.

I am speaking particularly to you students, who have before you the wonderful prospect of raising families but also desire to keep current with the world; and to those of you who are facing a new freedom for the first time in your married lives now that the children have flown the coop. I am also speaking to those of you who are active career women already but who seek new dimensions of activity outside your professional duties.

I have made a discovery in my life that I am sure many of you have made for yourselves. It is a life-renewing discovery. There is some magical energy, a secret chemical more powerful than Adrenalin, which pushes me on when I am doing something I love.

Someday I believe that medical researchers are going to isolate habitual fatigue only to find out that it is the presence of nothing? What else can explain the fact that the men and women who love their work are able to work twice as hard and twice as long and yet remain refreshed?

We have all had periods of nothingness in our lives when we felt too tired to begin to do something. But if there is one message that I would like to give you today, it is this: be aware of your hidden strengths. You have the capacity to change the face of your community, to elevate the level of life around you. Through the centuries, women have been the prodders. Good works go forward in proportion to the number of vital and creative and determined women supporting them.

When women get behind a project, things happen.

Things happen when we organize a yard-of-the-month program to make our hometown more beautiful.

Things happen when, up in the mountains of Appalachia, women take the bookmobiles back into the forks of the creek, carrying the miracle of good reading to people who never before knew the joy of a library.

Things happen when women support a good citizenship campaign or a Headstart kindergarten for disadvantaged children or a fund drive for one of the many worthy U.N. projects.

Education is a debt to be repaid with the gift of self. But we do not have to look on this as a painful obligation. Rather each of us should choose a challenge that will make our own life richer and happier. Then, work so that at the end of the day we feel excited instead of tired—excited over what we accomplished today and what awaits us tomorrow.

There are so many worthwhile things waiting to be done. When your children make their declarations of independence, be ready to make your own.

Life around the White House these days is very much like what you're doing here. It is one continuing seminar. A short while ago, I was supposed to meet with a group to discuss the Women's Job Corps. We looked around for a place where 100 women leaders

from all over the United States could talk about the hopes and pitfalls of this great venture.

In the East Room, a ceremony was being held to honor outstanding students from 40 States. The rose garden couldn't be used because a group of ministers were gathering to discuss community relations. The State Dining Room was being prepared for a luncheon and briefing of businessmen by the President and Cabinet members.

I didn't dare try for the second floor because Luci and Lynda were in the throes of exams and had issued dramatic pleas to keep everything quiet.

So we found our meeting place down in a far corner of the south lawn amid a wonderful grove of trees. Fortunately, it was a sunny day. In 160 years, I doubt that this particular part of the White House grounds had been put to such talkative use. But we gathered there, with coffee and doughnuts, full of ideas about how to get untrained young women into jobs.

Here, as in the White House, our pulses beat with a new tempo. It is a different paced world than the one I entered as a girl when I first fell in love with Alabama. From the age of 6 until I married, I spent every summer here visiting my relatives. Montgomery, Billingsley, Mobile, Prattville, Wetumpka—the places where I stayed come back to me in a mezzotint of memories.

I remember—who could ever forget?—the laughing hayrides and watermelon suppers, learning to swim in Mulberry Creek, the lazy curl of a cousin's fishing line flickering in the sun, church on Sunday, and then the long Sunday dinner with kinfolks—endless kinfolk—discussing the endless family gossip around the table.

Today, I am still under the spell of that special grace, but I also sense the spirit of a State on the move—decidedly on the move. I feel this most of all when I talk with the two Alabamians I know best—two men who stand tall in the Nation's Capital. I mean Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN.

I think of the top priority programs for the good of Alabama and the whole Nation that these men have helped to move: What could be more important than education and health? When we read that the Federal investment in education and training will reach $10 billion this year, we can thank the man from Alabama who is chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee—and also chairs the Appropriations Subcommittee on Education—LISTER HILL. No group knows better than this one of the contributions which Senator HILL and the Congressman from this district, ARMISTEAD SELDEN, have made to higher education.

When we drive through a small Alabama town or nearby 8,000 other towns and cities in America and come upon a modern, well-equipped hospital or nursing home offering health to the people, we can bless the author of the Hill-Burton Act.

Housing also ranks at the top when we consider our scale of values for the good life. I wonder how many farmers who own their own homes realize what they owe to that son of a tenant farmer JOHN SPARKMAN.

Nearly 15 million American families today are better housed because of legislation patiently crafted by the man who is known as "Mr. Housing" in Washington.

For him, housing doesn't stop at the home place. It reaches to almost every college campus in the country. Right here in Alabama, 27 institutions of higher learning have benefited from the college housing program sponsored by JOHN SPARKMAN.

Both these men have a quality essential to the public servant and the active citizen. They don't say die when the going gets rough. To quote the late Gov. Bibb Graves, they "keep on keeping on." Most things that are really worth accomplishing require this kind of persistence.

People sometimes ask me how I define the central purpose of all this activity in our land. I would like to refer to one more man. He happens to be my husband. He has wrapped it up in three words: "the Great Society."

In describing the Great Society, the President said at Ann Arbor: "The challenge of the next half century is whether we have the wisdom to use our wealth to enrich and elevate our national life, and to advance the quality of our American civilization."

Our conquest of nature has produced more abundance, and more promise of abundance, than the world has ever known. Our scientists and engineers have propelled us further into the age of comfort than we dreamed possible.

Yet we are uncomfortable, and to me the Great Society means facing up to the reasons why we are ill at ease amid so much achievement.

To my mind, there are three main problems.

We need to bring our human resources—our products of the mind and of the spirit—up to matching our products of the laboratory.

We head for the moon. We go further down into the oceans than man ever ventured before. We seem to be able to do anything except get along together.

One day we might hope that the conference table in Birmingham or Geneva will be as successful as the assembly line in Huntsville and the launching pad at Cape Kennedy.

The second problem is closely connected with the first. We need to learn how to make use—rich use—of the leisuretime which our technological advances are bringing us. We must avoid the repetitive, deadening, and slothful throwing away of time given us by our machines. If not, our leisure may become our Achilles' heel.

There is nothing very complex about this. It is a matter of attitude, of calling on the abundant resources in our country and inside ourselves. Quite aside from the time you give to your community, you must also reserve some time for self-renewal.

It is a time for remembering the joys of the simple things—taking your child fishing in the woodland stream, walking through an art gallery with a friend and delighting to learn that you both respond to the same painting, experiencing the beauty of Vermont in October, the majesty of the Rockies snowcapped, the lilt of an Alabama spring. Thirdly, we must see to it that the potentialities of all these things are spread to ever-widening circles of the 190 million Americans.

The history of the United States is the history of the constant expansion of opportunity for the people of our land. This is indeed the major theme of the Great Society.

The essence of the Great Society is that it cannot be a spectator society. It is a society of participation—full-hearted participation by individuals acting as individuals and local communities acting as local communities.

People will shape the Great Society in a thousand different towns and cities and in a thousand different ways.

The Great Society is a Headstart center I visited in Newark, N.J. It is—especially—the youthful volunteer I met who gives 6 hours each day taking children out of dull-eyed slums and sending them home bright-eyed with new horizons.

The Great Society is the group of energetic and farsighted clubwomen of East Moline, Ill., who raised money to replace trees destroyed by street-widening. One day there will be a majestic arch of shade for their grandchildren to enjoy.

It is the civic leaders of Altanta who, as a living memorial to the Atlantans killed in a tragic plane crash, are seeing to it that the people of their city will be able to fill leisure hours with a great new center for all the arts.

The Great Society is all those who, by personal example and effort, are trying to ease the pain and suffering of human beings. I do not mean merely physical suffering, but the sharpest pain—that of the spirit.

The greatest need of each human spirit is to walk with head high in the tonic air of self-respect.

To treat everyone as your fellow citizen is not always an easy thing to do. Some prefer noninvolvement, even with our neighbors. Custom or prejudice deter us from reaching out and offering the hand of partnership in the American experience.

Yet the spirit of the second half of the 20th century demands this partnership. We must think in a 20th-century way about human relationships.

We are doing that. The progress that has been achieved seldom makes page 1, but it is there and it is solid.

The promise of equality first made in our Constitution is ours to keep.

And so, the Great Society is a society which finds in its technological brilliance a challenge to its human backwardness. It uses its material affluence as a base for achieving its nonmaterial dreams.

You women leaders of Alabama are in the vanguard of this movement. Your energies, your talents, and your dedication are helping this State not simply to progress but to grow with grace. When I look at you, I know that Alabama can lead the rollcall, not just in alphabetical order, but in all the achievements that make a society great.

It has been a moving experience for me to be with you today. Let me extend to you my own and the President's best wishes in your endeavors.

A year from now, may each of you be able to look around you and find that life in your community is a little more kindly, a little richer, a little more expressive of the whole human spirit because you—as an individual—cared—and because you—as an individual—tried.

NEED FOR NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, I was disappointed last year when the Congress failed to appropriate money to fund the National Teacher Corps. I believe this is a vitally needed program. Hopefully we will rectify last year's omission by providing the necessary funds during the current session of Congress.

The need for these funds is dramatically illustrated by a letter which I have received from the superintendent of the Baltimore public schools. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

BALTIMORE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Baltimore, Md., February 16, 1966.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I hope you can see your way clear to support the supplemental appropriations for the establishment of the National Teacher Corps which is now before the Congress. These supplemental funds are needed so that we may:

1. Start immediately to recruit college seniors who are presently enrolled.

2. Establish summer institutes during the 1966 summer session to train these individuals.

3. Set up inservice programs to continue their training during the next school year.

4. Select outstanding teachers to guide this program. There should also be sufficient money appropriated in fiscal year 1967 to pay the salaries of these teachers during the 1966–67 school year.

As you can well appreciate, it is the responsibility of a public school system to do everything possible to upgrade the level of teaching and maintain it at a high-quality level. Needless to say, our task of recruiting teachers is even more difficult now because of the strong competition from other higher paying professional fields such as engineering, law, medicine, accountancy and the like. It is urgent, therefore, for the large cities such as Baltimore to face this keen competition by recruiting while the students are still in college. If we wait until they graduate, it is too late. To do the job effectively takes more money than the large cities can possibly squeeze out of their already limited budgets. We must, consequently, look to the Federal Government for assistance.

Because of the urgent need for competent teachers, I sincerely hope that you will support the supplemental appropriations for the establishment of the National Teacher Corps.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE G. PAQUIN,
Superintendent.

FORTHCOMING RETIREMENT OF SENATOR McNAMARA

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, official business required me to be in Nevada at the time of the announcement of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] that he will retire at the end of this year.

Many Senators have spoken of how PAT McNAMARA will be missed, but none will miss him more than I.

It will be hard for me to say goodby to this big, friendly Irishman. We have sat here side by side for almost 12 years. Because he has been seated next to me, I have known that there was a reservoir of strength and fortitude for myself and for all of us. His is the stalwart courage of an honest man.

Senator McNAMARA has earned the Senate's trust. His forthright directness on every issue has taught the self-seeking never to try battle with this fierce warrior of the truth.

I deeply regret his resolve to retire. But although he will not be here among us in the hours of stress and decision, the Senate will always take heart when it thinks of PAT McNAMARA.

MAUI AWARD WINNING ESSAY, "FREEDOM IS—"

Mr. FONG. Madam President, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge recently selected an essay submitted by Mrs. Rachel M. Jio, of Pukalani, Maui, Hawaii, for one of its 1965 Freedom Awards.

In her essay entitled "Freedom Is—," Mrs. Jio eloquently expresses her concept of freedom and cites many practical ways freedom is enjoyed every day in our land. One has only to read these to realize how often we take our precious freedoms for granted.

One idea developed by Mrs. Jio is worthy of special note. She wrote:

Freedom is relatively new and the tools of our pioneers—courage, work, and risk—the tools of free men, are still the same in the year 1965 as they were in 1776 * * *. Freedom holds a wide promise for the future, for freedom breeds self-reliance and vision. This is why America is a country of never-ending frontiers.

How inspiring to think that America is a land of never-ending frontiers because it is a land of freedom.

Madam President, so that my colleagues in Congress and all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may study this beautiful dissertation on freedom, I ask unanimous consent that the entire essay be printed in the RECORD.

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

FREEDOM IS—

(By Rachel Jio)

Freedom is the writing of the greatest of documents—the Constitution of the United States—the first Government in history to serve not the state but its people. In this Constitution the people gave themselves the power to make their own laws and astounded the people in the "old country" by creating a free, representative government. It is the flexibility of this great document that built the world's most powerful nation. And, yet, there are many in this country who feel that the Constitution is outmoded and cannot meet the challenges of the sixties, and there are so-called Americans who advocate that this document be changed or thrown out completely! I often wonder if this is so, then, how is it possible that such a Constitution has lasted for over a century? It is due to this great document as our guide that America has progressed beyond all the dared dreams of our forefathers.

Freedom is the right to disagree with our elected congressional representatives or with any elected body of people on vital issues which we feel are of importance to our country's destiny. Having this right to disagree and to present our thoughts and ideas are of utmost importance in this democratic society of ours. Without this right to disagree, our country will be a "nation of sheep" following the dictates of those who are in power. However, this right to disagree or to have a different opinion is oftentimes threatened in times of war or when fear is aroused in the populace.

Freedom is the right of every individual, regardless of creed, color, or race, to participate actively in the affairs of government. Each individual taking upon himself the responsibility to see that honest and sincere men and women are elected to office. Men and women who can be called statesmen and not mere politicians. Elected officials who will use their elective office to do the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Men and women who are not afraid to say "no" or "yes" to pressure groups no matter how difficult the task may be and not succumb to political expediency as ofttimes happen to those who are so afraid to stand up and be counted when the issues are too controversial or when particular issues might bring forth the wrath of militant groups and kill their chance of being reelected.

Every election day, this privilege to participate in the shaping of our Government is exercised by the lowly and the great. That precious X placed beside the candidates of our choice is only ours to write and no one else's. No one can dictate to us how we must vote. This privilege to vote is here for those who wish to exercise one of the most cherished rights of freemen. So long as men have love of country within their hearts, the right is here to stay. But sadly there are many in this country who fail to exercise this precious right.

Freedom is our right to choose—to choose our friends and neighbors; to choose the kind of work we want, the only limitations being our own ability and training; to choose the kind of program we wish to participate in; to choose the kind of life we wish to live so long as we do not deprive others of the same rights and privileges that we enjoy.

Freedom is the right to own property and to make use of this property for our benefit. Our property cannot be decreased in value by an act of Government without due process of law—that is according to legal procedures and established customs. To own property is our badge of freedom and the vast opportunity it gives us to develop this property to give us comfort and security for all times.

Freedom is our right to attend a Monday night Toastmistress Club meeting or a Tuesday night PTA meeting, or a football game on a Saturday. It is a camp out in Makena or a hike into the Haleakala Crater, or a swim in the blue Pacific. It is a christening of the newborn; a birthday party; testing for a merit badge; a prom; a wedding; and the paying of our annual income taxes.

Freedom is the crosses in the Pacific National Cemetery; remembering of the Alamo; the U.S.S. *Arizona* in the depths of Pearl Harbor; and the recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, one of the greatest generals of our time. His memorable words: "And like the old soldier of a military ballad, I now close my military career and just fade away, an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the right to see that duty. Goodby"—still echoing in the august Chambers of Congress to give inspiration to those who believe in victory in any war with no compromises and no appeasements.

Freedom is our hatred of barbed-wired fences and walls; of human shackles and of street riots in the name of civil rights. It is the burning love of family, country, and God. It is the flag that tells the story of courage and of noble deeds of the Boston tea party, the midnight ride of Paul Revere, and Washington crossing the Delaware. It is the pride and hope of the world that the freedom enjoyed in America will prevail forever.

Freedom is relatively new and the tools of our pioneers—courage, work, and risk—the tools of freemen are still the same in the year 1965 as they were in 1776. Because they were free they were able to create the land of opportunity and to develop the immense natural resources and, thus, start the American dream marching along its glorious road.

Freedom is a hard-won prize. Each generation must work at it to keep it. Freedom is responsibility; it demands courage and hard work. It demands knowledge and the ability to work to think. It does not promise equal gains for all or automatically provide every one with easy, comfortable living, wisdom, or happiness. It promises only equal rights and equal risks. We must be alert to our opportunities to improve for this is the chance that freedom gives us.

Freedom holds a wide promise for the future, for freedom breeds self-reliance and vision. This is why America is a country of never-ending frontiers. The land frontiers may be gone, but the frontiers in education, science and industry are wide open. This, then, is freedom in the United States of America of today. It has its faults, but it has promises, too. More promises for every one living here than those who live in other lands. What will be done to turn promises into realities depend upon Americans of today and tomorrow in how they use their heritage of freedom.

TRIBUTE TO A NAVAL HERO—FLEET ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. FONG. Madam President, the late Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz has a special place in the history of wartime Hawaii and the hearts of Hawaii's people. He, more than any one individual, personified the role of protector and defender of the Hawaiian Islands in the dark days after Pearl Harbor.

The people of Hawaii looked to Admiral Nimitz with unflagging confidence that he would rebuild the bomb-shattered fleet and direct the Allied forces to ultimate victory. This he did, with supreme skill and resolute leadership.

This great American, who assembled a 2-million-man, 5,000-ship Pacific force that drove the enemy back to his homeland, has passed to his reward. This mastermind of Pacific victory is no longer with us, but he will long be remembered.

In paying tribute to the memory of Admiral Nimitz, I voice the highest admiration of Hawaii's people, who regarded him as one of their own. I extend their deepest sympathy and heartfelt gratitude to his wife and the family in their bereavement.

Many words of praise and remembrance have been written and spoken since the admiral's passing. They have extolled his military genius, his quiet courage, his notable capabilities in welding a unified Pacific Command, and his superb naval strategy and timing.

Less well known but equally inspiring are certain facets of his personality and career. These have been recalled in the past few days, in affectionate memory, by several writers in Hawaii.

I ask unanimous consent that the following be printed in the RECORD at this point:

An article by William H. Ewing, assistant to the publisher of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, who developed a warm friendship with Admiral Nimitz while serving as a war correspondent during World War II; an article by Wayne Harada of the Honolulu Advertiser staff, relating Admiral Nimitz' support of Hawaiian statehood and his admiration for Hawaii's people; a fine tribute by the Shipyard Log, published at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard; and a letter by Charles G. Braden, printed in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, which recalled a poignant incident and endeared the late, great admiral to the people of Hawaii.

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

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Feb. 21, 1966]

ADMIRAL CHESTER W. NIMITZ

(By William H. Ewing)

At a time when great trouble haunts the earth, when not only our own Nation but all civilization is in danger, when small men move with one eye on their goals and one on the polls, the fact that a man such as Chester William Nimitz has just died should make us all pause.

For it can be said of him that he wanted above all else to serve his country, and did so without ever any thought of personal ambition or the vain glory that comes when ambition is satisfied. He would never have said, as Robert E. Lee once said, that duty is the sublimest word in the English language, but only because he was not given to ennobling language. The concept, however, fitted him as well as it fitted Lee.

When Admiral Nimitz came to Pearl Harbor on Christmas Day 1941, he was, in my late and still unhesitating estimation, the one man who could perform best the task that had to be done in the ensuing 3 years in the Pacific. Among all his other virtues—strength of character, resolution, knowledge of the task assigned to him—none stood forth more prominently than patience. When on occasion he would appear publicly in Honolulu during those early days of 1942 and use the Hawaiian phrase, "hoomanawanui," meaning "have patience," he meant it in all seriousness. He knew it would be a long wait, not much more than a holding action, before the forces under his command could set out to destroy the Japanese enemy.

Not only did Admiral Nimitz accept the grand strategy devised in Washington and London of defeating Germany first while holding off the Japanese, he believed in wisdom, though it can be said without hesitation that had he been of different opinion no one would ever have known it. He believed in obeying orders. To hold off the enemy did not mean, to him, to sit tight and do nothing. In the early months of the war he sent a message to all commands which was, in essence, the same d'Artagnan received when his father set him forth on his travels: "Fight on all occasions." For such a message there was some grumbling, the idea being that a proud Navy should not have to be told to fight. But nobody knew better than Admiral Nimitz that the Pacific command consisted of thousands of middle-aged men who had never heard a shot fired in anger, to whom the services had become an easy-going way of life, and who were filled with horror at the thought of being killed. It was necessary to order them to fight, and Admiral Nimitz so ordered them and fight they did.

He was the only man who has ever come to mind who could have carried out so well the obligation of command that became his that Christmas Day in 1941. He had, first of all, a command which had just taken a terrible beating and was not quite sure how it would come off in a fair fight against the Japanese. He also had to deal with interservice rivalry which has probably never been worse, before or since. Admiral Nimitz knew he had to weld this command into a unified force in order for it to be effective against the enemy. The fact that his sense of fairness was as greatly respected in the Army and Air Corps as within the Navy itself had as much as anything to do with his success in this regard.

His understanding of problems outside his own particular field was quite remarkable. Early in 1942 Admiral Nimitz had been convinced by members of his staff that I, a two-stripe lieutenant on the staff of the district commandant, could more effectively serve the war effort talking over the radio than in uniform. So in June, barely 6 months after the war began, I was returned to inactive status and began a 15-minute 6-day-a-week war news commentary over KGMB. The idea was that I would go out to Cincpac every morning, confer with three or four staff officers, come back to town, write a 15-minute script and then take it back for their inspection, and, perhaps, demolition.

I gave it a fair try but it was simply unworkable. Sometimes the necessary staff officers were available together and sometimes they weren't, and even when they were we had constant interruptions. Moreover, they didn't understand what I was trying to do. They were supposed to inform me and also to tell me what I couldn't use. But when one of them would say, "Why do you want to say it that way?" I had no ready answer. I just knew that was the way to say it. Yet I couldn't answer, "Look, Captain, if you want to write the script, go ahead." Not and remain respectable.

So one morning I screwed up my courage and went to Admiral Nimitz's headquarters. I saw Capt. Jerry Wiltse, then assistant chief of staff and now a retired vice admiral living in La Jolla, and told him the problem. He was a fine officer; he listened intently, then went in and saw the Admiral. A few minutes later he came out and said, "You're on your own." And I never was censored from that time on, except for frontline dispatches, and I got into trouble only once. But that's another story. The point is that Admiral Nimitz had the understanding to grasp the problem that I faced, and solved it simply and quickly by placing me on my own responsibility.

I saw him last at his quarters on Yerba Buena Island in San Francisco Bay. He had slipped and fallen on the steps of the Federal Building in San Francisco earlier in the year and had not recovered from an injury to his hip. He was sitting stern-faced and patient, outside the house waiting for me when I arrived. I had a visit of about an hour with him and Mrs. Nimitiz, who is going to be very lonely now that he is gone.

I thought he had aged considerably since I had seen him about a year earlier but he was in good spirits and said the thing he missed most was being unable to pitch horseshoes but was looking forward to recovering sufficiently to do so before long. I could not help recalling a sparkling January morning in 1944 when a vast armanda moved out of Pearl Harbor to seize the Marshall Islands, and from the bridge of the old battleship *New Mexico* I looked down and saw the Admiral in his white uniform standing in his barge, come to see the warriors off. He was one of the great figures of our time and the greatest man I have ever known.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Feb. 21, 1966]

HE STOOD UP FOR AJA, BACKED HAWAII STATEHOOD

(By Wayne Harada)

Adm. Chester W. Nimitz ran the greatest naval war in history.

It was at Pearl Harbor—on December 31, 1941, at the beginning of the war—that his flag was hoisted aboard the submarine *Grayling*, signaling his takeover of the Pacific fleet.

It was from Pearl Harbor that he took his vessels across the Pacific and on to victory.

And it was at Pearl Harbor—on November 24, 1945—that he relinquished his command.

Despite losses at Pearl Harbor and the shortage of vessels, planes, and supplies, he organized his forces and carried on defensive warfare which ultimately halted the Japanese.

As rapidly as ships, personnel, and material became available, he shifted from defensive to offensive warfare.

"It was a story of success unequaled anywhere," the Advertiser said editorially on September 3, 1945. "He left in his wake the most brilliant, utterly audacious chapter in U.S. history."

In Navy Day ceremonies October 27, 1945, Nimitz said "the first fruits of a glorious and hard-won victory * * * finds us with many problems.

"We must maintain occupying forces in troubled areas of the world to insure that we will not lose much or all that we have gained at great cost.

"There is a classic lesson for us in the defeat of maritime Japan. It is there for all Americans to bear because the United States is a maritime Nation.

"Without adequate seapower we would not be the victors today. Without adequate sea-

power we cannot insure our children the fruits of that victory."

Three thousand people cheered the admiral later that evening in the first reception and dance at the Royal Hawaiian Hotel since the outbreak of the war.

Nimitz was a vocal supporter of statehood for Hawaii. On March 11, 1947, he told the House Public Lands Committee that he could see "no objection from a military or naval standpoint to the Hawaiian Islands' achieving statehood."

He said that before the war he had doubted the loyalty of the American citizens of Japanese ancestry.

"From my observations during World War II, however, I no longer have that doubt," he said.

"I had the opportunity to observe the people of the Hawaiian Islands and I have great admiration and appreciation of the wholehearted cooperation they gave the war effort," he testified.

"The citizens of the islands participated actively in the Army service of World War II and served with distinction. That includes many of Japanese ancestry."

When speculation of his retirement occurred late in 1945, Nimitz said he would not give up his career. He never retired.

But his ramrod bearing was giving way to a slump, and his face began to show the mark of time.

Today, a school and highway bear his name in Hawaii. Nimitz Elementary School was opened in the fall of 1954, and the old Pearl Harbor Road became Nimitz Highway on March 12, 1947.

The Pearl Harbor main gate was renamed the Nimitz Gate on February 24, 1960, in honor of the sea warrior on his 75th birthday.

Seventy-five trees were planted on both sides of Nimitz Highway, forming a colonnade to the gate—a living tribute to the admiral.

[From the Shipyard Log, Feb. 25, 1966]

DEATH OF A NAVAL HERO

"Imua, imua * * *. A lanakila—Forward, forward * * * on to victory."

That was the message which Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz sent to the Polaris submarine U.S.S. *Kamehameha* when she was launched at Mare Island Naval Shipyard a little over a year ago.

It could well have been the motto which guided him throughout World War II—from the dark early days of the war following the devastating attack on Pearl Harbor to the victorious day when he signed for the United States, accepting Japan's unconditional surrender aboard the U.S.S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay.

Admiral Nimitz, the mastermind of the Pacific victory, died late Sunday afternoon, February 20, at his home on Yerba Buena Island, overlooking San Francisco Bay.

He became the commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet 24 days after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. He directed the recovery of the battered U.S. fleet, and led the mightiest armada in history consisting of 2 million men, 16,000 aircraft, and 5,000 ships to a decisive victory.

Of Admiral Nimitz, Naval Historian Samuel Eliot Morison had this to say:

"He had an immense capacity for work, an equal talent at obtaining the best work from others, an almost impeccable judgment of men, and a genius for making prompt, firm decisions.

"He restored confidence to the defeated fleet. He had the patience to wait through the lean period of the war, the capacity to organize both a fleet and a vast theater, the tact to deal with sister services and Allied commands, the leadership to weld his own subordinates into a great fighting team, the courage to take necessary risks, and the wisdom to select, from a welter of intelligence and opinion, the strategy that defeated Japan."

Admiral Nimitz was close to the people of Hawaii and became a vocal supporter of Hawaiian statehood. On Navy Day 1945, the Sons and Daughters of Hawaiian Warriors named him high chief—a rare honor accorded to only a few by this society.

After the war he succeeded Adm. Ernest King as Chief of Naval Operations. He never retired from the Navy. At his death, he was the oldest member on active duty, serving as a special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy.

In Hawaii today, a school and highway bear his name. Nimitz Elementary School was opened in the fall of 1954, and the old Pearl Harbor Road became Nimitz Highway on March 12, 1947.

The Pearl Harbor main gate was renamed Nimitz Gate on February 24, 1960 on the 75th birthday of this great naval leader.

Seventy-five trees were planted on both sides of Nimitz Highway with the shipyard participating in the tree planting tribute.

As Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara said in announcing Admiral Nimitz' death to the Armed Forces, "The world has lost a distinguished citizen whose energies and vision were devoted without stint to a long lifetime of service to free men everywhere."

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Mar. 3, 1966]

HONOR RECIPROCATED

EDITOR, THE STAR-BULLETIN:

Last week the United States paused to honor the memory of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz. Many of us who had the privilege of serving under his command during World War II recalled anecdotes which illustrated the brillance and simultaneously the humanity of his leadership.

One such anecdotes stands out in my memory. It involves an incident here in Honolulu in the fall of 1945. An Hawaiian society, the Sons and Daughters of Hawaiian Warriors, decided to confer a rare honor on the famous admiral. They wanted to make him a "high alii" which honor had only been bestowed on one or two other haoles in recorded history. Admiral Nimitz was informed and replied that he would be pleased to accept the honor.

The ceremony was held on a Saturday morning and the locale was, naturally, the makai steps of Iolani Palace. Several thousand people, including representatives of many Hawaiian societies gathered to observe the impressive ceremony. After the conch shells were blown, an Hawaiian chant recited, two spears were crossed over the Admiral's head and the traditional yellow feather cape was draped over the shoulders of his sparkling white dress uniform.

At that point, Admiral Nimitz responded in a fashion as exquisitely appropriate as I have ever witnessed. He accepted the honor in a brief speech in Hawaiian. In spite of what must have been crushing demands on his talents and energy, he had taken time to phrase and then memorize his remarks in Hawaii's own language.

You can imagine the reaction of the crowd. Deep emotion was openly expressed and I recall that many senior Hawaiian ladies and gentlemen wept without reserve.

Hawaii has honored Admiral Nimitz in many ways. On that day in October 1945, the admiral honored Hawaii with a simple yet profound gesture that was typical of his true greatness.

CHARLES G. BRADEN.

VIETNAM—WE ARE THERE

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate, and to the country as a whole, the editorial in the New York Times on Sunday, March 6, entitled "We Are There." It seems to me that this editorial states with unusual clarity and precision what many believe our objectives are, or should be, in Vietnam.

The editorial said:

> The ultimate American objective must be to leave South Vietnam honorably and to leave it in condition freely to choose its own government and determine its own policy.

The editorial makes it clear, however, that it is not inconsistent with this objective to enter into direct talks with the Vietcong, and to make it plain that no one in South Vietnam would necessarily be excluded from participation in whatever interim government may be set up to precede the elections or in whatever government may be established after the elections depending, of course, on the outcome of the vote in honest elections. The editorial makes the point that the United States has moved quite far toward accepting the necessity of taking such steps but the editorial goes on to note:

> The American position has been obscured by crosscurrents emanating from various White House spokesmen, not to mention the South Vietnamese Government.

If I were to sum up the wisdom of this editorial it would be by pointing to the statement in the Times that "the fact remains that without compromise there can be no negotiation."

We must stand firm against any compromise that would mean accepting other than an honorable peace and would not establish the condition that would permit South Vietnam to choose its own government and determine its own policy. But this does not mean that we should deny reality for to do so would be to contradict our avowed desire to negotiate a settlement on this war. I believe that the New York Times editorial performs a great service in making these points clear.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 6, 1966]

WE ARE THERE

With the steady increase in the number of American troops in Vietnam—the figure is already 215,000 and will soon rise by another 20,000—there can no longer be much doubt that the United States is becoming committed to precisely what its civilian and military leaders have almost unanimously wanted to avoid: a massive land war on the continent of Asia.

Whether or not the figure will escalate to 400,000 or even to 600,000, as has been widely predicted—the fact is that already, as of today, "we are there"; and "we are there" on a scale and to a degree not even contemplated a relatively short time ago. The problem now is not to recriminate, but to see how and in what way the President can be aided in his profoundly serious search for peace—the peace that, as he said last week, "is within our grasp if we will both reach for it together."

While a strictly military victory in the normal sense of the word could, of course, be won by the United States over the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, the cost in escalation, in human life, and in moral, physical, economic and political damage could invalidate such a victory even before it was won. Quite apart from the risk entailed in war with China, the picture of Americans obliterating an Asian country and people—even with the highest, most selfless of motives—is not a picture that would in the long run redound to the benefit of the United States, nor to its long-range safety or interest.

It must be emphasized that the United States cannot and should not under present circumstances pull out of Vietnam. The United States, as the President has made clear, is not going to withdraw precipitously—or withdraw at all—without a satisfactory settlement. What this newspaper believes, and always has believed, is that constant military build-up is not the way to achieve such a settlement. Nor is it the way to accomplish the avowed purpose of the United States to transfer the conflict from battlefield to bargaining table.

If the non-Communist South Vietnamese are to have a fighting chance after the war, they must carry the main military burden now. The immediate American objective should be to strengthen our allies but not to replace or supplant them, as escalation much beyond present levels threatens to do. A build-up to 400,000 American troops would over-Americanize what is essentially a Vietnamese political conflict, while bombing of the North Vietnamese cities of Hanoi and Haiphong—which thus far President Johnson has wisely refused to sanction—would also change the whole character of the war. This newspaper has, in fact, opposed and continues to oppose the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam on the grounds that, in terms of the purposes for which the United States is fighting, it does far more political and moral harm than military good.

In fact, this kind of choice is the essence of virtually all decisions affecting Vietnam: a balancing of risks, a determination of which of two unattractive courses is the less attractive, a selection not between what is clearly desirable and clearly undesirable, but between what is more or less undesirable.

While continued military pressure is purely essential if Hanoi and the Vietcong are ever to be persuaded to negotiate, there is an important difference between the approach suggested above and a steady escalation of the American military effort, which—despite protestations to the contrary—is what seems to be occurring.

The picture is not clear. There is no doubt that President Johnson has restrained the more belligerent of his advisers, and he deserves full credit for doing so; but it is also evident that he has not succeeded in making as plain as possible the limited nature of the American involvement.

The surest way to do this would be by a far more persuasive and consistent diplomatic and political offensive than has even yet been undertaken. We have not the slightest doubt that the President would infinitely prefer peace to war. Yet, neither the world—nor, even more strongly, the enemy—has been persuaded that the U.S. purpose in Vietnam is purely defensive; that Washington really means negotiations to be "unconditional"; that it would enter a resurrected Geneva Conference without prior conditions; that the United States really does not intend to keep on building up its forces in Vietnam to the maximum degree possible into an indefinite future.

While the attitude of Hanoi has thus far been totaly negative and uncompromising, the fact remains that without compromise there can be no negotiation; and the United States should not be the party to this conflict that leaves any stone unturned in an honorable effort to achieve such negotiations.

For example, direct talks with the Vietcong are essential; and that fact should be frankly recognized despite the understandable aversion of the South Vietnamese Government to giving the immediate enemy even that much recognition. And it needs to be made even clearer that—as the White House has in fact suggested—the Communists would not necessarily be excluded from participation in whatever interim government may be set up to precede the elections; nor if the vote so warrants, from whatever government may be established after the elections.

In recent weeks the United States seems to have moved quite far toward accepting such a possibility; but the American position has been obscured by crosscurrents emanating from various White House spokesmen, not to mention the South Vietnamese Government. It is obviously not to America's interest to weaken the South Vietnam Government; at the same time, however, steady pressure must be applied on General Ky and his colleagues to open up a dialog with civilian political groups and to envisage the ultimate establishment of contact with the Vietcong, looking toward an interim coalition government into which the Vietcong could be incorporated along with the many other elements that make up the variegated political life of South Vietnam.

It goes without saying that the projected program of social reform emphasized at the recent Honolulu meeting is essential to any long-term solution in South Vietnam. If vigorously pursued, it would strengthen support for the Saigon Government and, in fact, aid it in negotiations with the Communists and in the inevitable postwar political conflict. But the trouble is that statements of South Vietnamese leaders give the impression that they have not much faith, or are not particularly interested in pushing this vital program. Such attitudes need drastic revision.

This newspaper believes that these modifications in present policy could conceivably lead to the beginning of a beginning of an end to the war. They may not work; but it is our belief that they offer a far greater hope of achieving an honorable peace and a far smaller risk of an "open ended" war than faces the embattled and bewildered American people today. The ultimate American objective must be to leave South Vietnam honorably and to leave it in condition freely to choose its own government and determine its own policy.

MERCHANT MARINE POLICY

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, a respected Member of Congress from Maryland, Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, delivered a speech on merchant marine policy at the end of last month before the Propeller Club of the Port of Washington.

Representative GARMATZ' speech pinpoints the needs of our declining merchant marine. It deserves to be called to the attention of the Senate.

I agree with Representative GARMATZ that the time is ripe for us to develop a realistic, positive, maritime program based on the framework of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

I also agree with Representative GARMATZ that such a program should include the second phase of our nuclear propelled commercial vessel development scheme. In general, shipbuilders need the same sort of assistance in vessel research that has already been granted to the aircraft industry.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Representative GARMATZ to the Propeller Club on February 23, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, DEMOCRAT, OF MARYLAND, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AT THE PROPELLER CLUB, PORT OF WASHINGTON, LUNCHEON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1966, AT THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Clark, members of the Propeller Club, Port of Washington, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me to appear before the Propeller Club of the Port of Washington.

The Propeller Club was founded to preserve the maritime heritage of our Nation and it is a symbol of our maritime industry and the American merchant marine. I am proud to say that I appear before you as a member—for I have enjoyed membership in the Propeller Club.

It is something more than simply a very genuine pleasure for me to address you today.

The broadly based objectives of the Propeller Club of the United States to promote, further and support an American merchant marine adequate to meet the requirements of national security and economic welfare of the United States apply to all of the 50 member ports within and without the United States and to the 15 student ports. They are the objectives sought to be fostered by the more than 10,000 dedicated individuals who make up our national membership.

Interest in the furtherance of these objectives is at a high level in all of the constituent ports.

And I wish to compliment the national and local leadership that is presently exerting itself to make the Propeller Club an effective force in the vital maritime affairs of our country.

But there is something special about this club—not that there is any greater interest or dedication to our objectives than there is elsewhere.

The something special is due to the unique concentration of representatives here in Washington of virtually every element that goes to make up the great complex of American maritime policy and all of its contributing components.

Just a quick look at a roster of the membership of the Port of Washington bears this out.

From the Government you have many members from most of the executive departments, including, of course, the numerous bureaus and agencies within such departments.

You have vice presidents and other high officials of most of the leading shipping and shipbuilding companies.

The major maritime trade associations are well represented.

Maritime labor is widely represented.

There are naval architects, steamship agents, leading manufacturers' representatives, and lawyers galore. You have beauteous lady members, Madeleine Carroll and Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN.

So, it is a special privilege, and I believe very fitting, that I should appear before you today to make what is virtually my maiden speech since election to the chairmanship of the Committee on Merchant Marine and

Fisheries. I am greatly pleased to see so many members of the committee here today.

I am looking forward to the coming years, and I am here to give you my pledge that I will do all in my power to carry out our national maritime policy and vigorously foster the objectives of the Propeller Club of the United States.

Although I have seen written reports that I am slanted in one way or another, I can promise you that my efforts will be directed in behalf of the overall good for the American merchant marine.

In my 18 years in Congress I have never witnessed a period when our national maritime policy has been the subject of so much uncertainty and confusion. Notwithstanding a clear statutory statement of policy, with a full set of implementing guidelines, we seem to be not only without a propeller, but apparently without rudder and helmsman as well.

At a time when the Soviet Union is expanding the size of its merchant fleet at a faster rate than any other nation in the world, the American merchant marine is experiencing a record decline.

I am concerned about the confusion and uncertainty that exists and I am concerned about the steady decline of this country as a maritime power.

It seems to me extremely shortsighted for this country to allow such a situation to exist and continue.

Our maritime industry should be a major and vibrant part of our economy—it is essential not only to our national defense—as the Vietnam conflict has once again proved—but to our commerce. If properly promoted, the merchant marine could by itself overcome our adverse balance of international payments.

Let us look at a few facts:

It is indeed ironic that the present budget calls for only 13 new vessels during the fiscal year 1966. In 1964, when 100 new merchant vessels were delivered to the Soviet Union, only 16 new vessels were delivered for U.S. registry.

A little over a year ago, the Soviet Union had 464 merchant vessels under contract in shipyards, including 111 tankers. As of the same date, the United States had only 39 new vessels under contract, including 1 tanker.

At the present time, the United States—the major power of the world and by far the world's major trading nation—ranks 12th in new vessel construction.

We rank behind such countries as Argentina, Brazil, Finland, and Peru.

For a nation whose growth and greatness have come from seapower, can these facts be other than alarming?

I have always considered that our basic maritime policy is sound.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, we have developed the world's most efficient and most modern liner fleet—even though inadequate in numbers. The detailed provisions of the act, however, have not been adequate to promote strong bulk carrier and tanker segments of our merchant marine.

Succeeding administrations have failed to seek the necessary implementing legislation or administer that which has been provided.

I would not attempt to contend that any statute, in the face of changing times, should remain unaltered for 30 years.

And we can have a more realistic program for assisting American-flag bulk carriers and tankers, without at the same time destroying that part of the act which has been successful. Some new legislation may be needed. Let us have it and we will act on it.

At a time when we should be considering a positive program for broadening the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to extend its benefits to all segments of the American merchant marine, we are floundering on the sea of uncertainty.

At a time when our domestic shipbuilding program should be at its peak, the present budget proposes a program that is the all-time low.

I am tired of reading analyses of the Interagency Maritime Task Force report, or of the report of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee. The business of our committee is legislation, and without a legislative program to consider, we are left to theorize like everyone else.

I am confident that President Johnson aims to dispel the atmosphere of despair that now prevails in our maritime program, as he has done in other areas. The picture is not entirely bleak.

Our country has the world's only nuclear-powered merchant vessel, the NS *Savannah*.

We are on the verge of technological breakthrough in the field of nuclear propelled commercial vessels, and the time is ripe for us to begin the second phase of our nuclear ship program.

The United States has the world's best, the most modern and most productive liner fleet—but we need more such vessels in private ownership to serve our complex society and the uncertain but demanding needs of war.

With assistance in vessel research similar to that of the American aircraft industry, I am convinced that our domestic shipyards could become competitive with foreign shipbuilders.

Lastly, but most importantly, most segments of maritime labor have tried to be reasonable and realistic in accepting reduced manning requirements resulting from automation.

There is virtually no industry in this country that is not subsidized either directly or indirectly through some protective measures. The American merchant marine is not unique in the assistance that it requires. Our economy has been able to flourish with the highest standard of living in the world as the greatest trading Nation because our industries, with governmental assistance, have been able to become the most productive industries in the world.

Recent technological developments in ship design, propulsion equipment, shipbuilding and cargo handling signify that a major technological breakthrough is imminent. Increased productivity is now possible in the maritime industry as never before.

Automation programs are reducing the impact of the differential between higher American-flag labor costs and foreign costs.

We are at a critical time when we must move forward with a program to promote all segments of our American merchant marine and our domestic shipyards so that these industries can achieve maximum productivity in our economy. There appears to be every hope that, with such a realistic and positive program, subsidy cost to the Government will eventually be reduced, rather than increased.

Our committee is most anxious to cooperate with the administration in any constructive new maritime program that will be presented.

Unfortunately, perhaps, too much emphasis has been placed on focusing on the revolutionary proposals in the Interagency Maritime Task Force report, rather than recognizing that in principle very few people disagree on what should be the main ingredients of a sound maritime program. For example, everyone agrees that—

1. We must build more vessels for operation under the American flag;

2. We must develop a realistic program for assisting American-flag bulk carriers and tankers;

3. Government interference with the steamship industry should be minimized and management should in most cases be free to exercise its own prudent business judgment;

4. Subsidies should be to the greatest possible extent direct rather than indirect; and

5. Our subsidy program should contain an element of incentive.

These principles form the basis for developing a sound new and expanded maritime program.

I do not agree with the proposal that we should permit vessels under this program to be built abroad. Such a step would, in my opinion, be inconsistent with the best interests of our country and our economy, and would have an extremely detrimental effect on our international balance of payments.

I am hopeful that the administration will not recommend such a proposal as a part of the new program.

Similarly, I do not agree with those who would seek to abandon our cargo preference laws.

Such proposals emanate from theoreticians who have no real interest in the American merchant marine. Foreign-flag merchant marines have too many built-in and hidden nationalistic advantages and too many preferences of their own for us to consider it realistic at this time to repeal our cargo preference provisions.

On the other hand, as new efficient bulk carrier vessels are constructed for American-flag operation, and—if they are paid a direct operating subsidy—the differential in rates for the carriage of cargo in American-flag bulk carriers as opposed to foreign-flag bulk carriers should be largely eliminated.

Again, I am hopeful that the administration will not recommend that we abandon our cargo preference statutes.

I also do not agree with those who would contend that we should completely do away with the essential trade route program.

It seems to me that this program is sound and that it has worked well. Perhaps some modifications could be made so as to allow the operators increased flexibility—but I believe that there must be the assurance that adequate American-flag service will be available on each essential trade route to meet our goals and commitments around the world and build our national economy in all areas of the country.

Insofar as passenger vessels are concerned, I am convinced that they are necessary as a part of our American merchant marine for national defense reasons and for economic and social reasons as well.

More and more people of the world are beginning to travel. The great percentage of these people prefer to travel by surface transportation. There is a great untapped market that is available for ocean transportation services.

I believe that this country must take steps to encourage the construction of several large capacity, low-fare superliners that will place ocean transportation within the economic means of the major part of our Great Society.

In short, I am enthusiastic that we can build upon the framework of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and develop a new, far-reaching program to promote all segments of the American merchant marine. I am most certainly optimistic.

The progress of our Nation has been one of steady development and evolution—we cannot destroy what we already have, but must use what is good to plan and create our programs for the future. This is the essence of the Great Society, and I am confident that its logic will soon be applied to the maritime industry.

Yesterday was George Washington's birthday. He was a man of great wisdom. He knew that history is eloquent in demonstrating that any nation which takes the easy way of permitting its commerce to be carried by foreign-flag ships—which rents the service and space it is too lazy or too shortsighted to provide—is embarked on a policy of dependency that has ended every

time with the nation in question becoming a second-rate power.

Washington knew this truth and warned against its neglect. In closing, I would like to quote the words of George Washington:

"We should not overlook the tendency of war to abridge the means, and thereby at least enhance the price, of transporting productions to their proper markets. I recommend it to your [Congress] serious reflections how far and in what mode it may be expedient to guard against embarrassments from these contingencies by such encouragement to our own navigation as will render our commerce and agriculture less dependent on foreign bottoms which may fail us in the very moments most interesting to both these great objects. * * * There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure."

Thank you.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION MOVES AGAINST FARM ECONOMY

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, yesterday—Monday, March 8—the administration took drastic action for the purpose of breaking the price of an important agricultural product—namely, hides.

All exports of hides and skins, except exports to Canada and except shipments valued at $100 or less, have been placed under a complete licensing control under the Export Control Act of 1949. That is, the goods may not be exported until the Government has given approval for each such shipment. The purpose of this action is clearly to break the price of hides. It has already had some effect in that direction. According to the Wall Street Journal, the order was responsible for profit taking in the hide futures market yesterday. It is a fact that hide futures fell yesterday by more than a cent a pound in a single day. On last Friday also, when this prospective action was being rumored, prices fell approximately a cent a pound.

It is true that hide prices have advanced during the past 2 or 3 years. Thank goodness for that. Until comparatively recently, hide prices have been at giveaway levels. During parts of 1963 and 1964, hide prices were at the lowest levels since before the war. At the end of my statement a table is inserted giving certain price comparisons to illustrate that point.

The recent advances have raised prices from those punishingly low levels, and even today hide prices are not high. They are about at the level reached as recently as 1959. On last Friday, March 4, the quoted price for the grade known as light native cowhides was 25 to 26 cents per pound. In 1959, for the same grade the average price for the entire year was 25.7 cents per pound, and for a great part of that year, the price was considerably higher.

The fact is that over a long period of time there has been a steadily declining market for hides, partly because of the development of synthetic materials as substitutes for real leather. The per capita consumption of beef has increased, but each beef animal has a hide and the per capita production of shoes made from leather has declined from 3.4 pairs per capita in 1952 to 3.2 in 1963. As a result there has been a growing imbalance between supply and demand, and a generally declining market. The development of export outlets abroad for our hides has enabled us to get rid of these surplus hides. The development of these export outlets has been a systematic project of the industry, with the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture. Now this arbitrary action by the Department of Commerce threatens to destroy the results of many years of careful work.

The destructive impact of this order on the price of hides will not stop there, unfortunately. Almost surely any price decline will be reflected right back to the market price for live cattle.

Hides are often spoken of as a byproduct, but the fact is that when hide prices are good, it means that the packer can pay more to the producer, without passing the extra cost along to the housewife in the price charged for the meat. The average hide weighs 60 pounds. Thus, a difference of 10 cents a pound in the hide market is equivalent to $6 in the price received for the live animal.

A serious question could be raised whether the export control law should properly be invoked in a case of this sort. Most of the products subjected to export controls are placed in that category for security reasons, or for reasons related to the foreign policy of the United States. The law also permits exports controls to protect the economy in cases of short supply, but only one other commodity—copper and certain copper products—is now subject to export controls under that provision of the law. Certainly, the hide situation is in no way comparable to the copper problem. With copper, there was a physical shortage of the metal, a difficulty in securing sufficient quantities for the manufacture of such vital military needs as shell casings, a need to dip into the strategic reserve of copper, and so on. Without doubt, there is a real shortage problem for copper, but there has been no such shortage of hides. The year-end inventory of hides last December was not greatly reduced from the normal year-end inventory figures. There has merely been a normal movement of surplus hides into export, and a price rise to something like profitable levels for a product which has suffered from chronic depression until recently.

It appears that this action has been taken to hold down costs for shoe manufacturers. The question is, was any assurance received from the shoe industry that if hide prices were pushed down, the prices of shoes would not be increased? Over the years, the tendency has been for the farmer to receive a smaller and smaller share of the consumer's dollar. That has been just as true for hides as for other farm products.

It is simply rank discrimination to invoke these extraordinary Government powers to push down the price of an agricultural product like hides, when dozens of other products are relatively much higher priced. It is for these reasons that I protest against yesterday's order.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks certain tables showing the course of hide prices during the years, and also an article from the Livestock and Meat Situation of January 1964, discussing the long-range decline in the use of leather in this country, and the development of export markets to take the resulting hide surplus off the market.

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

Packer hide prices, average per pound, Chicago

	Heavy native steers	Light native cows
1940	12.50	12.64
1941	14.49	14.68
1942	15.50	15.50
1943	15.50	15.50
1944	15.50	15.50
1945	15.50	15.50
1946	18.55	18.36
1947	27.25	28.70
1948	27.73	28.39
1949	22.60	25.25
1950	26.83	29.14
1951	31.02	34.24
1952	14.99	18.08
1953	14.86	17.81
1954	11.68	14.25
1955	12.38	13.51
1956	12.39	15.95
1957	11.03	15.65
1958	11.41	16.57
1959	19.16	25.61
1960	13.72	18.81
1961	14.91	19.54
1962	15.19	18.50
1963	11.23	12.83
1964	10.32	13.23
1965	14.2	15.7
1966:		
January	17.3	20.0
February	19.0	22.6
March (1st week)	21.25	25.5

Source: For 1940 through 1964, Livestock and Meat Statistics, 1962, and Livestock and Meat Statistics Supplement for 1964, both published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture; for 1965 and 1966, from Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Packer hide prices, average per pound, Chicago, 1959, by months

	Steers, heavy native	Cows, light native
January	12.1	21.6
February	13.3	22.8
March	16.8	25.8
April	23.3	30.4
May	21.5	26.9
June	24.5	29.1
July	24.1	29.6
August	22.9	29.3
September	22.2	28.0
October	19.1	24.0
November	14.3	19.2
December	15.0	21.1
Annual average	19.1	25.7

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

HIDE AND LEATHER SITUATION BRIGHTER IN 1964

(By John W. Thompson, Marketing Economics Division, ERS)

Hide prices in 1963 declined to their lowest level since the early 1930's. Average prices for heavy native steer hides, Chicago, fell from 15 cents a pound in 1962 to 11 cents a pound in 1963 (table 10). Cash prices for most other hides declined similarly while calf and dip prices fell by about 40 percent from their 1962 levels.

As hide prices continued their rapid and sizeable decline during 1963, hide buyers placed more emphasis on quality, and many hide dealers had difficulty moving poor quality hides at any price. This was especially true of firms marketing country-locker or

butcher hides. Many packers and dealers reported throwing No. 3 hides into rendering tanks.

The drop in hide prices only slightly affected finished leather prices, and had almost no effect on leather footwear prices. The index of hide and skin prices (1957–59 base) fell 21 points—from 106 in 1962 to 85 in 1963—while the finished leather price index fell only 6 points during the corresponding period (table 10). Indexes of leather footwear prices remained almost constant at 108 in 1962 and 1963.

IMBALANCE IN SUPPLY-DEMAND

The dominant factor contributing to depressed hide prices in 1963 was the 4-percent increase in cattle slaughter while leather demand for use in shoes remained almost unchanged. Further large increases in hide supplies are anticipated for 1964. Cattle slaughter in 1964 is expected to be the largest ever, about 3 percent over the 28.1 million head slaughtered in 1963.

Most of this imbalance in the supply-demand situation which began in 1952 results from the increasing per capita consumption of meat, while per capita consumption of leather shoes—which uses over 80 percent of finished leather supplies—has been declining. During the 12-year period (1952–63) per capita consumption of meat increased about 33 percent, while leather shoe production fell from 3.4 pairs per capita in 1952 to less than 3.2 in 1963. During this period when hide supplies were increasing and domestic consumption did not keep pace, the United States was able to export most of its excess hide supplies.

HIDE EXPORTS UP FOR 1963

Early in 1963 the outlook for a strong world demand for U.S. hides looked promising, although a known buildup of United States and European hide inventories occurred at the end of 1962. Shipments from Argentina, the major exporter, were expected to be sharply curtailed in 1963 as herd rebuilding got underway. But the decline in Argentine hide exports did not materialize. As a result, U.S. hide exports were below expectations the first 6 months of 1963, but picked up considerably in the latter half of the year. During November 1963, U.S. cattle hide exports totaled 843,000 pieces which brought the 11-month total for hide exports up to 7,311,000. This was an increase of 10 percent over the 6,587,000 hides exported during the first 11 months of 1962. Cattle-hide exports for 1963 are estimated at about 8 million pieces—a new high.

CONSUMPTION OF LEATHER MAY BE UP

An upturn in consumption of hides during 1964 appears likely. Estimates of leather shoe production are 621 million pairs. This is an increase of 3 to 4 percent over the 598 million pairs produced in 1963. Presently, shoe inventories are below normal levels as a result of larger-than-expected Christmas sales. If these inventories are rebuilt, it should provide more impetus for a strong leather demand early in 1964. Another bright spot in the leather situation is the recent upturn in exports of finished leather. Present estimates for the first 11 months indicate that exports of finished upper leather have increased from 10.8 million square feet in 1962 to 16.4 million square feet in 1963. Assuming the United States can continue to expand this market, the hide and leather industry could work itself out of the current imbalance in supply and demand. U.S. cattle hide exports may be around 8 million pieces in the coming year.

HIDE PRICES NOT LIKELY TO CHANGE

Although consumption of hides and leather may be larger in 1964 than in 1963, hide prices may not improve appreciably. Cattle slaughter will be up, present hide inventories are larger than normal, and leather shoe production will continue to encounter strong competition from synthetic materials, sneakers, open types of shoes and shoe imports.

TABLE 10.—*Selected hide and leather statistics for 1962 and 1963*

Item	1962	1963	Percent change
Cattle slaughter, total (millions)	27	28.1	+4.1
Hide exports (1,000 pieces)	6,587	[1] 8,000	+18.0
Hide prices (Chicago) (cents per pound):			
Light native cows	18.5	12.8	−31.0
Country hides, extremes	13.5	9	−33.0
Heavy native steers	15.1	11.1	−27.0
Calfskins (under 9½ pounds)	57.6	33	−43.0
Kips	47.8	30.2	−37.0
Hide indexes (1957–59=100):			
Hide prices	106.2	[2] 84.7	−20.0
Leather prices	108.5	[2] 102.1	−6.0
Leather footwear prices	108.7	[2] 108	0
Leather shoe production (million pairs)	598	[3] 598	0
Per capita consumption	3.20	[3] 3.16	−1.2

[1] Estimated.
[2] 11-month average.
[3] Tanners' Council estimates.

THE NATIONAL CRIME RATE

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I ask unanimious consent to insert into the RECORD a newspaper story from the Detroit News of February 16, 1966, under the byline of James L. Kerwin. The story details the problem of one large American city, Detroit, which is plagued by the commerce across State lines in weapons, of all varieties, to criminals, addicts, mental patients, and so forth.

This particular story was occasioned by the shooting of a rabbi in a Detroit synagogue by a member of the congregation, who was apparently ill himself. The man, who turned the gun on himself after shooting the rabbi, had purchased the weapon in a nearby Toledo, Ohio, novelty shop without question.

A Detroit detective said:

Toledo has become the arsenal of Detroit and there is nothing we can do about it.

I agree with the detective. But Detroit is not the only large city confronted with the same problem.

The guns displayed in the windows of a number of these Toledo novelty shops are the same cheaply made for imports that have turned up by the thousands in my investigations of the mail-order gun problem by the Juvenile Delinquency Committee. And these window displays also contain the same collection of military surplus guns now plaguing law enforcement officials across the country. The dealers frequently offer the guns for sale without permit and offer credit on the purchase.

I ask my colleagues how this type of commerce aids in reducing the national crime rate, and whether or not Congress can move to stop this traffic?

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

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Feb. 16, 1966]

GUNS FOR SALE—NO PERMITS NEEDED—AND IT'S ALL LEGAL IN TOLEDO

(By James L. Kerwin)

TOLEDO, February 16.—The sign hanging over the sidewalk advertised "novelties-jokes-tricks." But in bigger letters was the word "guns."

Behind the dingy window beneath the sign was a deadly array of weapons—a huge guaranteed automatic with an extra clip, a hand-operated tear gas device, and a row of knives with blades as long as 10 inches.

Propped in a corner above the arms display was a red-lettered, cardboard sign which reads:

"No permit required to buy guns but you must be 18 years or older."

Attached to the poster was another sign, "credit?"

OTHER SIMILAR SHOPS

The small shop, which failed *to display* a single "novelty or trick" in its show windows, is one of a half dozen establishments in downtown Toledo that offer weapons for sale to practically all comers.

All the shops offering the guns, some of them pawnbrokers, are operating legally since Ohio—unlike Michigan—virtually has no restrictions on gun sales.

From one of these stores 2 weeks ago, Richard Wishnetsky, mentally ill and brooding, purchased a pistol that he used to gravely wound Rabbi Morris Adler at synagogue services last Saturday before turning the weapon on himself.

"Toledo has become the arsenal of Detroit," observed one veteran Detroit detective. "And there's nothing we can do about it."

PHONY NAMES USED

Although denying it is a "major problem," top police officials in Toledo concede that many Michigan residents buy guns here, using phony names and addresses.

One Toledo gun dealer, who displays weapons alongside the beads of a rosary in the front window of his loan firm, admits that 90 percent of his customers come from Michigan, principally Detroit.

He and other gun salesmen here prominently exhibit weapons with such tags as "only," "reduced," and "bargain."

The choice of weaponry is inexhaustible to the gun seeker.

POLICE .38, $65

For the fashionable James Bond set there is a .25 caliber European make available for $34.95. A powerful automatic like a .38 caliber police special cost $65. Blank starting pistols are offered as low as $7.95.

There are derringers, boxes of razor blades, a variety of target pistols, magnums, and any caliber pistol used by law enforcement agencies—or criminal elements.

When a photographer tried to make pictures of the weapons displayed for sale, one gun dealer rushed from the store to protest:

"Tell me what I'm doing wrong. It's not illegal."

The same shop had been involved in a recent case where a Toledo plainclothes officer saw two men departing in a Michigan car after buying guns.

Although they had used false names and Toledo addresses in buying the revolvers, they were traced through the license number. Later, in Flint, they were arrested after a series of holdups.

DEALER CLAMS UP

Two brothers, Moe and Hans Shapiro, known more popularly locally as the "gold dust twins," operate one of the busiest gun exchanges. But they refuse to discuss their operations with reporters.

"You made the wrong approach," one of the brothers complained. "The milk has been spilled. We wouldn't recognize anyone who bought a gun, nor tell you."

A few blocks away, Dick Phillips, whose loan shop is crammed with second-hand items, has several show cases filled with shiny, new revolvers.

"A lot of nice people come down here from Michigan to buy guns," he insisted. "Some are very educated."

MOST FOR MICHIGAN

He estimated that of the 150 hand pistols he sells each year "90 percent are bought by Michigan people."

"I sometimes sell as many as 25 on a Saturday", Phillips recounted, adding that sales spiral when tension is aroused by a crime or racial strife.

Like other dealers here, Phillips asks the gun purchaser to sign a card with his name, address, and signature.

TURNS DOWN KIDS

He only began asking for signatures 4 months ago after Federal officials, who oversee sales of hand weapons, insisted on "closer supervision."

But still he doesn't ask for identification from gun buyers since he's not required to by Ohio law.

Asked if he imposes any restrictions on gun buyers, Phillips said he never sells weapons to anyone under 21.

"The kids in the black leather jackets have got turned down so often that they don't even try me any more," Phillips boasted.

SUBURBS COMPLETE

He added that he also refuses to sell hand weapons to anyone "who has been drinking" or "acts touched."

Phillips admitted that occasionally a pistol he sold may have been used in a crime.

Toledo Police Chief Anthony A. Bosch said Toledo once had one of the toughest gun ordinances in the Nation but that it was repealed in 1957 under "commercial pressure."

Gun merchants in Toledo, he recounted, suffered because customers could go to any of its suburbs and purchase a hand weapon without having to have himself checked for a police record, fingerprinted, and having his photograph put on file.

"Not only was it hurting local merchants, but it penalized good citizens who wanted handguns," said Bosch.

"If some fellow wants to get a gun to stick someone up, he can get it no matter what we do."

QUIZ APPLICANTS

Others suggest Ohio should pattern itself after Michigan where an applicant's record is closely checked to establish if he has a felony conviction in the last 8 years.

Reason for the applicant's bid for a gun are checked also, and to carry a concealed handgun, the applicant must answer searching questions before a special board which sits in each Michigan county periodically.

Bosch said that there has been "no clamor" in Ohio for similar restrictions.

He said he has received few complaints from Michigan authorities over illegal gun purchases and that recently a team of Detroit detectives checked records of gun purchases in Toledo and "went away seemingly well satisfied."

Top Detroit detectives, however, said the current system of keeping track of purchases in Toledo was "meaningless information."

Another quipped that released convicts today are given "a new suit, a $10 bill—and the address of a Toledo pawnshop."

NOMINATION OF SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON, OF NEW MEXICO, AS A CANDIDATE FOR A FOURTH TERM IN THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. MONTOYA. Madam President, on February 22 the Democratic Party in New Mexico held its preprimary nominating convention to select a slate of candidates for the November general election. At the convention in Albuquerque, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON was nominated by acclamation to be the Democratic candidate for a fourth term in the U.S. Senate. Mr. Don L. Dickason nominated our esteemed colleague. I ask unanimous consent that the nominating remarks of Mr. Dickason be printed in the RECORD.

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

NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE CLINTON P. ANDERSON AS A CANDIDATE FOR THE U.S. SENATE

I deem it a high honor to be able to place in nomination as the Democratic Party's candidate for the U.S. Senate, a man who has served his State and Nation with great distinction for three decades. President Johnson has called him "one of the most able and dedicated public servants in America." President Kennedy said that while this man represents New Mexico, he "speaks for the Nation."

Last fall he considered the possibility of not seeking reelection to a fourth term in the U.S. Senate. But his Democratic colleagues—and even a few distinguished Republicans—urged him to run again. They recognized the need in public life for a man with his vision, vigor, intellect, and influence.

Those qualities enabled him to achieve an amazing record of accomplishment during the last 6 years. One of his measures vastly expanded efforts to convert brackish and sea water into usable water. Another of his acts expands research on local and regional water problems. New Mexico State University received the first grant under that program. He is the author of the law which provides planning for the future of entire river basins on a logical and efficient basis; and he is pushing ahead on legislation to accelerate weather modification and increase useful precipitation. He was one of the leaders whose untiring efforts finally brought into being the San Juan-Chama and Navajo Indian irrigation projects, giving a large part of our State the increased water supply essential to growth and prosperity. It is not surprising that the majority leader of the Senate calls him Mr. Water.

But water is only one natural resource. The man I nominate is a member and former chairman of the Senate Interior Committee. Over the last 6 years his work on the committee has been marked by some of the most forward-looking conservation and outdoor recreation legislation in history. For New Mexico, outdoor recreation and tourism mean jobs and revenue. His bill became the Wilderness Act to preserve primitive stretches of American land for future generations.

Tens of thousands of Americans are involved in the atomic energy program. The man I nominate is a member and former chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which oversees that program. His constant efforts helped produce the decision to develop the Meson facility at Los Alamos, that will assure the major role of Los Alamos in nuclear science. He has had undying faith—and that faith is being rewarded—in the nuclear propelled rocket which is of importance not only to Los Alamos but to laboratories and industries in the Albuquerque area.

As chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, he has had a significant voice in the boldest scientific and technical venture ever known. An energetic space program is underway at White Sands. Many of our universities and industries are involved in this space effort. This role can grow—and it will with this man's help.

But while he is concerned about the distant planets, he has helped make life on earth better. Millions of older Americans and their families will be benefited by medicare—in large measure the work of the man I nominate. His prompt action led to New Mexico being one of the first States to have a food stamp program. He worked untiringly with the Governor and other members of our congressional delegation to maintain Fort Bayard as a hospital so that the facility would not be closed for public use.

In northern New Mexico many individuals and government agencies are laboring to improve the region's industrial and agricultural pace. The man I nominate believes in developing the full potential of the people and resources of that region.

He understands intimately the problems of agriculture. He championed the program to eliminate water-wasting plants in the Pecos River Basin. He has sponsored legislation to allow transfer of cotton acreages from elsewhere to the more productive areas of our State.

He is a ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee which handles all tax legislation, including depletion allowances for such important New Mexico industries as oil and gas.

Recognizing that economic and social progress are founded on education, he has been a leader in the cause of better educational opportunities for Indians.

He can do more for New Mexico because the record proves he has done more.

I place the nomination as a candidate for another term in the U.S. Senate, the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE'S MOVE TO ENFRANCHISE SIX ADDITIONAL TEAMS

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, last month I urged the Senate and House Antitrust Subcommittees to undertake an investigation of the National Hockey League's recent move to enfranchise six additional teams. While my initial action resulted from articles in our Baltimore newspapers and a flood of letters and telegrams from local hockey enthusiasts, in recent days I have received support for my efforts from hockey fans throughout the United States and Canada.

There appears to be a widespread feeling among those closely associated with professional ice hockey that the recent franchise selections were not based on individual merit, but rather on the selfish economic interests of a few individuals.

From the information I have been able to obtain thus far, it appears that a serious violation of our antitrust laws may have occurred. It was for this reason that I requested Attorney General Katzenbach to look into the matter.

As you know, Madam President, 13 groups from 8 different cities deposited $10,000 apiece in order to bid for the 6 available National Hockey League franchises. Five of the eight cities were awarded franchises while Baltimore, Buffalo, and Vancouver were rejected. The sixth franchise was awarded to St. Louis—a city which apparently did not have a deposit, bidders, or visible owners. Why St. Louis was enfranchised is still shrouded in mystery. It is known, however, that the late James D. Norris, former owner of the Chicago National Hockey League team, was also coowner of the St. Louis arena. It has been hinted that Mr. Norris made

a St. Louis franchise a precondition for league expansion.

I believe the National Hockey League's action has implications that go far beyond the parochial question of whether one city or another gets a hockey team. The questions that must be determined are: First, has the National Hockey League deliberately violated our antitrust laws; second, is stricter enforcement of our antitrust laws necessary in the field of professional sports; and third, is further legislation needed to protect the public from backroom dealing.

The dispute over the league's actions is not confined to the United States. Many Canadians are bitter that Vancouver was not included in the expansion. They are afraid that Canada's No. 1 professional sport—hockey—is being sold out of existence. Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson has gone so far as to discuss the matter before Parliament. The remarks of Gordon Juckes, secretary-manager of the Canadian Amateur Association, are typical of Canadian feelings. He charges that the National Hockey League has "finally removed the blinds completely and presented its true money-grabbing philosophy to the Canadian people."

The National Hockey League's actions have also been viewed with considerable concern by the Baltimore City Council. On February 21, 1966, the council passed a resolution "requesting an investigation of the methods employed by the National Hockey League in granting six new franchises."

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to include the council's resolution at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION 1534

Resolution, city council requesting an investigation of the methods employed by the National Hockey League in granting six new franchises

(Introduced by the president and Messrs. Soypher, Prucha, Rubenstein, Panuska, Caplan, Duffy, Myers, Pica, Edelman, Curran, Best, Leone, Ward, and Schaefer)

The members of the City Council of Baltimore are completely puzzled by the methods employed by the National Hockey League in recently granting six new franchises.

Baltimore City made a strong bid for one of these franchises. The city has a civic center which could have been used for the games. It has for years given strong support to professional hockey, and seemingly the city fulfilled all requirements to qualify for one of these franchises.

The city of Baltimore was turned down in its bid for a franchise, and there are some unanswered questions as to why this occurred. For one thing, the cities of St. Louis and Philadelphia, which were late entries in the application for franchises, both were given places in the National Hockey League. In addition, there have been disquieting rumors in the public press to the effect that the coowner of the St. Louis minor league team had "forced" the National Hockey League to give a franchise to St. Louis.

Such rumors and such decisions as in this instance do the professional sports world much harm. Thousands of citizens and sports fans in the Baltimore area are disappointed and outraged over the failure to get a franchise in the National Hockey League. These feelings are aggravated when as in this instance it appears there may have been undue favoritism and influence at work in the determination of these new franchises.

In any event, the whole subject needs consideration and publicity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of Baltimore, That this body requests Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, and Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, to investigate the antitrust and monopoly aspects in the recent action of the National Hockey League in turning down the strong bid of Baltimore City for a franchise in that league; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the council is requested to send copies of this resolution to Senator PHILIP HART, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, the president of the National Hockey League, and each member of the Maryland delegation in the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, I believe the Department of Justice should vigorously pursue its investigation of this business transaction so as to better determine whether a violation of our antitrust laws did occur. The information obtained in such an investigation would be invaluable to the Senate and House committees concerned with the antitrust laws as they apply to professional team sports.

NEARLY ANYBODY CAN BUY A GUN

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a detailed series of articles by Tom Nolan, of the Newspapers Enterprise Association, which was published recently in the Washington, D.C., Daily News. The series reflects the enterprise of both the reporter and the news service, and the conscience of a publisher to inform the public.

In this instance the news items concern the year's long attempt of Congress to pass legislation that would bring a reasonable measure of sanity to the traffic in mail-order weapons, which now includes everything from pistols and revolvers to bazookas, cannon, and antitank guns.

The weapons are advertised for sale to anyone with the nominal purchase price including felons, addicts, and mental patients. Sales slogans say it is the World War II materiel used by the enemy to "smash" U.S. forces.

I say that commerce in these death dealing weapons has reached the point where it is inconsistent with a well regulated society to allow it to continue. These articles provide a fair outline of this situation, why it exists and, possibly, why nothing has been done about it.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues for their better understanding of the problem when it is considered by the Senate in the near future.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Jan. 20, 1966]

NEARLY ANYBODY CAN BUY A GUN

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Is there any way to limit the easy availability of weapons—from pistols to bazookas—without, at the same time, hindering the legitimate activities of sportsmen? This is the issue with which Congress soon will grapple. And a bitter fight rages. In a provocative three-part series. NEA's Tom Nolan looks at the gun problem. Following is the first article in the series.)

(By Tom Nolan)

WASHINGTON.—On November 22, 1963, President John Kennedy was killed by a bullet fired from a mail-order rifle purchased by a mentally deranged man.

Last February the wife of a Falls Church, Va., school principal shot her four children to death before killing herself with a pistol. The woman, who had spent 6 months in two mental institutions the year before, bought the pistol that morning at a department store.

In Baltimore—where a written statement from the police commissioner and a 15-day waiting period are necessary before a pistol can be purchased—a robber in mid-1964 took a taxi to surburban Essex where he bought a pistol. Four months later, a bullet from the gun killed a Baltimore policeman.

A San Mateo, Calif., electronics worker bought a rifle at a shopping center last October. Two hours later, he used the weapon to kill his girl friend and himself.

These senseless tragedies occurred in part because anybody in the United States can buy a gun. There are no restrictions on the sale of rifles and shotguns anywhere. Only seven States require a permit to purchase a handgun.

Despite the emotional furies aroused by the assassination of President Kennedy, despite a national poll which showed eight out of 10 Americans favored stiffer firearms-registration requirements, despite a strong plea for a tough gun-control measure by President Johnson, Congress has twice failed to do anything about the easy availability of guns.

This is not due to lack of opportunity. Altogether there have been 34 firearms-control measures introduced in the last 26 months.

The primary reason for this foot dragging is the strong reaction of a small, but vocal, segment of the public hunters, gun collectors, firearms dealers, and patriotic organizations.

CAN FIND ARMS

Opponents to severe Federal firearms legislation point out than any criminal who seeks weapons and ammunition can always find them. Even the most stringent law would not prevent this.

At the same time, they say, any law which tightens the availability of firearms would seriously curtail activities of dedicated hunters and marksmen who, after all, should have the right to pursue their particular hobby.

Spearhead of the gun lobby, one of the most powerful in Washington, is the National Rifle Association, an organization which because of loopholes in the Federal Lobbying Act, is not required to register as a lobby.

From a small group of New York National Guard officers, the NRA has grown in 94 years to a national organization with more than 700,000 members. It can mobilize roughly another half-million supporters in some 12,000 NRA-affiliated gun clubs and groups.

Focal point of the NRA effort over the past 2 years is the President's gun bill, introduced by Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Thanks mainly to NRA tactics, this hard line measure has aroused the bitterest opposition since Franklin Roosevelt tried to pack the Supreme Court. DODD's bill would ban all mail-order gun sales; impose tougher recordkeeping requirements on retail dealers to aid local police in keeping track of gun sales, raise license fees; and ban the import of foreign military surplus weapons.

The NRA interprets these provisions as prohibiting "the interstate movement of all firearms to all persons other than Federal licensed manufacturers and dealers."

Thousands of NRA members have interpreted this statement as saying that the bill would bar a Connecticut duck hunter from buying a shotgun in Colorado. This is misconception, DODD says.

With statements such as the above, the NRA caused a virtual inundation of Congress by letter and wire.

DODD says this campaign is the primary reason the bill has been stalled in his own Judiciary Subcommittee for 2 years. He was unable to round up a quorum to act on the measure after hearings were completed last July. This year, DODD vows, it will be different.

READY TO VOTE

"I'm going to get a vote at long last," he says, "if I have to use every parliamentary trick in the book, and several that aren't."

Though the NRA is flatly opposed to the President's bill, it likes several others which have been introduced—including one which DODD put in before the assassination of President Kennedy.

Says NRA Executive Vice President Franklin Orth:

"Obviously there are some abuses that we all agree need correcting."

Adds the NRA executive committee: "There can be good, forward-looking, Federal legislation. It is not necessary to accept unreasonable restrictions."

But the NRA's idea of acceptable legislation does not block the easy availability of guns—the basic reason for having a firearms-control law.

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 25, 1966]

NRA GUN PROPOSALS ARE FULL OF HOLES

(By Tom Nolan)

(Second of three articles)

It shouldn't be said that the National Rifle Association is against any form of gun-control legislation.

Its leadership freely admits the need for a law and is officially backing a three-part proposal sponsored by Representative ROBERT CASEY, Democrat, of Texas. The proposal has been called the toughest gun bill in Congress.

And, indeed, it is tough.

Basically, the bill would make it a Federal offense to use a gun in specified criminal acts, ranging from robbery and assault to kidnaping and rape. First-time offenders would face a mandatory 10-year prison term; repeaters, a mandatory 25 years.

Under the Casey bill, roughly 100,000 gun crimes handled last year by State and local police would require investigation and prosecution by Federal law enforcement officers.

The bill reflects the NRA belief that the only justifiable firearms laws are those providing stronger penalties for the criminal use of guns and that preventive measures, such as a registration requirement, would neither stop criminals from getting guns nor reduce crime.

Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, who has his own bill in the congressional hopper, is not in favor of the NRA-backed bill, to put it mildly.

"I wonder," he muses, "whether the NRA, in supporting legislation it knows stands little chance of becoming law, is just supporting a gimmick to see that no new legislation is passed.

"Such a law, if strictly enforced and if upheld by the courts, would present staggering administrative problems."

A conservative guess is that the existing Federal enforcement staff would have to be tripled in size to cope with the Casey bill requirements. If only a third of last year's offenders were convicted under the bill, the existing Federal prison system capacity would have to be expanded by 150 percent.

Most congressional observers agree that the bill's chances of being passed are virtually nonexistent.

WIDE OPEN

The second NRA proposal would make it a Federal offense for a licensed dealer or manufacturer to ship a gun in contravention of a State law.

But only seven States now require a permit to purchase a pistol or revolver. There are no restrictions on the sales of rifles and shotguns. And the NRA proposal apparently gives a shipper of guns an easy out, since no conviction could be obtained if he made a reasonable effort to learn if a State law is being violated.

Such reasonable effort is now construed as simply requiring a signed statement by the purchaser to the effect that he is under no legal disability which would prohibit shipment.

THE BIG HARDWARE

The third NRA proposal would provide Federal control of such military ordinance as bazookas, grenades, cannons, and rockets. These weapons would be subject to a $200 transfer tax and registration with the Treasury Department which enforces Federal gun laws.

This proposal looks fine on the surface, but—under NRA specifications—such weapons as the .50-caliber machinegun and six antitank guns currently advertised in mail-order catalogs would be excluded, Senator DODD says.

BIG BUSINESS

Hunting, target and trap shooting are big business in the United States today. Their devotees spend roughly $250 million a year on guns, ammunition and accessories. The side effects probably produce more than a billion dollars annually for the makers of cars, boats, fuel, and clothes.

It is estimated that there are about 54 million guns of various kinds in private possession in the country today. Each year this number is increased by domestic manufacture and swollen by a flood of firearms from abroad, mostly the discarded military models of foreign governments imported to be sold cheaply by mail-order merchants.

THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

Originally formed to promote proficiency in rifle shooting, the NRA over the years has become the chief defender of the citizen's right to keep and bear arms.

This crusade is based on what Senator DODD calls an out-of-context reading of the second amendment to the Constitution—which constitutional experts say was intended to safeguard only the people's collective right to bear arms as members of a militia.

Despite modern Armed Forces, a National Guard, and local police, the NRA argues that an armed citizenry is necessary to defend the country against enemies both within and without.

The NRA stands squarely on the premise that the ownership of firearms must not be denied Americans of good repute. To this end, the organization says it carefully screens its membership applicants.

Each must certify that he is over 18, has never been convicted of a crime of violence, and is not a member of any organization which seeks to overthrow the Government. Each applicant must also be endorsed by an NRA member, a public official, or a military officer of the United States.

Last month I applied for membership in the NRA by filling out an application clipped from a barber shop magazine. I enclosed a check for $5.

For the endorsement, I just printed the first name that came to mind—out of the air. Presumably I was carefully screened. My NRA membership card arrived in the mail a week later.

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 26, 1966]

A BIG LOBBY IS NEEDED TO STRETCH THE TRUTH

(By Tom Nolan)

(Last of series)

Lobbyists come in different shapes and sizes.

From its plush headquarters on Farragut Square, the American Medical Association—a registered lobby for more than 200,000 doctors—spent $152,000 in one 3-month period last year in its losing fight to prevent passage of medicare.

In a small office on Indiana Avenue, Harry Maginnis directs the activities of the Associated Third-Class Mail Users—also a registered lobby. On a budget of $70,000 a year—dues from 800 junk mailers—Mr. Maginnis has been remarkably effective in protecting the present low third-class postage rate.

And from its new $3 million building on Rhode Island Avenue, the National Rifle Association wages an intensive and effective battle to prevent "unreasonable restrictive" firearms control laws. In 1963, NRA's legislative and public affairs division spent nearly $145,000 to produce, among other things, 42 special legislative bulletins urging Members to oppose various gun bills.

Perhaps the primary difference between the tactics of the AMA lobby, Harry Maginnis, and the NRA is that the NRA is not registered as a lobby.

EDUCATIONAL LICENSE

The reason for this is that the NRA claims its function is not to influence legislation, but merely to inform or educate its members and the public.

This is one of the ways in which NRA educated its members on the evils of the President's gun bill last April 9:

"If you transported your rifle or shotgun to another State for a lawful purpose, such as hunting, you would have to comply with such burdensome restrictions and redtape as might be required."

To hunter Bill Willard of Grangeville, Idaho, this spelled the end of his beloved mountain goat hunting forays to Wyoming. He promptly fired off protests to his Congressman and Senators and to Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, sponsor of the President's bill.

Tens of thousands of other hunters did the same.

WHAT THE LAW SAYS

As Senator DODD pointed out to NRA Executive Vice President Franklin Orth in hearings last year, there are no restrictions in the President's measure pertaining to anyone other than criminals or fugitives who transport rifles or shotguns across a State line.

The deluge of letters resulting from NRA bulletins played an important part in Congress' failure to act on any firearms-control bill last session.

Though the organization vigorously denies it is a lobby, an NRA folder urges readers to "watch for firearms-control proposals that may appear in Congress or your State legislature, in your community, city, or town" and to oppose them "by letter, telegram, or telephone call, or by personal appearance at open hearings."

The 1963 NRA operating report states that "during 1963, 350 bills of concern to gun owners were introduced in State legislatures and 32 in the U.S. Congress * * * 42 legislative bulletins were mailed to 320,000 members and clubs in 50 States. NRA members reacted promptly, firmly, and in force. As a

result, none of the legislation deemed severe was enacted."

AMMUNITION

One NRA bulletin said, "Anyone engaged in the manufacture of ammunition would be required to have a $1,000 manufacturer's license.

In fact, the bill provides only a $500 license fee. Shotgun ammunition is excluded altogether.

The NRA also implies that the bill introduced by Senator DODD—at President Johnson's request—is more "far-reaching and restrictive" than the President intended.

"The NRA knows this isn't true," Senator DODD asserts. "It knows I have the complete backing of the administration on this bill. Yet it has persisted in confusing the issues and disrupting the truth."

Lobby or not, the NRA is probably the only private pressure group to receive a direct subsidy from the U.S. Government. A Defense Department program has provided NRA members—and only NRA members—with free ammunition and surplus Government guns at a fraction of their retail value.

COSTLY FOR TAXPAYERS

It is run by the Army's National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and, since 1959, it has cost taxpayers more than $12 million. From 1959 to 1964, the Board gave away to NRA-affiliated gun clubs nearly 250 million rounds of free ammunition worth some $7.2 million.

Though the practice has been curtailed, the Board in the last 6 years has sold some 500,000 guns to NRA members.

In effect, the NRA is the sole beneficiary of the Board's annual appropriation of $500,000, which includes most of the cost of putting on the national shooting matches each year at Camp Perry, Ohio, a tournament staffed by some 2,000 U.S. servicemen who spend the week operating as cooks, target pullers, and judges.

Last year at Camp Perry, Armed Forces PIO issued a "press kit," containing among other items, the latest issue of the American Rifleman (the NRA official publication) which contained a blistering attack on the President's gun bill.

THE FOSTER GRANDPARENT PROGRAM

Mr. HARRIS. Madam President, the United States must find better ways to use the talents and experience of its older citizens and give them opportunities for additional private income.

I want to voice my praise for the foster grandparent program, which is sponsored jointly by the Administration on Aging and the Office of Economic Opportunity, as being a step in the right direction.

The foster grandparent program, established last year on a pilot basis, is a step in the right direction and serves several needs. It brings together children in institutions, who need personal attention and love and affection, and older people, who need income and have love and affection to share.

The foster grandparent program is now operating on an experimental basis in 20 States, primarily with mentally retarded children, and has had great success. The program needs to be expanded, and we need it in Oklahoma.

Representatives of the Administration on Aging, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Five Civilized Tribes, and the Oklahoma Department of Public Welfare will meet in Tulsa, Wednesday, March 9, to discuss development of a foster grandparent program project for eastern Oklahoma.

This particular project would not be limited to Indian institutions, although they would be a major part of it. I certainly hope the project can be approved.

We have got to stop wasting the talents and experience of so many of our older citizens, many of whom receive welfare but desire the opportunity to earn additional income.

I want to see the foster grandparent program expanded to include using older citizens to work with children who are not in institutions, but who need the personal attention that only a foster grandparent can give.

I think the first place we ought to expand it is in the Headstart program, sponsored by OEO, which gives preschool training to deprived children.

At my request the Administration on Aging and the Office of Economic Opportunity have scheduled a Washington conference of their two staffs to discuss the possibility of extending the foster grandparent program to include working with the children in the Headstart program.

If this new concept is agreed to by the two agencies, I intend to see that an Oklahoma community is the first to become involved in this new idea, because we in Oklahoma believe this expansion of both programs is needed.

HOW TO FIGHT PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, since I began my efforts to create a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials, I have received many, many inquiries from worried parents who ask: "What can we do to fight pornography?"

A number of community projects have been begun. Special interfaith groups have worked out programs. These are good—but the most effective way, I believe, is for each family to have its own program of keeping smut out of the hands of children and replacing it with good books and reading materials.

Columbia, the official magazine of the Knights of Columbus, has run a series of three articles on the subject of obscene literature and how to combat it. In the latest issue, the article is devoted to the problem: "How To Fight Pornography."

I believe that this is a well written, well-thought-out article which offers guidance to parents who are concerned about the traffic in salacious literature.

In addition to the splendid article written by James M. Shea, there is a special message from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article "How To Fight Pornography" and the special message from Mr. Hoover printed in the RECORD.

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

HOW TO FIGHT PORNOGRAPHY

(By James M. Shea)

(NOTE.—The Nation's leaders in the fight against pornography give many-faceted advice on how parents can cope with the problem, but they all agree that the action must be decisive and quick.)

One thing the average parent can do about the contagion and corruption spread by pornography is to complain—loudly, vigorously and constantly.

"If the public were vocal enough, the problem would not exist," according to the leaders of a crusade against obscenity.

But that's not all the public—parents, fathers, housewives, ordinary folks—can do.

Interviews with a cross section of American leaders deeply concerned about the plague of pornography show a consensus that says, first of all, "Do something." To do nothing is virtually to come to the aid of the traffickers in smut. In public apathy lies their chief strength.

Second, says the consensus, "Do everything." In other words even the most "average" citizen ought to see that there are steps he can take, some thoroughly positive and constructive, to turn back the evil tide.

In a special statement to Columbia, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, emphasized that even the utmost efforts of law enforcement authorities aren't enough. "The cooperation of all decent citizens—and particularly parents—is essential in combating this effort to degrade our young people."

Charles H. Keating, Jr., founder and chief counsel of the nationwide Citizens for Decent Literature, pointed out that "parents at least can act to reduce the problem by making their views known to newspaper editors and other molders of public opinion."

"But probably the most important thing parents can do," Keating declared, "is to make complaints wherever pornography is found."

Some of the other measures that ordinary citizens—"average parents"—can and ought to take to protect their children from the ravages of pornography, according to the leaders interviewed by Columbia, are:

1. Make sure their own homes are God-centered, formed with religious values and established in a love that is reflected in a spirit of happiness, joy and well-being.

2. Be sure they give their own children adequate and accurate instructions in the full meaning of sex so that at every period of their lives the children have their natural curiosity satisfied with information that is geared to their intelligence and at the same time is reverent and wholesome.

3. Cultivate in their own children a desire for good reading, a love of good books, a discriminating taste in literary and other matters so that even on a natural basis they may be able to choose the good because they are able to recognize it and because they have learned to appreciate it.

4. Be informed—as so many parents are not—about the true nature of the problem, the depth of the depravity of a business that probably exceeds $2 billion a year in volume, much of it aimed directly at "hooking" young people.

5. Support the work of organizations dedicated to fighting the merchandisers of pornographic books, magazines, pictures, slides, films, records, and tapes.

6. "Pray hard," as an experienced judge suggested, "for cleanness of mind, body, and heart for their children."

Hoover, who has become a symbol of the Nation's law-enforcement bodies, has no illusions about the possible effect of pornography on young people. "Not only does reading or viewing such material often lead to immorality and other disturbances on the part of the young person," he said. "It can result in acts of violence as well. In a number of instances individuals, arrested after committing vicious sex crimes, have stated that the impetus came from sampling obscene material."

And he knows where a beginning must be made. "The basic ingredient in assuring that young people will not be harmed by obscene material is instilling in them at an early age high spiritual and moral values. Parents must by their own example teach their children the traits of decency, self-respect, and clean thinking."

Moreover, Hoover continued, "It should be impressed upon teenagers that peddlers in filth are seeking to exploit their curiosity and are using them as dupes for their vicious racket."

"Children should be encouraged to read good books," he said, "so that they can develop an appreciation for excellence in literature. They will then have no difficulty in readily recognizing offcolor material for the trash that it is."

Hoover went on to say: "You as parents have a deep responsibility in the fight against pornography. My plea to you readers of Columbia magazine is to assure that proper guidance is afforded to our youth so they will shun the peddler of obscenity. In so doing, you help them develop into wholesome and responsible adults."

Msgr. Joseph J. Howard, executive secretary of the National Office for Decent Literature, was equally emphatic about the responsibility of parents and he told Columbia that "the average parent must be made aware of the problem."

"The average parent," he went on, "must realize that smut is a $2 billion business and that acording to surveys between 75 and 90 percent of it falls into the hands of youth."

"Parents should ask dealers who handle such trash to get rid of it," Monsignor Howard declared. "If the dealer refuses to cooperate, then the parents should make their purchases in another store."

The NODL official called for support of stringent laws against pornography. "We spend billions for education," he said. "Why do we allow unscrupulous merchants to destroy this education? This battle can be won only by the interest and determination of parents."

Cincinnati Municipal Court Judge John W. Keefe, himself the father of six children, has presided over some of the showcase trials of smut peddlers and distributors initiated by the Cincinnati-based Citizens for Decent Literature.

A realist, Judge Keefe is convinced of the necessity for organized, civic action against the deep-running menace of obscenity. In fact, he believes existing organizations need to become broader. He feels that only by enlisting leaders of all faiths on a national basis can an effective war be waged against the problem.

At the same time the judge, who also is active in the Knights of Columbus in Cincinnati, emphasizes that "parents can do a great deal to combat obscenity and pornography in the home."

"Often the magnitude of the problem seems to overwhelm and almost paralyze parents into a complete lack of action," he said. "This is unfortunate and unnecessary."

He was among those who called for "a wholesome sex education" for children "at a reasonable age." He said the parents themselves ought to do this, but added that "if they feel they are inadequate they can have a clergyman or an intelligent and understanding physician help."

Judge Keefe cited other steps parents ought to take, including that of "impressing your children wtih the realization that all through life they will be confronted with countless choices of right or wrong and that they must learn at an early age to make sound choices."

Equally certain that parents have to play a significant role in combating obscenity was Patricia McMackin, family life chairman of the National Council of Catholic Women, whose husband, Bernard P. McMackin, Jr., formerly held the equivalent position with the National Council of Catholic Men.

While she understands the need for organized campaigns locally and nationally, Mrs. McMackin, mother of five children, believes that a positive program of good reading coupled with a strong moral climate in the home comprises the most effective bulwark against the inroads of printed poison.

"We don't emphasize 'don't,'" smiled Mrs. McMackin. "We try to emphasize the positive. From their earliest years the children have known that we love and respect good books."

Reading to the very young members of the family is a well established tradition in the McMackin family. Moreover, when the children are reading books of their own choice, their parents contrive to discuss the books with them, leading them to make discriminating judgments.

Mrs. McMackin doesn't discount the mother's role in the religious formation of the children, but she nevertheless stresses the importance of the father's role. "A father gives his children an example, no matter what he does—either a good example or a bad one. Youngsters take their cue from dad, and if he brags about visits to an offcolor club he must be prepared to have his children seek out the material that will instruct them in questionable values."

Another element of family life to which Mrs. McMackin attaches much importance in relation to antipornography efforts, as well as to other matters, is that of love. "If a child is secure in love at home and has a sense of being an important person in a closely knit family, he is unlikely to feel a need to gain attention—and handling pornography sometimes begins as a means of gaining attention."

One of the Nation's best known crusaders against pornography is Charles Keating, former Olympic swimming champion, ex-Navy flyer, father of six children and the man behind the nationwide Citizens for Decent Literature organization.

CDL is dedicated to enforcement of the laws against obscenity and to making the public aware of the nature of the menace as well as of the legal means at their disposal to fight it.

In its 10 years of activity CDL probably has been the means of alerting more U.S. citizens to the extent and seriousness of the danger of pornography than any other agency. It has seen successes and setbacks, though Keating indicates that only a long-range view can carry a crusader through the many frustrations he experiences.

He expressed a fairly optimistic opinion about the American public's recognition of the problem. "You will find that individuals and families and even the press not only will tolerate but actually will encourage the arrest and prosecution of the pornographer today," he said. A decade ago, vague references to freedom of the press were enough to turn away public attention and interest.

Besides, "prosecutors are better educated concerning the problem," he said. What may lead to a major breakthrough for antipornography organizations now, he said, is the possibility of Supreme Court decisions upholding recent convictions in several cases now pending. If the Court does uphold the convictions, Keating expects to see "a wave of action against pornographers" and possibly "a substantial cleanup in 2 years."

But no matter how the Court decisions go there remains the responsibility of parents to "learn just how tough this material is," Keating commented.

He spoke of the "tremendous inroads made by Playboy magazine and the Playboy philosophy," noting that 50 percent of the Nation's male college students read the magazine and that the total circulation of Playboy is 7,500,000.

"Playboy gets away with murder because parents don't realize its philosophy and the stimulation it offers. This is a massive problem which parents must meet directly," he said.

Turning to the need for parents to "make complaints" every time they encounter pornography, Keating said: "I am always surprised to find out around the country that police say they have received no complaints in this matter."

Dr. Donald Cortum, Torrance, Calif., physician and national cochairman of the Citizens for Decent Literature, holds that "in a pluralistic society the only way we ever can unite on where to draw the line on obscenity is to go to court and use the jury system which embodies the conscience of the community."

But public opinion is needed to support law enforcement, Dr. Cortum added. "If Americans were not buying the stuff, no market would exist. If every Knight of Columbus would say something to the retailers, the market would be diminished. If someone persists, call the police and file a complaint.

"Further, provide healthy sex attitudes and adequate sex education in your own family to protect your children against the influence of this material."

Dr. Cortum has no illusions about fast results in this battle against the pornographic plague. Right now, he says, we must defend and insist on community standards.

Dr. Robert Buckley, of Santa Monica, Calif., president of the Guild of Catholic Psychiatrists, regards "proper and practical instruction about sex" as one of the most effective ways to keep children from becoming pornography addicts.

"Education seems the real treatment to prevent progressive addiction," he said. "This education can be accomplished only by a vigorous attack spearheaded by parent, pastor, physician, and teacher working together, not separately."

Also emphasizing the need for all-out concerted effort to drive out the pornographers was Father Morton A. Hill, S.J., secretary of Operation Yorkville, New York-based group fighting pornography.

Officials of the interfaith organization say that the pornography problem "has never been so far-reaching" as it is now and that "a generation of American children has never been so dangerously threatened."

Father Hill and his fellow workers in Operation Yorkville insist that "the voice of the people must always be heard."

"Sporadic expressions of community standards * * * are not effective enough against a well-organized, big-monied, full-time network of pornographers and defenders," he said.

Recently Operation Yorkville took a dramatic step in its campaign when it launched a nationwide citizens' appeal to the President.

Convinced that only a full-scale war against pornography, with President Johnson himself mobilizing the forces of decency in the Nation, could be effective, Operation Yorkville called for citizens around the country to flood the White House with requests to the President.

Out of such a "nationwide awakening," comments Father Hill, "there would have to come a full-time interfaith organization with headquarters in Washington and affiliates in each State."

This will not come to pass unless the "average parent" wants it, understands the need for it, and supports it.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has this special message for Columbia readers:

"The peddling of pornographic literature to America's youth presents a serious problem. Not only does reading or viewing such material often lead to immorality and other disturbances on the part of the young person,

it can result in acts of violence as well. In a number of instances individuals, arrested after committing vicious sex crimes, have stated that the impetus came from sampling obscene material.

"Law enforcement is doing its utmost to curb the peddler of pornography. But this is a task that we cannot accomplish alone. The purveyor of smut has seemingly endless sources producing his merchandise and he uses a variety of clever tactics to outwit the law. The cooperation of all decent citizens —and particularly parents—is essential in combating this effort to degrade our young people.

"The basic ingredient in assuring that young people will not be harmed by obscene material is instilling in them at an early age high spiritual and moral values. Parents must by their own example teach their children the traits of decency, self-respect and clean thinking. It should be impressed upon teenagers that peddlers in filth are seeking to exploit their curiosity and are using them as dupes for their vicious racket. Children should be encouraged to read good books so that they can develop an appreciation for excellence in literature. They will then have no difficulty in readily recognizing off-color material for the trash that it is.

"You as parents have a deep responsibility in the fight against pornography. My plea to you readers of Columbia magazine is to assure that proper guidance is afforded our youth so they will shun the peddler of obscenity. In so doing, you help them develop into wholesome and responsible adults.

THE INDEPENDENT STATUS OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news release issued by the Small Business Committee dealing with a resolution urging continued independence for the Small Business Administration.

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

[For immediate release, Mar. 8, 1966]

SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

A resolution urging continued independence for the Small Business Administration was adopted today by the Senate Small Business Committee in its annual executive meeting, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, committee chairman, announced.

Acting on persistent rumors that plans are being actively considered by the administration to merge the Small Business Administration into the Department of Commerce, contrary to the Small Business Act which specifically states that the SBA should be independent the committee adopted the following resolution proposed by Senator SPARKMAN:

"In 1953 the Congress established the Small Business Administration as an independent agency 'under the general direction and supervision of the President,' and provided specifically that the Small Business Administration 'shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government.'

"Consideration is now being given to abolishing the Small Business Administration as an independent agency and transferring its functions to the Department of Commerce.

"Such a transfer would deprive small business of an effective advocate within the Executive Branch of Government.

"The Select Committee on Small Business of the U.S. Senate favors the continuation of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency and recommends that its function not be transferred to the Department of Commerce, or to any other department or agency."

EXTENDED NURSING CARE IN THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a good many questions arise about the provisions for extended nursing care in the medicare program. Recently, Senator Moss, who is chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Aging, was interviewed on the subject. I ask unanimous consent that the interview be printed in the RECORD.

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

VIEWPOINTS: AN INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS

(NOTE.—A member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging since June 1963, Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, heads its Joint Subcommittee on Long-Term Care for the Elderly, which has held comprehensive hearings on nursing home problems and national needs in both institutional and noninstitutional services. He is chairman of the subcommittee on housing and a member of its panels on retirement income and health of the elderly. The 54-year-old native of Halladay, Utah, holds the degree of Juris Doctor from George Washington University Law School in Washington, D.C. He served for 10 years as city judge in Salt Lake City and for 8 years as county attorney for Salt Lake County before election to the Senate in 1958. Now in his second term, Senator Moss serves on the Small Business, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Public Works Committees in addition to the Aging Committee.)

NURSING HOME BEDS AND MEDICARE

Question. You have said people are overestimating the effect medicare will have on the nursing home field. Why?

Senator Moss. Medicare is a hospital-oriented program primarily concerned with acute, short-term illness. The crucial point is that payment for care in nonhospital facilities under medicare is not for the purpose of financing conventional nursing home care but for the purpose of economizing on hospital facilities.

Thus, those nursing homes which will be providers of services under medicare will be those that wish to offer a comparatively short-term, intensive service and to enter into arrangements with hospitals to serve, in effect, as extensions of those hospitals. This is not the major or usual service of most nursing homes and it probably will be a minor phase of the nursing home business. I think there is a danger in thinking that medicare's extended care benefit represents a bonanza to the nursing home field.

Question. Isn't it true that there is a shortage of nursing home beds?

Senator Moss. We hear a lot about that. Of course, there are shortages in some localities. There is also a need to replace some facilities that are hopelessly substandard. However, sometimes what may appear to be a nursing home shortage in a given community may actually be, in large part, a shortage of alternative services for elderly people who need some care. And our subcommittee has received testimony that an excess of beds has been built in certain areas.

Question. Which ones?

Senator Moss. In major cities of the Midwest and West, such as Chicago, St. Louis, Denver, and Los Angeles. In my own State, Utah, figures indicate there may be a short-run surplus.

There's a paradox for you: a much publicized shortage and yet new facilities experience low occupancy and frantic competition for survival.

Question. Why this overbuilding?

Senator Moss. Testimony suggests that some of it has resulted from speculative building in anticipation of State's implementing the Kerr-Mills law for medical assistance for the aged. This mistake might be repeated on an even larger scale if people widely suppose that medicare will support a considerable addition to the current inventory of nursing home beds.

There are indications this may be happening. I have been told that small business investment companies, supported by the Small Business Administration, have had many applications for loans to build nursing homes to meet the supposed demands of medicare. SBIC officials report that many applicants have not even read the law and don't know medicare details. Another bit of evidence: business opportunity pages of newspapers advertise to speculators in nursing care. For instance, an ad in the New York Times said this: "Be ready for medicare—motel suitable for conversion to a nursing home." I know of large corporations that are considering diversifying into the nursing home field to cash in on medicare.

Question. If what you say about overbuilding is true, won't that leave us with competition among providers of care? Won't such a situation improve the nursing home field?

Senator Moss. I don't think a surplus of nursing homes produces a healthful competition. Rather, it produces a situation in which nursing homes have great difficulty in meeting basic needs of their patients from the revenues which they can derive.

Question. What do you think will be the positive effects of medicare on the nursing home field?

Senator Moss. Medicare pays on the basis of reasonable cost. This represents the first time that this principle has been applied federally for nursing home care. Despite the limited role for nursing homes in medicare, the program represents an opportunity to show what the costs actually are when the services demanded by the public are provided. I hope we may be able to adopt this principle for all public programs dealing with nursing home care. This would bolster the economic base for the progress and improvement all of us would like to see.

Nursing homes, potentially, are centers where knowledge and techniques to promote self-care and independence in daily living can be applied. This care must be financed realistically for patients under public programs. In this session of Congress, I plan to introduce legislation to assist nursing homes and other institutions in servicing the chronically ill and aged patient.

HARTKE KEY ROLE IN VIET TALKS IS REVEALED

Mr. BURDICK. Madam President, in the last few months our colleague, Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, has played an important role in contributing to the national debate over our policy in Vietnam.

Although not a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he has contributed as much as any Member to the debate in this Chamber which all of us have witnessed these past weeks. He has made excellent speeches on his own and has persuaded others to join the

debate and offer their solutions to the Vietnam crisis. A recent issue of the Evansville Press from Senator HARTKE's home State of Indiana had an excellent article describing his activities in recent weeks.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HARTKE ROLE IN VIET TALKS IS REVEALED

(By John V. Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Just before last Thanksgiving, the paths of Senators VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, and J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, crossed in Hawaii.

HARTKE was starting a round-the-world trip with a Senate delegation for foreign policy discussions in Japan, India, and Pakistan.

FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was en route to a parliamentary conference in New Zealand.

Both Senators had long been troubled over the grinding war in Vietnam and the ever-present threat that it could spark a nuclear battle and a land war with Red China.

As HARTKE recalls the chance meeting, FULBRIGHT repeated his desire to conduct open hearings on Vietnam by his committee and his inability to get them going.

"I told him I'd help him," HARTKE says. "I knew there was great sentiment in the Senate for a debate."

If one event can be singled out as the starting point of the great debate on Vietnam, it may well have been this discussion thousands of miles from the Senate Chamber.

When HARTKE returned from his month-long trip, he was even more convinced of the need for a complete airing of U.S. involvement in Vietnam, U.S. objectives, and U.S. efforts toward ending the war.

HARTKE found little support for U.S. presence in Vietnam. And he came back thoroughly disgusted with the costly foreign aid program.

"VANCE came back from the trip with strong feelings," recalls Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, a member of the group that some are calling "doves."

HARTKE returned as President Johnson halted bombing of North Vietnam and launched his peace offensive.

From a series of meetings in FULBRIGHT's and HARTKE's offices and informal cloakroom discussions came the outlines of the Foreign Relations Committee hearings and floor debate.

HARTKE participated in preparing the list of committee witnesses (although he is not on FULBRIGHT's committee) and in scheduling the floor speeches.

Toward the end of January, after the peace offensive had got no place, it became apparent that Johnson would order bombing of North Vietnam resumed.

HARTKE, and other Senators who feared what escalation of the war might lead to, decided to appeal to the President to continue the lull in bombing while pursuing peace efforts.

HARTKE had a letter to Johnson drafted—the author HARTKE won't name—and circulated it among a handful of Senators for their comments.

Some thought it "too conciliatory, too polite."

A request that Johnson "consult" with the Senators before resuming the bombing was softened to the wording: "We believe you should have our collective judgment before you, when you make your decision."

And this sentence was added: "We believe we understand in some small degree the agony you must suffer when called upon by our constitutional system to make judgments which may involve war or peace."

The letter was dispatched to the White House less than 24 hours after a late-evening meeting in FULBRIGHT's office, at which HARTKE agreed to round up other signatures.

After a talk with Vermont's GEORGE AIKEN, senior Republican in the Senate, HARTKE agreed to ask only Democrats to sign the letter.

It went to the White House with 15 signatures. Johnson reacted with a curt reply, and 4 days later bombing of North Vietnam targets was resumed.

In February, FULBRIGHT's committee aired opposing viewpoints on Vietnam strategy, and the Senate Chamber reverberated with debate over Johnson's policies.

HARTKE, according to a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, worked on procedural questions arising in the hearings. The day Secretary of State Dean Rusk testified, HARTKE occupied a seat behind committee members.

In the Senate, HARTKE also made a series of speeches warning against escalation of the war, emphasizing the threat of a land war with China and calling for a U.S. military holding action in Vietnam.

Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, describes HARTKE as "a kind of catalyst" who brought together the group of like-minded Senators who have "misgivings about the war."

"He put it together," says METCALF. "He saw the opportunity to assert some leadership and to advance something he sincerely believed. It's about time Senators started exercising leadership."

Another Senator credits HARTKE with welding the peace group from members who had merely been expressing scattered concern about Vietnam policy.

"He hits head on," the Senator says. "He's not afraid to take a single position. He's a person of independent judgment, energy, and drive. He's concerned more with achievement—to unify the group—than in making a personal record."

By sticking his neck out, isn't HARTKE risking a complete break with the White House?

"I don't think this has made any difference," answers a Senator. "If anything, he's gained recognition. This man downtown just looks at power."

In any event, HARTKE, in his 8th year in the Senate, has fashioned a new power base to be reckoned with.

LONG-LINE COMMERCIAL FISHING IN THE OCEANS

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, I recently read an article in Sports Illustrated that brought to my attention a potential crisis in the world's oceans.

This article, written by Martin Kane, a senior editor of Sports Illustrated, points out that if the technique of commercial fishing called long-lining is allowed to continue unregulated, the world population of big game fish may be seriously diminished.

This problem deserves the attention of every supporter of conservation.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the January 31, 1966, issue of Sports Illustrated entitled "Plenty of Fish in the Sea?" be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article in the January 28, 1966, issue of Time on the same subject be printed in the RECORD.

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

PLENTY OF FISH IN THE SEA?

(By Martin Kane)

The world population of big game fishes—most notably swordfish, the marlins, sailfish and the various tunas—is threatened with early decimation. A technique of commercial fishing that is centuries old but has been applied on a large scale only recently is ravaging the oceans. It is called long-lining, and it is the subject of dismayed denunciation in every big game fishing port on the coastal perimeter of the United States, throughout the Caribbean, along the coast of Mexico, in Scandinavia, Australia, and New Zealand. It has sparked skirmishes between sport and commercial fishermen. It has alarmed marine scientists, most of whom concede its devastating effects as a matter of commonsense but urgently need funds to establish scientifically the precise extent of the harm it has done to fish populations already and what its continued untrammeled use portends. Objective of the research: international controls. To many a salt water angler the prospect that such controls can be instituted in time is dim.

Robert S. Nyburg, a Baltimore sport fisherman and advertising man who specializes in billfish, fears that "there may be no more [salt water] sport fishing in this country" by 1970. (If you think striped bass are a sport fish, Nyburg does not know you. He thinks in terms of bigger game.) "There is a real and present danger," Nyburg says, "that, unless some fast action is taken, there will be no more marlin, sailfish, giant tuna or broadbill fishing on either coast of the United States in a very few years."

At least equally alarmed is Ed Louys, executive secretary and director of the Caribbean Gamefishing Association.

"Soon there will be no fishing in the Caribbean," he said recently in Miami. "Commercial fishermen themselves told me this in Venezuela, in Trinidad, in Jamaica—that, unless restrictions are placed on this fishing, they will be destroyed. Since the long-lining thing came out we have been answering questions from hundreds of people asking what we should do, what can we do, to prevent overfishing."

Gerald Talbert, head of the Tiburon (Calif.) Marine Laboratory of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, believes that since the Japanese are by far the most extensive users of long-lining, "our only hope is to appeal to the basic good nature and sense of fair play among the Japanese people. If properly approached," he says, "I believe they would understand and withdraw from the sport-fishing area. So far as I know, no official protest has ever been entered."

Though there are others who hold that the only effective recourse would be a threat of economic sanctions in areas other than fishing, Talbert's view is by no means naive. The Japanese have been singularly cooperative in game-fish tagging programs aimed at understanding and eventual conservation of the fish involved and are more aware than any other national fishery of the excessive efficiency of long-lining. But they do need enormous quantities of fish to supply the protein requirements of their national diet, as do many island peoples. To pose the importance of recreational fishing against this need may be difficult, but there is more to it than that. While long-line fishing has been profitable for them, their catches have begun to thin out under long-lining pressure and they might well be amenable to international controls if these were to be proposed with sound scientific backing.

Unfortunately, sound scientific backing does not exist. If sufficient research grants were available immediately, it might take 5 years or more to put together a persuasive argument of solid scientific validity. In 5 years, many sport fishermen believe, the whole matter may be tragically academic.

Long-lining is as simple as it is ancient. Tie a line to the handle of a glass jug, add a hook and bait to the line and toss the jug over the side. As the jug drifts free, the bait will attract a fish. When a fish is hooked it pulls against the resistance of the jug and seemingly tries to drag it under. The jug always wins. The fish is inevitably exhausted. The fisherman recovers the jug and hauls in the fish.

Multiply that single hook by thousands and the glass jug by hundreds of glass-ball floats, all connected by surface lines that, strung together, may extend 10 miles or more, and you have long-lining, the deadliest method of ocean fishing ever devised.

The long-line's basic unit, called a "basket" because the line is coiled into baskets on deck, is a main line about 300 yards long, buoyed to the surface by float lines. Branch lines, to which baited hooks are attached, extend down into the water at variable depths. About 10 hooks are used for every 300 yards or so of main line. Baskets are connected one to another until a length of 10 miles or more may be reached. A drift in a current, such a line has the effect of a wide broom sweeping the sea.

Tuna constitute 85 percent of the Japanese catch in Pacific waters, the remaining 15 percent being billfish. The boats put out individually and in fleets, some accompanied by a mother ship, aboard which the catch is processed and canned. There is one major fishing firm which operates 2 mother ships and 112 catcher boats, each of them long-lining. At 10 miles to a line, though actually some lines are shorter, these 112 boats would represent 1,120 miles of fishing line in simultaneous operation.

Long-lining can deplete the sea itself. It has done just that in the Indian Ocean, which is the world's third largest and second deepest sea. Long-lining so drained it of yellowfin tuna—the catch dropped from 12 fish per 100 hooks set to about 5 per 100—that the Japanese all but quit fishing for them there. They switched to marlin and sailfish and in 1956 began to concentrate on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans in ever-widening scope. Now the Japanese seem to be fishing themselves out of the Atlantic. With declining catches there, half the Japanese Atlantic fleet has been ordered back to Japan. The bankruptcy inherent in long-lining is being seen in the Pacific, too. According to the Sport Fishing Institute in Washington, "Marlin harvests by Japanese long-liners fishing off the Pacific coast of Central America" were poor in 1965—only three or four fish per boat, compared with catches of hundreds per boat in 1964. Average weight per fish was about two-thirds of what it used to be, a fact confirmed by sport fishermen, who note that along the Pacific coast marlin once averaged 110 pounds and now are down to 60 or 70 pounds. Mexican resort owners, largely dependent on sport fishermen, are in a state of panic.

The Sport Fishing Institute, which is largely supported by tackle manufacturers and provides research grants for scientific institutions, observed in its November Bulletin that "bluefin tuna stocks in the Atlantic Ocean also may soon be in trouble." Not just long-lining but purse-seining threatens the Atlantic tuna population, to such an extent that O. V. Wells, Deputy Director-General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, said last summer that "the rational utilization of tuna resources in the Atlantic Ocean requires urgent international attention." During 1962, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found, U.S. fishermen landed a mere 40,000 pounds of tuna at Middle Atlantic ports. Two years later the U.S. figure had jumped to 6 million pounds, and the fishery had become so attractive that purse seiners were moving in from as far away as the Pacific coast.

The Japanese are by no means the only long-liners. The Norwegians are in the Atlantic, off the U.S. coast, concentrating on sharks but getting a share of swordfish and other gamesters, too. Swedish sportsmen are decrying the fact that long-lining has begun to affect their salmon catch. Canada has some 250 vessels in the summer and 25 in the winter long-lining the Atlantic for swordfish, once taken mostly by harpoon as they lolled on the surface. The U.S. fishery has a score or so of long-lining vessels in the Atlantic, and these have been averaging 300 swordfish a trip during the peak fall season. Red China is long-lining, but no one knows to what extent, and the same is true of the U.S.S.R., which has just announced a new 5-year plan aimed at increasing its catch more than 50 percent. Cubans are long-lining for marlin. And the Spanish are at it, too.

But all these, separately and together, are minuscule in comparison with the Japanese operation. Its growth from 1956 to 1963 was astronomical. In 1956, when 164,000 hooks were set by the Japanese, they caught 7 metric tons of striped marlin (100 fish) and 50 metric tons of blue marlin (400 fish). By 1963 they had more than 50 million hooks out and took 8,236 metric tons of striped marlin (126,700 fish) and 9,413 metric tons of blue marlin (75,300 fish). Not to mention countless other billfish and tuna.

Today Japan has 625,935 persons engaged directly in the fishing industry, a decline from the 790,000 so occupied in 1963. The decline was due largely to the fact that expansion of Japanese industry and higher wages on land pulled many a fisherman away from the sea.

Japanese boats, ranging in size from 300 to 800 tons, fish through the South Seas and deposit their catches in southeast Asia, then move on through the Indian Ocean to unload their next haul in Mediterranean ports. From the Mediterranean their course takes them into the South Atlantic, down through the Caribbean—some to the east coast of South America, others through the Panama Canal and out into the Pacific again, where they deposit their catches in Samoa before sailing back to Japan. This marketing system somewhat compromises the theory that the Japanese are seeking protein only for home consumption. Thirty percent of the fish taken by their wandering fleets, in fact, is sold to foreign countries.

Behind the explosive expansion of the long-line fishery is the development, in 1955, of the tuna hotdog, which has become widely popular in Japan. This sausage made possible the exploitation of the bigeye tuna, which had been held in low regard until then the yellowfin and bluefin being preferred. Then the marlins began to be used for sausage and the billfish kill became a valuable adjunct to the tuna fishery. The Japanese also like marlin raw as sashimi, an appetizer. (North Americans seldom eat marlin, though it is esteemed in Latin America.)

Last year the Japanese fleets did not do too well, especially with tuna, but it is impossible to say whether the decline was due to overfishing, as sport fishermen insist, or changes in water temperature, available food and salinity, as some marine scientists suspect.

There is no reason to suppose that it was not both. There is every good reason to believe that overfishing, by purse seiners as well as long-liners, is the leading villain. The 1964 annual report of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission recalled that in 1962 Dr. Milner B. Schaefer, then its director of investigations, was able to assert that "the maximum average equilibrium catch" of yellowfin tuna would be in the vicinity of 183 million pounds. In other words, overfishing would begin at this point. The catch in 1959 was 145.4 million pounds, jumped sharply to 234.2 and 239.8 in 1960 and 1961 respectively, fell off for a couple of years, then rose again to 197.8 in 1964.

On the other hand, some few commercial fishermen, perhaps responding to long years of warfare with sportfishing interests, profess to see no threat to the tuna-fishing industry from long-lining. One of these is August Felando, general manager of the American Tuna Boat Association in San Diego. Felando points out that the Japanese are primarily interested in bigeye tuna, which are deep swimmers and unimportant to either the U.S. commercial fishery or sport fishery. The yellowfin has become a secondary prize (20 percent of the total catch in the eastern Pacific), and bluefin tuna are only occasionally taken by the Japanese in the Pacific.

But Felando does concede that his association's boats see increasing numbers of Japanese long-liners fishing off the Mexican coast and that these are working primarily for swordfish and marlin.

Bruce Barnes and Bill Poole, partners in a San Diego charter-fishing operation, believe that the decline in the marlin catch out of San Diego during the 1965 season could well be attributed to the more extensive use of the long-line technique off the Mexican and South American coasts. In 1963 the confirmed count of marlin at San Diego docks was 1,500. In 1965 it had dropped to 400.

There is something approaching terror on the Atlantic side of the Mexican-Central American land strip.

"This year [1965] is the worst Jamaica has had," says Ed Louys. "In the blue-marlin tournament only five fish were caught and the biggest weighed 162 pounds. But a Japanese vessel which needed medical attention for one of its crew put into Montego Bay in late September. It was loaded with blue marlin."

Sportsmen like Louys are not impressed by the fact that the Japanese and other long-liners are harvesting protein. The profits derived from sport fishing, they feel, are a source of life, too, for those engaged in boat-building, tacklemaking, resort maintenance and allied servicing of sport fishermen. In the United States alone, salt-water sport fishermen spent $626,191,000 in 1960, according to the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Talbert notes that in 1960 1.7 billion pounds of edible fish were caught commercially, but marine sport fishing brought in almost as much—1.4 billion pounds. So, say the sportsmen, their kind of fishing is a rich source of protein, too, and does not deplete the available stock.

But the high seas are free, whether they be considered to begin 3 miles, 12 miles, or 200 miles out from shore. Besides, it is not just coastal overfishing that threatens the sportsmen. The pelagic fish he most esteems are far-ranging wanderers, and it matters not a whit whether they are destroyed 5 miles out or 500.

Since no practical means of controlling the long-liners has yet been devised, or even proposed, a few frustrated sport fishermen have been taking matters into their own hands. Long-line sets have been destroyed in the Atlantic. Off Acapulco, sport fishermen, persistently wreaking havoc on long-lines off their coast, forced one Japanese vessel to abandon the area as too expensive. U.S. sport-fishing boats sailing off the shores of Baja California play a game called "ocean skeet." They shatter the long-liners' glass buoys with shotguns.

The damage inflicted by such means is, of course, a mere nuisance and will have

little or no effect on the enormous enterprise that long-lining has become. But when a Japanese long-liner ran aground last September on the southernmost tip of Baja California gleeful Mexican fishermen indulged in soul-satisfying fantasies to account for the wreck and take credit for it.

The 350-ton vessel crashed onto a reef at about 2 a.m. The 18 men aboard all got ashore safely. Some commercial and sport fishermen went aboard and found the boat equipped with the very latest in navigational and fish-finding equipment, from radar to sonar. Stacked in her freezer locker below decks were an estimated 140 tons of tuna, 40 tons of marlin and an unknown quantity of shark meat, in addition to dolphin, wahoo, and sailfish.

How to account for the wreck? The Mexicans wink and tell any of a number of stories:

1. Mexican fishermen turned off the light in the lighthouse. (Ah, but with all that electronic gear a modern vessel does not bother with lighthouses.)

2. They turned off the light and set up another light atop a high cliff to lead the Japanese astray. (But the radar would have indicated the huge land mass—cliffs several hundred feet high on the beach—behind the Judas light.)

3. Long-line sets are equipped with transistorized "homing" buoys that send out a signal to guide the fishing boat to where the sets have drifted. The Mexicans took one such buoy and put it on the beach. (This one is more ingenious than plausible. The Japanese navigational gear again would have foiled the plot.)

What hope is there, since even the wishful cleverness of Mexican wreckers is no match for the vast Japanese fleet? One theory, not very attractive, is that overfishing will solve itself.

"In some ways long-lining may be considered self-limiting," says Frank J. Mather III, associate scientist at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution and himself a sport fisherman. "When the catch declines enough it becomes unprofitable. I think there is cause for concern but don't know what can be done. Agreement among all the nations involved would be very difficult."

"We know the extent of long-lining," Mather says, "but we have no idea of the size of fish populations." Such knowledge would be essential to the establishment of meaningful international controls, but it simply is not there to be laid on the bargaining table.

There is unanimity among marine scientists that research is a sine qua non of international controls.

"We are getting more and more letters from Congressmen inquiring about long-lining," says Albert H. Swartz, Assistant Chief of the Division of Fishery Research of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. "Some people are advocating an extensive research program. Others are talking about an international convention—but there are no facts to bring to it. A research program would take about 5 years before we could go to the Japanese regarding conservation measures."

Swartz made a point that sport fishermen and their associations might consider.

"Until now," he said, "international conventions have always been on food fish. The sport fishery has never been represented. Now sport fishing should be represented. The International Game Fishing Association should have a voice."

It should indeed. And so should all sport fishermen, organized or unorganized, who know the names and addresses of their Congressmen, who, in turn, might well be persuaded to initiate preliminary negotiations with the Japanese while a crash research program is under way. The extent of this crisis cannot wait for precise scientific determination. The commonsense evidence is plentiful now. At this juncture the need for controls is clear. In the long run, controls need not deprive the Japanese of their protein supply. They could, in fact, preserve it.

Edward W. Allen recently was chairman of an international meeting which sought, unsuccessfully, to institute new controls on fishing in the North Pacific. Though he spoke in another context, in a statement to the conference he may have suggested the theme for a preliminary meeting of world sport-fishing associations and the leading fishing nations. He put it this way:

"Ocean fisheries should not be deemed to exist merely for the benefit of (commercial) fishermen and cannery operators, but should be considered to be a great trust for the benefit of humanity."

[From Time, Jan. 28, 1966]

FISHING: SLAUGHTER ON THE LONG LINE

Like most fishermen, the Japanese crewmen aboard the commercial boat *Yoku Maru* could not resist a bit of a brag. When the 100-foot vessel put into Jamaica's Montego Bay last fall, the skipper invited some local sport fishermen aboard. Modestly the Japanese apologized that a mother ship had carted away most of their catch. Then they threw open their lockers. There, stacked like cordwood, were the carcasses of thousands upon thousands of game fish: yellowfin tuna, wahoo, sailfish, and blue marlin.

Relations between sport fishermen and their commercial cousins have never been exactly cordial. Lately they have been strained to the breaking point. No longer satisfied with harvesting such traditional meat fish as cod, halibut, salmon, and the smaller tunas, commercial fishermen from Japan, Scandinavia, and Russia have now invaded the world's best sport fishing areas with superefficient methods that devastate the population of rare game fish. In the once renowned waters off New Zealand's Mayor Island, where 900 big fish—swordfish, striped, and black marlin—were boated in 1949, not a single billfish of any size was caught in 1964. Off Acapulco, Mexico, headquarters of one of the world's biggest (300 boats) sport fishing fleets, commercials have zeroed in on that most spectacular of seagoing acrobats, the Pacific sailfish. Two years ago, in Acapulco's annual tournament, 48 anglers landed 176 sails; last year's catch was barely half that.

GONE, OVERNIGHT

One top sport-fishing hole so far seems safe; Panama's Piñas Bay (Time, July 10, 1964), where hundreds of marlin and thousands of sailfish were boated last year. Maybe the commercial fishermen were too busy elsewhere. Off Montauk Point, N.Y., where a favorite sport is fishing for sharks, commercial fishermen have practically eliminated the scrappy and tasty porbeagle. The pressure is growing at Maryland's "Jack Spot," the summer home of the tough little (world's record, 161 lbs.) white marlin. Until commercials showed up in the Jack Spot last summer, it was rare for a charter-boat captain to return emptyhanded. Last September, after a fruitless day trolling at the Jack Spot, Maryland's Gov. J. Millard Tawes and Delaware's Gov. Charles L. Terry, Jr., issued a joint statement demanding protection of U.S. game fish from foreign meat fishermen.

The commercials' methods are as brutal as they are efficient. Instead of nets, which are useless against big game fish, the fishermen string out long lines—ropes or metal cables anywhere from 2 to 60 miles in length with baited hooks attached every 12 to 25 feet. The long lines are left in the water for 24 hours or more, supported by buoys and equipped with radar beacons to spot their location for the boat. Fish hooked on the long lines fight hopelessly against the miles-long cable until they drown or are mutilated by sharks. Off Baja California one day last spring, enraged Mexican sport fishermen counted more than 300 sailfish on the 2,000 hooks of a single long line. The line was only one of five laid by a Japanese boat that fished the area for 14 days. Total estimated catch, 21,000 sailfish.

RAW DELICACY

By Western standards, sailfish and marlin are practically inedible. Even the Japanese can think of nothing better to do with the coarse oily sailfish than grind it up into fish sausages. But marlin is considered a delicacy in meat-short Japan, where it is served fried or raw, garnished with soy sauce and horseradish to make a dish called sashimi.

Sport fishermen around the world have been bombarding government agencies with complaints about the commercial long liners. Now, tired of waiting, the protesters are taking matters into their own hands.

In Jamaica last summer, sport fishermen blasted away at a long liner's glass floats with rifles. In Alcapulco, only the timely arrival of a Mexican coast guard boat averted a shooting match between charter boat vigilantes and a Japanese long liner armed with a machinegun. And last July, when a flotilla of Norwegian long liners steamed into Maryland's Jack Spot, a pair of charter-boat skippers roared out and carved up the long lines with their boats' propellers.

LOUELLA DIRKSEN CHRISTENS NAVY'S NEWEST NUCLEAR SUBMARINE

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, on February 26 it was the privilege of this Senator to attend the ceremonies in connection with the launching of the Navy's newest nuclear submarine, the *Sturgeon*, at Groton, Conn.

The event was remarkable on a number of counts. The *Sturgeon*, or SSN 637, is the first in a new class of attack vessels, armed with Subroc, the Navy's most potent antisubmarine warfare weapon. The 2,500 persons who attended the event were impressed with this latest addition to our Nation's naval might.

But perhaps even more remarkable was the fact that our respected minority leader, although in attendance, was just one of the 2,500.

Madam President, the star performer on that Saturday afternoon was another Dirksen—the vivacious Louella Dirksen, whose assignment it was to christen the *Sturgeon*. Evelyn Archie, a staff writer for the New London Day put it this way:

The Senate minority leader may be the star of the show on the Washington scene, but in New London with his wife christening a new submarine, he's just the husband of the main attraction.

It's Louella Dirksen who's basking in the limelight this weekend, not EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, on whom the spotlight generally focuses.

And she likes it.

"It doesn't happen very often and I plan to enjoy every minute of it," she said last night.

"I don't like it at all," drawled the Senator in the same gravel-voiced, deliberate intonation which has become familiar to millions of television viewers.

The principal address, Mr. President, was made by Dr. William T. Alexander, president of the Webb Institute of Naval Architecture at Glen Cove, N.Y., who

stressed the importance of ships of quality in times of tense international situations. The launching of the *Sturgeon*, he said, "gives us a feeling of pride and accomplishment as well as added confidence in our total arsenal of defense weapons."

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of Dr. Alexander's remarks.

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

LAUNCHING OF U.S.S. "STURGEON"

(Remarks of Dr. William T. Alexander, president, Webb Institute of Naval Architecture)

The launching of any vessel is a thrilling occasion, for it is then that an inanimate inert mass of ironwork and assorted machinery aggregations officially is named, first, because a real entity with an important mission, and one could almost say, that at this time she begins to develop a personality of her own.

With the currently tense international situation, which virtually seems to be the usual rather than the extraordinary, the launching of another fine SS(N) gives us a feeling of pride, and of accomplishment, as well as added confidence in our total arsenal of defensive weapons.

As many of you know, our country must have access to products from overseas; manganese, copper, and tin among many others, in order to operate a prosperous peacetime economy, not to mention the greatly expanded requirements for strategic materials in a war period. Also, foreign trade, with a reasonably favorable balance of dollar credits, is essential to prevent loss of status of the dollar in international markets, and the resulting financial chaos at home.

Moreover, in spite of the great advances in air transport capability, again in Vietnam it has been demonstrated that an army overseas must be supplied by shipping in great quantity even though the assault wave is airlifted.

This clearly lays down two requirements, essential both in peace and in war. First, we must have ships which are free to sail the seven seas and carry out these vital functions. In fact, at the start of hostilities there must be available a substantial fleet of merchant-type ships, and under our control so that they are immediately available.

The second requirement is protection adequate to permit our ships to carry out their missions. The vessel which is being launched today is specifically designed to combat the submarines of any enemy, which currently are the most dangerous threats to our ability to use the seas as needed.

The residents of Groton, related to the sea both by proud heritage and present employment, know well the importance of control of the seas. However, I fear that many of our citizens are in danger of forgetting that effective control of the seas is as important to national survival today as it was in the days of Lord Nelson or of Admiral Mahan.

That this lesson has not been missed by the Soviets, is proven by their greatly expanded maritime activities, both military and civilian.

Most of us think of the submarine as a very modern craft, but it has had a long history indeed, even if we ignore the early philosophical speculations and dreams about subsurface exploration and travel.

As early as 1578 William Bourne, in Britain, drew plans for a submarine with a wooden frame covered with greased leather. This was to be rowed both on the surface and under water, and its displacement was changed, to dive or surface, by pulling in or expanding its sides. After some moderate success with actual boats, and just as the Pilgrims were nearing Plymouth in 1620, Cornelius von Drebble built the first really successful submarine of Bourne's design. This boat actually operated in the Thames 12 to 15 feet below the surface.

By 1727, 14 types had been invented in England alone. Thirty years before the American Revolution primitive ballast tanks were described. Made of goat skins and attached to hull openings, at will they could be filled, or twisted to expel the water.

A submarine was first used offensively during the American Revolution. *The Turtle*, invented by David Bushnell, a one-man, hand-driven, screw-propelled submersible, attacked H.M.S. *Eagle* in New York harbor. The attack failed, as the screw designed for attaching the explosive to the enemy hull could not penetrate the vessel's copper sheathing.

Robert Fulton worked with submarines before building the *Clermont*. He built a superior iron boat named *Nautilus*, hand powered under water, and with a sail for surface propulsion. The Governments of United States, Britain, and France were uninterested and he subsequently devoted his talents to surface craft.

Experiments with hand-powered submersibles continued. One hundred and two years ago this month the first sinking of a warship by a submarine occurred, when the Confederate *Hunley* sank the U.S.S. *Housatonic* off Charleston. This was really hazardous duty as the *Hunley* sank, for the fourth time, after the attack with the loss of all hands.

Until Thorsten Nordenfelt invented a practical torpedo tube in the 1880's, and Whitehead developed a self-propelled torpedo, a submarine attacked a vessel by fastening an explosive to its opponent's underwater hull. This produced about an equal hazard to the submarine as to its target.

The first successful periscope was developed during the Civil War possibly by Thomas Doughty, a Navy designer. Prior to this essential development a submarine was conned by looking through a small port or an open hatch, a practice responsible for the loss of the *Hunley*.

Shortly after the Civil War, submarines were powered by steam when on the surface, and by electric motors submerged as an improvement over hand propulsion. The first all electric boat was built in 1894 but with an effective radius of only about 90 miles.

Modern U.S. submarines owe their final basic development to two men, J. P. Holland and Simon Lake. In 1894, Lake built the *Argonaut Jr.* a hand-propelled vessel built with double planking of yellow pine, and 3 years later he launched the *Argonaut*, propelled by a 30-horsepower gasoline engine.

The first extensive open sea voyage of a submarine, from Norfolk to New York, was made in a November storm by the *Argonaut* in 1898. Lake's boats were designed primarily for underwater exploration and for other peacetime uses.

J. P. Holland launched his first submarine in 1875. This boat had horizontal planes for diving, effective water ballast tanks, and other improvements over previous models.

In 1895, he started to build the *Plunger* for the U.S. Navy. She was designed to use steam on the surface and electricity when submerged. After many modifications this hull was abandoned in favor of a newer model, the *Holland*, being built in Elizabeth, N.J. Upon delivery in 1900, she was Holland's ninth submarine, and the first for the Navy.

By early in the 20th century, reliable electrical equipment and diesel engines had become available, and the basic development work had been done, so that the foundation was soundly laid for the great submarines of World Wars I and II.

Diesel power served well until steam again became popular in the 1950's, now generated by nuclear fission rather than by burning coal or oil.

The Electric Boat Co. has been a pioneering leader in this field. Beginning with the 54-foot *Holland* in 1900, the Navy's first submarine, this company built 44 for the U.S. Navy, and several for foreign nations, prior to World War I. During the war, it delivered 65 more submarines to the Navy.

The first four boats built at Groton in the 1920's were to fill an order from the Republic of Peru, and in 1931 the U.S.S. *Cuttlefish* was constructed, the first U.S. Navy submarine to be built at Groton, then a diesel engine manufacturing plant.

The company delivered 21 submarines to the Navy between 1931 and 1941, and 74 during our engagement in World War II, with 10 more completed after Japan's surrender. This is a tremendous achievement and the effort of Electric Boat has been of major consequence in two World Wars.

Pioneering submarine development continued at this yard and culminated in 1954 with the launching of the *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear-propelled vessel.

The *Nautilus* was followed by successively more advanced types of submarines including the FBM, or Polaris vessels, another monumental achievement.

It was in this period also that submarines changed from surface vessels which could dive, to true undersea craft.

The SS(N)-637, which will be christened and launched today, is the third ship of the fleet proudly to bear the name U.S.S. *Sturgeon*. And this is a most appropriate name for such a craft. For a sturgeon—

1. Lives most of the year in the deep seas.
2. Is very tough and especially hard to kill.
3. Attains great age—sometimes 200 to 300 years.
4. Adapts itself to fresh or salt water.
5. Is found all over the world along the coasts and in the great rivers.
6. Is most common in Russia and North America.

Indeed the sturgeon is a kingly fish, as its great value for its caviar and edible flesh has caused the English sturgeon to be designated as the property of the king since the time of Edward II.

The first *Sturgeon*—SS-25—135 feet 3 inches long, and with a submerged displacement of 342 tons, was launched by Fore River S.B. Co., Quincy, Mass., June 11. She was renamed E-2 later that year and commissioned in February 1912. E-2 was commanded by Ens. Clarence H. Hinkamp and carried a complement of 1 officer and 19 men. Armed with four 18-inch torpedo tubes, she was designed for 13.5 knots on the surface and 11.5 knots submerged.

E-2 was based at Newport as a unit of the Atlantic submarine flotilla and carried out exercises and training along the Atlantic coast and in the Carribean.

In June 1915 she entered New York Naval Shipyard for an upkeep period and while still there, a violent hydrogen gas explosion on board killed four men and injured seven others. Shortly thereafter, she was decommissioned and was used for testing of the Edison storage battery.

With World War I in progress, *Sturgeon I* or E-2 was recommissioned in 1918, under the command of Lt. L. S. Refsnider. After a shakedown, she patrolled off Cape Hatteras and guarded the approaches to Chesapeake Bay. Two war patrols won a commendation from CMO as "exceptionally long for a submarine of her size." The vessels named *Sturgeon* had already begun to distinguish themselves.

E-2 was decommissioned in 1921 and was later scrapped.

The second *Sturgeon* (SS-187) built at Mare Island and commissioned in June 1938, was a more potent craft. With a length of 308 feet, almost 173 feet longer than *Sturgeon I*, she displaced 2,198 tons submerged.

She carried 5 officers and 50 men, and was designed for 21 knots on the surface and 9 knots submerged.

She was fitted with eight 27-inch torpedo tubes, a 3-inch deck gun, and could carry 24 torpedoes.

After a shakedown cruise she carried out normal training exercises, and on June 2, 1940, Lieutenant Commander Barnes, her original commander, was relieved by Lt. Comdr. William L. Wright.

On Pearl Harbor Day, as a member of the U.S. Asiatic fleet, *Sturgeon II* was moored in Marviles Bay. Her ordnance and gunnery officer was Lt. Chester W. Nimitz, Jr.

On the afternoon of December 8, *Sturgeon* got underway for her first real war patrol. During this patrol the Cavite Navy Yard was destroyed, and the less than 30 submarines of the Asiatic fleet were left, with no air cover, no capital ships, and practically no means of resupply, to try and delay the swarm of Japanese ships sweeping southward.

Her record is a heroic one, like that of every Pacific submarine—the exhibition of courage, skill, and the utmost in devotion to duty.

Sturgeon made 11 war patrols, received 10 battle stars, and 7 of her war patrols were designated successful for the award of the Submarine Combat Insignia.

On her last patrol, in attacks on two heavily escorted convoys, the blasts were counted from 273 depth charges and aircraft bombs directed at her from the convoy escorts. Her skin was as tough as that of the fish whose name she bore and she suffered no major damage.

Sturgeon II had seven commanding officers over her lifetime but her actual fighting was done under three officers:

Lt. Comdr. William L. Wright (June 22, 1940, to Aug. 13, 1942).

Lt. Comdr. Herman A. Fleczentkowki (Aug. 13, 1942, to Aug. 6, 1943).

Lt. Comdr. Charlton L. Murphy (Aug. 6, 1943, to Aug. 16, 1944).

Decommissioned in November 1945, she was scrapped 3 years later.

Sturgeon III S.S. (N) 637 is a modified "permit class" and will be the first of the 292-foot Sturgeon class, six of which will be built at Groton. These vessels are capable of long submerged voyages and are fitted with effective detection equipment and the most modern of antisubmarine weapons. They will be formidable adversary indeed for the submarines of any future enemy nation.

It has been truly said the "Nation's most important single asset is her manpower. The success of any effort is simply the results of the combined thoughts and efforts of hard-working men and women."

Consequently, I wish most sincerely to congratulate and thank all of those whose thoughts and efforts have combined to produce this fine vessel.

I am sure that Commander Shellman and his carefully selected crew not only will inherit an excellent craft, but also, that they will groom her into the top quality fighting unit for which the submarine forces are noted.

It is most fitting that the *Sturgeon's* charming sponsor should be a national figure, and one who has assisted her husband to exhibit statesmanship in the finest American tradition.

Moreover, how better could we celebrate the end of Engineer's Week than by the launching of one of engineering's most impressive creations?

Good luck and Godspeed, *Sturgeon*.

DEBATE IN BRITISH HOUSE OF LORDS ON SUBJECT OF CHINA

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, on February 10, 1966, there was a debate in the British House of Lords on the subject of "China." I think it is a historic document of importance. It is a document the contents of which do not give us in the United States any encouragement in support of any view that the British are enthusiastic about our course of action in Asia.

Let us face it—if we continue our course of action in Vietnam, we will end up in a war with China, out of which will come no victories, but only world chaos.

I ask unanimous consent that the contents of the debate be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

CHINA

(3:25 p.m.)

Lord Kennet rose to draw attention to China; and to move for papers. The noble lord said: My Lords, I do not know whether the Government will have their statement ready at precisely 3:30 p.m. I intend to speak for 20 or 30 minutes, and I do not know whether it is convenient to begin the debate now. However, I puzzled for some time over the best wording for this motion. To call attention to what? Should it be, to British policy toward China; to Chinese policy toward America; to China's growing strength; to China's absence from the United Nations—to what? It seemed to me, in the end, that it was China itself which needed calling attention to. I know that the Guardian, in its leader on Tuesday, called attention to this debate under a headline which said, "China Calls Attention to Itself." Well, so it does. But I am not sure that we answer its call quite often enough or quite deeply enough. I prefer the view of my noble friend Lord Chalfont, who said recently that there was a conspiracy of silence about China; about China's real position, capability and intentions; about what kind of an animal China actually is. So I decided to call Your Lordships' attention simply to China, in the hope of bringing about a debate on all the manifold aspects of that extraordinary country and its affairs.

I am not an old China hand, but I look forward to a good debate this afternoon, because I know that some noble lords who have put themselves down to speak are, in one sense or another, old China hands. I look forward to every speech, but particularly to that of the noble lord, Lord Caccia, who was for so long responsible for seeing how China could best be fitted into our world policy, and to the maiden speech of the noble lord, Lord King-Hall, to which I know the whole House is looking forward with keen interest.

At the last meeting of the NATO Council, Mr. McNamara asked three questions. First, does China intend over the next 20 years to extend her political domination over a great part of Asia, Africa, and Latin America? Second, if so, will the vital interests of the United States and her allies be affected? Third, if this expansion is a threat to the West, what measures should be taken? Let us now listen to the voice of China, and let us listen to a man whose position there, though not precisely corresponding to Mr. McNamara's, is not too far from it—Lo Jui-Ching, chief of the Chinese general staff. He said:

"The danger is at the very gates of China."

I think that is an instructive comparison. We must never forget the questions which Mr. McNamara asked. Our safety and prosperity will depend on their right answering. But we must also not forget the Chinese view.

It leaps to the eye that Mr. McNamara's first question—does China intend over the next 20 years to extend her political domination over a great part of Asia, Africa, and Latin America?—is the one by which the others stand or fall. If China does intend this, then we shall have to take certain measures, because there is nothing we should like less than a domination of a country in the first stages of Communist regimentation, anywhere in the world. If China does not intend this, then we need not ask Mr. McNamara's other two questions at all. There will be no need to resist or parry or counter the intention to dominate.

The Chinese may, of course, wish to improve their position around the world in another way, in some way that falls short of Mr. McNamara's phrase of "political domination." They may simply wish to increase their influence and to do what they can to insure that governments friendly to them are installed in countries important to them—which means, of course, in Asia. Africa and Latin America are not important to China, except ideologically, which being translated means sentimentally. In answering Mr. McNamara's first question we should have to decide whether China's ideology of town and country—the House will know that they say that underdeveloped countries are the world's countryside, while America, Russia, and Western Europe are its cities; the Chinese revolution succeeded because the countryside managed to capture the cities in the end—and the evident wish to lead Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the capture, as it were, of North America and Europe, reflected a true intention of domination or merely a myth, a statement of belief, a self-reassurring assertion that history is on their side. Such statements are familiar enough in all cultures. The Russians used to say loud and clear that there would be a world revolution but they have stopped now. We ourselves use to say that one day the whole world would become Christian, but we have stopped now. The Chinese will probably stop the town and country nonsense soon.

To be able to answer Mr. McNamara's first question we shall have to look quite objectively at China's real relations—relations of fact, and not of propaganda—with his neighbors and with countries further afield. Let us start with Asia—that is, China's actual neighbors—and let us begin in the south and go clockwise, so that we come to Vietnam last. Laos we may almost leave aside. Its fate, with only 2 million inhabitants compared with Vietnam's 32 million, and with no industry or anything, is entirely dependent on that of its larger neighbor. Little Cambodia is a sort of joker. Its song-writing prince, one of the few real political geniuses of our generation, skims over the muddy water with dazzling skill. At the moment, he is skimming rather close to Chinese policy, although he will always cock a stylish snook at the last moment and veer off before any of the big ships can haul him on board. For years the United States resisted a conference to neutralize Cambodia, and when they finally agreed, somebody (I forget who) suggested it would be a good place to talk about Vietnam. But Prince Sihanouk was not going to have any other countries talked about at his conference; so we shall have to think again about that. But I do not think we have to worry too much about China capturing him.

Thailand is the headquarters of SEATO. There are 20,000 American servicemen there—about the same number as there were in Vietnam when we began to call that a war. Five large American airfields are built or building; a jet fuel pipeline is being laid from the one at Sattahip to the others. American bombers and assault planes take off from these airfields to attack targets in Laos and Vietnam. It is presumably for

these reasons that China thinks herself entitled to invite the population of Thailand, over the radio, to rebel, to unearth the veteran Thai Prime Minister, Hai Pridi Panomyoung, who has been living 15 years and more in China, and to encourage the banned Thai Communist Party to recruit vigorously. Thailand is now fully engaged in the Sino-American cold war, and is in immediate danger of being another Vietnam.

Burma is the showpiece of Chinese benevolence among all China's neighbors; but the frontier settlement of 1961, where China showed considerable generosity and good will, has not bought Burmese acquiescence. It has not stopped Burma from signing the test ban, working hard and usefully in the United Nations, and being strictly neutral in the Indo-Pakistan dispute, all of which are quite unpalatable to China. Even here there is a cloud on the horizon. China is beginning to back a revolutionary movement called "The White Flag," but one may still hope that a desire to have at least one relaxed neutral neighbor, uncoerced by anybody, will override China's temptation to try to obtain a bargaining position inside the country.

With India we come to a completely different story. We here (and, of course, the Indians even more so) see simply a menace in China—a menace rising at times to severe, unprovoked aggression. The Chinese see it differently, and if we are to get a true picture of Chinese intentions we must know how they see it. The lines across which the aggression took place in 1962, and on which they leaned so heavily last year, was drawn by the British at the height of British imperial power. It even has a British name—MacMahon. Before that, the territory in question was Chinese. That was at a time when we were at home in Britain. Along we come and, China being then weak, we swipe part of China for our colony, India. Why should they accept that line? Why should the time of our power and their weakness be the time to settle all posterity? Now they are strong again, and we are away in Singapore, and India is not as strong as they are. Negotiations between China and India have failed over the years. So why should not the earlier line, drawn during Chinese strength and Indian weakness, be the one adopted now?

The argument has force, in this case as in others. It is always used by resurgent nations. It is also dangerous, and causes wars. But it is not amazing. To China, India is the heir of imperialism. Although our sympathies are with India, yet we must recognize how China sees it. Their Indian frontier is a hangover of the age of the Opium War and the Extraterritorial Concessions, just as surely as Hong Kong and Formosa themselves. And their attempts to rectify this frontier have been unsuccessful. They have shown their military superiority but have then retreated and kept calm, in face of growing American and Russian support for India.

The frontier with Bhutan is disputed in the same way. China will not speak to India about this because she does not recognize the Indian guidance which is established in the treaty between India and Bhutan. The Sino-Bhutanese frontier was open until recently, and is now closed. A Bhutanese independence movement draws strength from the national desire to reopen it.

Sikkim, where also the frontier is closed, is guarded by Indian troops, unlike Bhutan. Until the late 19th century it was a vassal of Chinese Tibet. Again the Chinese ask: Why should the clock be supposed to stop at the worst moment for China? China would like these two countries to follow more of the Nepalese pattern. In Nepal a kind of Indian protectorate was established in 1961. But the Chinese frontier was settled the same year, and Chinese influence has since been increasing. The frontier is open, and the last bit of a road from Katmandu to Lhasa, the stretch inside Nepal, is nearing completion. I know that later in this debate the noble lord, Lord Birdwood, is going to be able to tell us about the effect of that road on Nepal, and I look forward to hearing him. I know of no evidence of Chinese intentions to annex or subjugate any of these principalities, and with two of them there is not even a frontier dispute. There appears only to be a wish to resume traditional trade and to have there the kind of political presense which will insure normal relations.

Pakistan, China's great ally against India, has only a very short frontier with China. It was settled in 1963. Part of it, the Karakoram range, is closed by nature. The Gilgit section is open. Sino-Pakistani friendship is entirely due to a fortuitous community of interest against India: What Kashmir is to Pakistan, a few disputed frontier territories are to China. This community of interest has not prevented Pakistan from accepting a cease-fire in the Kashmir dispute at the hands of the United Nations, which is so much detested by China; and, of course, Pakistan is still nominally an ally of America. The fact that they agreed to go to Tashkent must have been another severe blow to China. The short Chinese frontier with Afghanistan was settled in 1963, but Afghanistan is and looks like remaining far outside the Chinese sphere of influence. It is between the rival blandishments of the United States and the Soviet Union that Afghan statesmanship is exercised.

The immense Chinese frontier with the Soviet Union is also disputed, though as yet only in an offhand way. Here China touches what is in her estimation, and must also be in ours, another 19th century empire. The usual forms of political conflict are in full swing. In the Soviet Union the Chinese also see the country which let them down in the late 1950's by withdrawing aid, both civil and military. America has always been the enemy, but Russia is the turncoat, and that is worse. Mongolia, for some time in dispute between the Soviet Union and China with regard to influence, is now squarely in the Soviet camp. She joined the Comecon in 1962, and signed a treaty of military alliance with the Soviet Union last month. To all intents, China thus faces her enemy, Russia, from Korea right round to Afghanistan. In North Korea, China has had a small friend for some time; but even here Russian influence is not lacking. When Japan and South Korea entered into some military arrangements in April last year, it was to Russia that North Korea turned in order to redress the balance, and not China. In Japan, as in the United States, China sees a country which does not see her. Tokyo does not recognize the Peiping Government, and the war in which the Japanese armies plunged through Manchuria is still, technically, unended.

In recent days, China has seen a rapprochement between Japan and the Soviet Union, a rapprochement which 5 years ago would have caused Washington to hit the ceiling but which now raises hardly an eyebrow there or in Britain. China also sees the movement of what she calls the "core" of the American military presence in Japan, from Hokkaido opposite the Soviet Union down to Kynshn, opposite China. In Formosa, Hong Kong, Macao, Quemoy, and Matsu, they just see part of their country under foreign occupation; as we should see the Isle of Wight, the Isle of Man, Harwich, or Cardiff. Those parts held by Britain and Portugal are tolerated for the mutual advantage that there is in it; those that are held by the United States are deeply resented and deeply disturb the world.

Lord CONESFORD. My Lords, may I put one question to the noble Lord? Is he going to mention Tibet?

Lord KENNET. My Lords, I was not planning to mention Tibet, since Tibet's border runs around the border of China. It is part of China; it was reabsorbed, and the action was recognized by India in 1954—and, for my money, what India recognizes we may also recognize. It is, though, of great historical importance.

About Vietnam I will say very little, because everything that can possibly be said, whether wise or foolish, has been said. There is one point that I would make, however, and it is this: not even in North Vietnam does China seem to have a reliable ally, let alone a satellite. We take it for granted that they must have; but we may be wrong. We do not allow for the facts that, for instance, the North Vietnamese last year publicly celebrated an 18th century victory over China; and, in their list of New Year's greetings last month, Russia was mentioned first, and not China. Nor ought it to escape our notice that when Hanoi blames the United States for risking general war in southeast Asia, it is always the danger to Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Burma that they mention—never China. As far as they are concerned, they think China can well look after itself. No, I do not think we should answer Mr. McNamara's first question well, if we took North Vietnam as an example of Chinese political domination, or even, as I have said, North Korea. They are in dispute between China and Russia.

Before leaving Asia, let me return for a moment to the Soviet-Chinese dispute. Let us not worry too much about the ideology; that will change. What is permanent is the fact that there runs between these two hostile giants, from end to end of Asia and deeply into each of them, a great belt of Islam. With the exception of Aden, these are the only Muslims in the world who are not yet in charge of their own destinies. They will not have forgotten that when Russia was conquering them, Britain was conquering the Arabs and Malays, France was conquering the North Africans and Holland the Indonesians. So far the Russians have omitted to liberate their Muslims. They will want to be liberated in time. The Russian Empire will be bound to break up in time, just as have the British, Dutch, and French. The Chinese will work to help that on; and they will work all the harder because their natural line of expansion lies precisely into those barely populated Muslim territories of what used to be generically called Turkistan, the way Marco Polo took, and into Mongolia. They have Mogols in China and Muslims of all sorts. The land is empty. There is no ethnic break.

My Lords, if anyone's interests are threatened by Chinese expansionism, I do not think it is in the first place those of the West. Indeed, I think we may find Russia edging nearer and nearer to the West in order to have earned a helping hand when her Empire begins to break up. I imagine we might urge them to a commonwealth-type solution. But sufficient unto the day are the puzzles thereof. The picture of China's position in Asia is not to my mind, a very alarming one for us in the West; they are not doing too well at all. Outside Asia they are doing even worse. The time was when we used to tremble at their appearance in Africa; but I think that is gone by. The African nations who were strong and wise enough to end European domination are not likely to be so weak and foolish as to turn right round and accept an Asian one.

In Cuba, which refused to sign the Test Ban and could fairly have been counted no less China's friend than Russia's, the Chinese have just made the most absurd blunder; they apparently have tried to buy Castro, and then, over his head, the army, by linking the level of rice deliveries to some political accommodation or other. They found that Castro could not be bought

any more than Mao Tse-tung could be bought, or Lenin, or Nasser, or General de Gaulle, or George Washington. And in Indonesia, too, once the most promising bastion of Chinese influence outside their own frontiers, they have overcalled their hand and met with a complete rejection from the still governing, if enfeebled, Sukarno. In all this it is hard to see evidence of attempts to dominate. There is much evidence of attempts to gain influence—and much evidence, too, of the failure of such attempts.

Anybody who reads Chinese propaganda—I mean reading it directly, without the filter of the Western press—may get quite a shock at first. He sees all the familiar elements: the truculence against America, the doctrinaire stuff about world revolution, the vaunting of their own invincibility. But he also sees—and this is not familiar because the Western press does not print it—quite unmistakable evidence of a very real fear. I have just been arguing that the Chinese are not doing too well around the world. They themselves feel that the world is closing in on them; they are, in a word, dead scared. They tell their own people in so many words: "We are encircled, we are grossly inferior, we are in very great danger; but if the Americans attack us we shall beat them."

A week ago last Saturday the People's Daily of Peiping published a map showing what it called the two chains of imperialistic encirclement. The inner chain was South Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan, the Philippines, South Vietnam, Thailand and India. The outer chain consisted of the Bonin Islands, Iwo Jima, Guam, and what they call "the British strategic chain," meaning North Borneo, Singapore and Malaya, and the chain of island bases across the Indian Ocean lying beyond India. All this is true: there are Western military bases in all these places, and the West with its nuclear arms, is immensely more powerful than China. And on the west and north of China there is not so much a chain of encircling bases as a solid mass of hostile territory, some of which passed under Russian control as recently as Hong Kong and Formosa passed to Britain and Japan. It is hardly surprising that they have built their own nuclear weapons. All this they tell their people.

Now these feelings exist in a country where the population is so dense in parts that little girls on their way home from school pick up leaves on a pin and their grandmothers sort them out into those the pig can eat and those you can burn on the fire; so dense that you cannot get round to yoking oxen instead of men and women because there is nowhere to pasture the oxen—it is all needed to feed the people. In these places you cannot dig an irrigation canal 10 feet wide; someone will starve if they lose that much land. I am not talking about the old-fashioned bogey of lebensraum. That never happens without aggressive intent as well, and in practice there is plenty of room still in the inland parts of China. It will be an internal problem for them, perhaps inland and then westwards, but in the meantime the psychological impact of the two great enemies pressing in on a people so crowded should not be ignored.

I said "without aggressive intent." Is there, in Chinese propaganda, as opposed to Chinese action, evidence of aggressive intent? I do not know of any. The propaganda against America is very violent—even bloodthirsty; but it is always about defense. There is a new phrase, "ocean of people's war." It is said that "We will draw them into an ocean of people's war." But the context is always quite explicitly one of the defense of China against invaders. There is the endlessly repeated phrase, "If the imperialists impose a war on us * * * If they force a war on us * * *." I think I am right in saying that nothing has been published, or made available to the public in the West, from any source (and I have read a great deal by now), which suggests, even by remote implication, that there is any plan, or preparation, or wish, to fight anywhere except on the soil of China if attacked. Moreover, the Chinese are grossly inferior militarily. This is the key to their pronouncements, so hard to follow until you have this key, about the importance of politics and ideology in warfare. Listen to this. It comes from a published report by the Director-General of the General Political Department of the Chinese Army—and I quote:

"War * * * is politics with bloodshed. Victory is impossible without politics, without the factor of man. Victory is impossible if the theory that 'weapons decide everything' is adopted. We always rely for our victories on the factor of man, the factor of politics. This is the moral atom bomb when our side alone possesses. We have always had absolute supremacy in this respect."

Have your lordships ever heard a more forlorn whistle in a dark more pitchy?

There is also some evidence to suggest that this endless harping on the importance of the fighting man, as opposed to the weapon, is directed by the party at the army's wish to run back to Russia for modern weapons. If American pressure is now such as to make the Chinese Army want to compose the quarrel with Russia, that is something which should give us pause. Their famous aggressive rallying cries, their shouts of self-congratulation, may be no more than the voice of a terrified government preparing its people to die, and die bravely, on their own soil. I do not know that they are, but I put the hypothesis forward for serious consideration. If they are that, then certain conclusions should be drawn for Western policy and Mr. McNamara's question should be answered in a certain manner.

Much of what I have been describing is quite new—the use of the word "encirclement" in internal propaganda, for instance. The whole tone of their speech, both for internal and for external use, is changing. In the last 2 months—I do not know if those who follow these things will agree with me—the whole tone of Chinese utterances has become amost hysterical. Of course they can read English. When they look at the United States, they are overcome by a sort of hysterical suspicion. It is only natural that they should ignore the Mansfields and Fulbrights and Restons and Lippmanns and Gavins, who take the longer view. The Chinese are too scared and suspicious to do otherwise than ignore them. It is understandable, perhaps, that they should be suspicious even of the administration's words. In any case, what they do see, apparently in America is a country exclusively divided between the "goodies," who are campus liberals waving flags of peace, and the "baddies," who are all like Senator STENNIS, the chairman of the Senate's Preparatory Investigation Subcommittee.

Senator STENNIS said, a couple of weeks ago—and one must imagine Chinese eyes reading this:

"Stepped-up operations against North Vietnam may well raise a very serious question as to whether we will provoke Red China to full intervention in the war * * *. In view of our commitments, I believe that we must face and accept the risk involved and be prepared to meet Red Chinese military aggression, if it should come, with the requisite military might * * *. For my part, I would never put our boys in mortal conflict against the hordes of Red Chinese coolies without using every weapon we have."

This, of course, is exactly what the Chinese most fear: that America should use the Vietnam war to attack them with nuclear weapons. And in the word "coolie" they hear all that they fought to get away from; and for that reason they fear that they might have to fight again. They read that it is now no longer a matter of hawks and doves, but of superhawks, too, who want a preventive war on China now.

Since they have no representation in America, and cannot even brush up against America at the United Nations, they can hardly be blamed for failing to distinguish between who has power and who has not; for misunderstanding the role of the President, and for making the worst assumptions about American intentions. Mao's advisers must be saying to him, "It may be as bad as this"—whatever it may be; and he must be replying, "It may be: we must act as though it is until we can find out more certainly." And in Washington, the very same process is at work the other way round about China. Each side takes the worst possibility. This is why mutual ignorance is the common cause of war.

I said that this almost hysterical fear is something new. There have been other changes, too. Until less than a year ago, China was still making disarmament proposals, most of them not very clever or very fair. But one, at least has since been taken up both by the Soviet Government and by Senator KENNEDY in America—that is, the idea of a multilateral agreement never to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The House will remember that China is the only country in the world which has promised unilaterally never to use nuclear weapons first. But even that now is passed. "Disarmament" is a dirty word in China nowadays. It is a tragic thing, but they now see it simply as part of the Soviet-American plot to rule the world. Beyond that phrase, of course, lies their fear that the Soviet Union might stand aside, if the United States attacked them. That is looking far into the mists of horror, but it is a sad fact that if we, and the Russians, want China now to turn her thoughts back to disarmament, we shall have somehow to convince her that we do not plan to "gang up" on her and divide the world between us.

Two days ago, in the House of Commons, the Foreign Secretary was asked whether China's increasing nuclear power and the aggressive statements of some of its leaders were not the reason why we were supporting our American allies in seeking to contain this power in the Far East. He replied, with characteristic moderation, that:

"Our policy toward China must be seen in rather longer terms than the honorable Member has used."

And the next day, the Prime Minister said:

"It is not in the interest of world peace that Russia or America should be driven into a position of intransigent isolation."

That is profoundly true. And it is also true of China.

We are at the beginning of a new pattern of world affairs, and the decisions we take in the next year or two will govern our lives for the next 20. There are now three superpowers in the world. Two of them lead alliances; one does not. We are not a great power, but we do occupy a very prominent place in the alliance America leads. Let us look—bearing in mind what our position is—at the relations between the three superpowers. America and Russia are not nose to nose any more; they touch nowhere, they know one another and they have cooled off. China touches both Russia and America, nose to nose, in an immediate confrontation of the greatest armaments in the world, differing over the greatest issues, and in mutual ignorance, at least as regards America and China.

Those two countries understand each other so little. America speaks all of peace, but bombs China's neighbor. China watches her actions, and ignores her words. China speaks all of war, but there is not a single Chinese soldier outside China. America listens to

her words, and ignores her actions. It is historically determined. To America, China has always been a prostrate congeries of malfunctioning micro-units, crying out for the helpful tutelage America could give, and did. But for China, that period, the last handful of decades, is, though tragic, insignificant. The real China was a legitimate and respected power for centuries when there was not such a thing as America at all.

That period, the greatness of China, which she believes she is now regaining through whatever domestic hardships and injustices, simply does not exist for America, because there were not any Americans around. China's greatness was, however, observed by "yours faithfully" Europe, whose travellers and traders were going there for a couple of hundred years before they ever went to America and for 500 years before the American State came into existence. We must remember that this historical knowledge is simply not shared by the Americans, as Americans, in the sense of a live political tradition. We must remember that the leader of our own alliance, and our best friend in the world, is in very great trouble about this. The Times 2 days ago said that they had an "unpolicy" towards China. We must try to help them find a policy, and one which corresponds with reality.

Lastly (I have already gone on for too long), a word about the United Nations. It is a commonplace, almost a hocus pocus, by now that China ought to be allowed to join the United Nations so as to get on with arms control and everything else. So she ought; and I know we all with the Government well in their attempts to get it done. This has been British policy for years now. Let me just say, in passing, that there still seem to be two things that the Government might do to bring China in more quickly. One would be active lobbying among our friends; and the other would be that we should vote China in, not only on the substantive vote but also on the procedural one which governs it. It is true that this is an important matter, and it would be funny to vote that it was not. But if we want China in, that is exactly how we have to vote.

It is very good news that the Americans have taken Vietnam to the United Nations, I am always in favor of taking everything there, however hopeless or even unsuitable it may look at first sight. I hold this view even more strongly because I know that our Government, at least, will not allow the Security Council discussions to hold up the attempts to get the Geneva Conference reconvened. We have watched their efforts in this direction over the last year with the keenest good wishes and sympathy, and we continue to hope that it will not be too long before the Russians swallow whatever bone it is that is sticking in their throat and agree with us as cochairmen to recall that conference.

My Lords, I started by referring to Mr. McNamara's question: Does China intend to dominate the world politically? He was right to ask it. We must now answer it. It is lucky that here is no tremendous hurry; we have a year or two to think. Let us work really hard on these answers, looking always to the hard evidence in fact and discounting the froth of propaganda, which as often as not is self-contradictory, anyhow. I wonder what the answer will be. If I were in on this inquiry, my own working hypothesis would be: "China is rapidly becoming a super power, like the other two, and though for the moment she may wish to dominate the world about as much as Russia does, and a little more than America, she stands no chance of doing so and will soon lose interest." If this proved to be right on examination, then the answers to Mr. McNamara's other two questions would be: (2), the interests of the West are indeed affected on the political level; there is now a super third power around; and (3), the measures which should be taken are the normal ones of diplomatic contact and pressure, increasing mutual knowledge, and foreseeing and negotiating the issues which may lead to conflict. My Lords, I beg to move for papers.

(4:05 p.m.)

The EARL OF DUNDEE. My Lords, I gather that the statement is not ready yet, and we can therefore continue with this debate. Whatever your Lordships may think about the noble Lord's motion, at least you cannot complain that its terms are too narrow. It is rather like calling attention to the universe. It gives a nice, broad latitude for discussion. In a debate the day before yesterday in another place about the Far East, your Lordships may have noticed that both party leaders gave an extremely long, though interesting, account of their own recent travels in that part of the world. I am afraid I cannot compete with that. The only time that I have ever been to China was in 1942, together with my noble friend Lord Ailwyn, who was the head of a parliamentary mission which went out there. It also included my noble friend Lord Teviot and the late Lord Lawson—Jack Lawson, who was afterwards the Secretary of War in the Labour Government. He and I were then both members of another place.

The purpose of our mission was to persuade the Kuomintang Government of Chiang Kai-shek that we were going to win the war, which was not then universally accepted as an undeniable proposition, and also to persuade them that it would be worth their while to fight a little more vigorously against the Japanese invaders. The Japs at that time held all of China which they could conveniently hold with their potentialities of manpower. They held the whole of east and southeast China. The only regions held by the Kuomintang were the Province of Chunking, where the temporary capital was, and Yunnan in the south, with its capital at Cheng tu, which we also went to. There were about 20,000 or 30,000 Chinese students there from universities from all parts of occupied China. They had walked there on their feet, with nothing to wear but their gowns, carrying their books with them, many of them for 1,000 miles; and their teachers had come with them. There they were living on nothing but a bowl of rice and sleeping on straw in a hut, carrying on with their lectures and their studies as well as they could, as they would have done in their universities in the east. I thought it was a most impressive example of Chinese devotion to education and the sacrifices which they are willing to make in order to get it. They also held Sinkiang in the north, going up to the Yellow River, where the Japanese forces were, but very little fighting was going on.

Further north there were the Chinese Communists, who were then nominally in alliance with Chiang Kai-shek. Although they had been fighting him long before, they had agreed to combine toegther to fight the Japanese. We had a long talk in Chunking with Chou En-lai, who is now the Prime Minister of China, and who was then leading the Chinese Communist army. Our talk might have been a little more informative if Chou En-lai had not insisted on trying to speak in English, although we had a first-class interpreter with us. He managed to tell us a good deal about what the Chinese Communist forces were trying to do in the north, although they had very few weapons. He did not trust Chiang Kai-shek and Chiang Kai-shek did not trust him. Neither of them at that time had anything but small arms: they had no heavy artillery, no tanks and no heavy aircraft.

The only kind of aircraft the Kuomintang had was a small force of light aircraft, which was organized by the American General Chennault who was attached to Chunking for this purpose. We all thought he was a man of great talent and ability. He had built up the small well-trained Chinese Air Force out of almost nothing, and he was continually pleading with his superiors to get the American Government to send him more equipment and more materiel, so that he could make it into something really worth while. But he was the kind of officer whose imagination and talents are sometimes unacceptable to his immediate superior officers, and I do not know whether his representations ever reached the highest quarters in Washington.

When the noble lord, Lord Ailwyn, and I got home, we sent a report to our own Government, urging them to represent to our American allies that it would be a good thing if they could give General Chennault what he was asking for. I do not know whether any such representations were made, but if so no attention was paid to them. At that time, the Russians were not able to spare any arms for Chou En-lai and his Communists because they had to use all their own tanks and airplanes in resisting the invaders of their own territory. But as soon as the war was over in 1945, the Russians poured all their surplus equipment, which they did not need any more, over the frontier into north China when the Japanese cleared out, for the benefit of Chou En-lai and the Chinese Communists. The Americans were slow and reluctant to give similar help to the Kuomintang because their administration was so corrupt. It was common form that quartermasters would take all the medical supplies and sell them for their own benefit.

When the battles came between the Communists and Kuomintang, Chiang Kai-shek had a very large army, 2 or 3 million, but they had hardly anything but rifles. They began to feel that it was not much fun fighting a war when the other side had all the tanks, airplanes, and heavy artillery, so they did what Chinese armies have often done in civil wars—they changed sides. Chiang Kai-shek had to retire to Formosa with the remnant of troops which were loyal to him. After this Communist victory in China, the Americans developed a kind of guilt complex on the whole subject of China. Most of the missionaries in China had been Americans of many denominations, and they had built up fairly large congregations rather extensively throughout China. The Communist victors in the war expelled them all and suppressed and persecuted the Christian congregations. When the missionaries returned to America, they had so many stories to tell of cruel persecution and oppression of their religion that it had a deep effect on the American conscience. They began to feel: if only we had woke up and done something in time, we might have stopped this, and we have not. They developed a deep and bitter feeling against the Chinese Communist Government which they felt was establishing a new kind of civilization inimical to the whole conception of a free world.

It has always been one of the reasons for disunion between the Americans and ourselves that we have had different principles about recognizing foreign governments. We have always taken the sensible view that you ought to recognize a government which has effective control over the territory in which you want to have diplomatic representation, whatever the political or moral complexion of that government may be. The Americans have always been inclined to take the view that you recognize a government because you think it is a good government, which will behave well and do what is right. That works both ways. Three years ago, the Americans recognized the government in the Yemen, and were rather annoyed that we did not, because they thought it was a government which would be on the right side. We did not recognize it because it had not effective control of the territory, and only kept control

of the little it had with the support of 40,000 Egyptian troops. In China; it was the other way around. The Americans never have been willing to recognize the Communist Chinese Government. We recognized it from the beginning because it had effective control of the country; it was the effective, de facto government.

The question of admission to the United Nations is not quite the same as the question of recognition of the Government, but it is similar. We have always felt that it would be right that China should be admitted to the United Nations. But for a very long time, although we made representations to this effect, we never went to the length of moving a resolution and voting against the Americans on this subject in the United Nations, because we knew that if we did that we should deeply offend the conscience of the American public. There were even some observers who thought that America might resign from the United Nations if this were done. After a long time—I think it was in 1962—we supported by our vote in the United Nations a resolution for the admission of China, which we thought we should win and the Americans thought they would probably lose. But, greatly to their surprise, I think, the vote went in their favor, and China was not admitted.

I hope that the present Government will continue to do what they can to get China admitted to the United Nations. I think all parties here are agreed that it would be an advantage in every way that this should be done. There are two particular reasons. One is the question of whether we shall ever get a treaty on the proliferation of nuclear weapons on which, perhaps, the avoidance of nuclear war may one day depend. You cannot get an agreement on nonproliferation, I think we are all agreed, until you have agreement between the United States and Russia. But, after that, China will have to be brought in—because China now has nuclear weapons—either by persuasion or in some other way. It cannot possibly reduce the chance of an agreement on nuclear weapons if China is in the United Nations; it may greatly increase it.

The other reason I would put to the noble Lord is that the bulk of the common people in China are, I am afraid, rather strong racialists, by tradition and upbringing. They are almost like the legendary Englishman who is reported to have said that niggers began for him when he left Dover. They take an arrogant, xenophobic view of foreigners. A cynic might say that that will be strengthened by their membership of the United Nations, or it may not. I do not think it will. I think it would be a factor mitigating their feeling against the inferiority and even the diabolical nature of foreigners, which so many Chinese entertain, if they were accepted, as they ought to be, as members of the United Nations.

Another thing which the Communist government did when they came into power was to issue a declaration in 1949 about Chinese obligations to the rest of the world under its foreign treaties. They declared that they were going to examine all the treaties made by the Kuomintang Government which preceded them, and were either going to accept them or to abrogate them, or to renegotiate. And they did not say they were going to do all this at once; they said they would do it at the appropriate time, which might be any time in the future; and more recently the official government newspaper has been saying that this renegotiation will apply much further back in history, to all treaties that were made by the Manchu Dynasty. This need not necessarily mean that China intends to be a threat to her neighbors.

The noble Lord, Lord Kennet, took a run round the countries bordering on China, and I do not think I need follow him in every detail of it. As he said, in 1960 the MacMahon Line with Burma was recognised by a new treaty with the Communist People's Party in China. As for Hong Kong, nothing has been done about that, and the treaty does not expire until 1997. It seems that the Chinese are likely to allow the present situation to continue, and to go on doing nothing, because it is convenient to them to have this window into the outside world, although it is always an advertisement for the superiority of the free world against communism because so many millions of Chinese refugees go there.

The noble Lord, Lord Kennet, did not mention Tibet, as he explained in reply to an interruption, because nominally it had been part of China. And although it was, in effect, an independent country, I do not think it had been recognized as a sovereign government. But the impression made on world opinion by the Chinese invasion and conquest of Tibet was not, I think, so much the legal aspect of it as the horrible cruelty, and even genocide, with which, according to reports, the unhappy population of Tibet has been treated.

With regard to the aggression into India, I think it is quite possible that the Chinese did not intend to do much more than rectify the frontier. I should have thought that, if they had aggressive intentions, the very sparsely populated and rich plains of Siberia would be a far greater temptation than the overcrowded subcontinent of India. Of course we do not know whether or not they have long-term intentions of aggression, but one of the difficulties about persuading our friends to accept them into the United Nations has been (whether or not they really meant it, one does not know) that the Chinese leaders and officials have certainly stated in recent years that nuclear war may be a good thing; that they have over 700 or 800 million people and can easily afford to lose 300 or 400 million in a nuclear war, and they might well be the gainers in the long run.

Lord KENNET. My Lords, this is a matter which is often quoted, and not always quite correctly. I do not think they ever said that nuclear war would be a good thing. There does exist one broadcast from 1957 in which one of the Chinese leaders made the point that if there were a nuclear war they would suffer less than others, because of the size of their population; but in the last 9 years even that point has not been repeated.

The EARL OF DUNDEE. My Lords, I cannot substantiate any argument to the contrary, but I believe that other statements, besides the one broadcast, have been made. The noble Lord may be right, but it certainly has been an obstacle to their admission to the United Nations because many people naturally say, "After all, the United Nations is an organization which is intended to keep the peace, and nations which talk like this cannot really want to keep the peace."

But, my Lords, I think that if the Chinese have permanent intentions, either of military aggression or of gaining influence over the whole world by propaganda, they have very largely defeated their own objects by their stupidity. They are an intelligent people, but the Chinese Government has acted with great stupidity in this matter on many occasions. For instance, during Chou En-lai's visit to Africa 2 or 3 years ago he made some extremely tactless observations made about Africa being "ripe for revolution," and nearly all the work which had been done by years of persistent Chinese propaganda was undone.

Then when the war between India and Pakistan was going on, a few months ago, Your Lordships will remember the rather silly ultimatum which the Chinese sent to the Indians, saying they would take military action unless the Indians immediately returned (I think it was) 4 refugees and 59 yaks which had apparently strayed over the frontier into Sikkim. The Indians, instead of reacting in a warlike way, said that they would discuss it, and the Chinese, finding they had not got the reaction they expected, withdrew and pretended that the Indians had admitted their delinquency and had withdrawn. Of course that made a bad impression on all China's neighbors, who do not particularly want to have war and who felt that the Chinese were obviously the sort of people who were ready to make war for the sake of 4 refugees and 59 yaks. I think that by this act of stupidity the Chinese have done themselves more harm to their diplomatic status in the world than any government has done in recent times.

The noble Lord, Lord Kennet, has mentioned the third example of foolishness, in relation to Cuba. They had been getting a very good hold in Cuba, they were liked there better than the Russians, who had not stuck to the Cubans in the 1962 crisis; but now they have completely lost that. I do not know whether Lord Kennet's parallel with de Gaulle and Washington is right—whether Castro is more or less marketable than either of those characters—but he is certainly a man who is rather more likely to lose his temper than either of them. He has thoroughly gone off the deep end about this, and China's influence in Cuba now seems to have destroyed itself.

With regard to the present war in Vietnam it seems to me that probably the North Vietnamese do not want to be dominated by the Chinese, though there is no doubt that the Chinese, for their own ends, are supporting the war. If we want to achieve the results which I know all your Lordships, and the noble Lord, Lord Kennet, would like to achieve—that is to say, peace in the Far East, and, let us hope, an agreement on a nonproliferation of nuclear weapons—then we must support the defense of freedom against aggression, where aggression is taking place at this moment.

I do not think I could put it better than in the words of Sir Alec Home, in a speech which he made 3 weeks ago in New York, when he said this about the British and the American part in keeping peace in southeast Asia:

"The military prospect for the United States in Vietnam and for Britain in Malaysia is not inviting."

I would add that it is particularly uninviting in many ways in Vietnam; it is going to be a long struggle. Then he said:

"Each of us would strongly prefer a political settlement, but when it comes it must be real and more effective than those of 1954 or 1962. The longer and wider vision demands that nothing should be done to prejudice the future independence of Japan, the Philippines, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaysia, and ultimately Australia and New Zealand. A peace settlement, therefore, must be seen to provide the end of aggression and the prospect of orderly change within a framework of political stability, something far easier to say than to do, but something which, given the will by Indonesia and North Vietnam, could be done."

I am glad that Her Majesty's Government recognize the truth of this fact: that if we want to see the end of aggression, and ultimately an agreement on nuclear limitation and nonaggression, we must be seen to have stopped aggression, to make it evident that aggression will not pay, and that orderly change may take place within a framework of stability.

(4:46 p.m.)

Lord KING-HALL. My Lords, some 26 years ago I underwent an experience which was so alarming that I could console myself only with the thought that it could not possibly happen to me again—at least, not on this planet. But today I know that I was wrong; because although to make a maiden speech

in another place may be, and indeed is, most alarming, to make it here is more than alarming, it is absolutely daunting—for this reason. Although Your Lordships have surrendered some aspects of political power, there is no doubt that this House has enormously gained another aspect of power in the influence which its debates have on the formation of public opinion, an influence which I venture to say is of great value to our democracy. Therefore, it is a great responsibility, and I think particularly alarming, to have the opportunity of addressing this House for the first time. But Your Lordships are also renowned for the kindness and courtesy with which you conduct your affairs, and it is with this consoling thought in mind that I ask you to give me your indulgence for a few minutes.

My first connection with China took place some 40 years ago when, as a young naval officer, and with the assistance of 25 sailors, I spent some weeks refereeing a local Chinese war at Amoy. I was on Amoy island to protect an extraterritorial British concession, a quite small one, and the island was controlled by a certain General Chik-Ping. He was being attacked by a General Yet and also by a Chinese admiral who, curiously enough, was an honorary British K.C.B. The Chinese admiral was also at war with General Yet, which somewhat confused the issue.

It was relevant to this triangular contest that, as the Principal of Amoy University, a learned man who was a friend of mine, explained to me, it had been traditional for centuries in China, and was a well-established convention, that in contrast to the barbaric and manifestly stupid behavior of the Western Powers, who broke off diplomatic relations as soon as hostilities began, it was the Chinese view that as soon as hostilities began it was more necessary than ever to intensify and increase diplomatic relations because the situation had become much more serious.

It was for this reason that the three belligerents I have mentioned came with a request that they should use the British concession, and my modest headquarters therein, as a place for their regular and daily meetings at which they could discuss amongst themselves the state of the war. I am glad to say that, with the assistance of the British vice consul and with security provided by the 25 British sailors, an arrangement on a cash basis was reached, after some negotiations, which was extremely satisfactory to all concerned. I am reminded, when I look at four rather charming Chinese pictures, that the neutral power was not forgotten in this arrangement, which perhaps illustrates the rather realistic Chinese saying, which goes something to the effect that:

"The host is happy when the guests have gone."

It occurs to me that this Chinese piece of wisdom can perhaps best be adapted to parliamentary life if we reword it by saying:

"The house is happy when the speechmaker has sat down."

So I shall be brief. I have informed your lordships of this little episode in Anglo-Chinese relations because I submit that what the British Government did by way of conciliation on a minute scale at Amoy some forty years ago is illustrative of what Government policy might be on the world scale in the Far East. I think that it should be our endeavor, before it is too late, to use our influence to bring China into the great debate about the future of mankind which is now shaping up. And I trust that it will remain a debate and not deteriorate into something much more serious. We are living in difficult times. The shrinking of the world, in terms of the time space factor; the application of nuclear energy to military purposes, and the proliferation of such weapons; the population explosions, and the racial question in Africa—these are some of the great questions which, if they are to be resolved peacefully, will have to be dealt with to an increasing extent through what I have described as the beginnings of embryonic world government, which I regard as meaning the strengthening of the United Nations by making its membership truly universal. It is essential to bring about without delay China's membership of the Security Council.

The practical problem which emerges from this is what arguments can we advance to our American friends to persuade them of the wisdom of this policy. It would appear to be the opinion of important parts of the American administration that China is out to conquer the world, either by force of arms and/or by subversion, and that this ambition must be contained, particularly in southeast Asia. This does not fit in with my reading of Chinese history, though I will not weary Your Lordships with my reasons for this opinion. In broad terms, we are witnessing today the consequences of the fact that for the first time in their enormously long history the Chinese people have a strong central government. It is inclined to be a nationalistic government which is operating in the ideological framework of communism internally and externally, much as the Japanese militarists operated in a framework of shintoism.

It is my guess that if the Chinese have any serious aggression, their long-term purpose may well be to regain from the Soviet Union the territories taken from China by the czars in northeast Asia and, maybe, central Asia. The occupation of Tibet; their attempt to get influence in Indochina, to counteract Russian influence there, on the southern flank of China; the development of their nuclear capacity, and other measures, could all fit in with the belief that what they may face is a war with the Soviet Union.

There are a number of well-substantiated reports showing that there is a great deal of friction and tension, and a good deal of shooting, on the borders between Russia and China. I think we must recognize that a Russian-Chinese war would be a major disaster for all of us. I fear that if China remains as a kind of international outlaw over the next 10 or 20 years, we may see some extraordinary developments, in the shape of China and Japan coming together, on the one side, with the Soviet Union and the United States on the other side. Such a confrontation could be the prelude to a great racial conflict in which the nonwhite "have-nots" would be alined against the white well-off peoples.

At this time our American allies have enormous military strength, and I hope that they will see the wisdom of acting from strength and reversing their policy of nonrecognition of China, before the Chinese are in a position to say "Thank you for nothing." Furthermore, if the Americans could, as it were, inaugurate a new deal with China by supporting their admission to the United Nations, and perhaps move on to give economic aid, on the lines of the strands of American policy in southeast Asia, it seems to me that the Vietnam problem, which is so important and so central at the moment, would then be treated at one, and only one, of a number of problems in East-West relations. We should remember that for a brief period of about 150 years the Western powers, as a Chinese writer put it, "tried to carve up the Chinese melon." And later on the Japanese tried to annex China with their 21 demands and invaded her.

I would remind our American allies that they were always in the forefront of endeavors to save China from what they regarded as imperialistic Western powers. What we are seeing in Asia today is a readjustment of forces consequent upon the departure of the Europeans after their brief domination of the Far East. The control which the Western powers exerted began to crumble with the fall of Singapore, which was one of the great events of history. We must be very careful of the danger of having policies which may seem to Asians to be an attempt by the West to reenter Asia and to tell them how to conduct their own affairs—not that I believe that that is any part of Western policy; but we must be careful to see that it does not look as if it is.

If China can become a member of the United Nations and occupy a position therein to which her present and particularly her potential importance seems to entitle her, we shall have made a beginning with the creation of a situation in which an attempt could be made to reach peaceful solutions off the whole range of world problems, some of which I have mentioned; and we should hope that in world affairs China would play a constructive role.

I conclude by suggesting that we should not assume that, because at the moment China is in what one might describe as "the high temperature phase" of communism, she will not pass into what one might describe as bourgeois communism, which is what seems to be happening in Russia. If I may sum up, in a sentence or two, what I believe should be Britain's role at this time in the Far East, it is that we should strive to be bridgebuilders between China and the United States. I realize (to conclude with another Chinese saying) that: "To say is easy; to do is difficult." Nevertheless, we should attempt this task, and I hope that it is a policy which is likely to be supported by many persons of all parties and also by all cross-bench opinion.

(4:57 p.m.)

Baroness SUMMERSKILL. My Lords, I am delighted to follow my noble friend today. I have listened to his speeches on many occasions in another place, and after all these years it gives me tremendous pleasure to listen to him again and to realize that his eloquence, his fluency, and his wit are unimpaired. We look forward to hearing him many more times. The noble lord quoted the Chinese saying about visitors—namely, that the host is always happy when the visitors have left. The saying I remember is this one: "Visitors, like fish, should never be in the house more than 3 days."

I apologize to the House for speaking in this debate, because I have addressed Your Lordships a number of times during the past week or two, but when I saw this motion on the order paper, "To draw attention to China," I felt that, at this time when world attention is focused on China, those of us who have had some experience of China fairly recently should make our small contribution. My contribution is going to be quite different. Listening to the speakers who have already contributed to the debate, I realize the great difference between the male approach to that country and the female approach. The male thinks in terms of aggression, military forces, frontiers, relationships between countries. But a woman's approach is entirely different to a big new country. She is concerned more with personalities, with social services, and with the human problems that face a country with a quarter of the world's population.

Having listened to the most interesting and detailed speech of my noble friend Lord Kennet, and not having his knowledge and wisdom, I feel that there are so many imponderables in politics that it is difficult for a politician fully to understand the government in any country other than one's own. Therefore, I must confess I found my noble friend a little dogmatic about the relationships between China and other countries, and I felt that some of his speculations might

prove to be unfounded. Nevertheless, I believe it is possible to visit another country, to savour the life there, and to make certain broad deductions regarding social and political trends.

In 1954 I was a member of a small group of the National Executive Committee of the Labor Party invited by the Government of China to visit that country, and my noble friend Lord Attlee—I am sorry he is not here this afternoon—was with that group. I was the only woman in the group, and it seemed to me that I had a unique opportunity of satisfying my curiosity concerning the social conditions of that vast country.

On our arrival, Mr. Chou En-lai made it quite clear that we could go anywhere we liked, ask anything we liked, and he would always be available; and he kept his word. He was there with us time after time and was prepared to face up to any questions, some of them easy and some of them less easy. On the first day, he gave me a little booklet on the new marriage law of China. I had been told that they attached tremendous importance to this, and I took a great interest in it. What I read I already knew, but, nevertheless, I read that polygamy and child marriage were prohibited, and that the woman was given equal rights with her husband for a divorce.

When I asked Chou En-lai why I had been given that immediately, he hold me that it was one of the first measures introduced after liberation. I said that I was pleased to find that he was such an ardent feminist. He replied that he did not take credit for that; that these provisions were regarded as the very foundation of the new China. He said that the men of old China were spoiled, first by their mothers and then by their wives, and they did not provide a quality of manpower capable of building a new society. This was not said in a jocular manner. I was told this because the hierarchy of China attached great importance to laying proper foundations. Indeed, when I saw Mao Tse-tung for the first time, he asked what I thought of the new law. Then he said to the interpreter: "Tell her that we thought she would appreciate the start of the birth of our new society, and tell her that the best plants grow in good soil." That was my first glimpse into the life of China. With 4,000 years of history, the Chinese are determined to build a society which will last at least many generations. Their greatly admired architect—and in this country we really must not underestimate his power—Mao Tse-tung, has directed his genius to fostering the enduring elements in Chinese society.

I think we should remember that it was in 1917 that Mao Tse-tung put a small advertisement in a Hunan Provincial newspaper, in which he sought to meet others whom he described as "interested in patriotic activities and prepared to work and make sacrifices for our country." That was half a century ago, and he has never ceased to urge his countrymen to work and make sacrifices without thought of reward. His thoughts on the subject have not altered, and they are injected day by day into the minds of the Chinese millions. No Bolshevik—Lenin, Trotsky, or Stalin—fought so long a series of battles to advance a cause as did Mao Tse-tung.

In discussing these things with the youth of the country I found that they were very prepared to discuss all kinds of problems with us, and were desperately anxious to learn about the political scene in Europe. I did not find anybody there who was acting as "big brother," and inhibiting those boys and girls from asking questions. The prospect of decades of struggle does not appear to distress the youth of China. On the contrary, they seem to regard it as a challenge, a way of life which must be reflected in everything they do. And I must say that if faith can conquer, then the faith which the people have in the leaders and their cause must entirely overcome all obstacles.

The Minister of Health, a quite remarkable woman, showed me what vast improvements had been made in the health services since 1949. To get this into proper perspective, she described to me the death carts which used to arrive in the small towns to take away those who had died from typhus—typhoid and all the diseases associated with dirt, unsanitary conditions and bad feeling. Some people like to ridicule the high standard of cleanliness. How stupid it is for these prejudiced people to say that all that the Chinese have done in Peiping is to get rid of the flies. If that is all they have done they have done a remarkable thing, for it was precisely the flies and the dirt and the unhygienic conditions which killed off the children, and now the high standard of cleanliness is something at which we must marvel. There is the universal instruction of the people in preventive medicine, and the intensive education of doctors. If they cannot take a whole medical course, they are given a limited course and specialize, let us say, in the chest, but they are experts on the lungs and heart. This has reduced the morbidity and mortality rates in China in dramatic fashion.

I listened to my noble friend Lord Kennet talking. I could hardly believe my ears. I do not know which year he was in China, or for how long. I should like to ask him which year it was.

Lord KENNET. Never.

Baroness SUMMERSKILL. Really, my Lords, I do feel that my noble friend should not have been so dogmatic when he talked about the little girl going along with a long pin with leaves on. Then he said that she took it home where some leaves were taken off for the pot and some for the pigs. I have some commonsense. I have traveled a very long way, from the south to the north, in big towns and small towns, and there is concentration on the feeding of the children and the welfare of the children. The great increase in the population just shows what importance the Chinese attach to that.

Lord KENNET. My Lords, may I interrupt the noble lady for a moment to put her out of her worry about this? I did not say that the children were eating the leaves. It was not one for the pig and one for the pot. It was one for the pig and one to be burned on the fire.

Baroness SUMMERSKILL. I speak very sweetly to my noble friend, but one cannot make generalizations and be quite so dogmatic about things like that unless one has been to the country. After all, there was at one time infanticide in China; the hunger of the people, the children and the mothers was so great that a woman had to expose her infant in order that it could die. I agree that that used to occur, but things are changing in quite a remarkable way. The harvest of 1965 was greater than that of 1964, and this year China is looking forward to even more plentiful crops. When my noble friend goes to China, I hope that he will look out of the plane as he crosses the Great Wall. He will get his first glimpse of the country from the air and will see the careful cultivation by the Chinese. They are so careful and industrious that they will cultivate a strip right up to the apex of a mountain, or so it seems from the air. It reminded me of a beautifully stitched piece of embroidery.

Now I believe that the determined resistance of the simple peasant in Vietnam today to the high-powered bombing stems from a knowledge of the successful outcome of the Chinese struggle. I believe that the only antidote to communism is to devote the vast sums spent on waging war to raising the standard of living of the millions in Asia. I ask Your Lordships to read the leader in the Times this morning, which is a development of this theme. I can think of nothing more depressing, after Honolulu, than to hear that the solution of the problem in Vietnam is to be more bombs and more doctors. My Lords, what a paradox. The people in Vietnam see what is happening in China, and they know that the standard of living of the Chinese is increasing.

On the question of aggression, I can say only this: the Chinese make no secret of their aims. They are determined—and I was told this unequivocally—ultimately to remove the puppet government in Formosa which claims to speak for China. They feel that America's presence in the Formosa Straits offers a constant provocation. I hope that, when the Government comes to reply—and I am glad to see my noble friend Lord Walston on the front bench—my noble friend will tell me that there is no substance in the charge made by China that the British Government has offered Hong Kong as a base for the United States to expand its war against Vietnam. That would be the height of folly, and would deserve the censure of the whole Commonwealth.

I believe that Mr. Johnson—indeed the whole American Nation—are deluding themselves about the vulnerability of Vietnam and China. The strength of China is certainly not in its material possessions, although by Asian standards they are well off. It is the temper of China which seems to me to be beyond the comprehension of the United States. There is a measure of self-sacrifice and heroism in the young people which is prodigious.

The other day, on television, I saw a picture of a young U.S. serviceman who, in answer to a question on why he was in Vietnam, said, "We must stop communism here; otherwise, it will spread." I felt that that boy's concept of communism in Asia was similar to his view of a revolution in say, a South American republic. He felt that it was a 9 days' wonder which would fizzle out, only to be replaced by an equally tawdry regime. But one has only to go to China and see these people, dedicated to helping their country to progress, to realize that the concept of that unfortunate (as I think) young American is entirely false.

The United States of America must stop thinking that China does not exist. In fact, it is a highly organized country which is operating more efficiently every year. The Chinese have for centuries been choosing administrators by competitive examinations. I met some of them—men who spoke perfect English, who were knowledgeable, and who, far from having that parochial attitude which some people suggest the Chinese have, had an international approach to life. These people also have an inherent courtesy and charm which derives, I believe, from the Confucian philosophy and which, I should think, enables them to work harmoniously together.

My Lords, there is an atmosphere of a nation on the move. The opinion I formed was confirmed by the Times special correspondent in Peiping in an article on October 26, 1965, which was not long ago. Under the title, "China: A Disciplined Nation," he wrote:

"As long as Peiping does nothing rash, the days of civil war and famine seem finally to be over. * * * Life has visibly improved since 'liberation,' and * * * most people * * * understand that, if they help production to rise, there will in the long run be a reasonably sized slice of cake for everyone."

He concluded: "* * * the people appear to be quite solidly behind the Government."

My Lords, history has surely proved that the Chinese are a pacific people, but Mao Tse-tung reminds them now that if they are not armed they will be destroyed—hence the

nuclear bombs. Nothing supports Mao Tse-tung's contention more powerfully than the bombing of their present neighbors, the Vietnamese, by the United States. For this reason, I believe that every bomb dropped will have a boomerang effect.

Finally, may I say my word about the United Nations? The exclusion of China from the United Nations was not only a denial of justice and contrary to the provisions of the charter, but was a colossal diplomatic blunder. China, with one-quarter of the world's population, was a founding member and a permanent member of the Security Council. Yet, since 1949, she has been refused the right to occupy the seat which legally had always belonged to her. I ask my noble friend to use his good offices in this direction. The government should take every opportunity in their conversations at all levels with the representatives of the United States, wherever they may meet—and I understand they have many contacts with the United States these days—to urge China's claim to a seat in the United Nations, not only to remedy a gross injustice but to facilitate peace in Asia.

(5:17 p.m.)

Lord BOURNE. My Lords, we are all grateful to the noble Lord, Lord Kennet, for putting down this motion, and I, for one, am especially grateful to him for explaining the situation in such detail and from such great knowledge. He really gave us such a wealth of information about China that, I am glad to say, it makes our subsequent speeches rather shorter. I should also like to congratulate the noble Lord King-Hall, on his maiden speech. Of course, we expected it to be like it was, because he has talked to us in many other places, and many of us are his friends. But he is a great acquisition to your Lordships' House, and I am sure we all hope we shall hear him many times again, with his expert knowledge.

Next, I should like to thank the noble Baroness, Lady Summerskill, for introducing a new note into the rather aggressive subject which we have in front of us. She is quite right, of course, to talk about the wonderful urge and aims of the new China—and she is lucky in having been to China more recently than I have. I am sorry that, although I have worked and played with Chinese in many places—and I still work with them—I have not actually been to China since 1931. On that occasion, I remember, their sense of humor was rather well displayed, because my wife and I were taken along to the Temple of Heaven on a Monday morning. We got there at about half-past 9, and the guide said, "I'm a bit late." We said, "Late for what?' He replied: "Late for the Monday morning executions." We were very glad to be late.

Now I shall have to return to the more mundane aspect of China at the present time, but, always remembering what the noble Baroness has told us about the attitude of the Chinese, and to underline that point, I should like to remind your Lordships of a Chinese proverb which I picked up in Malaya when we were looking for soldiers. It said:

"You do not make a nail with good iron; you do not use a good man to make a soldier."

That, I believe, is part of their philosophy. It was extremely difficult to get the Chinese to serve in the army as soldiers, or to serve as policemen in Malaya when we were fighting there.

My Lords, I believe that China suffers from four hates. The first hate is against the imperialists—admittedly it is an historical hate; but the fact remains that the imperialists occupied the Treaty Ports for more than 100 years. They had their own judicial courts and they did what they liked in those Treaty Ports; this has never been forgotten. Secondly, she must hate Japan. I remember leaving Peiping in September 1931. There was a Japanese soldier standing on the station at Peiping. His successors, his reliefs, did not leave until 1946. They occupied the country for 15 years. It required a tremendous effort on the part of China, including a rather unexpected alliance with the Communists and the Kuomintang States, and by her allies (but not inside China) to defeat the Japanese in China.

Next, she hates the United States for reasons I will not go into; but it is a fact. Lastly, she has learned quite recently to hate the Soviet Union. The noble lord, Lord Kennet, was right when he said that we should not take too much notice of the ideological difficulties, because they will change. But there is one very deep ideological difference between the two countries, if they both aim at world revolution and world domination. The Russians have tried to put off these aims. Mr. Khrushchev, when he was in power, said that the Russians would aim to catch up with the economy of the United States in 15 years. He was rather forgetting that the United States is a moving target. The Chinese, on their way to world domination or world revolution, have not given up the thought of, perhaps, having to use force on the way; while the Russians definitely have.

I picked up an extract from an article in Pravda only yesterday. It was discussing the advance to world domination and it pointed out that this or that maneuver was not acceptable because it would risk thermonuclear war. The Chinese do not agree with that. They are now accusing the Russians of actually collaborating with the United States for a Soviet-United States domination of the world. It is a most extraordinary change. Again, if we look back at China's actions over the last 15 years to see how she is leading up to her aims, we find they have been a combination of subversion (as in Malaysia and Indonesia, where her aims have been defeated but which took a long time) and actions due to her great sensitivity along her periphery. I will not go right around the periphery in detail except to say that the countries concerned are Korea, Laos, Burma (where she has friends), and India, where as the noble lord, Lord Kennet, said, she has been rectifying the frontier according to the map. Tibet was, perhaps, not a frontier rectification; but there are Ladek, Sikkim, and Butan, and one can go on and on.

But I think the most extraordinary thing about this list is the gaps in it, the inactions on the part of the Chinese, the holding back. There have been two outstanding examples. The first was when the Chinese defeated the Indian Army in either 1962 or 1963 (I forget which) and, when they were on the edge of the tea gardens, they could, I believe, have got down to Calcutta and occupied it. But they refrained. They actually withdrew. The second example is Burma. If you wanted to accuse China of aggression and of trying to spread her frontiers outward, Burma would be a classic example of an easy place to have done so. Burma is a divided country and has a poor army—I know a little about it, for I trained it for a year—and could not have resisted them for more than a month at the very most. If China had wanted to gain a port on the Indian Ocean, namely Rangoon, she could have taken it any day. It was free to take; it would not have been difficult. But she refrained. I find that very curious. I do not believe it fits in with the general picture of the march of aggression. Nor does it fit in with aggression to the south. People are afraid that the Chinese have thoughts of military aggression toward southeast Asia; but southeast Asia is full, it is prosperous and there is no room for any more. But there is plenty of room in the other direction in the west.

Lastly there is the business of the nuclear bombs which China exploded unexpectedly and rather more successfully than was expected, because we must remember that she has had no military assistance and no nuclear assistance for 5 years. She did it by herself. I believe it is a precautionary move. So far, the revolutionary method, Mao Tse-tung's classic revolutionary method, has been to advise countries to surround the cities from the countryside and to use conventional tactics. China may have thought that in 15 years' time she would need thermonuclear equipment. I think it is well to remember that if she has built missiles (rather simple ones to start with), because airplanes will be out of date, those missiles will be within range of the Soviet Union before being within range of the United States.

I would say that, for the various reasons I have given, Chinese foreign policy and military policy would be one of caution for the next 10 to 15 years. In fact, I believe her aims are: first, to strengthen her own internal economy. I think she has embarked on two or three 5-year plans and one of those plans had a terrible setback. She is now embarking on another and is laying special emphasis on economy in the empty northwest. She is fully occupied with that internal plan. Secondly, she is engaged in defending herself—this is from the Chinese point of view—by establishing a series of friendly vassal countries around her periphery. We might call them vassals—she would call them friendly states—but by friendly vassal states I mean states which will have a Communist ideology and a government.

Moreover, while carrying out her internal and external policies with no military aggression of any kind, and fighting her wars by proxy, which has been very cheap and effective so far, she will at all costs avoid direct confrontation with the United States, because she simply dare not do that. At the present time she could use only conventional equipment. It would be the "human waves" tactics, which were suitable in Korea but are not suitable in other parts of the world—and certainly not so against the United States directly. The "human waves" tactic is getting out of date. China will have to wait for many years before she can get level with the Soviet Union and the United States.

My Lords, what should our policy be in reply to this cautionary Chinese policy? I suggest the first thing is to keep open our communications and be able to talk, trade, and deal with the Chinese and to live with them. We have learned to live with the Soviet Union and our relationship now, if perhaps a little stiff, are at least quite effective, and second, while doing that, to adopt the successful policy which we adopted with NATO in Europe—that is to say, to show a firm front. We have been greatly helped in Europe over the last 15 years by two things: The colossal atomic superiority of the United States and by an Iron Curtain having a clearly demarcated line, across which an angry shot has not yet been fired.

We have atomic superiority in Asia and there is no threat against us. If we also had a clear line, that would help, and it is being set up now by the action of the various States which have been mentioned. So I believe that our policy in the East is right at the present time. We must be friendly but we must be firm. In case any noble Lords think that we can abdicate and leave it to those countervailing forces which have been talked about a great deal recently, let me remind Your Lordships that these forces do not exist. The countervailing forces to China, if we regard her as a military power in Asia, are only two. One is Japan, which, by treaty, does not yet have any forces, and the other is India, which is more than fully occupied and in any case cannot afford it because she is in difficult financial straits.

India has no exportable military power at the present time. So the many weak new countries, about which I have spoken before in Your Lordships' House, still have to be defended by the United States, Britain, Australia, and New Zealand.

One last word. It is common practice to talk about power vacuums—I have been talking about them for a good many years—but I would remind your Lordships that they are very real. If we create a power vacuum by leaving, somebody else steps in. We had an example of this on television only last night, when we saw Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, the Prime Minister of Singapore, with whom I had a talk at one time on this very subject. He said that if the British left Singapore he would have to go down to the quayside and bow and surrender to the Indonesians. He added, "I have attended one surrender in my life, to the Japanese—one is enough." But what he said is an example of what would happen if ever we came to create a power vacuum by abdicating our power in the East.

(5:33 p.m.)

The EARL OF SELKIRK. My Lords, I should like to congratulate the noble Lord, Lord King-Hall, on his maiden speech. It is a pity that he is not more extensively employed in refereeing and deciding the troubles of other countries. If he were called in in all cases he would be pretty fully occupied.

The question of China is a watershed on which people come down violently, on one side or the other. I think that it is worth remembering the position in which China finds herself. She has been through 150 years of decline in her ancient civilization, to which she attaches tremendous importance, and has now established what I believe can be called a new dynasty. The noble baroness, Lady Summerskill, explained some of the developments which the dynasty is taking. One hears many different stories, some good and some bad, and though many good things are being done, I think that we can only regard China as a formidable enigma. The noble Lord, Lord Kennet, said that China was not alarming. I think that he put it in terms far too favorable at the present time. We have only to look at the size and the population of China—twice that of the whole of the African Continent—and to the fact that it is a united country under probably the ablest body of people in the world, to see that China is undoubtedly formidable.

I should like to tell Your Lordships why I think China is an enigma. In China there are two great strengths—communism, on the one hand, and the Chinese character and history, on the other. No one knows which is going to predominate in the end. We see guerrilla warfare and incitement to revolt taking place in many parts of the world; a refusal to accept peaceful coexistence; a belief in world communism, and the desire to lead it. Conversely, there is an equally strong belief in the importance of the Chinese nation. There is no Chinese in southeast Asia who is not delighted that China is important. They have a great sense of nationalism. This is seen in the question of boundaries. They talk of their traditional boundaries and go back to the empire of Tang, which was somewhat contemporary with King Arthur and the Round Table. This claim of traditional boundaries is very convenient because there have been a great many changes in the Chinese frontier. For example, if we take the empire of Genghis Khan, it stretched as far as Turkey.

On the question of Tibet, the noble lord, Lord Kennet, came down strongly on the Chinese side. I doubt whether Tibet was part of China in the time of the Tang empire. I understand that it became Chinese only in the Ching dynasty, in the early 18th century. I would say to the noble baroness, Lady Summerskill, that the Chinese did not show themselves to be a pacific people in the way they handled Tibet, and, as Your Lordships know, they were condemned by the United Nations for their complete disregard of human rights in Tibet. We have to recognize that if the Chinese think they have a right, there is no limit to what they may do, and it is unlikely that they will argue about what their right is.

Another tendency of the Chinese, to which my noble friend Lord Dundee referred, is racialism. There is absolutely nothing multiracialist about the Chinese. They have a tremendous contempt for all other nations. Not only that, but all Chinese outside the country have an immense regard for Mother China; and Mother China, in turn, expects some recognition from the overseas China that they belong in some way to the Chinese race.

Lord CHORLEY. My Lords, is the noble earl not aware of the number of indigenous racial elements in China, who number several millions—people who are not in fact Chinese—and that their method of dealing with these separate nationalities has been extraordinarily successful?

The EARL OF SELKIRK. My Lords, I think that the number percentagewise is not very great—a million among 700 million is not very much. Frankly, I think it very unlikely that the minority races are ever regarded as on the same footing as the people of Chinese race.

What worries me particularly is the attitude of China to the outside world, the ruthless resolution with which they seek to impose their views on countries overseas. We have had some examples given today of their relative failures. The Algiers conference was certainly not a success. There was their threat on the Indian frontier, from which they withdrew. There was the misplaced coup in Indonesia, which certainly was a resounding defeat; and there were their difficulties with Castro in Cuba. And in Africa they have probably been turned out of as many countries as we have which, of course, is saying quite a lot. M. Bourguiba, of Tunis, said recently:

"Madmen wage wars, and I fear that the Chinese fall into this category."

So there has been a pretty violent reaction from Africa.

That is not everything. I am going to ask the noble Lord, Lord Walston, if he will tell us what is happening in Zanzibar. Very few people know what is happening there. Some people say that there is a Chinese camp at one end, and a Russian camp at the other. Is Dar-es-Salaam in danger? What is happening in Kenya? Is Mr. Odinga being paid a large sum of money, running into perhaps six figures, by the Chinese? Has the noble Lord any information on this subject, or not? What is quite clear is that they are seeking to gain a foothold, if they can. It is these policies which we find particularly objectionable and to which we take exception.

The noble Lord, Lord Kennet, said that countries were "ganging up" against China. I look at it rather the other way. I think that China has the most astonishing self-assurance. Not only do the Chinese insult the Americans, but they carry on a dialectical warfare, I am told in the most superb language, against the Russians. They attack the Indians, and their relations with the Japanese are pretty poor, although, as has been said, the Japanese are making better approaches to China. Those countries would not normally "gang up" together, except in their attitude toward China. They have no common interests whatever. I would rather put it the other way. I wonder how frightened the Chinese are. Are they really frightened of the Americans? If you are frightened of the Americans, are you going to insult the other nuclear power in the way the Chinese are doing? I find it extremely difficult to accept this.

When I come to the future policy of China, I find myself very close to the noble lord, Lord Bourne. Mao Tse-tung has put it in this way:

"Strategically despise; tactically respect."

That is probably not a bad basis on which to proceed. Of course they do not tell their people very much about atomic power. As the noble earl, Lord Dundee, said, they pretend, that they are not very frightened of it, but I do not think their leaders are under the slightest illusion about what atomic power amounts to. I think one is forced to the conclusion that China is fairly confident that nobody is going to attack her; and I think she is probably right. I believe that her position was well stated by Sir Robert Scott in a recent issue of the Institute of Strategic Studies. He said:

"I do not myself believe that Communist China is expansionist in the sense of conventional military aggression. It is not territorial gain she seeks, but a ring of Communist buffer states; vassals of China, not of Russia."

That, I think, may be true. But I do not think we can take the slightest consolation from it, because this would give China complete dominance over very nearly half the world. Her boundaries can be adjusted almost entirely as she likes. She would thereby gain what she thinks she wants; first, world revolution of communism; and second, that that revolution should be dominated from Peiping rather than from Moscow.

In those circumstances, it is extremely difficult to say what our future policy should be. It would be foolish, of course, to throw over America and make friends with China. I am also certain that it is futile, as the noble lord, Lord Bourne, said, to show any sign of weakness. I am quite sure that not only do the Chinese respect strength, but all the countries in the neighborhood do not want to be made pawns; and unless they feel there is someone in the area with strength, to use words that I have often heard, they will not have the will to resist.

Naturally, it is a good thing to continue every form of contact, whether it be with trade fairs, through commerce, or in any other way. I personally should like to think that more people were learning Chinese. After all, nearly a quarter of the world speak Chinese. From my experience at Singapore, I would say that you can live in one of two worlds, according to whether you speak English and Mandarin. The range of contact is entirely different, and very few people can step over that line. The other thing that I should like to know is how the Chinese teach history in their own country. I read many histories in English, but I have never seen a translation of how the Chinese teach in their own schools.

The difficulty is: what advice do we tender to the United States of America? It is true, although I think regrettable, that anyone who has a "soft" China policy stands very little chance of public election—at least, that is what I am told. This is a pity, because I believe that the Americans basically do not distinguish sufficiently between the Communist element and what I call the Chinese element. My own view is that in due course the Chinese element will win, though this may not be for an exceedingly long time. I agree with the noble lord, Lord Bourne, in thinking that there is not much change; and I do not think that there will be much change. What I am sure of is that anything approaching appeasement will be the greatest possible mistake. I feel that the present situation must be looked on as something that is going to continue for quite a long time. But, above all, let us try to understand a lot more about this important and fascinating country.

(5:47 p.m.)

Lord CACCIA. My Lords, I should like to join with others in expressing appreciation to the noble lord, Lord Kennet, for having initiated this debate. I think it is quite remarkable that anyone who himself says that he has not been to China should have mastered so many of the facts and details of its history and its relationship with its neighbors. Now that it is comparatively difficult for foreigners to live in China and become experts on that great country, it is all the more necessary, I submit, that there should be those among us who give time to study that country from the outside, which is much more difficult, and follow in the great tradition of experts from here like Sir Eric Teichman, Sir John Jordan, Sir Robert Hart, and many others, who over decades have been the best informed people about the celestial kingdom.

Having said that, may I go on to follow the noble lord, Lord Kennet, in a slightly different way. He took Your Lordships around the periphery of China as it is, and in a geographical description showed some of the problems that exist. I should like to take Your Lordships back into history and give some reflections about China itself, its policy, and our attitude toward that country. Here I must declare a minor interest, in that I perhaps just qualify, but only just, as an old China hand: I served in Peiping in our legation there in the early thirties, and I revisited the country in 1961 on my way back from Washington.

To take the earlier period, I arrived in China at the time when Professor Tawney had written a book entitled, "Land and Labour in China, 1931," in which he described what the position was at that moment in masterly, definitive, and sympathetic terms. He pointed out—which was an obvious truism—that China had missed the revolution in industrial and agricultural method which had affected the Western World. To take agriculture first, and to give some picture of the state of China in those early thirties, which was a time, of course, when the present Government was growing up, these were the conditions they knew; these were the things they were determined to change.

In land tenure, although China had no landed aristocracy, the average landholding was 3.6 acres. The rents in some Provinces amounted to 50 percent of produce. A good village moneylender, regarded as a blessing in his village, took 25 percent. In communications in large areas of China, away from the treaty ports, no merchandise could be sold profitably over a distance of 50 miles, because the mere cost of transport on men's backs over a greater distance meant that there could be no profit.

In a sentence, although the Chinese peasants' methods were the finest of their type, the type itself had missed the stimulus which progress of agricultural science had made possible in the West.

In industry, the story was much the same. Endowed with valuable raw materials and high traditions of skill, China long possessed important manufacturing industries. Until the rise of Western machine production toward the end of the 18th century, that technique was identical in character with the West's, and quality was not infrequently superior—for instance, in silk and porcelain. There is, as Your Lordships know, the oft-quoted reply in 1793 of the Chinese of the day to the British proposal for closer trade relations:

"Our Celestial Empire possesses all things in prolific abundance and lacks no product within its borders. There is therefore no need to import the manufactures of outside barbarians."

At that time there was more economic justification for this statement than the West has since recognized.

From the end of the 18th century, while the West was "taking off" in agriculture and industry, China continued her traditional ways and politically went through one of those troughs which are common in her history. The great Ch'ing Dynasty was in decline, and when I was there in 1930 there was no effective central government. Of course, it is now fashionable to run down the Kuomintang and the efforts they made from Nanking. But their difficulties were enormous. It was not only the economic position of the country, which I have sought to outline very briefly; it was also that there were competing war lords in other parts of China. In addition, there had already been Japan's aggression in Manchuria, carried on into Jehol, and later to be further developed into the so-called China incident.

None of this is new to Your Lordships, and why should I go over well-worn ground? The past has gone, and with the advent of the present Communist government things have radically changed. There are two reasons. First, it is against this background that the West should, I think, reconsider its attitude toward China and, secondly, all this affects the attitude of the Chinese themselves toward their own problems and toward the West. I take first the West's attitude toward China.

The way in which we were won't to regard China between 1800 and 1950 must be accepted as totally out of touch with what should be regarded as a more normal reality, once China achieved a strong central government. She is a naturally great power, with enormous economic potential, not only in the numbers of her people, but also in resources and skill and in their extraordinary vitality where they can compete with local populations, other populations, from the north of Manchuria to the tropics, and compete invariably with success.

If that is so, what of the other side of the medal, the attitude of China to her own problems and to the West? When I came back from Washington, I stopped in Peiping and saw the present foreign secretary. I think it no abuse of diplomatic courtesy for me to say now that the first thing which he stressed, and which other Chinese in authority stressed when I was there, was that the matter of paramount importance for China must be to grapple with her own enormous problems. It is for that reason that I gave some of those figures about the problems they faced in agriculture and in industry. They were then the first to say that they made mistakes. Of course, like any other government, they were capable of making mistakes, and we would add that they were hagridden by extreme doctrines. But, they said: "If we make mistakes, do not believe that we cannot put them right." I think it would be a mistake for us to conclude that their doctrines will always make it impossible for them to make great progress in the organization of their population and resources.

If that is their attitude to their own internal problems, what of their attitude to the West? As has been pointed out by many other noble lords who have spoken, the Chinese have no sense of inferiority toward the West—quite the contrary. And, indeed, why should they? From their point of view they would say that they have been a civilized power at times when most of the ancestors of some of the Western powers, who had pushed them around for the last 150 years, had been painted blue. It was not only in 1793 that they took their attitude which I have described to foreign trade. Even in 1839 Lin Tse-tsu wrote to Queen Victoria:

"The things that must be had by foreign countries are innumerable. On the other hand, articles coming from the outside to China can only be used as toys. We can take them or get along without them. Since we can get along without them, what difficulty would there be if we closed the frontier and stopped the trade?"

That is far from the spirit of the present age or the present regime, except in one thing, and that is that the innate sense of greatness survives in every Chinese, whether in China or in the overseas Chinese, and with it, alas, the sense of grievance—the sense that "we wuz robbed."

The practical application may be illustrated in that many commentators write as if it were an odd thing that the Chinese should wish to spread their influence to other parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America. If you reflect on this from a Chinese point of view, you would say: But what prescriptive right have the palefaces to think that these continents and these other areas should be exclusively theirs to influence? Therefore, quite apart from their doctrinal urge to make their form of communism successful in other areas, I think there is also the sense of pride of race, pride of culture, and that they have every much right as the next one. They have not been very successful but all I am saying is that I do not think anyone should be surprised that they should try.

Nor do I say, of course, that any of this is convenient. It is quite the contrary, in many cases, but it is one of the inconveniences of international affairs with which we have to try to live. Now how to do that? Here it is fair to recognize some particular difficulties. The first of the particular difficulties, which has been mentioned by the noble earl, Lord Selkirk, and the noble lord, Lord Bourne, is that they have apparently outstanding territorial claims; that is to say, there are areas in their neighborhood where at one time or another in history Chinese suzerainty has been accepted, and what is not at all clear yet is which of these claims they wish to press, and when, and how; and which may be regarded as permanently in the discard.

This is a real difficulty. It is compounded, of course, by two other factors; their extreme doctrinal version of communism and the extraordinarily violent language which they use. The noble lord, Lord Kennet, said that it was almost hysterical, and he has studied it more closely. I dare say, than any of your Lordships here present. They talk quite openly about "war being a great school." These are factors which I would have thought any responsible government has to take into account.

It may be that the present Chinese Government has no intention of exercising any of its claims by the use of force, but this is an opinion, and I should have thought that any government, such as our own or the United States Government or Indian Government, must take precautions against the possibility that they may wish to use force. I say that even recognizing, of course, that their words need not be taken literally.

The Chinese have a phrase for this, as they have for many other situations in life. They are usually expressed in short lapidary phrases, and this is one of four characters. The four characters are "Yo Ming Wu Shih," which translated in a rather free way, would be "What I say sounds fine, but it need not be taken too seriously." Maybe, but if you are a government faced with the language, faced with these rather uncertain claims, faced with the fact of the form of communism which they profess then I do not think it is surprising that precautions should be taken. And I do not think it at all ill founded, as the noble lord, Lord Bourne suggested, that there should, as soon as possible, be achieved some line, which the Chinese themselves freely accept.

Having said this may I confess that I, for one, have no new specifics to offer. With respect, I believe that the course followed by Her Majesty's government has been one of understanding, of reality, and correct. First,

the United Nations. I would entirely agree with what so many speakers have already said: that it would be a great advantage to the West if China could become a member of the United Nations. The Americans say—and I think this puts their case more fairly—it is not that they do not recognize China. They claim that they have almost more to do with the Chinese than any other government. They say that their representative in Warsaw meets regularly with the Chinese representative accredited for that purpose. But what I think your Lordships have in mind is that what is wanted is to get representatives of the Chinese Government to New York, to have them exposed to the whole pressure of world opinion, to meet other people and to get about; and that cannot be achieved (and as a diplomat I say this regretfully) between one diplomat and another in Warsaw. In that I think there would be very little quarrel here. But I think it is also fair to recognize that there might still be difficulties, partly over Formosa, and now apparently because of a Chinese claim that the United Nations resolution condemning China for aggression in Korea should be withdrawn.

In recognizing these possible rocks, I think it is well to say that if they are the ones on which the entry of China into the United Nations founders, this will be because of China's choice and not because we have obstructed. It would not be our doing, unless "obstruction" is taken to mean failure to give in to every demand of the other side, no matter whether justified or unjustified. However, I hope that this may be a matter which can be resolved.

The counterpart to this wish to bring China more closely into the comity of nations must be an attempt, also through discussions, to show that claims in areas of uncertainty can only be resisted, and will be resisted, by force. They must recognize that there is a line to be drawn and that there are things which they cannot afford to do, and I think that can become evident only if there is a general interchange. Once again may I say that I think Her Majesty's government have done everything they can to bring China into discussions about such subjects as Vietnam and disarmament—for without a Chinese acquiescence in a disarmament agreement it is not evident what its value might be.

Then trade. The Chinese attitude to trade has changed, and I believe that nothing but good can come of the efforts made by successive governments to increase trade with China. It is a matter of record that it was on our initiative that the more exclusive China List was equated to the General List for strategic imports into Communist countries. If that list can be at any time further reduced to those items which are of continuing and direct military importance, then I hope that that will happen. The same may be said of the efforts we have made on the cultural front, and I hope the government will do what they can to further these efforts. I think the Royal Society has made successful attempts to see that these methods of communication between our countries remain open, which is all to the good.

So may I say again, in summing up, that the attitude of Her Majesty's government has been realistic in the setting at the beginning I tried to sketch in historic terms. Simply stated, it is to develop a policy of "live and let live." As other speakers have said, I do not think this will be easy. Resentments of 150 years will not go quickly. The Chinese Government, at the present constituted, grew up under the impact, as they felt it to be, of unequal treaties. But with persistence, and so long as it is clear that there are certain things which it would be dangerous for them to press by force, and so long as we are ready to discuss these matters and try to promote discussion wherever possible, I should hope that, if not in our lifetime, at one time or another, it will be possible to develop with success this policy of "living and letting live."

(6:09 p.m.)

Lord AILWYN. My Lords, may I start by warmly congratulating my noble friend Lord King-Hall on his excellent maiden speech? I do not think I ever had the honor and privilege of serving with him in the Navy, but while he was there his name was as well known in the Navy as it has been since in all kinds of public work that he has carried out. We are very pleased to have him here, and we hope that we shall hear from him on many occasions.

The terms of the motion appear to let me in for a brief intervention, although I make no claim whatever to have any special knowledge of Mao Tse-tung's China; nor do I feel that I have any right to discuss the general strategic situation which has been so well gone through today by many experts. The China that I knew belonged to the end of the Manchu dynasty and it happened that I found myself at Hankow, 600 miles up the Yangtse from Shanghai, when the first shots of the rebellion in October 1911 were fired; and I was landed from my small ship with a small posse of sailors in order to help defend the British concession. There followed, as we all know, the China of Sun Yat Sen, the China of Yuan h'si Kai, the China of Chiang Kai-shek. To me it is difficult and horrible to think of China today under Communist rule—those happy, smiling, gentle, courteous faces, contentedly working their water buffaloes in the paddy fields, brought up on love of the family, on ancestor worship, uncomplaining in the face very often of extreme poverty, facing famine and floods and other disasters with their usual courage and stoicism.

Then in 1937 came the Japanese onslaught, and for 4 years they fought alone under their Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, that great patriot who through countless vicissitudes kept the flag flying without any assistance from this country whose hands at that time were full with Germany and Italy. Then in 1942, as my noble friend Lord Dundee has already told your Lordships, four of us were sent out to explain the situation to Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and how it was we were unable to help them or give them any real assistance until our hands were free. All I should like to do before I sit down is to pay my humble tribute to that great man Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and his generous and valiant lady for their wonderful achievement in building up and maintaining that stronghold of resistance to the Red scourge, the Island of Formosa, and to tell them that their great kindness and hospitality to that parliamentary delegation has not been forgotten and will ever remain green in our memory.

(6: 13 p.m.)

Lord BIRDWOOD. My Lords, we have all listened with alert ears to what the speakers in this valuable debate have so far had to say. We have listened with more than usual interest to a very good maiden speech, and if I as a tyro in this House may add my congratulations, I do so. What have we learned? What conclusion or generalizations or predictions shall we be going away with? Simply, what are the Chinese doing now and what do they plan to do, and why? Can we honestly answer such questions? I do not think we can. And yet I feel I want to try. I want to find answers to them because I believe that China's role in the world's future will always be more important than people are prepared to accept. But I believe too that only if we go on trying and trying shall we get closer to answering those questions. What is China? The overwhelming fact is, of course, that it is a country whose population will exceed 1 billion before the end of the century. Other figures can be forgotten; this one cannot. And I will let it stand by itself as a fact that must color everything we say or think about China.

As I see it—it sounds original to say "as I see it," but in fact the noble Lord, Lord Caccia, has outlined it before—there are these two ways of interpreting China's activities on its borders and out in the world. The first is what I would call the optimistic interpretation: that China's actions can be regarded as those of a proud country reasserting itself in areas of former suzerainty. There is historical argument to support this. China up to the middle of the 19th century regarded itself as the center of the world. The name itself comes from Jung Wa, meaning Central Kingdom—a central kingdom whose relations with its neighbors was one of tribute rather than diplomacy. In this light China in, say, Tibet, or even Vietnam is reviving a dominance, a hegemony that it justifies to itself. In this light, too, once such ambitions are satisfied China would cease to be an expansionist force.

Came the mid-19th century, China was exposed to the other world powers. It is fascinating to trace the sequence of reactions this mighty nation showed as a result of such exposure. First a simple rejection of technology together with the belief that her, China's, philosophies were superior to those of any other power. Second, came the selective adoption of certain techniques; and third, the wholesale adoption—a factor that led directly to the movement of large numbers of Chinese to other countries—exchanging ideas, learning. Now from these reactions and from the events at the time one important element emerges. It is that China felt itself, and often was, humiliated. At this point I want to make a generalization. It is that the Chinese have never forgotten these humiliations, and that in the context of the present day any move which the Chinese regard as a comparable humiliation will result in a less accessible China.

I spoke of the optimistic interpretation of China's actions. The other, pessimistic, simply views China as an expansionist Communist power ideologically committed to revolution. This is, I admit, an apparently simpler case to support. Yet since 1956 China has compromised its ideology by associating itself with events in Algeria, Egypt and Indonesia, which did not automatically result in a Communist regime. And already we are in very deep water indeed. We cannot say whether these were, in China's eyes, just steps toward a goal or the goal itself. The recent moves in Indonesia suggest that they are the former, that exploiting discontent up to revolution is simply a first stage in the path of communism, a path planned in detail. But the typical paradox in thinking or speaking about China is that even this gives weight to the other, the optimistic, interpretation of China's actions.

Since the 1950's there has been a continuing debate inside China weighing the merits of alternative political techniques. One is that things are achieved by the patient application of proved methods; the other is that those same things can be achieved with fewer resources simply by surges of mass enthusiasm. I believe the two systems are referred to in China as "expert" and "red." Up till now red has dominated because it is closest in ideology to Mao Tse-tung's own thinking. And when we look at China's performance outside her borders I think we can see this principle failing when used in external context. But there is one example where the other, the slow, calculated approach is being used. It is an example where I had direct experience of China wooing a country.

If your Lordships will forgive me, I will sketch in the methods I saw being used in Nepal about 3 years ago. I was lucky enough

to be in that country without any official interference, walking from village to village with a few friends, living among the people and being taken into their confidence. The first thing that struck us was the hyper-awareness of every soul we met—their awareness of China. People talked of the roads that the world did not know about, roads cut through Tibet at terrible sacrifice, roads that ended at the border with massed lorries waiting for they did not know what; of prepared transit sites. These were the things people talked about. And certainly the Gurkha elements in Nepal are implacably hostile to China, and have sworn to resist an armed advance to the last man, and claim they could hold up such an advance for more than a year.

Of course, this was just one side of the coin. The other was the villages in which the central intellectual figure would be a man who had simply appeared a year or two previously, a man whose sole occupation was talking to the villagers, leading discussions, taking a prominent part in village life. Through individuals like these, young men in the villages would get invitations to Peiping, pro-Mao literature would be available to the village school, and the whole operation sensitively, delicately handled. Perhaps I am wrong to place so much emphasis on these activities. But I was deeply moved by looking at the Himalayas circling the horizon of the North Indian plain, and realizing just what it implied if these great rock battlements were in unknown hands. Sometimes it needs some powerful memorable image, like that one was, to put political theorizing into its true perspective. Whatever motives we might give the Chinese, I can only too well understand how tempting it would be to want control of Nepal, and from the most impregnable natural fortress in the world to look out upon all of Asia.

One of the complications of talking about China is that nothing in what it does or says can be isolated. China wants "great power" status. China wants leadership of the Communist world. I submit that everything we know of China carries traces of these. We can, for instance, regard most of their public statements of foreign policy as being filtered through levels of meaning: one level using America as a convenient bogey and rallying point for home use; one level which is carrying the Communist leadership message, and the level of extreme caution. Caution seems to be a fundamental part of Chinese leadership. But I take it upon myself to mention it again because it seems to run through everything that China does. I think we can see why, when we remember that a large proportion of China's leaders on this level were on the "long march"—a campaign where caution was often the only course for survival. But these men are old. When they are replaced it could be by men who do not share this caution.

China has always been intensely nationalistic. This nationalism is developing, even now, into one of the world's most potent forces. China's new leaders will have its measure. And why should they hesitate to use it? Certainly, China is still technically an impoverished society. But with the united wills of nearly 1,000 million people there is little that could not be achieved. It is too simple, is it not, to pin down our mistakes retrospectively? Bolting the stable door after the horses have escaped in Vietnam, in Cuba, in the Dominican Republic, in China itself. But we have got one stable left—this chance to wipe out old humiliations. I mean, of course, the inclusion of China to the United Nations. History always simplifies. History will laugh at us for this being delayed as long as it has, and will pity us if it is delayed longer.

(6:23 p.m.)

The LORD BISHOP OF SOUTHWARK. My Lords, I rise to speak quite briefly because I think there is one thing which might usefully be said from this bench. The church's communications with China are limited, and it is not easy for us to get reliable information, so many of our missionaries have been turned out. Nevertheless, we do have some. And when I asked one who was associated with China not long ago, "How do you explain China?" the answer was, "Well, it is not just in terms of economic undevelopment; not just in terms of national character or methods of Communist government; not just in terms of conflict with the United States or with the Soviet Union, though all of those things come into it. No; if you want to explain China, you must think, first and foremost, of a country which is being carried on by a dynamic new puritanism created by the teachings of Mao." In fact, I remember reading an article quite recently, that was headed in this way, "Maoism—China's secular religion. A 20th-century experiment in Puritan ethics."

In order to prepare for this debate, I spent some time last night with a teacher who had just returned from China. He was not a Communist, but he took an objective, tolerant view toward what is happening and, deeply impressed by what is happening, said, "That exactly hits it on the head. This has been my experience, and here is a country which is being carried along by this dynamic of a Puritan revolution." One illustration of it is the sort of film which is being shown in China at the moment and to schoolchildren and to universities. It is called, "The Life of Lee Feng." He was the son of peasants who died of hunger in order that this boy should live. A little later on he went to gather wood on the estate of a rich man who tried to cut off his hands, and the scars still remain. Then he joined the Red army. From the Red army he decided he was going to devote his life to serve the people. This is what is so strongly emphasized in the film, this life of service. He kept practically no money. He gave his wages to the victims of floods and other disasters, and to women who were going to have children, and so on, and whenever he passed work sites on his way back from his own work he would help.

One can laugh at all this surge and say, "This is the Boy Scout movement the wrong way round"; but it is quite meaningful to these people who see it. Here is the story of an ordinary person who devoted his energies to the cause of collectivity. This is the summing-up of this film, because Lee Feng died when he was quite young; life is short but the possibilities of serving the people are great. That is why I listened with much sympathy and interest to what the noble baroness was saying earlier in this debate. The things upon which she touched were aspects which are being emphasized in this film and in other teachings and illustrations that are being broadcast throughout China, and are believed with intense conviction. It is not just the youth who are concerned; it is also the factories and the professions. You have got a situation, so I was told yesterday—and I am sure there are many in this House who know it so much better than I do—that the professions now can see that the collectivity of joining in labor is something which is automatically done. I am told that even the politicians do it. Instead of spending all their time in their Parliament, they regard it as part of their normal duty to join together in manual work or in the fields. And, by 1970, all schools and universities will adopt this half-study program.

This dynamic puritanism helps us, I think, to understand the attitude of the Chinese now to what, rightly or wrongly, is called Russian revisionism. There is, as they see it, the reintroduction there of the profit motive. There is the fate in which they believe; and there is the division between labor and intellectuals in Russia, which is the opposite of what is sought in China. So they are extremely suspicious. It is as though a Christian were to be confronted by a church which the Christian thought was really undermining the basic tenets of the Christian faith. And, of course, it is out of enthusiasm for the purity of doctrine that they make all these pronouncements on practically everything—on even the painting of pictures, on the way crops should be planted, about the curriculums in schools.

In this situation there is here a country which passionately believes in what it is doing. What is its attitude toward us? I think China is trying to say two things to us. In any case this is what my church informants told me. They are trying to say that which is a contradiction; namely, "We are afraid of you," and, "We are not afraid of you." We are afraid of you in this way—and this again is what my teacher friend told me yesterday—of what the children are shown in the schools and what are to be put up in open spaces; there are nuclear stations and plants all around China, showing how easy it is for China to be severely, and perhaps fatally, attacked. There are also frequent references to invasions of airspace by allegedly American planes and directed missiles. Whether this is true or untrue I have not the least means of knowing, but it is believed and that is the important thing. A generation is growing up which believes that that is what we want to do. That is why they are saying, "We are afraid of you and we have got to resist you."

The other thing they are saying is this, "We are not afraid of you, because we believe we have a way of life which is much better than yours. Do not think we want what you British and Americans have. If you think we want what you regard as civilization, defend us from it. We are producing something infinitely more worthwhile which is an example to the rest of the world." We can dismiss this by saying, "This is the last thing we want," but we are dealing with a very large section of the world's population which passionately believes this and believes it with all the enthusiasm of a propagandist and of a missionary.

This is the situation, and how does one cope with it? I do not believe the answer is to look back to the regime of Chiang Kai-shek and the golden age—which I should have thought was anything but a golden age. I wholeheartedly agree with what was said about the United Nations and British policy. Surely something more could be done in the way of unofficial exchanges at this stage. I know that some of your Lordships used to have exchanges with Russia 20 or 30 years ago when we were trying to bring about better relations. I believe that those exchanges did a great deal. I am sure that that kind of thing can be done between China and the West by people who really care, who really believe in peaceful coexistence. I hope that a consequence of this debate will be to convince China—for I am sure she will take note of what has been said in this debate—that, although many of us are distressed by some of the things she does and are dismayed by her attitude in some things, yet we extend to her our sympathy and we want to show her our friendship. We believe it is possible for us to live together in peaceful coexistence.

(6:34 p.m.)

Lord HANKEY. My Lords, I hesitate to add to the length of this debate at this hour, but I should like to say one or two words about the economic aspects of relations with China. I believe it can be assumed rather too facilely that China is shortly going to be a great economic power. I do not believe that is so. It took the Russians between 30 and 40 years, from 1920 to 1960, to build up the vast economy they have created. Their progress was interrupted by the war, but, on the other hand, they had very capable people. The Chinese are at least equally capable. They are

perhaps, as has been said today, among the most capable people in the world, but they start from even further back than the Russians did. So that I believe it is not an exaggeration to say that it is likely to take the Chinese 30 to 40 years, starting from, say, 1950, to build up any comparable economic power, without which one doubts that they can attain the full measure of very-great-power status of which they are capable.

Meanwhile, it is a most serious matter that the Chinese should be applying the doctrine of exploiting the contradictions of the outside world in the way in which Lenin and Stalin laid down in their writings. It is a matter of great concern that a power even with the economic backing which China has should be beginning to do this. Fortunately it seems to me that the Chinese have considerably overplayed their hand. Diplomatic relations have been broken off with them in country after country, in Africa and elsewhere, because they have given so much offense. It is a good thing that they have suffered this setback. But it is unlikely that people with the subtlety and intelligence of the Chinese will always continue to do this. I am sure that we must expect to have a great deal of trouble from them if and when they get into the United Nations. I share the opinion of the noble lord, Lord Caccia, and other noble lords, that the Chinese ought to be in the United Nations, because that body ought to be universal. But we should be under no illusions about the amount of trouble we shall have with them.

Fortunately, the Chinese and the Russians seem to be at odds, and I should like to draw attention to the possible economic factors behind that. The Russians have for years been developing their Far East into a very rich economic territory, but the difficulty about it is that it is the coldest part of the earth's surface and it is hard to get people to work there. The czars tried to send people there as a penal settlement, and the Communists continued that policy; but it was not very successful because people undergoing penal servitude do not work very readily. Then they have tried paying people extra amounts to go there, and that has yielded some results. But basically the thing has to be done with machines, because Europeans do not seem to like the far northeast very much. The necessity for machines explains the extraordinary pressure on oil tanker wagons on the Trans-Siberian Railway and the building of pipelines and other measures with which we have become familiar. But that great open space could well be filled by Chinese people, and one wonders whether perhaps this demographic pressure from the south explains a good many of the frontier incidents of which the Russians have complained, and the general deterioration of relations between Russia and China. So that it seems to me there are perhaps more than plain ideological differences between the Russians and the Chinese which are likely to affect their relations.

We have heard that the Chinese do not seem to be afraid of war, but hitherto the Chinese have not had much to lose. I foresee that as they build up their industries—and inevitably they will build them up—they will have more and more to lose, and will become more and more reluctant to face the tremendous risk of war. Therefore in the long run I do not think we need to be pessimistic about relations with China. In the long run, by the time they have become powerful enough to be dangerous, they will also have become vulnerable enough to be cautious. Therefore, I hope that in the very long run we do not have to be too pessimistic. The real trouble is the short and the middle run. There I believe we have to be careful. I sympathize a great deal with what was said by the noble lord, Lord Bourne, that if we create a vacuum in southeast Asia somebody else is sure to flow into it, and it is quite likely to be the Chinese. That, I believe, is a very good reason for maintaining our power, and the power of the Commonwealth and of the Americans, in that area, not in order to dominate it, but in order to work with its inhabitants to protect it and encourage it to protect itself.

I believe that, in spite of the difficulties of our economic situation, we have to envisage sensible policies of aid to those countries. We have done a great deal in that area. We have encouraged others, also, by the Colombo plan and other measures, to do the same, and I believe that a very intelligent and forward-looking policy of aid to those countries is very necessary.

The noble lord, Lord Caccia, mentioned the difficulty which there is likely to be if and when the question of China's admission to the United Nations becomes more actual; that there will have to be a solution to the problem of Taiwan, of Formosa. It is rather remarkable that Taiwan has become so prosperous, that it is among the countries which is considered to be on the point of economic take-off. I do not know whether that analogy with an airplane is a good one, but the strides which Taiwan has made are quite remarkable. I hope that, when an agreement has to be made with the Chinese, we shall not have to sacrifice a territory which has done so relatively well.

Then I think we have also to recognize that we must continue to find a place in the Western World for Japan. Japan has done a magnificent job in building up industries—from our point of view perhaps too magnificent a job in building up exports. But there is no doubt that Japan deserves a place in the Western World, and I think that, as she gets more and more industrialized, she will also become a better and better market for British products, if we know how to sell our products there.

Your Lordships may say that this amounts to a policy of containing China, and I believe that in the short and middle run such a policy is indeed necessary. But we should continue, I am sure, to study with the utmost care, and to the best of our ability, what is happening inside China, though it is extremely hard to do.

I was particularly interested in what the noble baroness, Lady Summerskill, said, because I believe that the social policies of China would repay study, and that they are of very great interest. No doubt we shall have to take all that into account in framing our policy. But I personally get very impatient when I hear some people—notably across the Atlantic—talking as if China can be written off. China certainly cannot be written off, not only because it contains such a vast number of people, but also because it is infallibly going to have a very big economic future in the long run.

I am reminded of the Moscow story about the man who received a questionnaire from the police, the last question of which asked, "What is your attitude to the Communist Party?" He wrote in his reply with sacrilegious impertinence, "The same as my attitude to my wife." In due course, the police sent for him and said, "Well, comrade, we are not accustomed to being answered in riddle. What does this mean?" So the man said, "It is awful, but I have to live with her." That is the attitude which we shall undoubtedly have to adopt to Communist China.

(6:45 p.m.)

The Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Lord Walston. My Lords, my noble friend Lord Kennet set a very high standard when he started this debate, by giving us the benefit of the very great deal of thought and knowledge which he has acquired, even if he has acquired it without an actual visit to China—and here I must differ from my noble friend Lady Summerskill; I do not think that that necessarily makes him any less of an expert on the subject—and he presented it with such clarity that it was very easy for all of us to follow him.

Those who came after him lived up to that high standard, and it is not merely a matter of formal words when I say how very happy I was to hear the maiden speech from the noble lord, Lord King-Hall, delivered in such a delightful way and with so much sound commonsense and understanding of these problems.

I think it is better, rather than to try to deal individually with the different points raised, if I divide this subject of China—a wide subject, as many noble lords have pointed out—into two main headings: the internal policies of China and her external policies. First of all, there are the internal policies which she has tried to follow. I am here in complete agreement with my noble friend, Lady Summerskill, in giving the highest praise to the social advances which undoubtedly have taken place in China during these last years. It is undoubtedly a magnificent achievement, and I think many of us could learn a great deal from it. The right reverend prelate, the bishop of Southwark, was most helpful in his short contribution, when he spoke of the dynamic new puritanism and the sense of service which there undoubtedly is in China today. But that should not blind us, of course, to the fact that, in spite of their belief—as we all believe, in fact, in the Western World, too—that welfare is better than warfare, they do have a standing army of something in the neighborhood of 2½ million men and a militia, which is largely under arms, of over 10 million men; that they have spent a very considerable proportion of their scarce resources, not only in developing peaceful benefits for their population, but in developing nuclear weapons also. So they do not stand in a white sheet when it comes to the use of their resources solely for peaceful purposes.

We must also not close our eyes to the fact that there have been, and still are, very many instances of abominable cruelty, oppression, and suppression of liberty, which for us in this country is something entirely unheard of and which we find hard to comprehend. In our admiration for the advances they have made we must not forget this other side of the picture. But, again, as the noble lord, Lord Caccia, pointed out, the former state of China, in the older days, was in itself a bad one; one of poverty and oppression and hardships probably far greater than are experienced today.

I mention those points only so that one should not get the idea that now that China is a Communist country all is well, or that, because we know that there are certain cruelties and oppressions, all must be ill. There is, as in every other country, a mixture of good and bad. My own guess, although I have never been there (but I have read and studied a certain amount about it), is that in general the life of the ordinary person in China today is probably slowly improving over what it was in the past. And we sincerely hope that this will go on, because we wish China well. We wish their economic progress to advance far more rapidly than it has done before, and we hope that, as the economic progress advances, so will personal freedom and the liberty of the individual in China advance also. There is, I believe, room for a thousand flowers to bloom in the Chinese garden, not only in the intellectual garden but in all other gardens, too; and, in particular, in the garden of the ordinary man and woman in China.

It is because of this desire to see China advance economically and to advance toward further freedoms, too, that we cooperate with China in economic and cultural matters—and I was very glad to hear almost every speaker in this debate advocate that

this is what our policy should be. We believe that it is not only in their interest, but in ours also, that their economic progress should be accelerated; and we do what we can to help. There was, as your Lordships know, the Trade Fair in 1964, which my right honorable friend the president of the Board of Trade attended. Following upon that trade fair, and possibly (and I hope) as a result of it, there has been a very gratifying increase in our exports to China. They went up, in fact, by some 44 percent in 1965 compared to 1964, and there was a very nearly corresponding increase of exports from China to ourselves. That is all to the good. The only restriction which we place on trade, as the noble Lord, Lord Caccia, reminded us, is for items of strategic importance. Otherwise, we do all that we can to encourage trade in itself and to encourage visits by British businessmen to China and Chinese trade missions to this country.

We adopt the same attitude on the cultural side. As the noble lord, Lord Caccia, and the right reverend prelate both advocated, we want to see a far greater interchange between China and ourselves, not only of politicians and of businessmen but of students, of intellectuals in the wider sense of the word, and of ordinary tourists, also. Of course, there are many difficulties in the way. Cost is a very great factor. It costs a very great deal of money to travel between here and China. Language is another difficulty. There are very few young English people, or even older English students, research workers and professors, who can speak Chinese, and that is naturally a great handicap in going there. But there are at the present time some 50 Chinese students in this country, and there is also a smaller number of British teachers now in China. We certainly should like to see a very great growth in two-way exchanges; and we not only put no impediments in the way, but actively do what we can to encourage them.

On the more domestic side, we have a Chinese mission in London, just as we have a British mission in Peiping. Unfortunately, we do not have Ambassadors in either place; we have only Chargés d'Affaires. The reason for that is not for any lack of good will on our part but because, so far, the Chinese have not agreed to the appointment of an Ambassador. I mention these matters to show that, on the economic and cultural side, we believe that we should have closer contacts with China and that they can be only to the benefit of both our countries and the world in general. I share the hope that other noble Lords have expressed—in fact, I would say the belief that other noble Lords have expressed—that, in the long run, this will lead, as it has done in so many other Communist countries, to a far greater tolerance at home, to a lessening of hostility abroad, to a greater understanding of the problems that face other countries, to a greater understanding of their real intentions and to a greater realization that even though people may have different colored skins, speak different languages and be brought up in different surroundings, yet basically their desires and ambitions are very much the same; that is to live at peace with their neighbors and to enjoy the good things of this world.

Let me turn now from the internal aspects of China to her external activities. May I say to my noble friend Lady Summerskill right at the outset, for fear that I might forget it later, that there is no substance whatsoever in the Chinese charge that we are allowing Hong Kong, or shall allow Hong Kong, to be used as a base for military aggression by our American friends. We do allow, and we rightfully allow, American forces to come for recreation to Hong Kong from time to time, but that is a very different matter indeed from allowing it to be used as a base for aggression.

Many noble Lords have pointed out that over the years the Chinese have used very harsh words in their descriptions of and their attitudes toward foreign countries, principally toward the United States and toward the Soviet Union. There is no need for me to quote or requote to your lordships any of those sayings; but it is worth remembering that in spite of the words they have used—not only harsh but truculent and belligerent words—they have so far acted with prudence. They have shown, I am happy to say, determination to avoid any direct military confrontation with the United States or with the Soviet Union—and similarly, of course, so has the United States with regard to China. But in certain places—and it is only right to point this out—they have shown something more than aggression by words. They have, as I think the noble Lord, Lord Birdwood, reminded us, actually committed an aggressive act in Tibet, and a very successful and a very bloody one. They have attempted the same thing in India, but fortunately without success—though it is significant, perhaps, that they have not gone further south, as the noble Lord, Lord Bourne, also pointed out.

But we must remember—and here again I am in agreement, as I was with almost everything he said, with my noble friend Lord Kennet—that they are, or give the appearance of being, dead scared. The right reverend prelate made that point, also. One of the frightening things about somebody being afraid of you is that when he is really afraid he may become very dangerous. So we cannot simply sit back and say that because they have used loud words but done nothing about it we have nothing to fear at all. We must always be prepared for those words to be translated into action.

Now, over the past years China has made many experiments in foreign countries; and almost without exception they have been unsuccessful experiments. She has been looking increasingly overseas in an attempt to extend her influence, and it is interesting to see, when one looks at it, that she has had a long succession of failures. There has been the breach with the Soviet Union and increasingly strained relations with many of the Communist countries of Eastern Europe. In addition to that, there have been the failures in Africa. China has made very great efforts in the past 2 years to win friends and influence people throughout the whole of the continent of Africa. The noble Earl, Lord Selkirk, asked me about Zanzibar and Kenya. I do not know exactly the extent to which China is active in any of those countries; but I would be surprised if, having made an attempt in the past, and that attempt having failed, it would give up entirely. Even if it has failed at the moment, I do not believe that this will be permanent.

It is worth remembering that both the Central African Republic and Dahomey have broken off relations with China. That is a mark of China's failure to get a foothold in that very important continent. They have also suffered a great loss of prestige following upon the failure of the Afro-Asian Conference, which was to have taken place in Algiers. Following on that, relations with Indonesia have become strained. Perhaps that is rather a mild expression for some of the exchanges which have been going on between Djakarta and Peiping. And, of course, they tried and failed to make any capital out of Kashmir. Finally (and other noble Lords mentioned this, too), there has been the curious incident of Cuba, where only a few days ago Dr. Castro actually spoke of the Chinese in the following terms. He said: "The Chinese Government carried out a criminal act of economic aggression against our country."

So if I were the gentleman in Peiping who is responsible for Chinese overseas policy in any of those spheres, I should be feeling distinctly uncomfortable at the present time. But the question still remains, as the noble Lord, Lord Birdwood, put it: should we be optimistic or pessimistic about the future plans of China? The answer is that we should be neither. Clearly, we must not be complacent. We must just not say: "These are only paper tigers; they talk but they mean nothing. Everything they try to do they fail. We need not bother about their internal fears." That would be unwise. It would be even more unwise for us to panic now and say: "Here is a great nation, with a quarter of the world's population now in possession of nuclear weapons, full of aggressive intentions and giving full warning of what it is going to do. We must be prepared in the next few years for a major explosion." That, I think, would clearly be wrong.

Our policy must be basically one of containment. We have no aggressive intentions against China, and I am sure that none of our allies has them either. But we have a very firm determination to protect any countries, and especially both the smaller and larger neighboring countries which are China's neighbor's, against any form of aggression or any threat that may come to them from China. I think it is worth pointing out here that although it is very understandable that China may want to surround herself with a series of buffer states, as many countries do, the danger is that a Communist buffer state does not remain a genuine buffer; it becomes a Communist state itself. Then the Communist area is extended, and further buffers are needed to protect that. That is why we are very firm in our determination not to allow any further extension of Chinese influence beyond her present boundaries.

As an example, if one were needed, we immediately dispatched aid to India in 1962 when she was threatened by China. We also have undertakings under SEATO, and various other alliances in that part of the world—as, for instance, our Malaysian defense agreement. All of these were designed in no way aggressively; but they serve to contain China within her present very large boundaries.

My Lords, there is one further thing that I should like to say on this. We have no desire, or intention, to destroy communism in China. That is no part of our plan. Our quarrel is not with Chinese communism. Insofar as we have a quarrel with China, it is with China's imperialistic and aggressive actions outside her own boundaries. We believe, with all other noble lords, that the right way in which we can fight and mitigate this danger is by China becoming a member of the United Nations. I will not rehearse the logic of it. It has often been done and is known to all of us. All sides of the House during this debate have agreed that that is what should be done. We have done already, and shall go on doing, all in our power to bring the United States to our way of thinking, and I very much hope that the unanimity which has been shown in this House this afternoon will not be without effect upon them; because, clearly, until China comes into this organization of the independent countries of the world, there can never be any peaceful settlement of all the manifold disputes and problems which arise continuously.

To sum up, our intentions against China are in no way aggressive. We will resist their imperialistic ambitions wherever they may appear. But on the internal side, so far as their own country is concerned, as long as they stay within their own boundaries we shall do all we can to help them in their economic and cultural progress. The more contact we can have in that way, and the more we can work together, the greater, I hope, will be the chances of our avoiding future catastrophe.

(7:06 p.m.)

Lord KENNET. My Lords, in thanking all noble lords who came to speak in this debate in the usual way, let me first say what a great pleasure it was—as it must be to any person who loves his country—and what a great surprise it was, to find a very large measure of agreement between noble lords in all parts about what sort of an animal China is and in what sort of a way we should treat her. It has been a most interesting debate. If I may take 5 minutes of your lordships' time to pick up various points that have been made, it was especially good to learn from the noble earl, Lord Dundee, speaking from the opposition front bench, that he shared the opinion which I put forward, and which was later confirmed by my noble friend, Lord Walston, that the Chinese are not on the up and up in the world, but rather on the down and down; that they are not doing well; and that we are not in any immediate danger of having to revise everything in order to contain them.

I also add my felicitations to those of all other noble Lords to the noble Lord, Lord King-Hall, on his maiden speech. It was an excellent one. I am very glad indeed that we have that lucid, bass voice amongst us. I have listened to it with so much pleasure and instruction in other fora for many years. I should like to assure my noble friend, Lady Summerskill that my story about the schoolgirl picking up leaves with a pin was not a story about penury or degradation or backwardness: it was, on the other hand, a story about the proper frugality of a very highly civilized people living in very great density. This was the point I meant to make.

One of the great charms of the House of Lords is the fact that people say so many surprising things and one wonders, "How on earth can he know that?" only to find that the answer is "Because he"—the man concerned—"was in the class I taught at school." We had a splendid example with the noble Lord, Lord Bourne, this afternoon, when he said that, had the Chinese wanted to seize Rangoon, and get for themselves a port on the Indian Ocean, and so transform the world in their favor, the Burmese Army could not have stopped them. How did he know that? It was because he had trained the Burmese Army. There are delightful obscure bits of knowledge that crop up. I thought that that observation of the noble Lord, Lord Bourne, was a significant one. It was not generally known. It confirms the general line I have been taking this afternoon as have many other noble Lords.

May I make what is rather a scholastic precision with the noble lord, Lord Caccia? He said that it is only an opinion that the Chinese have no intention of exercising their claims by force, so that we must continue to take precautions in case they do so. But the opinion to which he referred is one that I do not share. I think it is quite likely that the Chinese have the intention of exercising territorial claims by force. My opinion is that they do not have the intention of imposing by force domination on a country over which they have no territorial claims. This is the point. I mean Burma and Thailand and so on, not little bits of frontier.

Lord CACCIA. My lords, if the noble lord will allow me, if we think in terms of Russia, it will not be just little bits of their frontiers.

Lord KENNET. But the distinction I want to make is between contested frontier areas, however deep they may be—and, after all, Tibet was of enormous depth—and those on which the Chinese make no claim. In my opinion, in those places we may not expect Chinese aggression.

With 9.9 percent of what my noble friend, Lord Walston, said, I heartily agree, and I am delighted that Government policy is as he outlined it. My 0.1 percent of disagreement with my noble friend was when he said that we must not allow any further extension of Chinese influence outside her present boundaries. I fear that if we try to stop that, we are going to have a hard time of it. If my noble friend had said "domination" or "hegemony" instead of influence, then I should have agreed 100 percent with him. I wonder whether Her Majesty's Government could look once again at the difference between influence and domination? We say that the United States has great influence in Latin America and that we have influence in Africa, but we do not dominate.

Lord WALSTON. My lords, I think I can persuade the noble lord to have 100 percent agreement with me. It was a misuse of words. Domination is the correct one. Influence we clearly cannot control.

THE UNCONTROLLED TRAFFIC IN DEADLY WEAPONS

Mr. DODD. Madam President, 4 months prior to the assassination of President Kennedy I introduced legislation to control the interstate commerce in mail order firearms. At the time I introduced that measure, through the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Committee, I had been investigating the problem for 2 years and was led to believe that I had, largely, the support of the gun fraternity. Now, 2½ years later, with the legislation still pending, I realize I was mistaken.

I can find no better illustration of the dangers of this uncontrolled traffic in deadly weapons, which includes everything from pistols and rifles to hand grenades, bazookas, bombs, and cannons than the stories printed by the Paterson, N.J., Morning Call.

On the second anniversary of the Kennedy death, the newspaper ordered a pistol in the name of L. H. Oswald from a mail order dealer in another State, and received it without question.

I ask unanimous consent that the stories, which speak for themselves, be printed in the RECORD at this point and commend a reading of them to my colleagues.

The publishers and editors of the Morning Call have illustrated, in printing this story, the threat to the community which exists because of this gun running in interstate commerce, and they should be recognized for their efforts. Both the reporting and editing were in the tradition of America's free press.

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

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Nov. 19, 1965]

SHADOW OF TRAGEDY: "L. H. OSWALD" BUYS PISTOL

(By the Call's special investigation team)

On the eve of the second anniversary of President John F. Kennedy's assassination, the Morning Call yesterday received a .38-caliber revolver addressed to "L. H. Oswald" via express from an Oklahoma mail-order house.

The pistol, a Smith & Wesson Enfield Commando—similar in type and caliber to the one Lee Harvey Oswald used to kill Dallas Patrolman J. D. Tippit—was delivered to the newspaper's offices at 33 Church Street, Paterson.

A few hours later, the weapon and related documents were turned over to Attorney General Arthur J. Sills, attending a convention of the League of Municipalities at the Chalfonte-Haddon Hall Hotel, Atlantic City, by Call Reporter Richard E. Benfield.

Sills said: "This is another strong endorsement for enactment of Federal legislation so that guns could not be shipped by mail-order houses to individuals they had no check on."

In Paterson, Mayor Frank X. Graves said he received a subpena from Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, sponsor of Federal gun-purchasing legislation, asking for 40 revolvers confiscated by Paterson police during arrests in recent months.

DODD, the mayor said, intended to use these revolvers—all of which were purchased without a permit—to further his campaign.

The Call sent for the weapon under the obviously suspicious name in order to illustrate the ease with which guns bought through mail-order houses could fall into the hands of undesirables because of lack of restrictions.

Several months ago, the Call, searching through sports magazines, answered advertisements aimed at gun enthusiasts and received numerous catalogs—all of them addressed to "L. H. Oswald," 33 Church Street, Paterson, N.J.

Deciding to purchase the .38-caliber Smith & Wesson Enfield Commando, the Call wrote to P & S Sales Co., of Tulsa, Okla., and received a form letter which in part stated: "We are sure that you are just as interested as we are in taking reasonable and proper precautions to deter undesirable persons from obtaining firearms."

The letter also stated: "Note: We must have any gun permit that is required within your city, county, or State."

The Call did not enclose any gun permits required by the city of Paterson and the State of New Jersey when it returned the application.

Over the signature of the purchaser, requested on the application, P & S included the following statement:

"I hereby state that I am a citizen of the United States and that I have not been convicted in any court of the United States, territories, or possessions or the District of Columbia, for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year. I certify that I am not a fugitive from justice, a mental incompetent, a drug addict or an adjudged drunkard. I further state that I am over 18 years of age, and that I am complying with my State, county and city laws."

The signature and address, signed by Joseph J. McGovern, assistant managing editor of the Morning Call were: "L. H. Oswald, 33 Church Street, Patersen, N.J." (Paterson was deliberately misspelled.)

Although McGovern completed the application November 6, 1965, he wrote October 4, 1966, above the signature, in order to test the alertness of the mail-order company.

And yesterday, a long brown box containing the revolver and addressed to L. H. Oswald was delivered to the Call office at 33 Church Street, by REA Express Agency.

The price of the gun was $18.95. The shipping charges were $4.20.

Controversy over mail-order sales of weapons was stirred immediately after the assassination of President Kennedy—killed with a mail-order Mannlicher-Carcano 6.5-millimeter Italian rifle obtained by Lee Harvey Oswald.

The pistol Oswald used to kill Dallas Patrolman J. D. Tippit also was a .38 caliber Smith and Wesson, which was similar to the one purchased by the Call.

Oswald, also using a fictitious name, ordered the revolver from Seaport Traders, Inc., of Los Angeles, Calif., under the name of A. J. Hidell.

U.S. Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach in urging a curb on mail-order sales of firearms said the Secret Service has frequently come across mental defectives who have access to guns.

Commenting on the application received and signed by the Call, Sills said the proposed

Federal legislation would require any out-of-State mail-order house to send the papers to a licensed dealer in the same State as the purchaser. The dealer, then, he said, would have to check on the applicant's qualifications.

"They would have to have more than a piece of paper saying 'I'm a good guy'," which in effect, Sills said, was what the Call signed.

"A gun such as this one cannot be carried in this State without a permit," Sills said, refusing to handle the weapon and instead turning it over to a State trooper.

Referring to documents concerning the purchase of the gun he received yesterday from the Call, the attorney general said they would be used in his fight to secure New Jersey legislation against firearms.

"This is just more proof of the fact the mail-order houses couldn't care less about the person to whom they are selling," Sills continued. "They just think of profit. They are merchants of death without any regard for the safety of society."

Mayor Graves said the 40 guns subpenaed by Senator DODD even included the one he himself purchased through a mail-order house last April 15.

DODD, the mayor said, was also interested in a gun with 50 rounds of ammunition found recently on an 18-year-old Clifton youth attending at Eastside High School football game at Hinchliffe Stadium.

In an effort to prove how easy it was to buy a gun, Graves last April bought a $13.95 money order and sent for a German-made 6-shot revolver from Global Import Co., in Chicago.

For his return address the Mayor listed: "Frank Graves, 151 Market Street, Paterson," which happens to be city hall.

On April 23, he received the package via railway express, athough he had volunteered no information about himself on the application.

CALL COMMENDED

A spokesman for Gov. Richard J. Hughes commended the Call for bringing the gun-purchasing controversy to the public in such a dramatic and effective manner.

The Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, headed by Senator DODD has introduced a bill to make it a Federal crime to sell a gun to any one who would not be permitted to buy or possess a gun in his own locality.

Currently, Federal statutes prohibit gun sales if the distributor knows local laws are being broken. DODD has argued that dealers can sell guns with ease under this law by stating: "I didn't know the purchaser had a record or used to be a mental patient."

Federal laws also do not permit prosecution of violators until after a crime is committed.

A spokesman for Senator DODD said last night Federal authorities could do nothing about the gun purchased by the Call.

"Any one can send for this kind of stuff," he said, "and if it violates State or local laws, then the dealer can say he didn't know about it."

Under present New Jersey gun laws, a person must have a police permit to carry or to purchase a pistol and a revolver. However, rifles and shotguns do not require registration.

The pistol received by the Call yesterday did not violate State statutes, because the gun was sold in Oklahoma, not New Jersey. However, it is illegal to carry a concealed weapon in New Jersey.

But there is no law in New Jersey saying someone can't buy a gun in Oklahoma without a permit—the law only says a citizen in this State can't buy a gun in New Jersey without a permit.

However, Attorney General Sills has received more mail on the gun registration than on any other issue since he took office.

Sports enthusiasts contend the legislation would give too much power to police chiefs and would harass them.

Others have professed a fear of an invasion by Communists, stating that it was their constitutional right to bear arms against an invading enemy.

Commenting on the revolver received by the Call, Paterson Police Chief John T. O'Brien said:

"This once again demonstrates how easy it is to get these weapons. And when you consider some of the people that send for them you can imagine the potential dangers.

"The problem is they don't ask for gun permits, or if they do it's just ignored. That's why we want Federal controls. * * * The fact they didn't notice the L. H. Oswald signature shows right away dealers are not very observant."

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Nov. 19, 1965]

PACKAGE FOR MR. OSWALD

The story of the mail-order gun on our front page today should awaken a lot of people.

That deadly .38-caliber revolver slipped through all existing gun control regulations. It could have armed a madman, a fugitive criminal, or a drug addict just as simply as it whisked, with no questions asked, from an Oklahoma mail-order house to a fictitious L. H. Oswald at 33 Church Street, Paterson.

It could not have been very different from the fateful transaction which landed a gun in the hands of the real L. H. Oswald a mere 2 years ago, and bloodied a noble page of this country's history.

There was determination after that gun was used to assassinate the President that this easy access to firearms would be closed. How little has been done is quite clearly shown by the speedy accommodation of "L. H. Oswald's" patently questionable mail order for catalog No. M355—a 6-shot Smith & Wesson Enfield Commando.

That "L. H. Oswald" ignored a form letter advisory to send locally required firearms purchase permits; that the notorious name was legibly inscribed to that form, along with an impossible date a year in the future, did not seem to interest the mail-order house, despite its pious claim of concern to deter undesirable persons from obtaining firearms.

This incident cannot help but give impetus to demands for sensible control of firearms sales. More immediately, it should jar State and Federal authorities into strict enforcement of existing regulations.

Had the Oklahoma mail-order house complied with the regulation prohibiting shipment of guns until proper permits are in hand, the Smith & Wesson would never have reached Paterson. Had the express company complied with the regulation that a gun cannot be delivered to a customer until he has produced a copy of the permit, the Smith & Wesson would never have been left at our door.

Apart from all this, had there been an exercise of prudence anywhere along the wide-open route between the Oklahoma gun house and the fictitious "L. H. Oswald," on Church Street, there would have been no transaction. If after the Kennedy assassination there remained any doubt that an irresponsible traffic in firearms exists, the gun story on our front page today should remove that doubt with finality.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Nov. 20, 1965]

GRAVES URGES CITIZENS TO REGISTER FIREARMS—KATZENBACH AND DODD RENEW GUN-CURB BID

REGISTRATION URGED

Mayor Frank X. Graves, Jr., yesterday appealed to the citizens of Paterson to register any firearms in their posesssion, and set up a special service for the project.

The mayor immediately assigned Lt. Peter Ventimigila and Detective Joseph Meola to conduct the registration program, and urged citizens to call Mulberry 4-3111 to make arrangements for registration.

"The police will make an appointment to come to the home and take down the necessary information," Mayor Graves said. "We do not want people to bring their guns to headquarters."

The mayor issued the registration appeal in conjunction with the Morning Call's campaign to end the increasing traffic in illicit firearms. Mayor Graves himself tested the loopholes in the mail order gun trade regulations by purchasing a gun without permit or identification.

COMPANY IN CLEAR

(By Daniel Weissman)

Treasury department agents in Tulsa, Okla., yesterday termed the mail-order transaction that brought a .38-caliber pistol to the Morning Call under the fictitious name of L. H. Oswald perfectly legal.

Although the official report of the probe of the gun-shipping deals made by P & S Sales of Tulsa will not be ready until Monday, Bill Gibson, Internal Revenue Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Unit investigator in charge of the study out of the IRS Dallas office, said: "I have investigated this company and have found they keep a good set of books and records. At this point, I have been unable to find a violation of the Federal firearms statute."

The preliminary finding by Gibson confirms what U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, leading sponsor of a Federal firearms bill to prohibit illicit sales of weapons, has been saying—that anyone who wants a gun in this country can get it.

DODD pointed out the Call's successful attempt to buy a weapon by devious means and have it shipped to the newspaper's 33 Church Street office with a minimum of questions asked is clear proof there is no effective legislation to keep deadly weapons out of the hands of persons who would use them against society.

A spokesman for the IRS in Washington said the investigation of the Oklahoma firm was ordered on the basis of the copyright story appearing yesterday in the Morning Call.

The investigation became a double-barreled affair when Paul A. Hankins, supervisor of the IRS Alcohol and Tax Unit serving the north Jersey area, dispatched an investigator from Newark to the Morning Call office to gather all information and documentation of the actual purchase of the British surplus hand weapon that was used by the Commandos during World War II.

He took back copies of the original order, made out in the name of "L. H. Oswald," a letter sent to the newspaper by the gun company asking for a permit, and a copy of the Railway Express stub for the delivery of the gun.

The pistol was ordered by Joseph J. McGovern, assistant managing editor of the Morning Call. McGovern intentionally did not send back the requested pistol permit and misspelled Paterson "Patersen" and put a wrong date at the top of the order to test the alertness of the company.

Despite the intentional oversights and mistakes in the order and the disregard of a notation at the bottom of the required confirmation of oath and good character that a State license must be submitted with the letter before the gun would be sent, the pistol was delivered.

Robert E. Sturgis, president of the mail order firm dealing exclusively in firearms, said, "I have nothing to say at this time, I would like to see the story."

Sturgis's answer to a question asked why the gun was sent despite the intentional mistakes and oversights, was: "We depend on the integrity of our customers." He added that the permit was the responsibility of the customers.

According to Federal statutes governing the sale and possession of pistols, a person found guilty of a violation can be fined not more than $2,000 or be imprisoned for not more than 5 years or both. In addition, the violator, who is guilty of a felony, is ineligible to get a license for 15 years.

Because of the suddenness of the probe, started by the Morning Call story, the IRS spokesman in Washington said, "We are neck deep trying to put ends together." He indicated a formal statement could be expected Monday.

The .38-caliber Smith & Wesson, Enfield commando pistol ordered by the Call was described as a weapon never meant for anything but close-range killing. According to reliable reports, American servicemen who have been exposed to the double action pistol that does not have to be hammer cocked to fire, refer to it affectionately as "The gut buster."

The gun, built by Enfield in England, is of a design patented by Smith & Wesson. It is named after a British World War II commando.

OFFICIALS INDIGNANT

(By Richard Benfield)

U.S. Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach said yesterday that the purchase of a .38-caliber pistol by the Morning Call under the fictitious name of "L. H. Oswald" was another demonstration of the need for Federal controls over the interstate shipment of guns.

U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, who is proposing a Federal gun control law to make it a Federal crime to sell a gun to any person not permitted to buy or own a firearm in his own locality, said: "Today, almost on the eve of the second anniversary of the assassination of John F. Kennedy, it is as easy to purchase a mail-order gun as it was for Lee Harvey Oswald."

"The experience of the Paterson Morning Call in purchasing a gun by mail order under the name 'L. H. Oswald' again reflects the need for Congress to establish what President Johnson called for early this year—reasonable regulations of interstate shipments of the tools with which criminals work—guns," Katzenbach said.

"As long as I live I can never forget that it was a mail-order rifle, sent to a post office box that had been rented under an assumed name by a man with an established record of defection and instability, that killed President Kennedy."

DODD, who has been pushing for gun legislation for 5 years, said:

"The Morning Call has once again proved what our congressional committee—the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency—has been talking about since 1961—that there is an unscrupulous element in the gun business that will sell a murderous weapon to anyone including emotionally disturbed youths, criminals, and would-be assassins."

DODD scored gun lobbies which, he claimed, have been grinding out mountains of propaganda against his gun control legislation.

"I do not intend to let these gun lobbies thwart the demand of the American people in the next session of Congress," DODD said.

"Enterprising journalism such as this focuses public attention and will result in a demand for action by the public. I urge all your readers to write their Congressmen and Senators demanding stricter Federal gun laws."

Citing the copyrighted story which disclosed the Morning Call's purchase of the pistol from P & S Sales of Tulsa, Okla., Camden Mayor Alfred R. Pierce, president of the New Jersey League of Municipalities, told the league's convention in Atlantic City:

"I want each and every person holding public office to realize the dangerous situation this poses."

The article, describing how the pistol was sent to the fictitious "L. H. Oswald," without any attempt to check the character of the buyer, appeared in the Morning Call yesterday.

Pierce, in one of his final acts as president of the league, read a complete description written by a Call reporter of how the gun was obtained.

While he had no specific solution as to how the sale of guns could be curbed, Pierce said, he considered the situation serious enough to warrant the attention of the convention.

Since a 10-day advance notice must be given for a vote on any resolution, the convention could take no action on Pierce's statement, but high municipal officials throughout the State expressed concern over the danger.

"I think it poses a definite threat to the well-being of the private citizen," said Hawthorne Mayor Louis Bay II, who was elected first vice president of the league.

Bay added that although he doesn't believe in preventing individuals from carrying firearms, some safeguard must be established to prevent the weapons from getting into the hands of irresponsible persons.

"The situation needs a lot of thinking so we can achieve the ends we want," Bay said.

Meanwhile, statements of concern from high officials throughout the Nation continued to stream into the Call offices.

John J. McCloy, a member of the Warren Commission which investigated the assassination of President Kennedy, also came out for some form of Federal gun control.

McCloy, Under Secretary of War under President Franklin D. Roosevelt and a self-described sportsman and gun enthusiast, noted the Government must be careful of placing undue restrictions on legitimate sportsmen.

"But," he said, "I do think some measure requiring credentials of a gun buyer would be a good thing."

Another strong supporter of gun control legislation, Representative CHARLES S. JOELSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, expressed hope the Morning Call article would arouse public indignation against the deplorable situation regarding the interstate sale of guns.

"I think the more people realize how easy it is for unidentified people to get guns, the more pressure will increase to get tighter gun control," the Congressman said.

JOELSON, who is currently vacationing in Florida, noted he sponsored a bill which would have required guns sent by mail to go to the chief of police, rather than the buyer. The chief would check out the character of the buyer, JOELSON noted.

"Realistically," he added, "I think there's too much interest in this because the National Rifle Association and others have distorted the issue out of proportion."

In Washington, aids to U.S. Senators CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey, said the two lawmakers were optimistic the Morning Call article would create interest in curbing the interstate flow of guns.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Nov. 20, 1965]

MORE GUNS OFFERED

PATERSON.—The day after the Morning Call received a mail-order pistol addressed to "L. H. Oswald," the gun firm which sent the weapon tried to interest its supposed customer in other purchases, with the newest fall catalog.

The brochure, listing a variety of guns and rifles, came from the P & S Sales Co., Post Office Box 155, Tulsa, Okla.

The catalog arrived at the 33 Church Street office of the Call yesterday morning, as the newspaper was on the stands with a description of the easy mail purchase from the firm of the gun, without a permit, by a customer with an obviously suspicious name.

The catalog was addressed with an automatic device, indicating that "L. H. Oswald" is now, or was, on the regular mailing list of the firm. The city is incorrectly spelled "Paterosn," apparently a typographical error.

Listing sporting goods and clothing, the catalog has a 2-page spread showing more than 30 firearms.

The display, with pictures and descriptions, includes a working grenade launcher. Also for sale is an M-1 Garand rifle, a basic infantry weapon in World War II. The blurb beneath it reads, in part, "Pumps out bullets as fast as you can pull the trigger."

Underneath a toy rifle, the caption says, "war games will come to life when backyard soldiers use Trainerifle, modeled after the army Springfield .03"

Among the cheaper weapons, a 7.62-millimeter M-91 Russian rifle is offered for $7.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Nov. 20, 1965]

CITIZENS FAVOR TIGHTER FIREARMS REGULATIONS; ENFORCING FIREARMS LAWS

(By Michael Batelli)

Paterson residents are shocked that 2 years after the murder of the 35th President of the United States, a person named "L. H. Oswald" could still buy a gun without question. They urged more stringent laws to control mail-order weapons.

Those interviewed on the anniversary of the death of President Kennedy—exactly 2 years ago today—complimented the Morning Call for dramatizing the accessibility of mail-order revolvers to undesirables.

The Call, Thursday received a .38-caliber pistol from an Oklahoma firm under the obviously suspicious name of "L. H. Oswald," although none of the required permits had been remitted to the mail order house.

One person a veteran of World War I commended the Morning Call for actually going through the process and purchasing a mail-order house weapon to prove how easily any person can buy a gun.

Another, a veteran of World War II and a widely known sportsman, urged enforcement of existing laws with a mandatory penalty of 20 years for any crime committed with a gun of any type.

Louis Feldman, of 330 East 23d Street, Paterson, who has had experience with firearms since World War I, said, "I am glad to see the Morning Call push for greater control of mail-order house sale of guns. I am 100 percent in accord with the Morning Call that your story of Friday morning should awaken a lot of people."

"It is disgraceful," Feldman added. "Here we are on the eve of the anniversary of the assassination of President (John F.) Kennedy by such a gun, and you can still order a murderous weapon through a mail-order house."

Mrs. Sidney Horowitz, wife of a partner in Edwin's Sport Shop, 217 Market Street, Paterson, said, "I am certainly in accord that something must be done to control traffic of guns from out-of-town mail-order and discount houses."

Pointing out that there has been a lot of pressure from certain sporting groups to ward off any new gun control laws, Mrs. Horowitz added, "The Morning Call proved that people can still purchase firearms without too much trouble."

Stanley M. Levine, of East 42d Street, Paterson, a Passaic Valley water commissioner known as a fisherman and hunter, was strong

in his belief that there are sufficient controls over guns.

"What is lacking," he declared, "is enforcement of existing regulations."

He favored the National Rifle Association stand that stiffer penalties and enforcement of present laws are needed.

"Give criminals who use firearms to commit lawbreaking acts mandatory jail sentences of 20 years," Levine suggested. "The thought of spending 20 years in confinement would deter others from illegal use of guns."

Levine agreed, however, that more stringent control over mail-order guns is necessary.

William Purdy, of Tamarack Road, Wayne, a warrant officer in the Passaic County sheriff's office, said, "There should be a definite check of the mail-order house gun. The Morning Call vividly showed how simple it is for anyone to get hold of a gun. It is not a good practice, and it should be stopped before another murder is committed."

Carl Buchner, of De Sepo Avenue, Hawthorne, said guns should be purchased in person, not through the mails or any other way. "I believe if a man wants a gun he should be man enough to stand up and purchase the gun at a store and not buy it through a mail-order house."

Walter Riley, of East 24th Street, Paterson, agreed. "I don't think guns should be bought through a mail-order house. It is a known fact that purchase of small arms (handguns) is illegal."

Eugene Davis of Georgia Drive, Wayne, believes the sale of guns without control should be stopped entirely. "There should be an investigation of any proposed gun purchase, whether it be for marksmanship, a starter gun, or any other type. I don't believe in killing and I certainly favor the strictest possible control over guns."

Herman Croland, of Glen Rock, a Paterson industrialist, said, "I agree there should be more control over guns. There is no doubt that it is easy for anyone to get his hands on a gun which could very easily be turned into a murder weapon or a tool to commit crime.

"The Morning Call did the correct thing in accentuating the ease one can buy a handgun. There must be laws strong enough to bring gun purchase applications immediately to attention of authorities."

Peter Currie, a South Paterson sporting goods dealer, declared, "It is not right for mailorder houses to sell guns without a permit."

He blamed legislators for lack of laws to control sale of firearms.

"Anything under 26 inches should be purchased with acknowledgement and under control of local police departments," Currie added. "Your newspaper is absolutely right. Guns should not be sold through mail-order houses to unknown purchasers."

Gene Russo, of Main Street, Paterson, stopped looking over fishing equipment to say, "I am in favor of registering all weapons. I agree 100 percent that there should be more controls over mail-order houses selling guns through advertisements to buyers they know nothing about—who they are, or how old they may be."

A man, who showed his NRA membership card, agreed with Levine that there are sufficient laws on the books to control gun sales and guns. "What we need is better enforcement of the laws we have. Let them sentence criminals caught with guns to mandatory 20-year jail terms, and you'll see less and less guns used in crimes," said the man who asked not to be identified for personal reasons.

He, too, agreed with the Morning Call on the urgency of control of firearms sales and immediate enforcement of existing regulations by State and Federal authorities.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Nov. 23, 1965]

THEVOS WILL INVESTIGATE—GUN-SALE PROBE MOVING TO COUNTY

(By Richard Benfield)

Investigations of the sale of a .38-caliber revolver to the fictitious "L. H. Oswald" will be transferred to Passaic County later this week, it was learned yesterday.

Governor Richard J. Hughes reached by the Morning Call aboard the SS *Constitution*, sailing from Spain, said he would push for enactment of gun-control legislation by the end of January.

State Police Maj. Frank Halley of the attorney-general's office said the investigation would be placed under the jurisdiction of Passaic County Prosecutor John G. Thevos.

Noting that the gun was purchased from a Tulsa, Okla. mail-order house by an editor of the Morning Call, Halley said:

"The entire transaction took place in Passaic County so it is only normal that officials of that county should conduct the investigation."

According to Halley, State Police officials, who have been working on the case since last Thursday, will turn their information to Thevos.

In Paterson, Thevos said it was uncertain how his investigation would be conducted. He announced his intention to question Assistant Managing Editor Joseph J. McGovern, the man who purchased the weapon under the name of Oswald.

Meanwhile, Federal officials in Oklahoma last night were continuing their investigation of the gun sale in secrecy.

Officials of the Internal Revenue's alcohol and tobacco-tax unit failed to comment further on the sale of the .38-caliber S. & W. Enfield Commando pistol by the mail-order firm of P & S Sales of Tulsa.

Paul A. Hankins, supervisor of the Internal Revenue Service alcohol and tax unit serving north Jersey, stood by earlier declarations of Treasury agents that the sale of the revolver was legal.

The transaction culminated last Thursday when the revolver was received at the Call offices, just days before the second anniversary of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

In ordering the pistol from the Tulsa firm, McGovern deliberately refrained from sending the requested pistol permit, to test the alertness of the company.

Reached by ship-to-shore radio, Hughes told the Call his gun-control legislation would not interfere with sportsmen.

The vacationing Governor asserted his proposal would assure that narcotics addicts, ex-convicts, subversives, and persons with records of mental instability could not obtain firearms.

Hughes disclosed he planned to discuss with lawyers Friday the possibility of a State law making it a misdemeanor to obtain a gun through the mails without a permit.

Such a measure, he said, might fill the need for that kind of legislation pending enactment of a Federal gun-control law.

However, Hughes said that his idea for a State bill controlling the mailing of guns might infringe on Federal prerogatives.

The Governor gave strong endorsement to the Federal gun-control measure proposed by U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, that would control the interstate flow of firearms.

In Paterson, State Senator Anthony J. Grossi, Democrat of Passaic, said the Call article demonstrated the need for legislation to keep guns out of the hands of irresponsible persons.

Grossi, regarded as a strong contender for the office of State senate president, called the article a public service showing the ease with which guns can now be obtained.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Nov 23, 1965]

MURDER BY MAIL

This newspaper has demonstrated that all it takes to get a gun are $23.15 and a postage stamp. No bother about permits, registration, or the other regulations that are supposed to protect the public; just send the money, and you have yourself a gun.

We offered the Oklahoma mail-order house every opportunity to trip us in our test of existing controls on firearms sales:

The order was made out in the name of President Kennedy's assassin (who used a mail order gun).

No gun purchase permits were enclosed, as prescribed on the mail-order house's tear-out order blank.

A form letter reminder as to the permits, primarily seeking the customer's signature on a statement that he wasn't a criminal, dope addict, or adjudged drunkard, was clearly signed with the Oswald name and mailed back—without permits.

"Paterson" was misspelled, and absurd future dates were used.

In short, the mail-order house was supplied every reason to check out this order on suspicion it came from a child or a madman. Instead, the company not only shipped out the gun but the next day shipped a fresh new catalog to L. H. Oswald.

Mayor Graves, who is keenly aware of the relationship between easy mail-order gun purchases and crime on the city's streets, personally tested loopholes in existing firearms regulations by purchasing a revolver himself, no questions asked, from a mail-order house. In addition he has shipped off to Washington 40 unregistered mail-order guns picked up in the course of routine police patrol in the city of Paterson during the last few months.

One of these mail-order guns was taken from an 18-year-old spectator in a crowd of 3,000 at a high school football game here 2 weeks ago. Another was knocked from the hand of a barroom customer who was about to fire it point blank into the face of a policeman.

While others in government are passing the buck or denying it exists, Mayor Graves is placing the power and resources of his office behind the Call's crusade to end this mail-order gun menace. He has appealed to the citizens of Paterson to register their firearms, and has detailed a team of policemen to help them.

Admittedly there's a limit to the effectiveness of local gun registration. It is not a substitute for realistic—and strictly enforced—State and Federal firearms purchase regulations. But the mayor's concern in the problem and his vigorous dealing with it at the local level should strengthen the resolve in Congress and the legislature to act on the firearms menace—act quickly, once they get back to work.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Nov. 23, 1965]

BEHIND THE HEADLINE DEATH FOR SALE—CHEAP

(By Ted Hall)

Many years ago an industrious and imaginative member of the Paterson police force set up a display of weapons that had been confiscated in the pursuit of law and order in the city. The 10-foot-long glass case was soon filled to capacity, and Police Chief John T. O'Brien describes the assembled revolvers, sawed-off rifles and shotguns, cane swords, knives, and bomb casings as obsolete. 'They're not nearly as dangerous as the guns we're picking up today," he explains.

Chief O'Brien has been in the department 35 years, but in all that time he hasn't seen

such a stray gun harvest as the last 2 years have produced for Paterson police, he says. This increased flow of illicit guns into the city is confirmed by Deputy Chief Marinus Riter, who has been around for a long time himself and recalls that the basement storage locker even includes a bow and arrow.

The guns that are being picked up today are small and nasty looking. Nearly all of them are .22-caliber revolvers, and nearly all of them were made in Germany and Italy. There is a particularly ugly looking .25-caliber automatic, and there is a starter's pistol which has been reamed to fire businesslike bullets. They are the type of guns that mail order houses sell, Chief O'Brien says, and they are the department's big headache nowadays.

LOADED AND READY

The confiscated guns were found on barroom floors, under the seats of automobiles, and in the pockets of troublemakers. The .22-caliber pistol and ammunition in manila envelope No. 22657 was taken from a nightclub patron. Exhibit No. 22609, an Italian make, was taken from a man in a downtown restaurant. No. 19560, a German RG–10 mail order type, was taken from a man who was threatening another man with it, and it was loaded. The .25-caliber automatic is a Spanish make, used by its owner in a holdup.

No more sinister looking than the others is exhibit 23323. That is the German RG–10 that was knocked from a belligerent bar patron's hand as he was about to fire it point blank into the face of Police Sergeant Robert Tanis when the officer responded to a trouble call in a notoriously troublesome nightclub.

Exhibit 17429, another German RG–10, was being used to terrorize a woman when the police arrived. Exhibit 18739 was carried by a man who had just burglarized a service station. A German Burgo (exhibit 22563) was taken from a man who was threatening his wife with it, and a German Omega (exhibit 17223) was dominating a family donnybrook.

The gun marked exhibit 19484, a German-made Romo, is noteworthy because a man was shot twice with it during an argument. Another German RG–10 was taken from a 17-year-old boy in a city housing project.

"About 80 percent of these guns were loaded and ready for action when we got them," Chief O'Brien says. He calls attention to the neat little paper bags attached to the guns, bank deposit envelopes used to store the cartridges that came from the guns.

INSTANT KILLING

This is a collection of the last few months. Hot weather produces more of these easily purchased mail-order guns than other kind of weather. "People have more physical contact with one another in summer," Chief O'Brien explains. "They get around more."

The police pick up other weapons too, both in warm weather and in cool weather. There are knives, razors, and old bayonets. But it is the loaded gun, the instant death weapon, that the police are determined to get out of circulation.

"Most of these weapons are picked up in bars," the chief says. "Their owners have been drinking. That's a dangerous situation." He says that when police respond to a barroom dispute they sometimes hear the illicit weapons dropping on the floor. "No one ever admits to having dropped them," Chief O'Brien says. "We pick them up and bring them in and tag them."

Chief O'Brien and Deputy Chief Riter agree that the easy order mail-order houses are the prime source of this loose gun trouble. In the old days the illicit guns were mostly brought in from States with lax regulations about purchasing and carrying a gun. But today they are no farther away from the potential holdup man or murderer than the corner mailbox.

FOLLOW THE LAW

"All we ask is that the mail-order houses comply with the laws of New Jersey," Chief O'Brien says. He refers to the law that requires a permit for the purchase of a gun. The application is made on a form available at local police stations and then checked with county and State police. If it clears, a copy must be surrendered to the gun dealer.

Recently Chief O'Brien turned down an applicant for a gun purchase permit, a man who needed it to qualify for a private detective job. "This man had three raps for assault and battery," the chief said. "He got a lawyer, and I told the lawyer that I didn't think the man was a good risk to have a gun. For one thing, he hadn't mentioned the assault and battery convictions on the application."

The applicant's lawyer kept trying. There was even an inquiry from the State police. "I told them I didn't believe in allowing a man of violent temper to have a gun," the chief said. "And when they heard the facts, the agreed with me."

HOW MANY ARE LOOSE?

No one knows how many guns may be kicking around in Paterson—in trouser pockets, under car seats, in nooks around a home. This bothers Chief O'Brien and Deputy Chief Riter and all the other men on the police force. But there is some satisfaction: "Every one of these guns we pick up is one bit of trouble less in town," Chief O'Brien says. And the police are going right on looking for them wherever there is sign of trouble, hopeful that strong enforcement of the gun purchase laws will aid them in their tasks of keeping a city safe.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Nov. 24, 1965]

GRAVES RENEWS APPEAL: FIREARMS REGISTRATION PRESSED

PATERSON.—Mayor Frank X. Graves, Jr., yesterday renewed his appeal for registration of all firearms in the city.

Noting that only one person has registered a weapon since the call was issued last Saturday, Graves urged city residents owning guns to call police at MU–4–3111 and to make arrangements for registration.

"Absolutely no punitive measures will be taken against persons who call," the mayor said. "But," said the mayor, "persons owning unregistered guns involved in police incidents will be in real trouble."

The appeal for gun registration came in conjunction with the Morning Call drive to end the increasing traffic in illicit firearms.

Graves said the campaign to register guns will continue through next week. Police will come to the homes of firearms owners and obtain the necessary information, he said.

The mayor urged gun owners not to bring their weapons to police headquarters.

Meanwhile, State officials were preparing to refer details of the Call's purchase of a pistol from a Tulsa, Okla., mail-order house to Passaic County Prosecutor John G. Thevos.

State Police Maj. Frank Halley of the attorney general's office said he would meet with Thevos here next Monday.

Thevos, meanwhile, has announced plans to question Assistant Call Managing Editor Joseph J. McGovern about the purchase of the .38-caliber S. & W. Enfield Commando pistol from P. & S. Sales, Tulsa.

McGovern sent for the gun in the fictitious name of "L. H. Oswald" to demonstrate the ease with which firearms can be obtained through the mails.

The weapon was received in the Call offices last Thursday despite the fact McGovern deliberately failed to send the company copies of the required gun permits.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Nov. 25, 1965]

TRAINING OF A HOOD

The two biggest threats to law and order in Paterson are easy guns and narcotics, Mayor Graves says. He adds that they have a way of getting together, with tragic results. Desperation drives the narcotic addict to armed robbery, and he's more apt to pull the trigger than are other holdup men. As the Call has demonstrated by easy purchase of a .38-caliber revolver from a mail-order house, there's nothing to stop a narcotic addict from sending in his money and having a gun delivered to him with no pertinent questions asked.

Friday the Paterson police arrested two men and charged them with possession of heroin. Sunday they arrested an 18-year-old boy, who is charged with the same offense.

Only the other day Mayor Graves disclosed that in the last few months Paterson police had picked up 40 stray guns in the course of their work, and most of them were mail-order guns that had drifted into the community without the knowledge, let alone the permission, of the police.

There we have two ingredients of very serious crime—narcotics and easy-come guns. It is something to worry about. It is another strong argument for realistic control of the mail-order gun business—as if another argument were needed.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Dec. 2, 1965]

TELEVISION EDITORIAL

Disturbed at the ease with which the Morning Call recently purchased a cheap pistol by mail in the name of "L. H. Oswald," CBS television last night added its editorial voice to growing demands for tighter gun control laws.

In an editorial broadcast by Michael Keating on the 6:30 p.m. news, CBS called for support of Federal gun legislation such as that proposed by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut. The editorial is reprinted in full:

"Ever since the assassination of President Kennedy 2 years ago, many in this country have been worried by the ease with which anyone can obtain a deadly weapon. As you know, Lee Harvey Oswald allegedly shot the President with a rifle purchased through the mail.

"To illustrate how this bad situation continues, the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call recently wrote to a mail-order house in Oklahoma for a .38-caliber revolver, a revolver similar to the one Oswald allegedly used to kill a Dallas policeman on that tragic assassination day.

"To make their point in a dramatic fashion, the editors of the Morning Call ordered the weapon in the name of L. H. Oswald.

"Well, despite the name, and despite the fact that the editors didn't provide the gun dealer with any of the gun permits required by the city of Paterson or the State of New Jersey, this package (the gun) arrived at the offices of the Call addressed to L. H. Oswald.

"It cost $18.05, plus $4.20 for shipping. This incident proves that if you have a few dollars, you can easily purchase a deadly weapon, no matter who you are, how old you are, or what your intentions.

"It is a menacing situation. According to our information, hunters and collectors—those who have a legitimate interest in guns—do not purchase their weapons through the mail. They want to see, feel, and test what they are buying.

"Who then buys guns through the mail? We don't know, of course, but we're worried about it, and as we've pointed out, you can easily purchase a gun, even if you order it in the name of L. H. Oswald.

"It seems obvious to us that Federal legislation is needed in this area, legislation such as that suggested by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecicut. We cannot understand why so little has been done."

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Dec. 4, 1965]

JURY TO GET FILE ON MAIL-ORDER GUN

Passaic County Prosecutor John G. Thevos may soon turn over his file on the Morning Call's recent purchase of a cheap mail-order pistol under the fictitious name "L. H. Oswald" to the county grand jury, it was learned yesterday.

Thevos said he is awaiting instructions from State Attorney General Arthur J. Sills as to action on the gun case.

The grand jury was to adjourn January 23, but the panel will remain in session 2 months into 1966 to wrap up its special investigation on the gun purchase, and an inquiry into recruiting activities here of the Ku Klux Klan.

New Jersey King Kleagle Frank W. Rotella Jr., and Paterson Klan Organizer Charles E. Brown were handed subpenas to appear before the grand jury Wednesday, after Rotella was confronted by Paterson Mayor Frank X. Graves, Jr., in the office of the Call Wednesday night.

The grand jury is also finishing investigations of the Zin-inspired diet which supposedly caused the death of 24-year-old Beth Ann Simon of Clifton, and of the controversial Thunder Mountain purchase.

Although the grand jury term is being extended, County Clerk Joseph A. Ryan said yesterday that a new 35-member panel will be selected Tuesday and Wednesday as scheduled.

Of the 35, Passaic County Superior Court Assignment Judge Morris Pashman will choose 23. The result will be two grand juries operating in the first 2 months of next year.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Dec. 6, 1965]

GRAVES EXTENDS GUN REGISTRY

PATERSON.—The mayor's drive to register firearms in the city will be extended another week.

Mayor Frank X. Graves, Jr., began the push for registration 2 weeks ago when the Morning Call showed the accessibility of purchasing mail-order guns by buying one through the mail under the name of L. H. Oswald.

"In cooperation with the Morning Call's drive, we're going to extend the drive 1 more week," Graves said last night.

The registration period was to end last night, but Graves said he had been encouraged by the number of people who had called with an interest to stop the illicit use of firearms.

"We've registered a substantial number of guns to date," he said, but would not specify how many.

Graves said that persons who want to register firearms should call MU 4-3111 and leave word that they have guns to be registered. Policemen will come to the house to get the necessary information. Guns should not be brought to police headquarters, he said.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Dec. 10, 1965]

PROSECUTION IN TULSA BREWING—MAIL-ORDER GUN HOUSE FACES ACTION

(By Richard Benfield)

Federal officials will attempt to prosecute a Tulsa, Okla., mail-order house that last month sent a .38-caliber revolver to the Morning Call under the fictitious name of "L. H. Oswald," it was learned yesterday.

According to sources in Washington, Treasury agents will ask U.S. Attorney John Imel, of Tulsa, to initiate action against the firm, P & S Sales Co., on grounds the concern sent the weapon to a person not having a gun permit.

The decision to push for prosecution came after a 3-week investigation by the Internal Revenue Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Unit of the Treasury Department.

Officials will attempt to indict the mail-order firm under a stipulation of the Federal laws.

Section 902, part C of that legislation states:

"It shall be unlawful for any licensed manufacturer or dealer to transport or ship any firearm in interstate or foreign commerce to any person other than a licensed manufacturer or dealer in any State the laws of which require that a license be obtained for the purchase of such firearms, unless such license is exhibited to such manufacturer or dealer by the prospective purchaser."

In mailing the .38-caliber S. and W. Enfield Commando pistol to the fictitious "L. H. Oswald," the Tulsa firm completed the transaction without receiving a permit.

And New Jersey law requires anyone buying a gun to have such a license.

According to the Washington sources, the Treasury agents will instruct Imel to bring the case before a grand jury.

If convicted of violating the firearms law, the sources said, the Tulsa firm would face revocation of its license to sell guns.

The Treasury Department probe of P & S Sales started hours after the Call received the gun at its offices in Paterson, November 18.

Assistant Call Managing Editor Joseph J. McGovern sent for the weapon in the name of "L. H. Oswald" to demonstrate the ease with which unlicensed persons could get firearms through the mails.

The gun itself was turned over to the New Jersey State Police after a Call reporter delivered it to State Attorney General Arthur J. Sills.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Dec. 10, 1965]

GUN-PROBE SENATORS SEEK GRAVES

PATERSON.—Mayor Frank X. Graves, Jr., awaits a subpena from a congressional subcommittee investigating mail-order gun sales.

An aid to Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, Connecticut, head of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency asked the mayor yesterday about the 40 mail-order weapons confiscated by police during the past few years. The Dodd committee will issue a subpena to the mayor to hear how he bought a gun by mail.

Graves purchased a .22-caliber foreign-made pistol in the spring in a test case promoted by reporters from the Morning Call. He received the gun merely by sending a bank check and providing only his name and the city hall address.

The mayor said he would send those weapons which are no longer needed for evidence in court cases.

"We have about 40, but I don't know how many are no longer needed for trials or appeals," Graves said.

The weapons would be sent to Washington, D.C., by a uniformed police officer, Graves said. It would be at least 2 weeks before the collection could be prepared and checked out, he said.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Dec. 13, 1965]

NEWSMEN TO TESTIFY IN GUN-SALE PROBE

Two staff members of the Morning Call have been subpenaed to testify before a Passaic County grand jury Wednesday on the ease with which guns can be obtained from mail-order houses.

Assistant Managing Editor Joseph J. McGovern and Richard E. Benfield, staff writer, were expected to be questioned on how the Call obtained a .38-caliber revolver from a Tulsa, Okla., gun firm.

The weapon, an S. & W. Enfield Commando pistol, was ordered from P & S Sales Co., under the fictitious name of L. H. Oswald. The pistol was sent to the Paterson offices of the Call.

The mail-order firm completed the transaction without receiving a permit, required in New Jersey to purchase a firearm.

McGovern ordered the weapon from a company catalog. Benfield turned the weapon over to State Attorney General Arthur J. Sills hours after it was received November 18.

The purpose of the Call's ordering the gun was to demonstrate the need for stricter enforcement of State and Federal laws governing the sale of firearms. The newspaper has also endorsed adoption of more rigid firearms legislation.

Treasury agents last week instituted action against P & S Sales on grounds it sent the weapon without demanding a permit from the potential purchaser. The case is in the hands of U.S. Attorney John Imel of Tulsa.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Dec. 16, 1965]

EDITOR, REPORTER TESTIFY ON GUNS

An editor and a reporter of the Morning Call yesterday told a Passaic County grand jury investigating mail-order gun sales how the Call purchased a pistol by mail under the fictitious name "L. H. Oswald."

Joseph J. McGovern, assistant managing editor, and Richard Benfield, a Call reporter, were subpenaed by the grand jury.

McGovern described how the order blank for the pistol was purposely filled out incorrectly, with 1966 dates which did not coincide with each other, to give the gun firm reasons to be suspicious.

No suspicions were aroused, however, and the company—the P & S Sales Co. of Tulsa, Okla.—sent the $18.95 Smith & Wesson pistol.

Although permits required by the city of Paterson and the State of New Jersey were not forwarded to the gun firm, the pistol, similar in type to one that killed Dallas Patrolman J. D. Tippet, was sent to "L. H. Oswald."

Paterson Mayor Frank X. Graves, Jr., said recently the city police have an arsenal of more than 40 pistols, all purchased without permits, which have been confiscated in the last year.

Graves speculated that many of them were probably purchased by mail.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Dec. 18, 1965]

GUN ADVOCATE SAYS LAWS NOW ENOUGH

WCBS-TV broadcast last month an editorial describing how the Morning Call purchased a mail-order pistol under the name "L. H. Oswald," with no permits and no questions asked. In its editorial, WCBS, called for Federal gun control legislation.

Last night, the station broadcast a rebuttal by Charles Dickey, director of the National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc., in which Dickey said the Call's purchase shows enforcement of existing gun laws is needed, not new laws.

Dickey took issue specifically with a statement by Michael Keating, who broadcast the original editorial, that, "If you have a few dollars, you can easily purchase a deadly weapon, no matter who you are, how old you are, or what your intentions."

"This statement is in error," Dickey said. "There are laws to cover such purchases," he continued, citing sections of Federal and State statutes. Dickey said he agreed with

a Call editorial that the stunt, as he called it, "should jar State and Federal authorities into strict enforcement of existing regulations."

"We certainly agree," Dickey said, "for here is a case where existing laws have not been enforced at all. This station (WCBS) implied there were no laws covering the transaction, and then went on to ask for more laws.

"This reveals how misleading the publicity of the antigun lobby has been. The laws are there, but they were not enforced."

Dickey concluded by saying the enforcement of existing laws should be given every consideration before more laws are passed. He urged all citizens to write to State and Federal Governments for copies of existing laws.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Dec. 23, 1965]

JURY DROPS GUN PROBE

A Passaic County grand jury looking into the purchase by the Morning Call of a mail-order pistol, decided yesterday against taking action on the matter.

The weapon was purchased from P. and S. Sales Co., of Tulsa, Okla., under the fictitious name of "L. H. Oswald."

William K. Azar, confidential aid to County Prosecutor John G. Thevos, said control over sale of mail-order firearms was up to Federal officials and State Attorney General Arthur J. Sills.

"This case is in the same category as Mayor Graves' buying a gun and others' purchasing guns through the mail," he said.

The reference was to the purchase by Paterson Mayor Frank X. Graves, Jr., earlier in the year of another mail-order firearm. At the time, Graves said he ordered the weapon to demonstrate the ease with which guns could be purchased through the mails.

While Graves had a permit to carry a gun, Call assistant managing editor Joseph J. McGovern, who bought his weapon under the fictitious name of "Oswald," did not.

A permit is required before mail-order firms can legally send a firearm to a New Jersey resident.

Both McGovern and Richard E. Benfield, a Call staff writer, testified before the grand jury last week. They said the gun was ordered to demonstrate the need for tighter gun legislation and more rigorous enforcement of existing weapons laws.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Dec. 27, 1965]

NO DIVERSION

The Passaic County Grand Jury has heard at first hand the story of this newspaper's purchase of a mail-order gun in the name of President Kennedy's assassin. The grand jury recognized it as the test of gun purchase controls which it was intended to be, and found no cause for action against those who conducted the test.

Needless to say, the grand jury was concerned about the ease with which a .38-caliber revolver was purchased from a Tulsa, Okla., mail-order house. There was no bother about the purchase permit required by New Jersey statute or the Federal law that directs compliance with such State statutes.

The grand jury quite correctly declined to create a diversion from the real and serious point of the purchase experiment, which is that somebody's not minding the store when it comes to enforcement of the New Jersey and Federal gun control regulations. Paradoxically, while the deadly .38-caliber revolver was being delivered without purchase permit to the fictitious L. H. Oswald in New Jersey, Attorney General Sills was out beating the drums for new gun control legislation.

The Morning Call's demonstration of the laxity in the traffic in firearms has been noted appreciatively in Washington, where stricter regulation of gun sales is under consideration. The coming session of Congress will be asked to act on firearms controls, and there, as the grand jury recognizes, is where the problem must be solved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, the 2 hours on the amendment are to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Who yields time?

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

There is pending before the Senate an important issue: an amendment which would provide needed additional revenue for the Government, would do so within the guidelines of equity, and, importantly, so far as our present economic situation is concerned, would have an anti-inflationary effect.

The amendment proposes to suspend the 7-percent investment tax credit as a substitute for the excise tax increase on automobiles and telephone service.

Congress only last year determined upon a policy to eliminate from our tax structure the regressive excise tax forms. The senior Senator from Tennessee thought that a laudable objective and a wise and equitable policy. I am not aware of an equitable social policy involved in levying excise taxes which lie not alike upon rich and poor, but more heavily upon the poor.

There is certainly great need, I believe, to eliminate the investment credit. It was enacted for the purpose of stimulating the economy. It has provided stimulation for the economy, perhaps more than was needed. At any rate, the inflationary pressures in plant and equipment and in skilled manpower are flashing danger signals to us now. I should think that about the last thing a committee of economists would suggest now would be for a further artificial stimulation of the economy, particularly in the fields of plant and equipment; indeed, I read into the RECORD yesterday articles and statements by a number of eminent economists who recommend now that the investment credit be suspended or repealed.

This step would not be sufficient to solve our economic problems. It would not be sufficient to checkmate the inflationary pressures, but it would surely be a step in the right direction.

Therefore, Madam President, I suggest it as a substitute.

As I said earlier, it would provide additional revenue. It would provide more revenue in the present fiscal year than the excise taxes proposed in the bill. It would provide about the same amount of revenue as the excise taxes during the next fiscal year, and a great deal more than the excise taxes in fiscal year 1969.

Therefore, it is more desirable from the standpoint of revenue. It is more desirable by the yardstick of equity and fairness. It is also desirable and needed for its anti-inflationary effect.

Because of these logical points, Madam President, I suggest the advisability of adoption of the pending amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, there are a number of reasons why I believe it would be unfortunate, particularly at this time, for the Senate to vote to repeal the investment credit.

One point which does not relate to the merits of the amendment, but does relate to procedure, is that if this were going to be done, it would amount to increasing taxes on corporations by approximately $1 billion annually.

In fairness to those corporations, they should have the right to expect to be heard by our committee and given the opportunity to make their case, if we really wish to vote such a heavy tax increase upon them.

The pending bill undertakes to raise approximately $5 billion on a one-shot basis. Of that $5 billion, approximately $3.2 billion is to be raised by a speedup in the rate at which we collect taxes from corporations.

It is true that the argument can be made, it is merely a matter of making corporations pay more taxes currently than they are presently paying them; yet, the fact remains that for the Government to net that $3,200 million, even on a one-shot basis, it would be necessary to extract that money in addition to the taxes which would otherwise have been paid, so that when we speed up collection of taxes, even on a one-shot basis, we would collect more money than if we simply let taxes be collected on the slower basis that they had been collected previously.

These corporations would be required to come up with the additional $3,200 million, and they would have to carry the cost of the fighting in Vietnam and other costs of the Government, in the effort to come as nearly as possible to a balanced budget.

If we add the $3,200 million that we are extracting from the corporations, to the $1 billion which this amendment would take from the corporations, that would work out to $4.2 billion to be taken from corporate profits after the $5 billion which we hope to raise in the bill.

Madam President, I submit that that is a very heavy load to place upon corporations, if we are looking for a way out to meet our current situation, to take it out of the $5 billion, to put $4,200 million on the backs of the corporate taxpayers.

In addition to that, there is some question as to whether it would be good for the economy.

For example, it is contended that one reason we have been able to continue to have increases in wages without a substantial increase in prices has been that we have been able to continue to improve plant and equipment and, thereby, to obtain more production by the application of the same amount of labor to the plant and equipment that we have.

In addition, we feel that this has made America more competitive in world markets and more efficient in doing so. It has also helped us to maintain our trade balance, to help balance our payments with foreign governments, and to help to ease the outflow of American gold.

In addition, there is severe doubt that business is really in very good shape to take this additional tax. For example, here is an article published in the Washington Post this morning pointing out what we know to be true, that the stock market has had its worst time since the assassination of President Kennedy during the past several days. The fact is, the article points out, that today the stock market took another nosedive. The Dow-Jones averages were off 14.58, which is the greatest decline since November 22, 1963.

There is just no doubt about it, if this additional $1 billion of tax were to be levied upon corporations, it would do a great deal to further depress business conditions in this country.

It is also well to point out that today we have received notice that unemployment is lower now by another 10 percent. That takes it down from the 4 percent unemployment factor to about 3.7 percent.

As the Secretary of the Treasury pointed out, as labor becomes more and more in short supply, we will need these new machines, we will need these new plants if we are going to be able to produce the goods that make it possible for us to resist inflationary pressures.

For those reasons, Madam President, it would seem to me that we should not, at this time, deprive business of any tax credit. If this were to be done, I am sure there would be some effort to postpone the effective date, so that those who have already ordered equipment will be able to obtain delivery and to erect new plants already on order, prior to the effective date of the tax. While that would necessarily be done in justice and in fairness, it would also tend to defeat one of the purposes of the amendment; namely, to bring more revenue to the Government, because if we are going to exempt all equipment presently on order, that would mean 6 months to a year before we could even hope to obtain the full revenue benefit of that which the amendment would hope to accomplish.

It is true that a tax on telephones is and tends to be a tax that hits practically all the taxpayers. Many people regard the telephone as being something of a necessity nowadays. But I point out that business shoulders a major load in this bill, amounting to $3.2 billion, so it can well be said that all the taxpayers should help carry the burden of the defense effort going on now.

The tax on the telephone represents one of only 85 cents for each telephone user. That tax is spread broadly over the whole country. I point out that is only about 20 percent of the revenue proposed to be raised by the bill. So the corporations are the ones which will have the big end of the tax load under this bill. I submit that to put practically all the load on them would be to go too far in levying the responsibility for raising revenues on a relatively select group.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from this morning's Washington Post and one from the New York Times 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 Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 8, 1966]

WORST BREAK SINCE KENNEDY DEATH: STOCKS BATTERED AGAIN—DOW INDEX DIVES 14.58

NEW YORK, March 7.—The stock market today took another nose dive as the retreat entered its fourth week. Trading was active.

The Dow-Jones industrial average fell 14.58 to 917.76, its sharpest loss since November 22, 1963, the day President Kennedy was assassinated, when the average lost 21.16.

Volume was 9,380,000 shares compared with 9,050,000 Friday.

The ticker tape was late briefly in the morning when the retreat began to gather steam but the tape was abreast of transactions for the rest of the session. Sharp losses were taken by some of the glamor stocks in color television, other electronics, aerospace and airlines. The pace of trading was such, however, that trading was orderly.

SOME BLUE CHIPS JOLTED

Zenith fell 12⅝ to 131⅛, Fairchild Camera 11½ to 165¼, Motorola 8¼ to 171¾ and Magnavox 4½ to 97.

Many of the leading blue chips were jolted severely, accounting for the large drop in the averages, but quite a few held their ground.

General Motors fell 2¼ to 95⅞, DuPont 4⅛ to 216⅞, Anaconda 3¼ to 84 and Kennecott 2¼ to 125¾.

On the other hand, Standard Oil (New Jersey) rose ⅛, Consolidated Edison ⅜, Alcoa ½, Atlantic Refining 1⅜ and Southern California Edison ⅛.

Analysts said it was a continuation of long-term-profit taking plus a wait-and-see attitude by large investors who are unwilling to go back into the market until it seems clear that the worst is over.

As of today's close the Dow industrials were down 77.39 from their historic high this year of 995.15. This is still not as much as the virtual 100-point decline of last May–June which punctuated one of the great advances of history.

RALLY POINT PIERCED

The Dow industrials today cracked through the 925 level, which served as a rally point last week and was regarded as a possible support level.

Of 1413 issues traded, 1013 fell and 230 rose. New highs for 1965–66 totaled 18 and new lows 79.

The Associated Press average of 60 stocks fell 5.0 to 344.3 with industrials off 7.9, rails off 3.5 and utilities off 0.6. This equaled last Tuesday's decline which was the largest since November 22, 1963, when the average fell 7.2.

Standard & Poor's 500-stock index fell 1.20 to 88.04.

The factors which have been linked with the 3-week decline were still mentioned—tight money, fear of higher taxes and controls, the competition of high-yielding bonds and other securities with low-yielding blue-chip stocks. No particular new element was added today.

One big brokerage house advises its clients that the market was "oversold" and predicted a stabilizing phase during which there would be considerable "bargain hunting" for the next uptrend.

Ten of the fifteen most active stocks fell, four rose and Reynolds Tobacco was unchanged.

SHORT-LIVED RALLY

American Motors seems heartened by the fact that Detroit Investor Robert B. Evans, who has taken a large position in A.M.C. stock, was made a director.

News from the White House that industry plans to increase its capital spending this year by 15½ to 16½ percent over 1965 accompanied a slight recovery in the market in early afternoon, but the improvement was shortlived and the list closed at its lows.

News of raised dividends, higher earnings, new products, and other normally bullish developments were largely ignored by the stocks concerned.

Prices declined on the American Stock Exchange. Volume was 3.28 million shares compared with 3.8 million yesterday. Pentron Electronics was active and up ¼ at 3⅛. Flying Tiger advanced 1⅜. Syntex fell 1¾, Western Equities 1⅛, Molybdenum 2⅞ and Eldo 1⅝.

Corporate bonds declined. U.S. Treasury bonds were stronger.

NEW DATA ALLAY INFLATION FEARS—EARLY MOVE FOR NEW TAX SEEMS UNLIKELY ON BASIS OF INDUSTRIAL SPENDING

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 7.—President Johnson issued new figures today on probable business spending this year on plant and equipment that appeared to rule out any early decision to ask Congress for an anti-inflation tax increase.

The President said the Government survey of plans for business investments, due late this week, was expected to show an increase this year "in the 15.5- to 16.5-percent range," or not much different from last year's increase. He pointed out that this was significantly less than the increase projected in a recent private survey by the Lionel D. Edie Co., which had raised considerable speculation that an early decision on a tax increase would be necessary.

A LETTER TO PATMAN

Business spending on plant and equipment is widely regarded as a key to inflationary pressure this year. The bigger such spending, the more inflationary strain is likely, particularly in such capital goods industries as machinery.

President Johnson gave his preview of the Government's figures in a letter to Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, who is chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. Mr. PATMAN had asked about the implications of the Lionel D. Edie survey for Government policy.

The President said his economic advisers believed that the Edie survey, which projected a 19-percent increase in plant and equipment spending this year, "substantially overstates the situation." In the important manufacturing sector in particular, the President said, the Government figure will be "far from the 32 percent predicted by Edie."

The President noted that the projected increase in the Government survey would be

"comparable" to last year's 15.5 percent, and that last year's increase was accommodated "without excessive strain." He conceded, however, that "the economy is closer to full use of its resources this year."

The President concluded:

"If the final figures [meaning those due by the end of the week] show an increase in 1966 comparable to the 1965 increase, we must continue to keep an extremely close watch on economic developments. We must be prepared to act quickly in the field of taxation if such action appears necessary. In this connection, I am pleased to learn that a subcommittee of your distinguished committee will be holding hearings later this month."

The hearings will explore what kind of tax increase would be best if one should become necessary. The President repeated today a statement in his economic report to Congress in January that "if quick action is ever needed, we should not have to begin a long debate on what the change in taxes should be."

The plant and equipment figures have been eagerly awaited as a signal of likely Government action. There is little doubt that if the increase had been as large as projected in the Edie survey, some if not all of the President's advisers would have considered this a signal of serious inflationary danger and would have recommended a tax increase.

The President said today that the Edie survey in the past "has often given a fairly reliable indication of business investment intentions." He pointed out, however, that the Government survey, made by the Commerce Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission, "has substantially broader coverage."

In the Senate today debate continued on the administration tax bill, involving chiefly a speedup in corporate and individual income tax collections and restoration of excise taxes on automobiles and telephone service that were reduced January 1.

Voting on key amendments was put off until tomorrow. The Senate adopted by voice vote an amendment by Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, affecting taxpayers who have small final settlements with the Government.

At present if a taxpayer owes $1 or less, or is owed $1 or less in refund, he is entitled to decline the payment or refund. The Long amendment would expand this to $5.

Several million taxpayers would be affected.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield, without prejudice to my rights, to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] for such time as he may require.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. How much time does the Senator from Maryland require?

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, it will take me about 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 1666.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1666) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, which were, on page 6, line 21, strike out "two", and insert "three"; on page 7, line 1, strike out "one hundred and twenty days", and insert "six months"; on page 7, after line 7, and three lines below "California:", strike out:

Central 12

And insert:

Central 13

And on page 8, one line below "New York:", strike out:

Western 4

And insert:

Western 3

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, I am happy at this time that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is also on the floor, since he was so tremendously helpful to me in my capacity as floor manager of the bill last spring when it passed the Senate.

The bill passed the House without deleting a single Senate amendment. The only major change in the judgeship bill is that the House added one district judge for the Los Angeles area of California.

I think this bill will aid immeasurably in reducing the great backlog in the courts of appeals and the U.S. district courts throughout the country.

I wish to emphasize that I am happy that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is on the floor when I make this statement. I do not think we can continue to increase the number of judges every 4 years or so as the sole method of reducing the tremendous case backlog which is continually growing.

I think we shall have to look at other methods of dealing with the problem, including the possibility of adopting administrative measures to assist and improve the handling of cases, in order to have speedy and prompt justice.

One of the suggestions made to the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary is the appointment of an additional law clerk for the judges of the courts of appeals in order to increase the capacity of those judges to handle the growing caseload. The subcommittee will look into this proposal.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is in a very important position, not only because of his membership on the Judiciary Committee, and not simply as chairman of the Government Operations Committee, but because he is the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that handles appropriations for the judicial system of the United States.

I think this year and in the years to come we shall have to look into improving the efficiency of the administration of the Federal courts, and not merely add judges year after year, or every 4 years, as the case may be, for simply adding more and more judges is not a satisfactory solution to the caseload problem if the administration of our judicial system does not allow the most efficient utilization of the judicial manpower that we already have.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I thank the Senator for yielding, and I appreciate the references to my interest in connection with the legislation and the general subject matter.

I am very glad that the amendments to the bill by the House are being accepted by the Senate, therefore avoiding the necessity of sending the bill to conference, where further delays may occur in the enactment of the bill.

I point out that the enactment of the bill is most timely because in certain circuits additional judges are urgently needed.

I wholeheartedly concur in the remarks of my distinguished friend from Maryland with respect to the improvement in judicial machinery as to the need for greater efficiency in the present judicial system as well as to meet the ever increasing case load that continues to come before our courts.

I think improvements can be made, and it is a matter which should receive, and it is receiving, attention. When we make those improvements, the necessity for additional judges will be diminished, although it will never be completely eliminated as long as we have a growing population.

As suggested by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, if we provide the improvement in the judicial machinery that is needed, instead of having a bill before us every 4 years to increase the number of judges throughout the country, it may suffice to have such a bill every 10 years.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Maryland for his work in this field and for having successfully processed and guided this bill through the legislative channels and to final passage in the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. His encouragement and guidance have been a great inspiration to me. I am delighted he is going to work with me to improve judicial administration.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time if the sponsor

of the pending amendment is disposed to do likewise.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Washington Post this morning, written by Joseph R. Slevin, and an article from today's Wall Street Journal.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 8, 1966]

FOWLER VERSUS ECONOMISTS: TAX DEBATE TO TURN ON SUSPENSION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

The big tax fight of 1966 is going to be over the 7-percent investment credit that the Government adopted in 1962 to stimulate business purchases of capital goods.

Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, will lead a drive to suspend the credit when the Senate votes on President Johnson's $6 billion revenue-raising bill this week. The expectation is that he will lose this time but the battle will be renewed if Mr. Johnson decides to ask for an anti-inflationary tax boost in the spring.

Suspension of the tax credit is being urged by a large and growing group of professional economists. They are saying publicly—as well as privately to key Government officials—that withdrawing the special 7-percent incentive will be the simplest and most direct way of taking unwanted steam out of the booming U.S. economy.

BOOM POSES THREAT

There is general agreement that the United States is being threatened by a capital goods boom. The beauty of suspending the investment credit is that the action will discourage purchases of capital equipment and thus hit the boom at the exact point where the inflationary pressures are the heaviest.

Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler is adamantly opposing any change in the investment credit in his appearances before congressional committees.

Businessmen are making investment plans in the expectation that they will receive the credit and any modification will be a breach of faith, he argues.

The Government can suspend the credit only if it exempts projects that already have been started and that would be self-defeating, the Secretary maintains. He contends that the capital goods boom would continue for many months and that the exact time when the Government would want capital expenditures to rise strongly again.

ECONOMISTS DISAGREE

But the economists disagree vigorously.

Some maintain that no exemption is required. They say the Government often changes tax rates and there is no difference between suspending the investment credit and increasing the corporate or individual income tax rate. People are making plans in the expectation that those rates will remain unchanged just as much as businessmen are relying on the 7-percent credit, these economists say.

Many of them agree with Fowler that the exemption should be granted but disagree that the exemptions would destroy the effectiveness of the suspension.

There are a number of companies that will not start planned equal expansion programs if the credit is suspended, the economists contend. New orders for machinery will fall off quickly and the unwanted steam will be taken out of the capital goods industry, they assert.

These advocates of suspending the credit stress that the Government wants to reduce activity in the capital goods industry—not to halt it. Suspending the investment credit would cause the postponement of enough expansion plans to bring about the desired degree of restraint, the economists declare.

ISSUE IS COMPLEX

There is more to the dispute than an argument over how you treat businessmen or disagreement about the best way to fight inflation.

Many Democratic congressional critics opposed the incentive when it was granted and believe deeply that it is a giveaway to business. Some very conservative Republicans object to it on the ground that the Government loses revenue that it can never recapture.

But Fowler and President Johnson are keenly aware that the investment credit now is highly prized by business and that any move to suspend the credit would endanger the good relations that Mr. Johnson assiduously has developed with the business community.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 8, 1966]

JOHNSON MOVES TO DISPUTE REPORTS OF INFLATIONARY CAPITAL OUTLAYS RISE—PLANT, EQUIPMENT SPENDING GAIN OF 15.5 TO 16.5 PERCENT SEEN IN 1966 BY FEDERAL SURVEY

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson hastily sought to knock down reports that capital outlays are soaring at a dangerously inflationary rate.

Disclosing the results of a still unpublished Government survey, the President said businessmen expect to increase plant and equipment spending this year 15.5 to 16.5 percent from last year's record of $51.8 billion. The projected increase is only slightly steeper than the 15.5-percent gain of 1965 and is just about the same as the rate estimated by the President's Council of Economic Advisers in its January economic report.

Even so, Mr. Johnson warned that the level of expenditures projected by the survey requires Government policymakers to keep "an extremely close watch on economic developments." He again stressed the need for Congress to gear itself for fast action if a general tax increase is deemed necessary.

DISCLOSED IN LETTER TO REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN

The general findings of the Government survey, taken by the Commerce Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission, were disclosed by the President in a letter to Representative PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee. Mr. PATMAN had written a letter to the President last Saturday inquiring about a private survey showing that manufacturers—which include only part of all business—plan a 32-percent increase in capital outlays this year from 1965. That survey was conducted by Lionel D. Edie & Co. The White House made public the President's reply; the complete Commerce Department-SEC report is scheduled to be published later this week.

The President said:

"The Council of Economic Advisers believes the Edie survey substantially overstates the situation. The present expectation is that the Commerce-SEC survey will show an investment gain for 1966 up only slightly over the 1965 gain—in the 15.5- to 16.5-percent range.

"You recall that total plant and equipment expenditures increased by 15.5 percent in 1965. The machinery and construction industries were able to accommodate it without excessive strain. In manufacturing in particular, the Commerce-SEC survey figures are far from the 32 percent predicted by Edie. Of course, as your letter noted, the economy is closer to full use of its resources this year.

"If the final figures show an increase in 1966 comparable to the 1965 increase, we must continue to keep an extremely close watch on economic developments. We must be prepared to act quickly in the field of taxation if such action appears necessary."

In New York, Pierre A. Rinfret, chairman of Lionel D. Edie & Co., said "One doesn't debate with the President of the United States, but I would stick to our estimate."

He noted that Edie & Co.'s prediction of a 32-percent increase in capital outlays this year covers only manufacturing concerns, adding that its overall projection for both manufacturers and nonmanufacturers is 19 percent. He said this 19-percent figure was the one comparable to the Government's projection of a 15.5 to 16.5 percent gain this year.

Mr. Rinfret contended that "in periods of substantial capital outlays" Government surveys frequently underestimate capital expenditures. He said that in 1951, 1964 and 1965, for instance, Government projections fell about 4 percent short of the actual increase.

At this time last year, Mr. Rinfret said, Edie was predicting a 22-percent gain for manufacturers' capital outlays in 1965 and the Government was estimating a 16-percent increase; the actual gain turned out to be 21 percent, he added. Similarly, he contended, Edie's overall projection at this time last year was 15 percent and the Government's 12 percent; this overall gain turned out to be 15 percent, he said.

PLEASED ABOUT TAX HEARINGS

The President said that he is pleased that a subcommittee of the joint Economic Committee will hold hearings later this month on standby plans for an individual and corporate tax increase. The subcommittee, chaired by Representative GRIFFITHS, Democrat of Michigan, will solicit advice from economists and others on the detailed mechanics of a fast tax rise. Mr. Johnson said, "I shall watch your hearings with great interest."

In general, the President's discussion of the projected capital investment increase was noncommittal; he stopped short of declaring outright that the 15½- to 16½-percent advance would be too much. Thus, Mr. Johnson and his advisers seem determined to postpone awhile longer a decision on whether the economy will require tough anti-inflationary medicine in the form of higher taxes.

At stake immediately, however, in the question of possibly excessive capital spending is the fate of the 7-percent tax credits for new investments by businessmen. The administration is trying to save the credit from attacks on the Senate floor, mainly by Senator GORE, Democrat of Tennessee, who wants to suspend the availability of the investment credit for 2 years. This would deny businessmen an estimated $1.2 billion of tax savings in the year starting July 1 alone.

This is about the same amount of added revenue that the Treasury would receive from the administration's proposed increases in excise-tax rates on autos and telephone service. The excise provisions are part of a $4.8 billion revenue-raising bill passed by the House and currently being debated on the Senate floor. Senator GORE has offered an amendment that would suspend the investment credit in lieu of raising the excise taxes.

REASONS FOR CREDIT TERMED "OUTDATED"

In a lengthy speech yesterday, the Tennessee Democrat said the reasons for congressional approval of the investment credit in 1962 has become outdated in the current booming economy. "It seems to me that artificial stimulation of the economy is about the last thing we now need," he declared.

Senator GORE said he has heard a report that Representative PATMAN's Joint Economic Committee, in its forthcoming annual report, will recommend suspension of the investment credit. This panel makes economic studies but doesn't act on legislation. A joint committee staff member said the panel hasn't yet finished its final draft of recommendations, which are to be published later this month.

Treasury Secretary Fowler has been urging Congress to leave the investment credit alone on the ground it is a desirable part of the permanent tax law. The administration view was reflected in yesterday's Senate debate by Senator SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, who said: "To cut back the expansion of the American economy through a suspension of the investment tax credit would, it seems to me, seriously hamper the efforts of business to cut costs and avoid bottlenecks and production delays."

A vote of Senator GORE's amendment may come today.

Administration leaders seem more worried about an effort by Senator HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, and others to remove the telephone tax increase—and possibly the auto tax increase as well—without substituting other provisions. The administration has been lobbying hard in recent days to retain the excise-tax provisions, which only narrowly survived a fight on the House floor. Chairman LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, of the Senate Finance Committee also has been trying to rally opposition against a proposal by Senator RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, that would provide a tax credit for college education expenses.

The Senate yesterday approved one amendment to the tax bill that could save an estimated 5 million taxpayers a few dollars each. The amendment, sponsored by Senator LONG, would let a taxpayer skip a final settling-up payment to the Government if his wage withholding or estimated tax payments come within $5 of his final liability. The taxpayer, however, would still be required to file a regular return. Currently, a taxpayer can skip any final payment if his withholding or estimated tax payments come within $1 of the amount he owes.

PRESIDENT HAILED SEER'S 1964 DATA, PANS 1966 EFFORT

WASHINGTON.—The perils of forecasting economic developments were underlined by President Johnson's move yesterday to discount a Lionel D. Edie, Co., survey on capital outlays.

President Johnson quoted his economic advisers as saying that the Edie survey, which found manufacturers contemplating a 32-percent increase in capital spending this year, "substantially overstates the situation." But an earlier Edie survey that better served administration ends was embraced by the President.

Signing the massive tax-cut bill in February 1964, at a time when the Government was attempting to keep the economy expanding, Mr. Johnson remarked on television: "This afternoon in New York, a leading industrial economist, Mr. Pierre Rinfret, estimated that the tax reduction will materially stimulate a boom of capital-goods expenditures in the years 1964 and 1965. Mr. Rinfret predicts that capital expenditures in 1964 alone will be 20 percent higher than (in 1963)." Mr. Rinfret is chairman of Lionel D. Edie.

Commerce Department figures show that actual 1964 capital outlays exceeded the 1963 level by about 14.5 percent.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I support the amendment introduced by Senator GORE to suspend investment credit instead of reimposing certain excise taxes.

Last year the Congress, after many months of deliberation, acted to eliminate a number of discriminatory excise taxes. In introducing the Excise Tax Cut of 1965, President Johnson said:

> The proposed program of excise tax cuts and revisions will spur growth and move us closer to full employment by removing an unnecessary drag on consumer and business purchasing power.

This was responsible legislation which I strongly supported.

The bill before us today, H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, would reinstate certain of these excise taxes—those on telephone service and passenger automobiles—as one means to raise additional revenue to finance our military involvement in Vietnam.

The amendment introduced by Senator GORE provides a more practical and a more equitable means of increasing revenues. Instead of reimposing certain excise taxes, the amendment would suspend investment credit. This alternative procedure will provide more new revenue than restoring excise taxes and will have a greater effect in fighting inflation.

Since the two approaches—that of the administration and that of Senator GORE—would accomplish the same purpose, we can afford to compare the alternatives on an equity basis. And I do not think that there can be any argument in favor of reinstating the excise taxes if equity is to be considered. The two excise taxes which the bill would reinstate involve basic necessities in the lives of almost every American. An automobile and telephone service can hardly be considered luxuries. So, as was stated over and over again when the Senate was debating the excise tax cut last spring, the reimposition of these two taxes will hit hardest at those who can least afford to pay.

The whole purpose of the investment credit plan, enacted in 1962, was to stimulate business expansion at a time when we had serious unemployment and underutilization of our industrial plant. We can raise more revenue and spread the burden over a broad group without causing hardship to any one sector of the economy if we suspend investment credit.

I urge the Senate to adopt Senator GORE's amendment.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 75, as follows:

[No. 44 Leg.]

YEAS—10

Bartlett	Gruening	Neuberger
Burdick	Hart	Yarborough
Douglas	Hartke	
Gore	Nelson	

NAYS—75

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Allott	Hill	Pearson
Anderson	Holland	Pell
Bayh	Hruska	Prouty
Bennett	Inouye	Proxmire
Bible	Jackson	Randolph
Boggs	Javits	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Russell, S.C.
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell, Ga.
Case	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Clark	Long, La.	Scott
Cooper	Magnuson	Simpson
Cotton	Mansfield	Smathers
Curtis	McCarthy	Smith
Dirksen	McClellan	Sparkman
Dodd	McGee	Stennis
Dominick	McNamara	Symington
Eastland	Metcalf	Talmadge
Ellender	Mondale	Thurmond
Ervin	Monroney	Tower
Fannin	Montoya	Tydings
Fong	Morton	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Harris	Murphy	Young, Ohio

PRESENT—1

Miller

NOT VOTING—14

Bass	Kennedy, Mass.	Morse
Brewster	Kuchel	Moss
Cannon	Lausche	Muskie
Church	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Hayden	McIntyre	

So Mr. GORE's amendment was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS, AMENDMENT NO. 495

Mr. PROUTY. Madam President, before calling up my amendment No. 495, I

ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be included as cosponsors.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 495

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 495.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] offers an amendment identified as No. 495, as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

"SEC. . (a)(1) Section 202 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'*Benefit payments to persons not otherwise entitled under this section*

"'(w)(1) Every individual who—

"'(A) has attained age seventy, and

"'(B)(i) is not and would not, upon filing application therefor, be entitled to any monthly benefits under any other subsection of this section for the month in which he attains such age or, if later, the month in which he files application under this subsection, or (ii) is entitled to monthly benefits under any other subsection of this section for such month, if the amount of such benefits (after application of subsection (q)) is less than the amount of the benefits payable under this subsection to individuals entitled to such benefits, and

"'(C) is a resident of the United States (as defined in section 210(i) of the Social Security Act), and is (i) a citizen of the United States or (ii) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence who has resided in the United States (as so defined) continuously during the 5 years immediately preceding the month in which he files application under this section, and

"'(D) has filed application for benefits under this subsection, shall be entitled to a benefit under this subsection for each month, beginning with the first month after September 1966 in which he becomes so entitled to such benefits and ending with the month preceding the month in which he dies. Subject to paragraph (2), such individual's benefit for each month shall be equal to the first figure in column IV of the table in section 215(a).

"'(2) The amount of the benefit to which an individual is entitled under this subsection for any month shall be equal to one-half of the amount provided under paragraph (1) if—

"'(A) such individual is a married woman, and

"'(B) if the husband of such individual is entitled, for such month, to benefits under this subsection.'

"(2) The following provisions of section 202 of such Act are each amended by striking out 'or (h)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(h), or (w)':

"(A) subsection (d)(6)(A),

"(B) subsection (e)(3)(A),

"(C) subsection (f)(4)(A),

"(D) subsection (g)(3)(A), and

"(E) the first sentence of subsection (j)(1).

"(3) Section 202(h)(4)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out 'or (g)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(g), or (w)'.

"(4) Section 202(k)(2)(B) of such Act is amended by striking out 'preceding'.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only in the case of monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months beginning after September 1966 based on applications filed on or after July 1, 1966, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is the earlier.

"(c)(1) Section 227 of the Social Security Act is repealed as of the close of September 1966.

"(2) Any individual, who (for the month of September 1966) is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under section 202 of the Social Security Act by reason of the provisions of section 227 thereof, shall be deemed to have applied for benefits under section 202(w) of such Act, and all applications which are filed for monthly benefits under section 202 of such Act by reason of the provisions of section 227 and which are pending on the date of enactment of this Act shall be deemed to be applications for benefits under such section 202(w).

"REIMBURSEMENT OF TRUST FUNDS

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, and to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, respectively, from time to time such sums as the Secretary deems necessary for any fiscal year, on account of—

"(1) so much of any payments made or to be made during such fiscal year from such Fund with respect to individuals whose entitlement thereto is attributable to the provisions contained in section 202(w) of the Social Security Act,

"(2) the additional administrative expenses resulting, or expected to result, to such Fund on account of such payments, and

"(3) any loss in interest to such Fund resulting from the making of any such payments,

in order to place such Fund in the same position at the end of such fiscal year as that in which it would have been if the preceding subsections of this section had not been enacted."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I point out first that this amendment has been cosponsored by the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

Mr. President, this amendment responds to a great inequity in the present social security laws—an inequity which we tried, but failed, to abolish in the first session of the 89th Congress. It is an inequity caused by the nature of the social security system itself.

One and one-half million older Americans are not eligible to participate in social security.

Designed as a scheme of basic protection against want, the social security system has expanded its coverage over the years so that now over 90 percent of employed Americans benefit by its protective shield. Such near universal coverage has not always been the case.

Of the 1½ million Americans over age 65 not eligible for social security coverage, a great number are retirees from some of the most important productive or necessary occupations in American labor—teachers, firemen, policemen, and self-employed farmers. Many retired before their jobs were covered by the social security system. Many worked in our State or local governments, earning less than their fellow employees covered by social security.

For example, Mr. President, what is to become of those presently retired teachers who are not now eligible for social security? The plight of these important people was brought home to me recently at hearings before the Senate District Committee on legislation relating to teacher's retirement. Some District retired teachers who are not eligible for social security earned as little as $1,200 per year during their working life. Now, without social security, they are asked to live out the twilight of their years on a pittance from the teacher's retirement fund.

Men and women who devoted 20 or more years of service to teaching the young of our Nation's Capital, earning $1,200 per year in the process and denied participation in social security, now must live out the rest of their years on pensions, which they paid for out of their meager salaries, but which now yield less than welfare payments. Yes, Mr. President, we are denying social security benefits to those whose fully funded pension plans bring them less than they could receive on welfare. What justice is there for these people? What sense does the social security system make to them? What is being done to protect them against the ravages of poverty? The shocking answer is, "Nothing."

The situation in which these District of Columbia retired teachers find themselves is, I am afraid, typical of a great many personal deprivations across this great country. Who are the deprived? Those denied participation in social security during their productive years.

The situation of our self-employed farmers is no less severe. As you well know, it was not until more recent times that farmers could participate in social security programs. For those who time passed by—for those who grew old before protection was available—for those disabled under a system which recognized their plight too late, the social security system has been a bright dream in a picture book—looked at, read about but never available in times of need.

The Congress grappled with this question in 1965. To my mind we declared a major war on poverty among the aged, then equipped the army with popguns. The transitional insurance provisions of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, provide less than minimum benefits to 355,000 older Americans, those with at least three quarters of covered employment. We ignored the remaining 1.5 million without any covered employment. While setting out to alleviate

long-term, hard-core poverty among our elderly poor, we enacted a short-term program with inadequate equipment and rushed to the aid of those in less severe distress.

Look closely at what we did in 1965. The transitional insurance provisions of the 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act pay a monthly benefit of $35—which is $420 per year or $1.15 per day—to those age 72 or over having at least three quarters of social security coverage. In other words, benefits less than the $44 Congress considered to be the bare-bones minimum for the lowest earning beneficiary were paid to those who evidenced some ability to work in covered employment during the years immediately preceding their retirement.

Mr. President, for the 355,000 Americans over age 65 who had three quarters of social security coverage the transitional insurance provisions, meager as they were, held a promise of hope. But, the provisions were a sad disappointment to the many, many hundreds of thousands of older Americans who had no quarters of coverage because the system did not permit them to participate. They were a bitter pill to those whose hard and earnest labors during a lifetime of marginal existence on the farms and in the classrooms brought no lasting financial rewards. They brought great sorrow to those whose dimming eyes and weakened hearts will not reach the 72d year.

In contrast, Mr. President, in the same act which propounded this mythical solution to a very real problem are provisions establishing broad spectrum medical care for the elderly. I refer my colleagues to a provision of the medicare title which reflects the incongruity of the transitional insurance plan.

Section 103 of title I, "Health Insurance for the Aged and Medical Assistance," blankets in for medical care all those over age 65 or those who become age 65 before 1968, or those who have at least three quarters of coverage. As a result, any person 65 or over is eligible for hundreds of dollars of medical care without regard to social security coverage. But the same person would not be eligible for even the minimum cash benefit unless he had some covered employment.

This disparate approach to providing protection for the otherwise unprotected makes little sense. As written the law launches an attack on the symptoms and byproducts of poverty among the elderly poor, but not the poverty itself. The 1½ million older Americans not eligible for cash benefits must wait until their poverty—their hunger—inadequate clothing and housing—cold stoves and heaters bring sickness, disease, and despair.

Poverty breeds sickness; among the elderly poor food, poor housing, poor clothing and poorly heated living quarters bring illness and disease, which in turn bring eligibility to participate in the medicare program under social security.

To those not eligible to participate—to those with no benefits at all, social security holds no bright ray of hope. There can be no promise of fulfillment in a program which absorbs an old person after all hope—all dignity—all health is gone.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to take a close look at the features of my amendment. Look at them in comparison to the transitional insurance provisions of the 1965 act and the medicare blanketing-in provisions.

First, I propose to blanket in all age 70 and above who are not otherwise eligible for social security benefits. These people would receive the minimum monthly benefits, which are now $44 per month, without regard to covered employment. They would receive benefits to insure them against abject poverty in their later years.

Unlike the blanketing-in proposals of the 1965 act, people becoming 70 in all future years will be eligible for benefits under my amendment. Unlike the 1965 amendments, there is no provision in my amendment which phases out later beneficiaries unless they acquire some quarters of coverage before reaching age 70.

I think it is preposterous to expect a great many of our older Americans, who had never worked in covered employment in years preceding their retirement, to get a covered job in their 70th year. Nor do I think it is equitable to provide medical care to all those now 65 without regard to covered employment while denying such coverage to all becoming 65 after 1968.

My amendment assumes that if we blanket in all those reaching age 70 in 1966, we must, in fairness and equity, blanket in those reaching age 70 in later years. The blanketing-in provisions of present law penalize later retirees. It asks them to pay twice—once for those presently of retirement age—through general revenues—and again for their own subsequent retirement. Under present law those nearest retirement age or those who have reached 65 but not 72 may have to seek some covered employment so as to be eligible for benefits at age 72.

Mr. President, the question of blanketing in should always be considered in the light of the economic realities inherent in the program. As social security coverage approaches universality the cost of my amendment diminishes. As more and more people work in covered employment and as more categories of employment come within the scope of the social security system fewer and fewer older Americans will fall outside the shield of its protection. What I ask my colleagues to do today is to bring hope to those whose jobs were covered after they retired.

Mr. President, I think it is of particular importance to look at my amendment's funding technique in comparison to that of the transitional insurance.

The report of the Senate Finance Committee on the transitional insurance program points out how $140 million was to be disbursed from the old age trust fund for benefits to the transitionally insured. It required substantial manipulation of the underlying tax base and scale of covered salaries to produce this $140 million. As a net result future participants in the system and future employers must pay for benefits disbursed in earlier years. Each subsequent retiree, then, has paid a share of the retirement of the transitionally insured.

Blanketing in of all age 70 and above, providing a floor of protection against the needs of our elderly poor, is a responsibility properly belonging to the Nation as a whole.

While Federal moneys to fight the war on poverty came from the pocket of each taxpayer, the aged poor are ignored. While the elderly are expected to support this program, they reap few of its benefits. The war on poverty is being fought on other fronts. Older Americans are a lost battalion.

My amendment is a call to do battle against poverty among the aged. It is a battle belonging to each of us—a battle belonging to the present. My amendment funds the program entirely from general revenues and, accordingly, makes no impact whatsoever on the actuarial balance of the trust funds. In fact, by supplanting the transitional insurance program in existing law, my amendment enables further development of programs under the trust fund.

Mr. President, this brings me to a related question intimately connected with the amendment I now propose.

My amendment brings all those age 70 and above not otherwise eligible for social security under a program of minimum benefits. In the light of the cost of living and the great impact of ill health on the earning capacity of our older Americans, the present minimum of $44 makes little or no sense. As you know, I have long pushed for an elevation of the minimum level of benefits to a flat $70. If the system is to provide a basic floor of protection against want it must do more for the millions of Americans who, if covered at all, are only rewarded by a miserly scale of benefits.

A modest but adequate standard of living for older Americans, living in one of America's larger cities, as seen by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is in the neighborhood of $3,200. Under present benefit levels, $44 per month nets a single retiree $528 per year. The older couple receives annually only $792 from social security. It is clear that social security at present minimum levels comes nowhere close to meeting the real needs of older couples. And, if social security is the aged couple's only income, there is no doubt they must live out their final years in abject poverty.

I am sorry my amendment is not broader of scope. I am sorry it brings 1½ million Americans under such a woefully inadequate scale of benefits. I am sorry it does not begin to provide real protection against want. But, it is a fundamental first step. It will provide bread and potatoes where before there were none.

My point, Mr. President, is this: While my amendment would have an impact on poverty among our elderly, it would only be the initial engagement in a war for meaningful, long-term protection against the devastating poverty that afflicts older America.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, my amendment is not a grandiose scheme to right all the wrongs that are done our elderly in the name of the war on poverty. It is a program that I consider minimal if we are ever to come to grips with the pressing problems of poverty.

I have heard the cost of this program discussed at some length. But there are some legislative matters, which, because of reasons of fundamental fairness, justice, and equity require that cost be put in perspective in the light of the values to be attained.

At a time when the President has assured us that the budget deficit will be one of the smallest of recent years—at a time when great poverty haunts many hundreds of thousands of older Americans—at a time when other Federal programs spend billions of dollars for everything from sewers to space—there must be and there is a way to bring food to the mouths—clothing to the backs and hope to the hearts of our forgotten old people.

This amendment does not propose a novel scheme. The financing for the amendment already has a precedent in existing law.

The portent of the amendment is along the lines of the Canadian public pension program which puts a flat-rate pension of $75 in the hand of every applicant over age 70.

Robert M. Clark, in his famous study, "Economic Security for the Aged in the United States and Canada," stated that in interviewing well over 300 persons in connection with this report:

> I have never discussed social security with anyone so devoted to principles of individualism that he did not favor action at some level of government to provide basic minimum of social security for everyone. Nor have I encountered anyone so imbued with extreme collectivist doctrines that he denied the desirability of at least a minimum positive role for private initiative in providing for social security. I hasten to add that the concept of a basic minimum to be provided by the state varies all the way from an amount barely sufficient for survival to an amount that would provide a comfortable and financially carefree retirement.

The objectives of my amendment have been acclaimed by such diverse parties in interest as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL–CIO. Every organization of older Americans that I have talked to unqualifiedly supports my amendment. In fact, last year I had an overwhelming number of letters suggesting that my amendment should be adopted before medicare—that in the scale of values my amendment was of more direct consequence and of more immediate benefit to those whose povertous afflictions would ultimately lead to ill health.

Why, in Vermont alone there are 2,500 people age 70 and over who are on public assistance but are not eligible to receive social security benefits. They receive not $1 of the $9.3 billion in cash benefits distributed nationally; nor do they receive a penny of the more than $23 million distributed in Vermont alone.

My amendment is not novel—it is fundamental—it is necessary—it is long overdue.

Mr. President, there are more than 18 million people over age 65 in our country today. It is estimated that by the year 2000 one-third of our population will be 65 and over. If 1960 income averages hold steady, nearly 4 percent or some 1,300,000 will have no money income whatsoever. Unless we now chart a course leading to meaningful programs of protection for older Americans we may come upon a period when our national resources must be largely directed toward correcting old wrongs.

My amendment, Mr. President, would, by blanketing in under social security those age 70 and above not otherwise eligible for benefits, put a paltry $1.45 each day into the pocket of a needy older American. While the poverty program in some of our larger cities has been putting thousands of dollars into the hands of a chosen few—the party hacks who bleed the poor to enrich the party—it has declined to put $1.45 into the hands of a needy old woman. While it has spent millions of dollars to set up new bureaucracies to tell the poor why they are poor, it has not had the courage, the boldness or the daring to tell older America why it does not provide $1.45 for food and clothing.

That is the remarkable feature of the so-called war on poverty, Mr. President. It is fought on the wrong battlefields at the wrong time for the wrong reasons. While legions of our older Americans are losing daily battles against invading poverty, a well-oiled, well-heeled war machine wheels past them, showering promises on ears deafened by time, waving banners before eyes dimmed by despair.

The National Council of Senior Citizens reports that nearly 5.4 million persons age 65 and over live in poverty. The elderly constitute more than one-half of all the poor people living alone. Their poverty is often invisible—by no means are they all congregated in slums, but are found in the rooms of old homes, in mining and railroad towns and in shacks in rural areas.

The older they get the poorer they become—literally thousands of them fail to survive the rigors of our winters. In this supposedly civilized and enlightened age that is a timeless tragedy exceeding comprehension.

Leon Keyserling, the former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, pointed out in a recent antipoverty conference in New York that of those receiving social security benefits, nearly 58 percent of the married couples, 58 percent of the unattached men, and 64 percent of the unattached women live in poverty. Among recipients of public assistance who do not receive old-age benefits under social security, almost 100 percent of the married couples age 65 and over live in poverty. Quoting Mr. Keyserling:

> During the years since the original Social Security Act of 1935, the marshaling of the national conscience, the marshaling of our national resources, the marshaling of quantitative income help for the old has lagged terribly. It has lagged not only behind the cost of living, but also behind the productive resources of the Nation, behind our per capita worth, behind our capacity as distinguished from our obligation to provide a decent standard of living for our old people * * *. We have the economic and financial resources to do this, allowing for all other priorities of our national needs—and we should do it.

Mr. President, these elderly people if their health, strength and skills had permitted, would have come under social security had they been able to work a few more years. But when they retired from the work force, the act was not broad enough to provide them with even a small retirement increase. Today these men and women 70, 80, 90 years old must live from hand to mouth, in many cases not knowing where their next meal is coming from.

My amendment would come to grips with this problem completely by blanketing in once and for all all Americans over 70 years of age not otherwise eligible for benefits.

Mr. President, I feel that the Congress has been derelict in understanding and responding to the needs of these people. We have succeeded in setting our older people as a group apart from the mainstream of American life. The elderly are with us, but not of us.

They trouble us precisely because we are such an affluent society. They have become a standing embarrassment, a mute reproach to the social conscience of the Nation.

Mr. President, it is high time that we took action to correct this great inequity.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator's amendment has great personal and human appeal, there is no question about it. There may be many citizens not covered by social security who do need some assistance once they have reached the age of 70. In our kind of society, it is hard for them to find gainful employment, or to obtain some income without becoming beggars so to speak. Therefore, the question I should like to ask the distinguished Senator is: How much will it cost?

Mr. PROUTY. I have the figures before me.

Mr. President, in response to the inquiry of my good friend, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], let me indicate the summary of the costs as I see them.

First. In 1965 Robert Myers, Social Security actuary, informed the Senate Finance Committee that there were 1.75 million Americans aged 65 and over not eligible for social security.

Second. The Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the AFL–CIO, the National Council of Senior Citizens, the American Association of Retired Persons and the National Retired Teachers Association claim that this figure should be 1.5 million.

Third. On March 2 of this year Robert Myers maintained there were 1.8 million age 70 and above not eligible for social security.

Fourth. Using the figures cited by the chamber task force the cost of the Prouty amendment—not including an allowance for any reduction in State welfare payments which may take place—can reasonably be expected to be $450 million.

Using the Myers figures, the net cost of my proposal would be $760 million.

I have struck a median figure between the high and the low level estimates of my proposal. I think it can reasonably be expected not to exceed $600 million.

I am sure that the labor organizations and the United States Chamber of Commerce task force have competent actuaries in a position to make reasonably good estimates.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand the Senator's amendment would be paid out of the trust fund, which would be reimbursed by the general treasury.

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. It is my understanding that we have a permanent debt ceiling of $285 billion. I recall that we have lifted the debt ceiling many times and it is now set temporarily at $324 billion. The national debt is $323.7 billion. That means we have a margin of only about $300 million.

If the amendment is adopted and the bill passes with the amendment, it will cost between $450 and $760 million.

Does the Senator make any provision for raising the ceiling of the debt limit?

Mr. PROUTY. Obviously the Senator from Vermont is not in a position to do that. I think there are many unnecessary items in the budget, and some that are much less important than taking care of 1½ million people who are in desperate need.

I do not know what is going to happen to the debt ceiling. If the deficit is held to what it is estimated to be, we may not have a problem.

Mr. PASTORE. But the Senator realizes that we have passed a bill providing for expenditures of $4.8 billion in order to carry out our obligation and commitment in Vietnam. It is because of that commitment and a hesitancy to raise the debt at this time that the administration is asking for money to pay for that obligation. Yet the Senator's amendment seeks to increase the debt by $450 to $760 million.

What the Senator from Rhode Island would like to have answered at this juncture is how we are going to cut taxes or give greater allowances at a time when we are trying to have a tax adjustment in order to meet our commitment in Vietnam.

I wonder if the Senator from Vermont can inform us how we can have our cake and eat it, too. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. PROUTY. I think taking care of a million and a half elderly citizens, 70 years of age and over, who are in desperate need, is entitled to a high priority; it is a very important consideration.

Let me refer to one of thousands of letters I have received over the past years. This one comes from the La Crosse Retired Teachers Association in Wisconsin. A study conducted by the association shows that 500 retired teachers receive less than $25 a month, while 637 receive $50 a month, and none of these 1,100 retired teachers was eligible for social security.

I have many others that I shall put in the RECORD, but that is typical.

Mr. PASTORE. May I say to the Senator, unless a motion to table is made, that I am looking rather sympathetically at the amendment, because if the Senator from Vermont or any Senator on the other side of the aisle is going to be Santa Claus, I would like to consider these people in my State, too; but if we are to begin to live up to our responsibilities, we had better act in a responsible way.

Such an important measure should have the benefit of committee consideration and calm judgment. These older people will be hurt by any quick rejection of their cause in a hasty floor discussion. They will be hurt even more by an attempt at an empty gift gesture with no practical money source to make it good.

It is not logical or helpful to tie their case with its considerable cost to a bill intended to increase the Government's income for Vietnam.

I shall vote to table the amendment although my heart will not be in it—for I favor a practical approach to the problem of their need.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] provides long delayed justice to the individuals who, by various chances of working conditions, have reached the age of 70 without an entitlement to social security coverage. The cost of furnishing them coverage would come out of General Treasury funds, under this amendment.

In my opinion, it is only a matter of time before this measure is enacted, and I only hope it will be now, rather than later.

It provides the "70 and over" age group with only the minimum coverage. But it seeks to correct the gaps in the law and in the circumstances of individuals whereby the intended universality of social security has not been achieved.

These people are dying by the day, week, and month. I think any further delay is going to continue to work an injustice on these citizens.

I warmly commend the Senator from Vermont for offering the amendment. I am pleased to be a cosponsor, to speak for it, and to vote for it.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I want to compliment the Senator from Vermont, not only for offering this amendment, but for the very masterful way in which he has marshaled the facts concerning the need for it.

I am a cosponsor of the amendment. I have long been associated with the Senator from Vermont in his efforts to secure help for these very people, those who are under social security, who are receiving a minimum amount, and those not under social security.

With all the benefits and alleged benefits being spread around this country, it is inconceivable that we should not do something to right the wrong in the case of this group.

I am very happy to be joining the Senator from Vermont in fighting for this very necessary and worthy amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I appreciate what the Senator has said. I recall last year he voted twice not only in support of an amendment similar to the pending amendment, but also to increase the minimum payments for social security beneficiaries. I appreciate the Senator's help. I know his support is going to add luster to this amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment is a social security amendment. It will cost $790 million. The Government needs revenue. We are trying to come as close to balancing the budget as we can. If this amendment is adopted, it will put the budget still further out of balance.

The amendment would provide a windfall in many State welfare programs, because a large portion of the people who need this help are already covered by the State welfare programs which are already matched by Federal funds.

With the Federal Government running a deficit, and the Federal Government being $320 billion in debt, it does not seem appropriate to put the Federal Government still deeper into debt.

Some of the States operate on a surplus. The State of Louisiana would not object to having a windfall, but the constitution of the State of Louisiana requires it to float a bond issue and borrow if it is going to have a deficit.

The State of Virginia, also, is not permitted to operate on a deficit. I see in the Chamber the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He was a State legislator and he knows that the State of Virginia does not operate on a deficit. They have no debt. Imagine that. Under this amendment it is proposed that we put the Federal Government deeper in debt by going to the aid of State budgets, when some of the States do not have a debt at all.

I have sympathy for helping the aged, and there are all sorts of things we can do for the aged. We did a lot last year. The social security and medicare bills we passed last year cost the Government several billion a year. Most of that would go to the aged and add to the cost of the social security increase.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that one of the worst fallacies in the area of this particular proposal is that of the roughly 1,800,000 people who would be covered under the amendment there are many hundreds of thousands who are already retired on a military retirement, a Federal retirement, or some private company retirement, and they are not asking for help? Some of these are

actually quite well-to-do people and yet this is going to give them $44 a month and their spouses $22 in addition. They do not need it or want it. The other 1,100,000 who would be benefited by this particular amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, are under the old-age assistance program. The State legislatures in each of these States would have to meet and devise a suitable means test to determine whether or not they are going to have this increase permitted because it may be, as the Senator from Louisiana pointed out, that the States would do nothing and the Federal Government would do all of it.

It would take at least a year and a half to get underway and cover people who do not need or have asked to be covered. It throws us into debt more deeply than we are now.

Here is a measure to meet the present cost of Vietnam and what are we doing but adding an amendment that will have a total cumulative 5-year cost of $3.4 billion. That does not make sense.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I may continue for a moment, I will yield to the Senator from Vermont.

In the State of Louisiana, we have a popular Governor who ran for office and committed himself to pay raises for schoolteachers. Ever since then the administration has been trying to find enough money to meet that commitment. They have found financing for part of it but not all of it. If we were to give them an additional amount from the Federal Government they could say, "Let's put that into the schoolteacher pay raise."

In that event this measure would not be for the old people but for the schoolteacher pay raise. They will say, "The Federal Government took these people off of our hands. We will give money we saved to the schoolteachers." It would not be the aged who would benefit but the schoolteachers.

Approximately 1.8 million persons would be blanketed in under this proposal.

Of this group, about 1 million are estimated to already be receiving old-age assistance from the States. This amendment would replace State funds now received by the needy and they would receive the check instead from the Federal Government.

The increased benefits would go to those who least need it—not those on welfare, but to the well-to-do who are not on welfare. They do not need it nor do they expect it. It would be foolish to spend the money in this fashion, especially when the Federal Government is running a deficit.

The proposal is arbitrary because there is no justification for selecting the age of 70 as the starting point. Why not the age of 68 or the age of 66? If a person were 68 or 66 years of age he might need the money more than a person a year or two older who is well off financially. The selection of age in this fashion would invite further reduction to perhaps 65.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I will yield in just a moment.

Last year Congress provided increased benefits for public assistance as well as designing a new program to allow greater Federal participation in the medical assistance programs of the States. Further, the medicare programs afforded hospital and medical benefits to all our elderly heretofore unprotected against medical costs. All of these programs allow our elderly to use previously unavailable funds and have greater purchasing power for nonmedical necessities.

The amendment is a crude way of getting Federal general fund revenue for the aged. It would merely replace Federal dollars for the State dollars going to persons on old-age assistance, with no assured increase in payments for the individual recipient. The substitution of Federal funds will enable the State to merely pocket the saving and then the State is free to spend it for any public welfare purpose, and the needy aged may not be the advantaged group. A straight increase in the old-age assistance matching formula would be a much more effective conduit of general revenue funds to the needy aged and it would avoid the windfall payments to the States who are well able to meet their own requirements.

I submit that the Committee on Finance has not ignored the needs of the aged in this country. We brought before the Senate last year, and I am sure we will again this year, measures to help provide additional benefits to the aged. The social security bill last year increased the cost to the Government by over $7 billion a year. Most of that $7 billion was for the benefit of the aged. We will take a look at our program sometime during the year, and as we study the figures, and the measures available, and the various services where we could better provide for the aged, we will recommend to the Senate what we believe would be the best program to be worked out after.

There are untold numbers of provisions that can be voted for each year by those who wish to benefit the aged. However, I do not think that it should be added to this revenue-raising bill.

I have seen many suggestions, all containing varying degrees of merit which would give benefits of one kind or another to the aged.

I believe that the Senate would be better advised to study all of these proposals and suggestions and at least let the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recommend those that they think we can afford at this time.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, first I recognize the responsibility of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana who opposed this legislation. Regardless of how he might feel about his job, as chairman of the committee, he is the spokesman for the administration. When I refer to the Senator's opposition, I am not thinking of him as an individual. I know that when a similar amendment was introduced last year the Senator gave a great deal of time and thought to it. I appreciated that very much.

We have to assume, I think, that he is speaking for the administration. It is his responsibility to do that when he opposes this amendment or those similar to it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say to the Senator that I am not speaking for the administration. I have not checked as to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Treasury Department's view. I would assume that the Treasury Department does not want it on this revenue-raising bill. It defeats the purpose of the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to seek to raise close to $5 billion to help balance the budget and to pay the extraordinary costs imposed on us because we have a war going on in Vietnam. What we are supposed to be doing today is raising revenue, not spending it.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. In view of the fact that I and other Senators have sponsored legislation similar to this over the last 4 years, and no hearings have ever been held by the Senate Finance Committee, I think it is logical to assume that the administration is strongly opposed to legislation of this nature. I shall place in the RECORD, at the proper time, a great many figures on this subject; but I invite the Senator's attention to the 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act, which provide incentives and penalties for certain reductions in State public assistance programs resulting from amendments to the Social Security Act. I shall place them in the RECORD in memorandum form.

However, the Senator from Louisiana well knows that if a State reduces its old-age assistance because of an increase in social security payments, it proportionately loses some of the Federal grant unless that money is used for some other State public assistance program, such as aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, and similar programs. Is it not accurate then to say that in such a situation my amendment has positive benefits?

A substantial number of States have already taken advantage of the voluntary exemption up to $5. I hope others will do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. From my point of view, that is one more thing that is wrong with the amendment. It should not give States windfalls in their budgets, it seems to me that there is no reason to enable them to reduce taxes while the Federal Government is increasing its taxes.

Mr. PROUTY. I shall also place in the RECORD, in the form of a memorandum, the 1965 actuarial report of the Civil Service Commission, which makes some startling observations.

To those who would not like to see my amendment apply to recipients of Federal pensions I would point out that of the more than 200,000 surviving widows and children of civil service retirees, 38 percent receive less than $50 a month; 79 percent receive less than $100 a month; 93 percent receive less than $150 a month. Ninety-nine percent of all surviving widows and children receive

less than the so-called poverty level of $3,000 per year. Of the 170-some thousand widows on the civil service retirement rolls as of June 30, 1965, the average age was 65.8, the average annuity a meager $80 per month.

The situation of surviving widows and children is not necessarily the most desperate. Look at the unfortunate figures relating to employee annuitants.

Four hundred forty-nine thousand and seven hundred receive less than $50 a month; 126,100 receive less than $100; 214,300 receive less than $150 per month; 307,600 receive less than $200. Viewing the so-called poverty level as $250 per month, 377,500 civil service employee annuitants out of a grand total of 508,500 receive less than poverty-scale annuities.

That poverty scale was established by this administration, which apparently is overwhelmingly opposed to the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. President, alarmingly enough, nearly 74 percent of all civil service employee annuitants receive less than the magical poverty level.

So let him who sees injustice, in including Federal pensioners in my bill come forward and identify himself.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not desire to deter Senators from making speeches on the amendment. If any Senator desires to discuss the amendment further, I shall yield for that purpose. However, unless some Senator desires to discuss it, I am prepared to move to table the amendment on the theory that it is a social security amendment, which more appropriately should be attached to a social security measure than to the revenue-raising bill now before the Senate.

Mr. PROUTY. I understand what the Senator has in mind. Unless other Senators wish to speak at this time, I should like to have a live quorum. Following the quorum call, I should like to be permitted to speak briefly, after which I shall be prepared to vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 45 Leg.]

Aiken	Ervin	McCarthy
Allott	Fannin	McClellan
Anderson	Fong	McGee
Bartlett	Gore	McIntyre
Bayh	Gruening	McNamara
Bennett	Harris	Metcalf
Bible	Hart	Miller
Boggs	Hartke	Mondale
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Burdick	Hill	Montoya
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Morse
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Morton
Carlson	Inouye	Mundt
Case	Jackson	Murphy
Clark	Javits	Nelson
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Neuberger
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Pastore
Curtis	Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson
Dirksen	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Dominick	Long, Mo.	Prouty
Douglas	Long, La.	Proxmire
Eastland	Magnuson	Randolph
Ellender	Mansfield	Ribicoff
Robertson	Smith	Tydings
Russell, S.C.	Sparkman	Williams, N.J.
Russell, Ga.	Stennis	Williams, Del.
Saltonstall	Symington	Yarborough
Scott	Talmadge	Young, N Dak.
Simpson	Thurmond	Young, Ohio
Smathers	Tower	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I point out that at the appropriate time, a motion will be made to table my amendment. I wish to make it very clear, particularly to the 1,500,000 elderly citizens, 70 years of age or over in this country who would benefit under this amendment, that a vote for a motion to table is a vote against the amendment. I repeat, a vote for a motion to table is a vote against the amendment.

I understand some of these elderly people, or some of their representatives, are in the gallery. I want them to report that to the people they represent: that a vote to table this amendment is a vote against a meaningful program of benefits for older Americans and, in my judgment, is a vote against 1,500,000 elderly citizens in this country who need help desperately at this time. So let there be no mistake about that.

I think it is unfortunate, Mr. President, that all of a sudden, the Senate of the United States is urged not to stand up and vote on the merits of this amendment. It seems to me that we should have sufficient courage to vote "Yes" or "No" on the merits of the amendment, and not on a procedural motion. And so again, Mr. President, let me make it very plain to the old folks of this country that a vote to table this amendment is a vote against the amendment.

Mr. President, after making the parliamentary situation clear, I should like to proceed to explain briefly what my amendment purports to do.

There are 1.5 million Americans age 70 and above who have no social security protection. The system has passed them by. Their jobs were not covered by social security during their working years. They are for the most part the teachers, policemen, firemen, and self-employed farmers who retired before social security coverage came to their profession.

Many of these 1.5 million older Americans either have no outside income or they receive small pensions based in part on salaries of the 1930's and 1940's. For example, some retired teachers with 20 or more years service have pensions of $25 per month. A number are on public assistance.

My amendment would "blanket in" under the protection shield of social security all of these people who reach age 70 without the benefit of social security coverage. They would receive the minimum monthly benefit which is now $44.

The precedent for my amendment was set in the 1965 amendments to the Social Secruity Act when all older Americans not covered by social security were made eligible for medicare at age 65. Additionally, the transitional insurance provisions added to the social security law by those amendments were an effort to make a start in the direction of my amendment.

My proposal is the logical extension of the "blanketing in" provisions of the 1965 Social Security Amendments. Its adoption is essential if we are to meet our commitments to fight poverty among our elderly poor. It is supported in principle by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the AFL–CIO, the American Association of Retired Persons, the National Retired Teachers Association, the National Council of Senior Citizens, and virtually every informed person or organization conversant with the plight of the aged needy.

Some weeks ago, when he appeared before the Committee on Aging, Mr. Shriver, Director of the OEO, stated in substance that the poverty program was not designed to help the elderly poor. He said, in effect, that while the program trys to bring some help to the elderly poor, it basically was not designed for that purpose.

I commended Mr. Shriver for being honest and forthright in making that statement. I asked him if it was not true that what the elderly poor in this Nation needed more than anything else was more money in their pockets, and in substance he agreed.

I now quote from Mr. John Edelman, legislative director of the National Council of Senior Citizens, when he appeared before the Committee on Aging.

He said:

> We have adopted, both by convention and by subsequent action of our executive council, a program for considerably more substantial increases in the social security benefits than even those pointed out by Mr. PROUTY. We applaud Senator PROUTY's efforts in this direction, and in the long run, we feel he is aiming at the most fundamentally necessary thing which needs to be done to alleviate the conditions of the elderly in the United States today. We support blanketing in all persons aged 70 under social security for at least a minimum benefit, and will continue to work for it very actively and very militantly.

Mr. President, let me quote briefly from a few of the thousands of letters that I have received on this question from old people throughout the country. Nothing tells more about my amendment—nothing better states its need—than the correspondence I have received over the years.

From Mrs. C, an 89-year-old widow with no social security, no pension, and little hope, a plea to buy bread for her table.

From Mrs. T, the widow of a minister with 50 years' service, a sorrowful request for redemption from the indignity of poverty.

From Miss C, a retired teacher with 50 years' service, a searching request for money to help her preserve her failing eyesight.

From Mrs. S, of Appleton, Wis., a touching note telling how much my amendment would mean to her. Her total income is $45 per month—she does not receive any welfare payments.

From the La Crosse County Retired Teachers Association, the results of a study which notes that 500 retired teachers receive less than $25 per month

from their pension while 637 receive only $50. None of these 1,100 retired teachers was eligible for social security.

From Mrs. M, of Little Rock, Ark., the story of an acquaintance who retired from teaching at age 70 and took a job as a waitress to get social security coverage.

From Miss M, of Rhode Island, a statement of the retired teachers great need for my amendment, relating how 250 of them receive pensions of less than $2,000 a year.

From Miss S, of Milford, Mich., afflicted with chronic allergic asthma, complicated by emphysema, who receives a pension of $113 a month, over half of which goes for medicines and I quote:

> I have at times considered just giving up with an overdose of sleeping pills at times—it is so discouraging. I have been a good citizen all my life but I really don't feel like one now.

From Mr. H, of New Fairfield, Conn., the holder of a Ph. D., these tragic words:

> I used to take it as an honor, but inflation has driven me to my knees to beg for some kind of relief.

From Mrs. U, from Moxville, N.C., a short, sad biography. For the past 14 years she was the sole support of her aged mother, who recently died at 97. Her pension over this period was less than $50 a month. Now her eyes are dimming and she writes me of her fear that she will not live to see the benefits of my amendment.

From Miss F, of Burlington, Vt., the recollection that for many of her working years as a public school teacher she received $6.50 a week, paying $2.50 a week for board. Today she cannot live on what little she saved. She is not eligible for social security.

From Mrs. F, of Louisville, Ky., a plea for adoption of my amendment and the very penetrating insight that "the elderly so far have been forgotten in the blueprint for a Great Society."

From Mrs. H, of New York City, an urgent request for adoption of my amendment because she is now being forced to support her husband's nursing care out of capital.

From Mr. A, of St. Petersburg, Fla., a report of hunger and little money and a call for the Great Society to do something tangible for the starving millions of older Americans who gave their all during their working years.

From Mr. E, of Huntington Station, N.Y., a comment familiar to those of us who have long studied the problems of the aged, he cannot find a job so as to qualify for social security. You see, he is 78 and employers tell him he is too old to work.

These letters are typical of the thousands I have received in recent years stressing the plight of the forgotten elderly and pleading for relief from the oppressions of poverty. These people are not the cold statistics of a census. These are real people in real distress.

Much has been said about the cost of the program. First, I remind Senators who are present in the Chamber that the Dominion of Canada, which clearly does not possess the financial resources of the United States, pays a pension of $75 a month to every citizen reaching the age of 70.

If our country, the greatest and most powerful country in the world cannot duplicate the effort of our northern neighbor, I believe we must take a new look at our entire social security system. Turning to some of the costs of the poverty program, I quote from hearings on the supplemental 1966 appropriations for the poverty program:

> PER PERSON COSTS OF OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE $44 PER PERSON PER MONTH $528 PER YEAR COST OF THE PROUTY AMENDMENT
>
> UNDER THE POVERTY PROGRAM
>
> *From hearings on supplemental 1966 appropriations*
>
> Cost of operating Job Corps camp per enrollee: $4,500, over 9-month period annualized, this cost is $6,035.
>
> Capital costs of Job Corps camp per enrollee: $500, as amortized over 10 years.
>
> Travel costs of enrollee: $70.
>
> Readjustment allowance per enrollee: $50 per month, plus $30 per month living allowance.
>
> Maximum clothing allowance per enrollee: $140.
>
> In the 1966 supplemental, Shriver asked for $235 million for job camps to meet a design capacity of 50,000 enrollees. The Prouty amendment asks for three times that amount to provide social security protection for 30 times the number of people. The goal is 100,000 enrollees at an annualized cost of $600 million poverty dollars. For one-third again the cost, the Prouty amendment benefits 1,500 percent more people.
>
> The poverty program benefits 50,000 young people in the prime of life. The Prouty amendment benefits 1.5 million older Americans in their dim and often desperate years.
>
> The Job Corps enrollee is paid enough to send $600 back to his parents each year. The aged, 70 years and over, not eligible for social security, are denied $528 if the Prouty amendment is defeated.
>
> The appropriation requested for 280,000 work trainees was $255 million, or roughly $911 per trainee. The amount requested per each Prouty beneficiary, $44 per month, $528 per year.
>
> UNDER MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT
>
> According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it costs nearly $2,500 per year to keep a man and his family on welfare for a year (hearings on Manpower Development and Training Act, Feb. 2, 1964, Senate, according to Commissioner Keppel). MDTA costs $1,200 to $1,300 per trainee.
>
> UNDER PROGRAMS OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION
>
> Depending upon degrees of disability, rehabilitation services run from $500 to $1,500 per person.
>
> In summary then, it appears that the Prouty cost-benefit ratio far exceeds cost-benefit ratios of existing Federal assistance programs. Additionally, the program benefits a category of beneficiaries too long neglected.

Mr. President, I should like to quote from the task force report of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It states in part:

> There remain over 1.5 million people age 65 and over who are not eligible for social security retirement benefits. These are principally retired Federal Government employees, veterans, and others who, either because of age or occupation, were not included in the Social Security Act of 1935 and subsequent amendments. The number of aged persons not covered by social security is decreasing each year as people in the upper age brackets die and as more people reaching retirement age are eligible for social security because of prior employment.
>
> Since 1935 the Social Security Act has been amended to include more groups, such as, for example, military personnel and self employed persons. Members of the medical profession, as a result of the amendments of 1965, are the most recent group to be added. Social security is a public program and no group of working people should be exempted from paying taxes to support it or from benefiting from it.

The task force's recommendations state:

> All Americans 65 years of age and over not eligible for social security retirement benefits should be brought into the program.

Mr. President, a little earlier, when there were few Senators in the Chamber, I pointed out some of the problems of the recipients of Federal pensions. I should like to reiterate their plight again for emphasis:

Of the more than 200,000 surviving widows and children of civil service retirees, 38 percent receive less than $50 a month; 79 percent receive less than $100 a month; 93 percent receive less than $150 a month. Ninety-nine percent of all surviving widows and children receive less than the so-called poverty level of $3,000 per year. Of the 170,000-some widows on the civil service retirement rolls as of June 30, 1965, the average age was 65.8, the average annuity a meager $80 per month.

The situation of surviving widows and children is not necessarily the most desperate. Look at the unfortunate figures relating to employee annuitants: 49,700 receive less than $50 a month; 126,100 receive less than $100; 214,300 receive less than $150 per month; 307,600 receive less than $200. Viewing the so-called poverty level as $250 per month, 377,500 civil service employee annuitants out of a grand total of 508,500 receive less than poverty-scale annuities.

Mr. President, alarmingly enough, nearly 74 percent of all civil service employee annuitants receive less than the magical poverty level.

So, let him who sees injustice in including Federal pensioners in my bill come forward and identify himself.

I wish to point out that there can be a fair and reasonable difference of opinion as to the cost of this program; the figures are quite intricate. I invite the attention of the Senate to an amendment which I offered last year on the floor of the Senate to increase minimum benefits to $70 per month per individual.

During the debate, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana estimated the cost of my amendment at that time at $3 billion. I estimated the cost at around $1.2 billion.

Subsequent to action on the bill, I received a memorandum from Mr. Myers, the Social Security actuary, in which he said in part:

> A discussion of the cost estimates that I had made for this proposal and for earlier versions thereof is contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 12, page

15909. Unfortunately, some of the cost information that I furnished to both Senator LONG and Senator PROUTY was not completely clear and I hope that this memorandum will clarify the situation.

He pointed out—and I am not referring to the amendment presently pending before the Senate—that the actual additional cost of my amendment over the Finance Committee bill was $1.8 billion, rather than $3 billion suggested by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

I am not suggesting that Mr. Myers deliberately—I know he did not—give different information to the Senator from Louisiana than he did to me. We approached the question from different standpoints. I think the Senator from Louisiana and I were both accurate, based on the information given us.

In closing, let me reemphasize that the Canadian Government pays to each citizen 70 years and older $75 a month, and $150 to a couple, if a man and wife are both living.

It seems to me this country can do no less.

May I repeat, if and when the motion to table is made, I want it clearly understood a vote to table this amendment is in fact a motion to kill the amendment. It is merely a procedure by which some Senators, if they wish to do so, can tell people back home, "I voted only to table; I did not vote against the amendment." But a vote to table is a vote against the Prouty amendment. I hope there will be no misunderstanding about it.

I am sorry we have had no opportunity to act on this measure over the 3 to 4 years since its introduction. I must assume the administration is opposed to the proposal. Otherwise it would have the support of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

I am perfectly willing to yield the floor at this time, and I am ready to vote at any time; but, once again, I wish to say that a vote to table is a vote against the Prouty amendment

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment should not be agreed to. I should like to point out why it does not make good sense. I explained the amendment to the Senate last year. The Senate tabled the amendment at that time.

I made the statement then and it is equally appropriate now that, rather than adopt the amendment, it would be just as well to climb to the top of the Washington Monument and scatter hundred dollar bills in a high wind.

In Louisiana we cannot get the policemen and firemen to come under the social security system. They prefer to be covered by the State pension system because they get higher retirement benefits under that system. After serving 20 years, a policeman can retire on full retirement benefits and receive full retirement benefits.

This amendment provides that, even while either the retired fireman or policeman is drawing a pension, which could be $500 a month or more, he would nevertheless be entitled to social security benefits of $44 a month for himself and $22 for his wife.

If any distinguished Member of this legislative body is 70 years of age, he receives the full retirement benefit of $900 a month. Under this amendment, he would also receive a further benefit of $44 a month for himself and $22 for his wife.

Further, a member of the armed services generally draws retirement benefits far greater than provided by social security. Under this amendment, he will get additional benefits of $44 a month for himself and $22 for his wife, even though there was no need shown for it.

One would think, if we were going to adopt this amendment, there would at least be a requirement to show a need. This need has certainly not been demonstrated. There is no question of need involved.

The Senator from Vermont has talked about schoolteachers. We cannot get the schoolteachers in Louisiana to enter the social security retirement program. They fear that if they do so, they would jeopardize their own pensions, under which they are guaranteed much better benefits than they would receive under the social security program. They do not want to take the chance, by coming under social security, that the State legislature would not appropriate the large sums of money necessary to provide for their present retirement benefits.

Yet under this bill, in addition to the State retirement benefits, each retired schoolteacher would receive $44 for himself and $22 for his wife.

Even more inequitable, under this amendment, a person can be a millionaire, draw a good private pension, and still be entitled to $44 a month for himself and $22 for his wife.

This is certainly a poorly conceived amendment, almost as inept as another amendment, which might have been offered. This other measure, namely, amendment No. 490, was also introduced by Senator PROUTY as a proposed amendment to the pending tax measure. It would provide benefits for everybody around the world who is aged 70 and over. It would include Mao Tse-tung, Charles de Gaulle, and everybody else. The Senator apparently will want to provide a pension for everybody in the world. The Senator may not call amendment 490 up.

At least, we can say the pending amendment applies only to American citizens. But it is equally objectionable, for there is no requirement of need or of contribution. Every State has a welfare program to take care of anyone who is truly in need. But those who are not in need and who have not contributed 5 cents to the social security trust fund would, under the amendment, receive benefits. There is no reason why we should be providing payments to people who can take care of themselves and have not made any contributions to the program.

For example, the Federal Government provides a better retirement program than people have under social security. Why should Federal retirees receive additional benefits under the social security system?

How about State employees? Many of them do not want it. If they want to come under social security, all they have to do is elect to do so.

When I tried to persuade such individuals to come under the social security program in my State, they demanded that I take any such proposal off the statute books for fear that the State legislature might not vote to provide the amounts of money necessary under their own retirement system.

The Government is about $320 billion in debt. Some States have no debt at all. This amendment would give some States a big windfall as to their own State programs, at the expense of the Federal Government, and put the Federal Government more deeply into debt.

Mr. President, there is no need for the amendment. In the event that someone had a case for people who are really in need, we would be glad to consider it on the Finance Committee and vote additional help for these less fortunate persons. Not only is there no need for this amendment, it does not belong on a tax raising bill.

H.R. 12752 is to enable us to move toward balancing the budget, and the proposed measure would unbalance the budget.

If we are going to vote for this amendment, we might as well go ahead with voting other measures which might provide for those who think they have no need for additional Federal benefits.

Because of the foregoing arguments, I shall move to table the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit some memorandums in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY OF COST ANALYSIS

1. In 1965, Robert, Meyers, social security actuary, informed the Senate Finance Committee that there were 1.75 million Americans aged 65 and over not eligible for social security.

2. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the AFL–CIO, the National Council of Senior Citizens, the American Association of Retired Persons, and the National Retired Teachers Association claim that this figure should be 1.5 million.

3. On March 2, Robert Meyers maintained there were 1.8 million age 70 and above not eligible for social security.

4. Using the figures cited by the chamber the cost of the Prouty amendment (not including an allowance for any reduction in State welfare payments which may take place) can reasonably be expected to be $450 million.

5. Using Meyers figures the net cost of the Prouty proposal is $760 million.

6. Striking a median figure between the high and low estimates the Prouty proposal can reasonably be expected to cost around $600 million.

MEMORANDUM ON COST

On April 30, 1965, Robert J. Myers, social security actuary, submitted a written estimate on the cost of blanketing-in all persons age 65 or over for benefits of $35 per month with $17.50 payable to the wife of the beneficiary.

This stated that there were 1.75 million Americans aged 65 and over not eligible for social security. Mr. Myers indicated that the number of such beneficiaries would

diminish each year reaching a level of 1.25 million by 1990. On March 2, 1966, Mr. Myers said that there were 1.8 million people age 70 and above who would be brought within the scope of my amendment.

Clearly, there is a wide discrepancy in Mr. Myers' underlying data. How can there be 1.75 million age 65 while there are 1.8 million age 70 only 1 year later, particularly in light of the statement by Mr. Myers that the group not now eligible for social security is decreasing in size each year.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce in its task force report on poverty and the aged notes that there are 1.5 million Americans age 65 and above not now eligible for social security. This statistic is confirmed by the National Council of Senior Citizens and the American Association of Retired Persons and the National Retired Teachers Association.

The difference in the ultimate cost figure is, of course, quite substantial. If the base figure of 1.5 million older Americans ineligible for social security is used for all those age 65 and above, the cost of the Prouty proposal viewed as a product of the annual benefit ($528) times the number of beneficiaries the cost is maximized at $792 million. The actual cost will be much less. For example, a portion of the 1.5 million will be wives who would receive one-half the minimum benefit. Additionally, the 355,000 transitionally insured (now financed from the OASDI trust fund) would be absorbed and included in the 1.5 million, releasing the present cost of transitional insurance, $140 million for other social security purposes. Finally, beneficiaries of the Prouty amendment might elect to go off public assistance, thereby diminishing the total Federal cost by virtue of the public assistance title of the Social Security Act.

The Prouty amendment does not blanket in at age 65. It blankets in at age 70. Using the Chamber's base of 1.5 million at age 65 it is fair to assume a base of 1.25 million at age 70. Using a base of 1.25 million would develop a maximum cost of $660 million from which reductions would be made for payments to wives, diminishment in public assistance payments, and a $140 million credit for the transitionally insured absorbed into the Prouty proposal. The net cost out of general revenue might be fairly represented by $450 million.

Taking Mr. Myers' highest estimate of 1.8 million beneficiaries age 70 and above less the credit for transitional insurance, wives' payments and reductions in public assistance, his estimate can be fairly read to require payment of some $700 million out of general revenues.

Striking a median cost figure between the high buyer's estimate and the low estimate a payment of some $575 million out of general revenues might be expected.

A more definite cost appraisal is not possible due to the wide fluctuation of the estimates provided by the social security actuary from 1965 to the present.

PER PERSON COSTS OF OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE $44 PER PERSON PER MONTH OR $528 PER YEAR COST OF THE PROUTY AMENDMENT

UNDER THE POVERTY PROGRAM (FROM HEARINGS ON SUPPLEMENTAL 1966 APPROPRIATION)

Cost of operating Job Corps camp enrollee: $4,500, over 9-month period; annualized, this cost is $6,035.

Capital costs of Job Corps camp enrollee: $500, as amortized over 10 years.

Travel costs of enrollee: $70.

Readjustment allowance per enrollee: $50 a month, plus $30 a month living allowance.

Maximum clothing allowance per enrollee: $140.

In the 1966 supplemental appropriation, Shriver asked for $235 million for job camps to meet a design capacity of 50,000 enrollees. The Prouty amendment asks for two times that amount to provide social security protection for 30 times the number of people. The goal is 100,000 enrollees at an annualized cost of $600 million poverty dollars. For one-third again the cost, the Prouty amendment benefits 1,500 percent more people.

The poverty program benefits 50,000 young people in the prime of life. The Prouty amendment benefits 1.5 million older Americans in their dim and often desperate years.

The Job Corps enrollee is paid enough to send $600 back to his parents each year. The aged, 70 years and over, not eligible for social security, are denied $528 if the Prouty amendment is defeated.

The appropriation requested for 280,000 work-trainees was $255 million, or roughly $911 per trainee. The amount requested per each Prouty beneficiary, $44 per month, $528 per year.

UNDER MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it costs nearly $2,500 per year to keep a man and his family on welfare for a year (hearings on Manpower Development and Training Act, Feb. 2, 1964, Senate—according to Commissioner Keppel). Manpower Development and Training Act costs $1,200–$1,300 per trainee.

UNDER PROGRAMS OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Depending upon degrees of disability, rehabilitation services run from $500 to $1,500 per person.

In summary then, it appears that the Prouty cost-benefit ratio far exceeds cost-benefit ratios of existing Federal assistance programs. Additionally, the program benefits a category of beneficiaries too long neglected.

MEMORANDUM ON STATE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act provided an incentive and a penalty for certain reductions in State public assistance programs resulting from amendments to the Social Security Act.

The incentive was provision for voluntary exemption of up to $5 of income in computing a welfare recipient's eligibility for continued or new participation in a State welfare program.

The penalty occurs under section 405 in the 1965 amendments and requires the diminishment of Federal public assistance grants to States to the extent that the State does not maintain expenditures from State and local funds as was spent under approved plans in a base period against which current quarter expenditures would be measured.

The net effect of adding these provisions to the Social Security Act is to persuade States to maintain their level of public assistance expenditures without setting off benefits received by welfare claimants from social security.

While these two provisions do not guarantee the complete pass-through of social security benefits to welfare recipients without a reduction in the welfare payment they clearly limit the instances in which a State will elect to make such public welfare reductions.

For example, since the effective date of the 1965 amendments, 11 States have implemented part or all of the allowable $5 exemption. Two States are going to implement it and an additional 12 jurisdictions have the matter actively under consideration.

Because of the maintenance of effort provisions, section 405, should a State reduce a beneficiary's welfare payment that money is more likely to stay within the States public assistance program—to aid the blind, children of unemployed parents, the physically handicapped—and accordingly the Prouty Amendment will support State public assistance programs.

Subject: States which have passed the OASDI benefit increase on to old-age assignment recipients by exercising the option in section 409 (a) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 allowing the disregarding of up to $5 a month of any income.

The Welfare Administration informs us that as of February 3, 1966, the following States had exercised the option as to $5 a month or less: Arkansas, $3; Delaware, $5; Florida, $4; Idaho, $5; Indiana, $5; Georgia, $4; Hawaii, $5; Missouri, $5; Vermont, $4; South Dakota, $5; Wyoming, $5.

Two more jurisdictions say that they are going to implement the provision: Michigan and Puerto Rico.

Twelve more jurisdictions state that implementation is under consideration at the present time: District of Columbia, Kentucky, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virgin Islands, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

The rest of the jurisdictions have indicated that they do not intend to implement the provision at the present time.

MEMORANDUM ON GENERAL REVENUE FUNDING

1. Amendment 490 which has been superceded by amendment 495 provided that the OASDI trust fund should be reimbursed on a "contribution-benefit" formula. That is to say from general revenues money should be covered into the trust fund to the extent that it would equate the contribution a Prouty beneficiary would have made to the trust fund if he had been covered by social security.

2. Amendment 495 which will be offered provides for funding from general revenues on a "cost-benefit" ratio. That is to say $1 is covered into the OASDI trust fund from general revenues for every dollar in benefits paid.

3. Under the principle of the funding technique in amendment 490 the cost of the Prouty plan is borne both by the taxpayers and the trust fund. Inasmuch as minimum beneficiaries never contribute as much to the fund as they take out, the Treasury would have to cover into the trust fund only the contributions beneficiary would have made if he had been covered. To the extent that such contribution does not pay for actual cash benefits the trust fund absorbs the difference.

4. Under the general revenue funding principle of amendment 495 no burden is placed on the trust fund, hence on contributors to the trust fund. All of the costs are borne out of general revenues, hence by the taxpayers.

EXCERPTS FROM CORRESPONDENCE—WHO BENEFITS BY THE PROUTY AMENDMENT

Mr. President, nothing tells more about my amendment—nothing better states its need—than the correspondence I have received these many months from people whose destiny turns on my amendment. Let me read to you some telling excerpts:

From Mrs. C. an 89-year-old widow with no social security, no pension, and little hope, a plea to buy bread for her table.

From Mrs. T, the widow of a minister with 50 years' service, a sorrowful request for redemption from the indignity of poverty.

From Miss C, a retired teacher with 50 years' service, a searching request for money to help her preserve her failing eyesight.

Fom Mrs. S, of Appleton, Wis., a touching note telling how much my amendment would mean to her. Her total income is $45 per month—she does not receive any welfare payments.

From the La Crosse County Retired Teachers Association, the results of a study

which notes that 500 retired teachers receive less than $25 per month from their pension while 637 receive only $50. None of these 1,100 retired teachers was eligible for social security.

From Mrs. M of Little Rock, Ark., the story of an acquaintance who retired from teaching at age 70 and took a job as a waitress to get social security coverage.

From Miss M of Rhode Island, a statement of the retired teachers great need for my amendment, relating how 250 of them receive pensions of less than $2,000 a year.

From Miss S of Milford, Mich., afflicted with chronic allergic asthma, complicated by emphysema, who receives a pension of $113 a month, over half of which goes for medicines and I quote, "I have at times considered just giving up with an overdose of sleeping pills at times—it is so discouraging. I have been a good citizen all my life but I really don't feel like one now."

From Mr. H of New Fairfield, Conn., the holder of a Ph. D, these tragic words: "I used to take it as an honor, but inflation has driven me to my knees to beg for some kind of relief."

From Mrs. U from Moxville, N.C., a short, sad biography. For the past 14 years she was the sole support of her aged mother, who recently died at 97. Her pension over this period was less than $50 a month. Now her eyes are dimming and she writes me of her fear that she will not live to see the benefits of my amendment.

From Miss F of Burlington, Vt., the recollection that for many of her working years as a public school teacher she received $6.50 a week, paying $2.50 a week for board. Today she cannot live on what little she saved. She is not eligible for social security.

From Mrs. F of Louisville, Ky., a plea for adoption of my amendment and the very penetrating insight that "the elderly so far have been forgotten in the blueprint for a Great Society."

From Mrs. H of New York City, an urgent request for adoption of my amendment because she is now being forced to support her husband's nursing care out of capital.

From Mr. A of St. Petersburg, Fla., a report of hunger and little money and a call for the Great Society to do something tangible for the starving millions of older Americans who gave their all during their working years.

From Mr. E of Huntington Station, N.Y., a comment familiar to those of us who have long studied the problems of the aged, he cannot find a job so as to qualify for social security. You see, he is 78 and employers tell him he is too old to work.

These letters are typical of the thousands I have received in recent years stressing the plight of the forgotten elderly and pleading for relief from the oppressions of poverty. These people are not the cold statistics of a census. These are real people in real distress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the amendment be laid on the table, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] would vote "nay."

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Califoria [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 51, as follows:

[No. 46 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Anderson	Holland	Pastore
Bayh	Jackson	Pell
Bible	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Brewster	Long, Mo.	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Long, La.	Smathers
Case	Mansfield	Stennis
Douglas	McClellan	Symington
Eastland	McGee	Talmadge
Ellender	McNamara	Tydings
Ervin	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Monroney	Yarborough
Hart	Montoya	
Hill	Neuberger	

NAYS—51

Aiken	Gruening	Nelson
Allott	Hartke	Pearson
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Bennett	Hruska	Randolph
Boggs	Inouye	Ribicoff
Burdick	Javits	Russell, S.C.
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Russell Ga.
Carlson	Kennedy, Mass.	Saltonstall
Clark	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Cooper	Magnuson	Simpson
Cotton	McIntyre	Smith
Curtis	Miller	Sparkman
Dirksen	Mondale	Thurmond
Dominick	Morse	Tower
Fannin	Morton	Williams, Del.
Fong	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Murphy	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—12

Bass	Fulbright	McCarthy
Cannon	Hayden	McGovern
Church	Kuchel	Moss
Dodd	Lausche	Muskie

So the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to cast my vote, I would "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 40, as follows:

[No. 47 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Aiken	Hartke	Pastore
Allott	Hruska	Pearson
Bartlett	Jackson	Pell
Boggs	Javits	Prouty
Brewster	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell, S.C.
Carlson	Magnuson	Russell, Ga.
Cotton	McClellan	Scott
Curtis	McIntyre	Simpson
Dominick	Mondale	Smith
Eastland	Morse	Sparkman
Fannin	Mundt	Tower
Fong	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Nelson	Young, Ohio

NAYS—40

Anderson	Hill	Proxmire
Bayh	Holland	Robertson
Bennett	Inouye	Saltonstall
Bible	Jordan, N.C.	Smathers
Case	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Clark	Long, La.	Symington
Cooper	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dirksen	McGee	Thurmond
Douglas	McNamara	Tydings
Ellender	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Monroney	Williams, Del.
Gore	Montoya	Yarborough
Hart	Morton	
Hickenlooper	Neuberger	

NOT VOTING—15

Bass	Fulbright	McCarthy
Byrd, Va.	Harris	McGovern
Cannon	Hayden	Miller
Church	Kuchel	Moss
Dodd	Lausche	Muskie

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana had addressed the Chair previously, and the Chair recognized him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment.

I think Senators ought to have an opportunity to hear the arguments made on this amendment. I should like to acquaint Senators with what this amendment does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator for Louisiana yield for that purpose?

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

Mr. PROUTY. Who has the floor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do. I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor, and the Chair did not recognize the Senator from Vermont to make his motion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have the floor. I do not yield at this moment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, wait a minute. Do not be impatient.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say, Mr. President, that I am not impatient but I still do not yield the floor. I should like to ask the Chair to protect my rights.

Mr. President, I do not want to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I insist.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe I do have the floor, and I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was recognized by the Chair.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry, which I understand is in order.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was recognized by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. I do not yield at this point.

Mr. PASTORE. May we have order, Mr. President?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, a point of personal privilege.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let us have a formal ruling as to whether or not——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I will yield for a question, and I will not yield for anything but a question. The Chair recognized the Senator from Louisiana when I addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor. The Senator from Vermont spoke a few seconds after the Chair had recognized the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been requested, and the Senator from Louisiana has the floor and will hold the floor if the Chair is able to enforce that ruling.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would like to know, when a vote has been taken——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without any prejudice to my right to the floor, and without yielding to any Senator the right to make a motion, I might yield for a brief statement by the Senator from Illinois; I repeat, with the understanding that I do not prejudice my right to the floor and I do not yield to him for the purpose of making a motion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I fully agree to those conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the result was announced, the Senator from Vermont was in the well of the Senate, and he moved to reconsider. It seems to me that even without formal recognition by the Chair, that motion can be made. That has been customary; and I moved to table that motion.

Now, did the Senator from Vermont have the floor, or did he not have the floor?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had tried to seek recognition for the purpose of asking for the yeas and nays on the motion to reconsider of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, but I was not recognized. So, as I understand it, due to the fact that the Senator from Louisiana was given the floor, there was no motion to table made which would have any validity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has stated the situation correctly. The Senator from Vermont will have the privilege, before any other business is transacted, of making a motion to reconsider.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I did not agree to that.

Mr. PROUTY. Well, Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My understanding, Mr. President, is that the person who holds the seat of the majority leader when all the Senators are shouting at the same time according to custom is entitled to be recognized first. That has been the procedure as long as I have been a Member of this body.

I wish to speak about the motion while a number of Senators are present, since very few Senators were present when I presented my arguments.

This is the same measure that was voted down by a vote of 55 to 36 last year. I merely wish to explain to the Senators how little sense this proposal makes. Here is what it would do.

In the State of Louisiana, for example, as in some of the other States, we permit policemen to retire after 20 years of service.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we cannot hear the speaker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In the State of Louisiana, just as one example, as in many other States, we let policemen retire after 20 years of service, and they can draw full retirement after 20 years. They do not wish to be covered by social security, because the retirement benefits under our policeman's retirement program are so much greater than they are under social security.

In my State, it is not at all unusual for a man to retire as a policeman and then go to work as a fireman; and after 20 years, he is eligible for a second full retirement, so that he can draw two pensions, both of which exceed the maximum benefit under social security.

The amendment upon which we have just voted now proposes to say that, starting at age 70, in addition to drawing two pensions, that a person could also draw a third pension, under social security, of $44 for himself and $22 for his wife, even though he has not contributed 1 cent to social security. Not 1 red copper penny must he have put into the social security fund. To pay for this amendment, we will have to take from the general revenues much of the money we hope to raise in the pending tax legislation. The amount required for the first year would exceed what we would raise by the increased tax on telephones. It would cost $790 million to provide these social security benefits to many who do not need them.

In addition, people in the armed services have their retirement program, and in many instances the maximum benefit under that program exceeds the maximum benefit under social security.

What would the Senator's amendment provide? It would provide that those people, in addition to drawing a military pension—which we provide with taxpayers' funds—would also draw $44 for themselves and $22 for their wives.

The amendment is so broad as to provide benefits even for Members of Congress, persons who are serving here right now provided they are not covered under social security. Every retired Senator 70 years of age or older would start immediately drawing a pension of $44, plus $22 for his wife in addition to his Government pension. So I say to my fellow Senators, you are voting yourselves a pension right now if you are over the age of 70 and not drawing social security benefits.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I think the Senator from Louisiana is making a good point. I think there is considerable substance to the arguments that have been made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. There are some people who have reached the age of 70 who may need some help.

But after all, this is a piece of legislation that should be studied thoroughly. I realize that what this legislation would do is put everyone under the umbrella. Once you have reached the age of 70, you could be a millionaire, and you would still be entitled to collect $44 every single month.

I do not think the Senator from Vermont means anything as far-reaching as that. He has been reading letters here of people who desperately need some

help; and we ought to do something for those people. But I think this is a measure which should be thoroughly studied, and that this is not the way to do it.

I believe there is substance to the arguments made on both sides, but I would hope we would not go off, willy-nilly, because it is attractive, this afternoon, to subscribe to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to go one step further. I wish to point out that anyone who is in need of such help can get it right now, under public welfare. We just finished increasing the matching formula to provide adequately for those under old age assistance.

So what it boils down to is a matter of whether the Senate wishes to embark on this program of providing monthly payments to people who have not paid one penny for it, who have no claim nor title whatever to it, and who have no need of it. If we are going to embark on such a course may our merciful Lord shed some help on this fair land of ours. If we are going to start voting pensions for people who do not need them, who have no requirement for them whatever, who are drawing pensions already, in some cases, of $700 every month, many thousands of dollars every year, people who have large annuities, who have all kinds of resources, then I would say there is no hope of ever balancing the budget, no hope of ever having any fiscal responsibility in this country.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that the bill with which we are involved here is basically a bill which seeks to raise revenue in order to meet our growing commitments in South Vietnam? Is that not the purpose of the bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that this amendment, if adopted, would cost the taxpayers an estimated $3.4 billion in 5 years?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, it would.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that we have in this country a somewhat inflationary condition already, and that if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, it would feed the fires of inflation about as much as anything we could do?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is no doubt about it; because it would put the money, for the most part, in the hands of people who have no need of it whatever.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would the Senator not agree that people who talk about believing in fiscal responsibility should by all means not vote for this amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am 70 years old. Will the Senator explain to me why I should receive an extra $66 a month—which I do not receive?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I just do not understand it. May I say to the Senator, if he retires, he will have a very fine pension available to him.

Why we have to provide additional pensions is something I cannot understand. It may be that there are some needy persons who need help, but for the most part they are being taken care of by public welfare. If we are going to start providing pensions for persons whether they need it or not, where they may be drawing three different payments, one from the armed services as a retiree, one from the police association as a former policeman, another as a schoolteacher or a former fireman, and in addition, provide $66 for the man and his wife even though they might still be working and drawing a large income, I cannot hazard a guess where it will stop.

All of that is provided for by this measure. Further, if we are going to provide benefits at the age of 70, what is sacred about that number? Why not make it 35? Why not provide here and now that everyone shall draw a pension of $1,000 a month and no one will have to work any more. It makes about that much sense.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is talking theoretically. However, if I should retire, I would draw a pension from the Senate. I have also served 35 years as an officer of an insurance company and I would draw a pension from them. Therefore, why should I receive $66 on this? I do not see it at all.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

To me, it seems unnecessary to vote $66 for Senators and their wives. To now accept the principle that everyone in good health, with plenty of money, and no need whatever, can receive a Federal benefit even though they are receiving two or three other pensions is disastrous. That is the one principle that seems to me, once we accept it in this vote; namely, that the Government will give us money whether we need it or not just cries out for everyone to dig into Uncle Sam's Treasury and take a barrelful of money home.

Once we adopt that principle, there will be little hope that the Government will ever be solvent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield for a question only, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, because there must be an observation made here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana cannot quarrel with me, because I gave him the vote. I share the logic which he has expressed but, of course, before us at the moment is the fact that here is a vote of 45 to 40. The Senate has voted. Now we are ready to reconsider the vote. I know of no good reason why we should not proceed with reconsideration, because the author of the amendment will so move, and we need not go through all this argument again. We had it last year. We have it today. The amendment has been printed. It has been before the Senate for a long time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say that one of the finest speeches I heard in this body was made on the Republican side of the aisle by former Senator Homer Capehart. I recall, during one night session, he took the floor and stated, "Why do we do these things? Why don't we think?"

I should like to suggest that we think once in a while and have some idea of what we are voting on.

I did not debate the amendment in detail, because last year, by a vote of 55 to 36, the Senate rejected this very amendment. It was my thought that it was not necessary to go into great detail explaining the matter from the point of view of those opposed to it.

Mr. President, in due course, the motion to table will be made, but of course Senators know that once that motion is made, it is not debatable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe that I should have a word or two to say before that motion is made.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator knows, of course, that was a different situation last year. Last year was not an election year. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Montana, under those conditions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that the adoption of this amendment will, as the distinguished Senator from Florida has stated, cost the Federal Treasury $3.5 billion over the next 5 years?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that every Member of Congress, even though we have fairly good pension funds to which we all contribute, would become eligible either upon retirement or at the age of 65, I believe it is, to also receive an additional $44 a month?

Mr. ANDERSON. Sixty-six dollars, with husband and wife.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is $44 plus $22 for one's wife.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would mean, then, that every Member of this body would be eligible, without having to pay one dime, if this amendment were adopted, and I would acquire an additional $44.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Provided, of course, we did not draw social security.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that I would hate to vote for such an amendment and then have to face my constituents who would know that I had voted a pension of $44 for myself.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Montana is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Vermont under those conditions?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield, under those conditions.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the criticisms made about my proposal apply to the social security system itself. The social security system imposes no true means test. I am sure that my good friend from Louisiana recognizes that we should not try to establish a means test. If the Senator wishes to do anything about it at some time in the future, that is one thing; but let me point out—the Dominion of Canada pays to every individual 70 years of age or older, $75 a month. It is certainly not the intention to add pensions to that of the distinguished Senator from Montana, or other Senators present. This is something that can be studied in the future, but it will mean changing the nature of the entire social security program to do it. What my amendment is intended to do is to take care of 1,500,000 elderly people 70 years of age or older who are desperate. There is no question about that. Do we want them to have a retirement annuity or do we want them to stand in the breadlines? If we wish to preserve some degree of human dignity in people who are retired—teachers and other professional people who were working before the social security program became effective, or were too old to qualify under the law which was approved last year, we can do it.

All of the associations of retired persons, the AFL–CIO, and the task force of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce feel that every older person should be brought in under the social security program.

I believe the actual cost of my program is going to be considerably less than the figure which has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I believe his figures have been inflated. I believe that it can be demonstrated quite effectively that that is the case.

Mr. President, I have placed many memoranda in the RECORD. I believe that Senators, if they were not in the Chamber at the time of this debate, will find that I justified the costs of a program in light of the old people who would be covered by this amendment.

I do not wish to continue this discussion. I am ready for the vote, when the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to do so, but I must say that this is unusual procedure.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Free debate has never been unusual. I have waited until the Senator was through speaking before I made the motion to table.

The Senator contends that I was in error in the estimate I made about one of his amendments. The Senator usually introduces his amendments on the floor and keeps changing them, which makes it rather difficult to know what the correct estimates are. The estimate I have, and one I made, came from someone regarded as the best man in the business—I am talking about Mr. Robert Myers, who estimated what this amendment would cost.

May I say that some things are a little bit difficult to explain. Here is amendment No. 490, which bears the Prouty name. It provides for monthly benefits of $44 and $22 for the spouse. This one says that everybody who has reached the age of 70 is entitled to the benefits. It does not limit it to American citizens. This amendment would make Mao Tse-tung eligible for the benefits. It would provide Khrushchev the benefits——

Mr. PROUTY. That is not the amendment before the Senate. Amendment No. 490 utilized an approach to eligibility paralleling the approach taken by the transitional insurance eligibility provisions of section 227 of the Social Security Act. Nevertheless, amendment No. 490 is not before the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was introduced and I have it here in my hand.

Mr. PROUTY. That amendment has not been called up.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But here it is, and it provides that everybody in the world age 70 and over would be eligible for the $44 monthly benefit and his spouse $22.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to table the motion to reconsider.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Chair state what is the question before this body?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The question is on the motion to table the motion to reconsider.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] are necessarily absent.

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

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 48 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Aiken	Fong	Nelson
Allott	Gruening	Pearson
Bartlett	Hartke	Prouty
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Brewster	Hruska	Ribicoff
Burdick	Jackson	Russell, S.C.
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Russell, Ga.
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Cooper	Kennedy, N.Y.	Simpson
Cotton	McIntyre	Smith
Curtis	Mondale	Sparkman
Dirksen	Morse	Tower
Dominick	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Fannin	Murphy	

NAYS—43

Anderson	Inouye	Pastore
Bayh	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Bennett	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Bible	Long, Mo.	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Long, La.	Saltonstall
Case	Magnuson	Smathers
Clark	Mansfield	Stennis
Douglas	McClellan	Talmadge
Ellender	McGee	Thurmond
Ervin	McNamara	Tydings
Gore	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Miller	Williams, Del.
Hart	Monroney	Yarborough
Hill	Montoya	
Holland	Neuberger	

NOT VOTING—13

Bass	Hayden	Moss
Cannon	Kuchel	Muskie
Church	Lausche	Symington
Dodd	McCarthy	
Fulbright	McGovern	

So Mr. PROUTY's motion to lay on the table Mr. MANSFIELD's motion to reconsider the vote by which the Prouty amendment was adopted was agreed to.

CIGARETTES HAZARDOUS ONLY TO AMERICANS?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on previous occasions, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. MAGNUSON] and I have remarked on the rather odd spectacle of the Department of Agriculture sponsoring a cigarette-promotion film entitled "World of Pleasure," for distribution abroad and within our own country, in vivid contrast to the action taken last year by Congress and the Public Health Service to educate the public on the health hazards of smoking. It seems the height of bureaucratic madness for the Department of Agriculture to try to stimulate cigarette consumption in light of the evidence of the Surgeon General's report and the latest Hammond study of smoking among women that health risks are reduced as cigarette consumption is reduced.

An excellent review of what happened is found in an article by Don Oberdorfer, the reporter responsible for bringing this matter to our attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, published in the December 29 Akron Beacon-Journal, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal, Dec. 29, 1965]

WHILE FIGHTING SMOKING HERE, UNITED STATES AIDS CIGARETTE PROMOTION ABROAD WITH TAXPAYER DOLLARS

(By Don Oberdorfer)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Government is warning Americans against the dangers of cigarette smoking—but overseas it is quietly spending taxpayers' funds to subsidize cigarette commercials, and a slick new pro-smoking film, "World of Pleasure."

The cigarette promotion work is part of the product development program of the Foreign Agricultural Service, a branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The aim is to sell more American tobacco abroad.

Just 770 paces down the street a newly created Public Health Service agency, the National Clearinghouse on Smoking and Health, is working hard to combat cigarette smoking at home. This effort was authorized by Congress after an official U.S. commission pronounced cigarettes to be a health hazard in early 1964.

For a time after the official smoking report, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman banned new Government-sponsored cigarette promotions abroad. About 6 months ago, however, commitments began to be approved again.

During the current fiscal year, Uncle Sam is pouring $210,000 into advertising to sell selected brands of cigarettes to the people of Japan, Thailand, and Austria. In each case, the cigarettes involved use substantial amounts of American leaf.

Among the U.S.-aided smokes are Peace, Hope, and Tokyo cigarettes in Japan, which will receive $80,000 for advertising from Uncle Sam this year; Falling Rain and Gold City cigarettes in Thailand ($75,000 from the United States); and Smart Export cigarettes in Austria ($55,000). Where possible, payment is made in American-owned foreign currencies.

Some of the promotion money goes to foreign newspaper and magazine ads, but most is used for television. For example, U.S. Government funds help a Thailand cigarette sponsor a Thai version of "The Virginians," as seen on Bangkok television.

Foreign audiences are not told that Uncle Sam is subsidizing the ads. Nor do the cigarette packs involved bear the warning, required by Federal law after January 1, in the United States, that "cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health."

The Federal money is funneled to foreign cigarette makers through four U.S. trade groups—Tobacco Associates Inc., Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Leaf Tobacco Export Association, and Virginia Dark-fired and Sun-cured Export Association.

The trade groups hire U.S. advertising agencies with their own funds to help prepare and to supervise the subsidized ads.

Meanwhile, operating through the same trade groups, the Agriculture Department is subsidizing a new Warner Brothers film, "World of Pleasure," to be shown in England, France, Belgium, Germany, Austria, The Netherlands, Denmark and Egypt.

The United States is paying $106,000 in foreign currency for its share of the film. In a contract with Warner Brothers, the trade groups add a contribution of their own. The industry-furnished sum is "a trade secret," according to John D. Palmer, president of Tobacco Associates.

A script of the 23-minute technicolor film on hand at the Agriculture Department contains scenes such as this:

"A young man and girl (over 21) run up to the surf and light and enjoy cigarettes as they look at the sea. Boy offers pack. Girl takes two cigarettes, placing one on boy's lips, one in her own. They light up, enjoy their cigarettes."

According to Hugh C. Kiger, director of the Tobacco Division of the Foreign Agricultural Service, the contract promises that Warner Brothers will distribute the film abroad as a short subject with its theatrical features.

Moviegoers will not be informed that it is subsidized by Uncle Sam or the U.S. tobacco industry, since officials feel this would negate the value of the "soft sell."

Foreign audiences will have to guess why "World of Pleasure," which purports to be a travelog, shows an attractive Egyptian couple lighting up beside the Pyramids, a French couple smoking at the Eiffel Tower, and so on.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last week, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] said that this whole issue was "much ado about nothing." He suggested that as the Department of Agriculture promotes other agricultural products abroad, such as wheat and cotton, it could not discriminate against tobacco; that the film in question, "World of Pleasure," was contracted for and filmed prior to the issuance of the Surgeon General's report and the action of Congress on cigarette health hazards; that not one American dollar was spent on the making of the film, but rather that foreign currencies or counterpart funds were used; that Congress specifically excluded the health-hazard label from cigarettes manufactured for export; that the film was not to be directed to those countries which have a national policy of discouraging smoking; that the film was an innocent travelog showing occasional couples smoking; and that there was no hard sell attempt anywhere.

I should like to offer a few observations on the points raised by the Senator from Tennessee. I am completely unmoved by the contention that because promotional films are sponsored by the Department of Agriculture for other crops, the Department is unable to discriminate against tobacco. It is quite true that the Department is charged with administering tobacco exports, but the Secretary is certainly not obligated to make Hollywood productions in support of that program. The Department exercises its judgment as to whether or not it will use films, and in this instance its judgment was very poor. The second defense is even more singular in its logic. The fact that the film was made prior to the issuance of the Surgeon General's report and the actions of Congress and the Public Health Service is no conceivable justification for its distribution afterward. One might just as well say that because thalidomide was produced and used prior to the knowledge of its tragic consequences, it ought to continue to be promoted. Besides, the contract did not call for the completion of the foreign language prints of the film until after the January 11, 1964, issuance of the Surgeon General's report.

It is true that the $106,000 that the Department of Agriculture spent for the film, "World of Pleasure," was from counterpart funds, or soft currency. How this is supposed to mitigate the judgment of the Department of Agriculture to continue to promote this film I cannot imagine. The question, after all, is not how much money was spent making the film, but whether or not the U.S. Government ought to be officially promoting cigarette sales abroad. But if the financing issue is to be raised, since when are counterpart funds placed in the category of play money? There are plenty of uses to which the funds could be put in Egypt to raise the standards of living and education, and I doubt whether all the problems of man have been solved in the 14 European nations named in the contract.

I find it incredible that the exemption of cigarettes for export from the Cigarette Labeling Act should be cited as justification for the promotion of cigarette sales abroad. After all, a warning in English is not going to do an Austrian or a Swede much good, and the exemption most assuredly does not reflect a congressional determination that cigarettes are hazardous only to Americans.

The contention that the film was not to be directed to those countries which have a national policy of discouraging smoking is not borne out by an examination of the actual contract for the film. Article IV of the contract states:

> The contractor, will provide for and make complete distribution arrangements through its worldwide organization for the films to be shown in theaters and made available for television showings through its distribution affiliates in the following countries: England, Scotland, Ireland, West Germany, Austria, The Netherlands, Belgium, France, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Egypt. The contractor shall have the right, but shall not be obligated, to distribute the film in all other parts of the world outside of the United States and Canada.

That certainly appears to mean that they are obligated to show them in the 15 countries just enumerated. Yet we all know that several of those countries have policies opposed to the consumption of cigarettes. Incidentally, that the film was to be shown only abroad is not made clear by the memorandum of agreement on the film between the Department of Agriculture and the tobacco cooperators. The memorandum states:

> The U.S. Department of Agriculture shall also have the right to make, distribute, and sell prints at cost or otherwise make use of the film in the United States.

The film itself is in no danger of winning any Academy Awards. It gives the appearance of having been created by splicing together several film clips of old travelogs. The narrative that is spoken with it is a model of banality. The fact that it is a bad film does not excuse the judgment of those who still wish to use it to promote cigarette sales. Simply put, the U.S. Government has no business sponsoring films, good or bad, with the purpose of increasing the consumption of cigarettes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the contract for

the film, the memorandum of agreement on the film, an article from the March 5 New Republic, a February 18 editorial from the Washington Post, and an editorial from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONTRACT

The Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc.; Leaf Tobacco Exporters Association, Inc.; Tobacco Associates, Inc.; and Virginia Dark-Fired and Sun-Cured Tobacco Export Association, Inc.; in furthering their cooperative projects with the Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, desire to have produced a series of tobacco motion pictures for theatrical and television distribution overseas to promote and expand the consumption of U.S. tobacco abroad.

This contract is entered into by and between the Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc.; Leaf Tobacco Exporters Association, Inc.; Tobacco Associates, Inc.; and Virginia Dark-Fired and Sun-Cured Tobacco Export Association, Inc.; hereinafter called the U.S. tobacco cooperators represented by its authorized representatives executing this contract, and Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., a Delaware corporation; hereinafter called the contractor. The parties hereto agree that the contractor will produce and distribute a series of films for the purpose of promoting exports of U.S. leaf tobacco in the foreign countries in accordance with the provisions set forth in the articles of the contract:

ARTICLE I—FILM PRODUCTION REQUIREMENTS

The parties agree that the contractor will produce a series of six motion pictures in six different language versions in accordance with the requirements listed below. Each film is to be 10 minutes in total running time and will be designed to include the same basic 7 minutes of visual story photographed in the United States.

The remaining 3 minutes of visual story will be photographed in the countries in Europe and the Middle East listed in section C1 of this article.

(A) From ideas proposed by the U.S. tobacco cooperators in conferences in Washington, D.C., contractor will prepare and submit draft copies of the shooting script for review and upon approval will prepare and submit copies of the final shooting script for review and approval prior to the start of photography on location.

Once the final script is approved, the contractor will be permitted to make only limited changes to improve the picture with photographic opportunities that present themselves and provided permission is obtained from the technical adviser (see sec. B below).

(B) In the various countries where photography and sound recordings are made, the U.S. tobacco cooperators or the U.S. agricultural attachés, when so requested, will serve as technical advisers on subject matter, and local customs and habits, and maintain liaison with foreign government agencies in regard to photographic restrictions or problems, all without cost to contractor.

Except for stockfootage showing tobacco in Connecticut, the contractor will photograph the films on original 35 millimeter Eastman color stock in accordance with the production breakdown and shooting schedule to be submitted and approved by the U.S. tobacco cooperators prior to the start of photography.

1. The photography will be accomplished by the contractor in the following locations:

(a) United States, particularly Richmond, Jamestown, Williamsburg, and Newsport News, Va.; Raleigh, Winston-Salem, N.C.; Lexington and Hopkinsville, Ky.

(b) United Kingdom.

(c) Norway and/or Sweden and/or Denmark and/or Poland.

(d) France and/or Belgium.

(e) The Netherlands.

(f) West Germany and/or Austria.

(g) Egypt, United Arab Republic.

2. The contractor will provide all film, tapes, reels, in addition to cans and shipping cases which will be appropriately identified in English and in the designated foreign languages.

(D) The contractor will supply special effects and opticals, as required by the subject.

(E) The contractor will supply proper titles on the 35 millimeter and 16 millimeter prints as required in the six language versions as specified.

(F) The contractor will perform all editing at Warner Bros. Studios, Burbank, Calif.

(G) Requirements for sound will include music, commentary, sound effects, and a composite sound track including music, voice, and effects. The music shall be an original score written for this film, with the same music for the 7 minutes of the U.S. photography and six different 3-minute endings for the six foreign versions.

In providing the music, the contractor will furnish worldwide music performance rights which will enable the U.S. tobacco cooperators to exhibit the films at any time and through any method of projection or transmission, subject to clearance by applicable performing rights societies in accordance with their customary practices and payment of their customary fees by parties exhibiting the film.

(H) Contractor will arrange for the translations and recordings of the narration of each film to be made in the five foreign-language countries with the recordings made by popular local narrators familiar to the populace of the countries of eventual distribution.

The contractor's international distribution division will make recommendations as to the appropriate film and language version to be shown in countries other than where produced.

The six-language versions shall be as follows:

1. English for distribution in the United Kingdom and in certain areas where English with local subtitles are recommended by the contractor's distribution division.

2. Arabic for distribution in Egypt, United Arab Republic.

3. German for distribution in West Germany, Austria, and portions of Switzerland.

4. Dutch for distribution in the Netherlands and Flemish part of Belgium.

5. French for distribution in France, Belgium, Luxembourg, and portions of Switzerland.

6. The appropriate language version and/or titles for distribution in the four Scandinavian countries.

(I) Key production steps will be finally reviewed in accordance with article II herein by the U.S. tobacco cooperators in consultation with representatives of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

(J) Preprint materials to be provided by the contractor are:

1. 35-millimeter color photography:

(a) One 35-millimeter edited original negative conformed in A and B rolls for printing and optical effect.

(b) One 35-millimeter color interpositive, including printed-in optical effects from original.

(c) Ten 35-millimeter color internegatives including optical effects from the interpositive and each internegative including its own language titles.

(d) Ten 16-millimeter color internegatives including optical effects from the interpositive and each internegative including its own language titles.

(e) One 35-millimeter master sound music recording on magnetic film for the basic 7 minutes; and six 35-millimeter master sound music ending recordings on magnetic film cued to the foreign-language versions.

(f) The 35-millimeter edited voice sound tracks on magnetic film, one for each language translation cued to the foreign versions.

(g) One 35-millimeter edited effects track on magnetic film for the basic 7 minutes; and six 35-millimeter 3-minute edited effects track endings cued to the foreign versions.

(h) Six 35-millimeter combined (mixed) sound tracks including narration, music and sound effects on magnetic film, each cued to the particular foreign version.

(i) Six 35-millimeter combined sound track negatives suitable for color release printing, one for each foreign language version.

(j) Six 16-millimeter combined sound track negatives suitable for color release printing, one for each language version.

2. Postscripts and narration scripts: Six copies of each of the postscripts in English and the final narration scripts in the respective foreign languages.

3. All preprint materials are to be properly identified and titled and shipped to the U.S. tobacco cooperators when they become available. All preprint materials will become the property of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

ARTICLE II—PRODUCTION PHASES AND DATES

(A) In the performance of this contract, the contractor shall periodically submit scripts, photography and recordings on or before the dates listed below to enable the U.S. tobacco cooperators in consultation with representatives of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., to review for approval the following production phases:

1. The effective starting date shall be the date that this contract is signed by the authorized representatives of the U.S. tobacco cooperators and the contractor.

2. Twenty copies of the first shooting scripts on or before August 1, 1963; and 20 copies of the final shooting script on or before August 14, 1963.

3. Twenty copies of the production breakdown and shooting schedule prior to start of photography.

4. Production of field photography to commence on or about August 19, 1963, and to be completed on or about November 15, 1963.

5. Screening the assembly of all field photography, shot in the United States as well as overseas, and of all titles on or before December 15, 1963, at the contractor's studios, Burbank, Calif.

6. Reading to the screen of the English narration cued to the rough cut of the entire English version, and the same for each of the other five foreign language endings with titles (with English translations) on or before January 15, 1964, at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

7. Interlock screening of each of the six language versions on or before February 15, 1964, at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

8. Screening of the answer prints of each of the six language versions on or before March 15, 1964, at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

9. Release printing will commence immediately after answer prints are approved.

ARTICLE III. RELEASE PRINTS

(A) The contractor will provide the number of 35- and 16-millimeter release prints of each language version to meet foreign distribution requirements. In addition, the contractor shall furnish one release print

of each language version to the Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. The print costs payable by the U.S. tobacco cooperators to the contractor will be at existing laboratory prices in the motion picture industry as listed in the latest available price schedule to be provided by the contractor.

(B) The order for release prints will follow decisions to be made by the U.S. tobacco cooperators and the contractor in relation to the distribution opportunities. The contractor shall be responsible for delivery and shipment of release prints.

(C) Where foreign government restrictions for theatrical release require dubbing or printing to be performed in the country of intended distribution, such arrangements will be made by the contractor.

ARTICLE IV—DISTRIBUTION

(A) The contractor will provide for and make complete distribution arrangements through its worldwide organization for the films to be shown in theaters and made available for television showings through its distribution affiliates in the following countries:

1. England.
2. Scotland.
3. Ireland.
4. West Germany.
5. Austria.
6. The Netherlands.
7. Belgium.
8. France.
9. Luxembourg.
10. Switzerland.
11. Norway.
12. Denmark.
13. Finland.
14. Sweden.
15. Egypt.

Contractor shall have the right, but shall not be obligated, to distribute the films in all other parts of the world outside of the United States and Canada.

(B) The distribution plan for theaters will be designed to achieve the widest possible distribution throughout the 15 countries listed in section A above, for the longest possible runs, subject to any lawful restrictions or prohibitions in any such country, and to contractor's ability to obtain the relevant release prints. The contractor will provide a general schedule of anticipated theater distribution for each country listed in section A of this article.

(C) The television distribution will follow the completion of the theater release, and contractor will use its best efforts to achieve distribution via television throughout the 15 countries listed in section A of this article (where television exists).

(D) Contractor will from time to time, at the written request of the U.S. tobacco cooperators and/or the U.S. Department of Agriculture, furnish them with reports in writing showing, to the extent practical, the countries in which said films have been exhibited, the dates of release to theaters and/or for television, the approximate number of bookings and similar information. It is acknowledged, however, that contractor does not keep detailed records concerning distribution of short subject motion pictures outside the United States and Canada. Consequently, contractor shall not be liable hereunder if information furnished hereunder is deemed incomplete or inadequate by the U.S. tobacco cooperators or by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

(E) The contractor will be responsible for all costs and expenses incurred in the distribution of the films, except print costs, to the extent paid by the U.S. tobacco cooperators under article VII C.

In no event shall the U.S. tobacco cooperators be liable for distribution charges incurred by the contractor other than the amount set forth in this contract.

(F) Upon completion of theater and television distribution, the contractor will make available to the U.S. tobacco cooperators all usable release prints.

ARTICLE V—PERSONNEL, MATERIALS AND SERVICES

(A) The contractor shall furnish all personnel, materials, and services necessary for the preparation, production, and completion of this film project including research, travel and all other expenses of the contractor's personnel.

(B) The contractor shall, to the extent practical, obtain releases from all persons, professional or otherwise, who will be recognizable in the film, such releases being of a nature that will entitle the contractor to own free and clear of any claim on the part of the talent all rights of any kind in the work or contribution of the talent, subject to applicable collective bargaining agreements. Furthermore, as a prerequisite to completion of the film contract, the contractor shall assign all such releases to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and as to all recognizable persons from whom releases are not obtained, contractor will indemnify the U.S. tobacco cooperators and the U.S. Department of Agriculture against liability.

(C) The U.S. tobacco cooperators reserve the right to approve any material, service and production personnel, narrator, or others to be furnished by the contractor. Every effort will be made by both the U.S. tobacco cooperators and the contractor not to engage any person in the production of these films if the participation of such person might, for political or moral reasons, embarrass the U.S. Government.

ARTICLE VI—U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(A) Although this contract is between the U.S. tobacco cooperators and the contractor, both parties will recognize the advisory role to be performed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture representatives throughout the planning, scriptwriting, production, and distribution of these films, and its representatives must be part of the reviewing and approving committee in production steps as set forth in this contract.

(B) All preprint materials will remain in the custody of the U.S. tobacco cooperators during the period of project usefulness, not to exceed 5 years, but at the same time will be the permanent property of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. All unused film, including negative and positive out-takes and cuts will be delivered to and become the permanent property of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., upon completion of the printing of the 35-millimeter release prints and prior to the final payment to the contractor.

ARTICLE VII—CONSIDERATION AND PAYMENT

(A) For all work under this contract, except purchase of release prints as covered in (C) below, the U.S. tobacco cooperators will pay United Arab Republic (Egyptian) pounds (to be spent only in Egypt) and French francs in the total amount of:

[Currency and approximate U.S. dollar equivalent]

(Egyptian) pounds, 3,475 United Arab Republic	$8,000
French francs (new), 458,565	93,585
Total	101,585

(B) Progress payments will be made as follows:

(a) Upon completion of story treatment, 3,475 United Arab Republic (Egyptian) pounds and 69,010 French francs.

(b) Upon completion of film production, 108,210 French francs.

(c) Upon review of all field photography, 108,210 French francs.

(d) Upon final approval of the answer print, 108,210 French francs.

(e) Upon completion of all work under the contract including distribution as confirmed by the fourth quarterly distribution report, 64,925 francs.

(C) Release prints:

In addition to the contract payments as specified in (A) and (B) above, the U.S. tobacco cooperators will pay the contractor for release prints in amounts not to exceed $9,000 United States. The number of release prints required by contractor for distribution in the 15 countries specified in article IV (A), as well as in all other territories where contractor may elect to distribute said films, will be determined by contractor up to a cost of $9,000. Price will be based upon existing laboratory prices at time of ordering. If the U.S. tobacco cooperators determine that additional release prints are needed, the contractor will provide them and payment will be made in French francs.

(D) Taxes:

It is understood that the amounts to be paid, as specified in (A), (B), and (C) above, are net to contractor or its nominee and, therefore, all taxes applicable to the transfer of currency to the contractor or its nominee are to be absorbed by the U.S. tobacco cooperators.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have executed this agreement as of the 9th day of October 1963.

Contractors:

WARNER BROS. PICTURES, INC.,
R. J. OBRINGER,
Assistant Secretary.

OCTOBER 9, 1963.

U.S. tobacco cooperators:

ROBERT L. MINOR,
Authorized Representative.

AUGUST 27, 1963.

———,
Authorized Representative.

AUGUST 29, 1963.

Approved by U.S. Department of Agriculture:

RAYMOND A. IOANES,
Administrator.

AUGUST 27, 1963.

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT ON THE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF A TOBACCO MOTION PICTURE IN SEVERAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE VERSIONS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

It is herein agreed that the Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., Leaf Tobacco Exporters Association, Inc., Tobacco Associates, Inc., and the Virginia Dark-Fired and Sun-Cured Tobacco Export Association, Inc. (hereinafter called the "U.S. tobacco cooperators") shall make a 10-minute motion picture, including several foreign language versions, to be used to promote U.S. tobacco in principal tobacco markets in the world. The movie and all language versions shall be produced and distributed under the market development project agreements, No. 86502-30 in France, and No. 86512-27 in the United Arab Republic, between the U.S. tobacco cooperators and the Foreign Agricultural Service in accordance with regulations and procedures contained in FASR, title 11.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the film and the respective language versions is to aid in the promotion and expansion of U.S. tobacco exports in the target countries listed herein. The film will depict the high quality and desirability of U.S. tobacco, showing the handling, harvesting, and marketing, and the language version for each respective target area will show the utilization and production of tobacco products containing U.S. leaf.

PLANS

Subject to the approval of the Foreign Agricultural Service, the U.S. tobacco cooperators will contract with a reputable producer/distributor for the production of this film and its distribution in cinemas, TV, and

commercial libraries of the target countries as an entertainment and educational feature.

The first 7 minutes (approximately) of the film will be the same for each language version and will be filmed in the United States. This section will cover some of the historical aspects of U.S. tobacco during the Colonial days, and move into modern production, processing, and handling of tobacco today. The final 3-minute portion of each 10-minute language version will be filmed in the respective target areas, highlighting the utilization of U.S. tobacco in accordance with local customs. Each completed language version will have as much educational value and local appeal as possible but still maintain a soft-sell approach.

Among the target countries or areas to be considered for this film are the following: The United Kingdom, Germany or Austria, France or Belgium, the Netherlands, the United Arab Republic, Norway or Sweden, Spain, Japan, Thailand, and Italy.

The contract will call for research, treatment, and scripts; photography in the United States and overseas; translations and narration recordings in languages of respective target areas; editing, music; production reviews and approvals; laboratory processing and printing and distribution according to detailed specifications developed for bid purposes and approval by the Foreign Agricultural Service.

COSTS

The estimated total cost of this project to be paid from foreign currencies contributed by the Foreign Agricultural Service and U.S. dollars contributed by the U.S. tobacco cooperators is the equivalent of $124,000 as listed below:

FAS:	*Amount*
(a) France, project No. 86502-30 (dollar equivalent)	$100,000
(b) United Arab Republic, project No. 86512-27 (dollar equivalent)	15,000
U.S. tobacco cooperators: U.S. dollars	9,000
Total	124,000

It is understood that the U.S. tobacco cooperators will not enter into contracts and incur other obligations for expenditure of funds made available by the Foreign Agricultural Service in excess of the amounts indicated above without prior approval in writing by the administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service.

Based on the detailed specifications (mentioned above under plans) covering all phases of production and distribution for this project, the U.S. tobacco cooperators will issue invitations for submission of bids from reputable movie producers to perform this work. The U.S. tobacco cooperators will review bids with the Foreign Agricultural Service and obtain approval for the contract to be awarded to the selected contractor, including approval of the contract between the U.S. tobacco cooperators and movie contractor.

FILM TITLES

Copies of this picture to be used in the United States, including any acquired by the Department of Agriculture, shall have an opening title limited to the title of the film and shall have an ending as follows: "Presented in the public interest by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and The Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc.; Leaf Tobacco Exporters Association, Inc.; Tobacco Associates, Inc.; Virginia Dark-Fired and Sun-Fired Tobacco Export Association, Inc. Produced by (film maker). The end."

FILM RIGHTS AND OWNERSHIP

The U.S. tobacco cooperators shall have the right to make, distribute, and sell prints at cost or otherwise make use abroad of the film produced under this memorandum of agreement. The U.S. Department of Agriculture shall also have the right to make, distribute, and sell prints at cost or otherwise make use of the film in the United States and foreign countries as desired.

The original cut picture negative and the composite negative sound tracks shall be and remain the property of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, but shall remain in the custody of the U.S. tobacco cooperators for 2 years following the completion of the production of the picture unless otherwise agreed in writing, subject to the right of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to call for delivery of such materials at an earlier time. The U.S. Department of Agriculture shall receive all negative out-takes and cuts not in the finished picture and the separate magnetic music and narration tracks upon completion of the film.

The film produced under this memorandum of agreement shall not be copyrighted in the United States or abroad.

In witness thereof, the parties hereto have executed this agreement as of the 24th day of May 1963.

U.S. Department of Agriculture.
Approved: Foreign Agricultural Service.
DAVID L. HUME,
Assistant Administrator.
MAY 23, 1963.
Concurred in: Office of Information.
HAROLD R. LEWIS,
Acting Director.
APRIL 22, 1963.
U.S. tobacco cooperators:
ROBERT L. MINON,
Authorized Representative.
MAY 24, 1963.

[From the New Republic Magazine]

BE HAPPY, LIGHT UP

The Senate Commerce Committee has been treated to the world premiere of a new Warner Brothers film, "World of Pleasure," soon to be seen (perhaps) in theaters in 15 nations. It will not win an Oscar, but the Department of Agriculture will be happy if it just hooks a few new cigarette smokers. While the Surgeon General was reporting a causal connection between cigarette smoking and lung cancer, and while Congress was enacting a mild law requiring health warnings on cigarette packs, the Department of Agriculture was spending $106,000 to make a 20-minute film, in five different languages, touting the pleasures of smoking. The film's existence was discovered by Don Oberdorfer, a reporter for the Knight newspapers, who wondered what the Department was doing these days for tobacco growers. He found that Agriculture spent $210,000 last year to subsidize cigarette commercials in Japan, Thailand, and Austria, and that it was about to release "World of Pleasure," a fatuous travelog. Everywhere one goes, a young couple is lighting up—at Hollywood and Vine, in the shadow of the Sphinx, in a Parisian cafe, in Winston-Salem, N.C. Ephrem Zimbalist, Jr., the English-language film's narrator, delivers the cigarette message: "Capture the flavor of the land and one of its most pleasurable products."

"Tobacco is a part of the lives of millions of people throughout the world—the pure joy part." "A symbol of pleasure within the reach of everyone." "An odyssey of global enjoyment."

Nowhere in the credits is the hand of the Department of Agriculture visible. Nor is it explained that the Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, the Leaf Tobacco Exporters Association, Tobacco Associates, Inc., and the Virginia Dark-Fired and Sun-Cured Tobacco Export Association were parties to the contract with Warner Brothers. (Senator THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, who approves of the film, speculated at last week's hearing that it would spoil the film's "softsell" to disclose that the U.S. Government was responsible for it. If you labeled the film, he said, it would automatically be called propaganda. People would be saying "the Department of Agriculture is giving us a lot of bunk.")

The Department of Agriculture says it cannot discriminate against one commodity when it makes similar films promoting the sale of others—lard, for example. Moreover, the film will only be shown in countries which welcome it. (The film contract calls for distribution in England, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, all of which according to Senator MAGNUSON have government campaigns against smoking. England, MAGNUSON said, prohibits cigarette advertising altogether.) Anyway, explains the Department, the film was paid for out of counterpart funds amassed in the food-for-peace program which must be spent abroad.

David L. Hume, Assistant Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service of USDA, defends the Department for looking after the interests of the "700,000 farm families engaged in tobacco production" in the United States. In a letter to Mr. MAGNUSON, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner calls attention to broader interests: "The overwhelming weight of scientific evidence indicates a strong link between cigarette smoking and lung cancer. We consider it essential to make that fact known as widely as possible." It was Secretary Gardner's understanding that "World of Pleasure" had not yet been released. It shouldn't be.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 18, 1966]

SMOKE AMERICAN

The Department of Agriculture is in the film business. Some $106,000 from Public Law 480 funds are to be paid to Warner Bros. for a travelog called "World of Pleasure." The object of the film is to promote American tobacco, a crop that accounts for $400 million in exports a year. To this end tobacco trade groups provided a portion of the cost and supervision for the film, which subtly stresses the pleasures of smoking.

Whether the United States should be propagandizing smoking is doubtful. The film was contracted before the Surgeon General's report was issued, but in light of the public dialog that preceded the report, the decision to endorse a film endorsing tobacco was questionable. Beyond this, however, is the problem of hidden Government involvement in any medium used to convey ideas—be it films, television, or books. A number of films boosting other commodities were made prior to the tobacco film. According to the Department the Government connection isn't revealed in the credits because this information would tend to limit distribution. And well it might. The Government proudly affixes a tax seal on cigarette packages. Let it also affix its seal on the movies, books and magazines it finances.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times]

SMOKE IN WHOSE EYES?

At home, the U.S. Government by law requires a warning on every pack: "Cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health."

Abroad, the U.S. Government subsidizes the promotion of cigarettes through advertising and a color film, "World of Pleasure," which contains a soft sell for cigarette smoking.

The Department of Agriculture in 1963 contributed $106,000 in foreign currencies to funds raised by tobacco trade groups for the production of the 23-minute film showing young couples enjoying cigarettes together. This fiscal year the Department of Agriculture will spend $210,000 to advertise in Austria, Japan, and Thailand cigarettes made from American tobacco.

While it is true that Congress in Public Law 480 authorized such expenditures as

part of the effort to expand tobacco and cigarette export, there is no compulsion on the Department to engage abroad in this promotional effort directly at variance with governmental policy at home.

Furthermore, the law requiring the health warning specifically exempts cigarettes sold abroad. And Congress has several times refused to eliminate Government supports for the tobacco that, in the form of cigarettes, "may be hazardous to your health."

The present two-faced policy badly needs correction both in Congress and in the Department.

THE ROLE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE IN INVESTIGATION AND OVERSIGHT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in his argument in the proceedings against the dean of St. Asaph, in 1783, the noted English attorney, Thomas Erskine, gave this description of the processes of government. He declared:

> The prosperity and greatness of empires ever depended, and ever must depend, upon the use their inhabitants do make of their reason in devising wise laws, and the spirit and virtue with which they watch over their just execution.

In these few words, Erskine described what have been and are today two fundamental responsibilities of the legislative branch—the enactment of laws as required by the Nation's needs, and the exercise of a continuing vigilance over the execution of these laws, the so-called oversight function.

Today, I wish to explore the investigative and legislative oversight role of the congressional committee.

Since World War II, few subjects have been the focus of as much literary comment as that of the investigating role of congressional committees. Violent criticism, based upon some aspects of past investigations, has been poured upon them, but over and again commentators have strongly supported their necessity and lauded the part they play in the maintenance of our system of free government.

The congressional investigation has often been called, "The grand inquest of the nation," a term first used by William Pitt in the House of Commons, in 1742, in describing the duty of Parliament "to inquire into every step of public management, either abroad or home, in order to see that nothing has been done amiss"—"Grand Inquest," by Telford Taylor, 1955, page 1.

The three major functions of Congress in today's world of complex relationships, and technological development, may be listed as: First. The enactment of legislation; second, supervision and oversight over the vast plethora of executive agencies, authorities and bureaus, and third, the informing and enlightening of public opinion as to the policies and operation of the Federal Government.

To its credit, Congress, perhaps alone among the major legislative bodies of the world, has offered, through its performance of these three functions, resistance to the growing menace to our republican form of government by technocrats behind the facade of a formal constitution.

In modern times with the executive branch constitution the primary fount of legislative proposals, some commentators such as Dr. George Galloway, senior specialist in American government in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, place emphasis on the second function, stating:

> Today, legislative oversight has become a, if not the, principal activity of the standing committees of both Houses ("History of the House of Representatives," George B. Galloway, Demas Crawill Co., 1961, p. 185).

Woodrow Wilson was in accord many years ago, and also favored the third function, that of informing, when he said:

> Quite as important as legislation is vigilant oversight of administration, and even more important than legislation is the instruction and guidance in political affairs which the people might receive from a body which kept all national concerns suffused in a broad daylight of discussion. * * * The informing function of Congress—

He declared—

> should be preferred even to its legislative function.

The instrument which Congress uses to secure the information to enable it to legislate and to inform and to perform the oversight function, is the committee, both standing and select. A standing committee, as we all know, is one, the existence of which is provided for in the rules of both Houses and exercises its functions continuously throughout each Congress. A select or special committee is one created on an ad hoc basis for a specific purpose and usually has a life limited to one Congress or less.

The work of congressional committees in maintaining an unrelenting watch over the activities of the bureaucracy is a result, in good part, of our system of separation of powers wherein the Executive works with, rather than controls, the Legislature, and wherein no agency, by and large, can operate irresponsibly for long in significant matters. Sooner or later it must expect to justify its action before its constitutional equal. And, despite alarm in some quarters at the history of aggrandizement of the Presidency, Congress, of late, is more than holding its own. Whether this is merely a cyclical swing remains to be seen, but the possibilities are that the role of Congress will continue to be that of a strong and influential institution of government. The history of freedom in the Nation will, to a considerable extent, depend upon its persistent adherence to this role.

Its committees are its major functionaries in this respect. They conduct investigations, analyze facts, and report conclusions and recommendations to their parent body.

In exercising authority to investigate committees carry out a legislative power that is older than the Constitution itself. As expressed by the Supreme Court in *McGrain* v. *Daugherty*, in 1927—273 U.S. 135:

> The power of inquiry—with process to enforce it—is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function. It was so regarded and employed in American legislatures before the Constitution was framed and ratified.

It was a practice found in the colonial assemblies and in Parliament. And article I, section 1, of the Constitution, in granting all legislative powers to Congress, also contains implicit authorization for legislative investigations. To quote again from McGrain against Daugherty:

> A legislative body cannot legislate wisely or effectively in the absence of information respecting the conditions which the legislation itself is intended to affect or change; and where the legislative body does not itself possess the requisite information—which not infrequently is three—recourse must be had to others who do possess it.

There have been considerably more than 800 major investigations conducted in our national history by congressional committees, the major portion of them during this century, reflecting the increasing oversight role assumed by Congress. Only three Congresses have been barren of legislative inquests, while no administration has been immune. Dr. George Galloway reports—supra, pages 185–186—that as many inquiries have been conducted by each Congress since 1950 as were carried on in the whole 19th century.

This development has been due, at least in part, to the directive in section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 that "each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution of any laws" by the administrative agencies within their jurisdiction. It has also been facilitated by the increase in standing committee staffs which have doubled in the Senate and tripled in the House during the past decade—Galloway, supra, page 186.

Since 1792, when the first celebrated congressional investigation was initiated by a select committee of the House of Representative appointed to look into the defeat of Gen. Arthur St. Clair by a league of Indians near the present site of Fort Recovery, Ohio, many investigations have been outstanding in bringing to light and correcting egregious misconduct within the administration, and in achieving far-reaching legislative accomplishments.

Examples of the former are the Teapot Dome oil reserve scandal of the Harding era and the income tax administration scandal of the Truman regime. In the latter area, studies of immigration, lobbying, munitions manufacturing, stock exchange operations, conservation, monopoly in industry, the organization of Congress, and the organization of the executive branch, are examples—see Ogg and Ray's Essentials of American Government, eighth edition, 1961, page 199.

Among the outstanding achievements which must be credited to congressional inquiries are the discovery of General Wilkinson's part in the Burr conspiracy in 1810; the disclosure of Andrew Jackson's conduct in the Seminole War of 1819–20, and of the light regard in which he seemed to hold certain restrictions of the Constitution; the unearthing of the Credit Mobilizer scandal of 1872, which jeopardized the political careers of James G. Blaine and Schuyler Colfax; the disclosure of frauds in the star route mail service in 1884; and the resignation

of Secretary Ballinger after his sensational controversy with Gifford Pinchot in 1911, which contributed to the disruption of the Taft administration and the split in the Republican Party in 1912. "The Investigative Function of Congress," George B. Galloway, American Political Science Review, volume 21: 47–70, February 1927.

Among more recent investigations have been those of the celebrated "Truman committee" during World War II, the efforts of which, by uncovering waste and contract manipulation, resulting in the savings of billions of dollars, of war financing, and of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight in 1957–58, which, in investigating the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies turned up evidence which led to the resignation of President Eisenhower's White House chief, former Gov. Sherman Adams of vicuna coat fame.

It is also true that Congress has not always lived up to the highest standards in conducting investigations. Political motivations have sometimes exerted an influence on investigations particularly where the President and the Congress might be of different political persuasions. The balance sheet, however, over the long run, reveals far greater benefits from investigations than abuses.

The power to investigate, while inherently a function of the legislative body itself, cannot be exercised by so unwieldy an institution. It is thus delegated to those legislative instrumentalities which can most appropriately utilize it, the committees.

For Senate standing committees there is continuing statutory authority to conduct hearings and investigations into matters within the jurisdiction of each respective committee and to issue subpenas in connection therewith. This was conferred by section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—2 United States Code 190b. The jurisdiction of each of the 16 Senate standing committees is set forth in Senate rule XXV.

House committees do not have the benefit of such a statute. Their authority to conduct investigations is conferred through the House rules and by action of the House itself. The House, in theory, has authority limited to each 2-year Congress. Consequently, it readopts its entire set of rules at the beginning of each Congress. House rule XI sets forth the jurisdiction of each of the 20 standing committees, and authorizes only the Committee on Appropriations, the Government Operations Committee, and the Committee on Un-American Activities to hold hearings, conduct investigations, and issue subpenas.

The other 17 committees—excluding the Rules Committee which does little if no investigating—receive authority to investigate by separate resolutions passed by the House early in each Congress. Since these constitute in reality amendments of the rules, the resolutions after being introduced are referred to the House Rules Committee and reported from that committee to the full body.

If select committees are to be created in either House to conduct special investigations this is achieved through an authorizing resolution adopted by the respective chamber.

In a few instances joint committees have been created by the Congress to investigate or watch over specific matters. Current examples are the Joint Committee on Defense Production and the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.

A decision by a committee to investigate can be made by a majority of the members but the chairman usually plays a very influential role in such a determination. Such decisions are significant because committees are the arms of Congress in assuring executive responsibility to obey the intent of the law and they have a profound influence on the exercise of administrative power. The existence of their specialization makes them formidable rivals to the departments or agencies in the evolution of policy in the areas of their jurisdiction.

A committee investigation, once having been decided upon, is, in essence, a process and not a single, definable instrument. It can perform many functions and is highly adaptable in the detail of its rituals.

It is employed to supplement the power of the purse and the lawmaking power and to supplant in large measure the even more unwieldy power of impeachment.

Investigation is synonymous, in many respects, with supervision. Governmental efficiency, the protection of private rights, and the execution of legislative policy as the will of the Nation, demand of Congress that it devise methods of supervising the administration of the law and the conduct of executive officers. It often enables responsibility, otherwise confused under our multiple agency system, to be fixed for every questionable administrative act and informs Congress when the Executive is opposed to the enforcement of the law and when legislative action is perforce required.

Most investigations commence with the securing of background information by committee staffs through their own research or with the aid of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. A checklist is made of interested persons and a tentative roster of witnesses, preferably balanced, is drawn up. Depending upon the hearing it may be composed entirely of voluntary witnesses or it may contain names of those who, the committee believes, will require summoning through use of the subpena.

After the initial spadework is done, a date is set for the commencement of the investigation.

Following the hearings, the committee meets in executive session to draw up an appropriate bill, if necessary, and write its report containing its recommendations.

Investigations may be directed at one or more objects. They may be of persons, particularly by Senate committees concerned with confirmation of Presidential nominations.

They may be of the administration of laws. These are sometimes undertaken independently, or they may be made in connection with appropriation measures or with bills amending, repealing, or modifying existing policies or practices.

They may be of "problems," such as in recent years, the Communist conspiracy, disarmament, and racketeering in labor unions. Sometimes these too, occur in connection with consideration of a bill.

An investigation, then, may have several roles. It is a primary factor in executive-legislative relations, a substantial educator of the public, a means of supervision over the carrying out of legislative policies, and of the unearthing of executive branch misfeasance or maladministration. It is a source for the acquisition of information essential to the process of legislating.

Investigations may curb the administration or they may aid it. Early in 1932, for instance, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was asked to investigate the activities of the Federal Farm Board. This agency, created by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929, had lost more than two-thirds of a $500 million revolving fund appropriated for the stabilization of the prices of agricultural commodities. The report, issued in 1935, was, to say the least, not complimentary.

On the other hand, an investigation into a problem may be in response to an administration need for assistance. An investigation by a joint committee, in 1937, into forms of income tax avoidance sustained the need for reform proposals that had been suggested to the President by the Secretary of the Treasury. Legislation designed to plug the loopholes was soon enacted.

These then are the major forms and functions of the congressional committee investigating process. They are peculiarly adapted to those situations in which no law has been violated, but in which there has been an apparent betrayal of public trust including failure to carry out the intent of Congress, or, distortion of that intent.

Their success depends upon numerous factors. A chairman can make or break an investigation through the use of staff intelligently, the allocation of questioning time to committee members, and the "tone" he imparts to the occasion. Adequate staff and adequate preparation are essential. The degree of witness cooperation can have a marked influence. Prior planning on areas for the direction of questions is helpful in achieving desired information.

The process relates to these factors and more, and often, if they are fully considered, the results can be enlightening and beneficial to the Nation as a whole.

Before turning to the constitutional and legal aspects of committee investigations, let me add a brief additional word about oversight. Oversight, as I have mentioned, a function traditionally practiced by committees and formalized in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

It is a scrutiny over the administration and execution of the laws. All committees exercise one or more forms of oversight. The Appropriations Committees and the Government Operations Committees are consistently involved in examining the allocation and expenditure of funds. Other committees have more limited areas of oversight depending upon their jurisdiction.

Oversight deals with the control and supervision of administration and of standards to be applied. It can be and is a source of some conflict between the legislature and the executive since there is no simple line beyond which Congress cannot tread in attempting to supervise the administration of the laws.

Control is essential; not only to reduce the tendencies of bureaucracy to become a force unto itself, but also to insure integrity and efficiency in the public service. Involved, moreover, are questions of policy determination, loyalty of personnel, and political power which can result from the administration of laws.

Oversight utilizes many techniques in addition to investigations. These involve detailed legislation; the use of congressional vetoes over executive branch reorganization proposals submitted under the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended; the confirmation of executive appointees; congressional veto power established under acts such as the Federal Highway Act of 1956 which requires that allocations to the several States be reported to Congress by the Secretary of Commerce and be approved by concurrent resolution before going into effect, or the committee veto such as was incorporated into the Public Buildings Contract Purchase Act of 1954, under which no funds could be appropriated for annual payments in excess of $20,000 in any lease-purchase contract unless the contract had been approved by the Public Works Committee of each House; use of concurrent or other resolutions to terminate specific programs or activities; the requirement of numerous reports to be submitted to the Congess or to specific committees; use of resolutions of inquiry directed to the departments requesting factual information, among others.

These techniques and more are useful in the exercise of the oversight function.

How effective is it all? This is hard to judge. Woodrow Wilson wrote in 1885 in a famous passage:

> Even the special, irksome, ungracious investigations which (Congress) from time to time institutes in its spasmodic endeavors to dispel or confirm suspicions of malfeasance or of wanton corruption do not afford it more than a glimpse of the inside of a small province of Federal administration. Hostile or designing officials can always hold it at arm's length by dexterous evasions and concealments. It can violently disturb, but it cannot often fathom the waters of the sea in which the bigger fish of the civil service swim and feed. Its dragnet stirs without cleaning the bottom.

This is perhaps a somewhat bleak picture, but Congress is in many cases at the mercy of a department, especially the Department of Defense, because of the sheer magnitude and technical nature of its operations. The necessary secrecy surrounding many military matters constitutes another hazard in this particular connection. So does the exercise of the so-called executive privilege whereby the President, for security or other reasons, refuses to release information to a committee.

On balance, however, Congress is successful in its efforts to keep the administration even more sensitive to public opinion than it otherwise would have been. There does exist an impressive record of concrete reforms and results. In the complexities of the executive-legislative struggle and cooperation, Congress has, and should have, in the opinion of many commentators, a significant role in the control and oversight of the administration despite differences on the proper extent of such control and the skill and objectivity with which it is exercised by Congress.

It is an essential and inevitable response of Congress to the dangers of a technical monopoly on the part of the bureaucracy. As we have noted, oversight investigations have increased markedly in the past two decades and the conclusion must be drawn thereby that the most all-pervading and powerful of our constitutional principles, those of the separation of powers and of checks and balances continue to have meaning and applicability in our system of free government.

But, bitter controversy has sometimes raged around the operation of the investigating process. It has stemmed, in general, from differences over whether an investigation has stepped over the line of obtaining information for legislative purposes into the area of harassment or exposure of the private affairs or opinions of individuals, and from the fact that a necessary corollary of the power of inquiry is authority to enforce it through resort to coercion for contempt.

Despite the fact that courts have laid down some standards to govern the conduct of congressional investigations, there are still numerous areas where the law is yet unsettled, and these, of course, constitute an invitation to controversy. For it is with the conduct of investigations that lawyers are most concerned and involved. They may appear as counsel for a witness before a committee, they may defend against a contempt citation in court. At issue are deep constitutional principles which run the gamut from the necessary use of government authority for the promotion of the general welfare and the maintenance of public order, to the preservation of individual rights.

Commencing with the decision in *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* in 1881, 103 U.S. 168, the Supreme Court has differentiated between investigations which are "in aid of the legislative function" and those that involve the private affairs of citizens. The former is a legitimate use of the investigating power, the latter is questionable. The Court summarized the principles relevant to the investigating power stating:

> That neither House of Congress possesses a general power of making inquiry into the private affairs of citizens; that the power actually possessed is limited to inquiries relating to matters of which the particular House has jurisdiction and in respect of which it rightfully may take other action; that if the inquiry relates to a matter wherein relief or redress could be had only by a judicial proceeding it is not within the range of this power, but must be left to the courts, conformably to the constitutional separation of powers; and that for the purpose of determining the essential character of the inquiry recourse may be had to the resolution or order under which it is made.

Admittedly, how much of a limitation the "legislative purpose" doctrine actually furnishes is unclear. The resolution empowering the investigation does not have to state explictly that it is intended in aid of legislation as long as it "plainly is one on which legislation could be had and would be materially aided by the information which the investigation was calculated to elicit"—*Kilbourn* v. *Thompson*, supra, page 177.

It is not necessary, even, that the authorizing resolution avow an intent to legislate, because: "it was certainly not necessary that the resolutions should declare in advance what the Senate meditated doing when the investigation was concluded." *In re Chapman*, 166 U.S. 661, 679—1897.

Neither does the limitation of the subject of investigation to that on which Congress may legislate seem to furnish a clear guide. As Mr. Justice Harlan recently wrote for the Court in 1959:

> The scope of the power of inquiry, in short, is as penetrating and far reaching as the potential power to enact and appropriate under the Constitution (*Barenblatt* v. *U.S.*, 360 U.S. 109, 111).

And again, in *Tenney* v. *Brandhove*, 341 U.S. 367—1951—the late Justice Frankfurter, in speaking for the Court, declared:

> Investigations, whether by standing or special committees, are an established part of representative Government * * * to find that a committee's investigation has exceeded the bounds of legislative power it must be obvious that there was an usurpation of functions exclusively vested in the judiciary or the executive.

Today, despite admonitory language in *Watkins* v. *U.S.*, 354 U.S. 178—1957—that there is no general authority to expose the private affairs of individuals without justification in terms of the functions of Congress, the exception of a nonlegislative purpose has lost much of its meaning.

The power of Congress to legislate in the field of Communist activity, for instance, has received such broad sanction from the courts—see Barenblatt against the United States, supra—and the precision with which authorizing resolutions are being drafted, have effected a severe reduction in controversies over whether a committee has projected its inquiry into an area not sanctioned by the parent body. This particular objection no longer seems to have the pertinency that it once possessed.

Attention consequently is directed to those other areas where witnesses seek to raise defenses, in judicial proceedings, against investigations. Two major areas of defense have been attempted to be created against the investigating power. These involve assertions that the ques-

tion was not pertinent to the inquiry; or, that notwithstanding the legitimacy of the committee's inquiry, the invasion of the witness' privacy, which the interrogation entails, outweighs in importance the committee's need for the information sought to be obtained thereby and, accordingly, is within the protection afforded by amendment I.

Both defenses involve the power of Congress to treat the failure or refusal of an individual to comply with the processes of either House as contempt. The case of *Anderson* v. *Dunn*, 19 U.S. 204—1821—early settled the question by holding that either House may attach and punish a person, other than a Member, for contempt of its authority. Contempt has usually been described as consisting of ignoring its processes or refusing to answer questions—see McGrain against Daugherty, supra.

The power to punish for contempt is not unlimited, however. The power of at least the House of Representatives to imprison for contempt must terminate with adjournment—Anderson against Dunn, supra. Consequently, Congress enacted a statute, presently codified as 2 U.S.C. 192, which provides that when a person summoned as a witness before a committee, willfully defaults or refuses to answer pertinent questions, he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 and imprisonment for not less than 1 month or more than 1 year.

Citations for contempt, voted by either House, are referred to the U.S. District Attorney for the commencement of appropriate proceedings in court to effect the statutory coercion and punishment. Although both Houses still possess authority to try individuals for contempt before their own bar, this practice has long been out of date, and resort is made to the statutory procedure under which a person ascertained to be in contempt can be punished for a term extending beyond the adjournment of a specific Congress.

Privileges of witnesses in the Senate rest in good part upon the respective rules of each committee relative to hearings. Such matters as right to counsel, confrontation of witnesses, or cross-examination, for instance rest upon such rules.

In the House, the same procedure exists except for a limited number of privileges adopted by that body as a permanent part of its Rule XI in 1955. These require the presence of at least two committee members for the purpose of taking testimony, the making of an opening statement by the committee chairman relative to the subject of the investigation, the furnishing of a copy of the committee rules to the witness, the privilege of allowing the witness to be accompanied by counsel for the purpose of advice concerning constitutional rights, and the handling of testimony that might tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. Rule XI also provides that no testimony taken in executive session may be released without the consent of the committee.

These protections, many of which are accorded by Senate committees as well, have gone far to reduce alleged abuses in committee hearings.

Problems still exist, however. For instance, the extent of objection by a witness to the presence of banks of television lights and cameras or of groups of reporters or spectators, has not yet been settled.

Whether a hearing is to be public or in executive session still rests in the discretion of each committee.

The legal effect of an objection of the absence of a quorum is still open.

The major cases in recent years have dealt with matters of pertinency both in the refusal to answer questions—Watkins against the United States, supra—and in the sufficiency of indictments under the contempt statutes, and with efforts to raise free speech as a defense.

As respects pertinency, the Supreme Court in the Watkins decision in 1954, emphasized that inasmuch as a witness by his refusal, exposes himself to a criminal prosecution for contempt, he is entitled to be informed of the relation of the question to the subject of the investigation with the same precision as the due process clause requires of statutes defining crimes.

Later cases have indicated, however, that the requirement of pertinency can easily be met by the committee chairman or counsel making a few introductory remarks, general in content, on the subject under investigation and providing a connection between the subject and the particular witness—see, for instance, *Braden* v. *U.S.*, 366 U.S. 431—1961.

Nevertheless, indictments under the contempt statute must indicate more than a mere reference to pertinency, and must show an identification of the subject in sufficient detail to inform the witness—*U.S.* v. *Russel*, 369 U.S. 749—1962.

Defense through use of the first amendment has thus far run into the so-called balancing formula whereby courts balance competing private and public interests that are at stake—Barenblatt against the United States, supra. Generally, once it has been established that communism is involved in the subject matter under investigation, the balance will be struck in favor of the governmental interest in protecting the national security—*Wilkinson* v. *U.S.*, 365 U.S. 399—1961.

Consequently, the first amendment road of defense has yet to be fully developed.

The majority of witnesses, of course, rely upon the fifth amendment and its protection against self-incrimination. The privilege is available to a witness before a congressional committee—*Quinn* v. *U.S.* 349 U.S. 115—1955—and is one that must be accorded liberal construction—ibidem.

To have it claimed by a witness, it need only be evident from the implications of the question, in the setting in which it is asked, that a responsive answer could invoke an injurious disclosure—*Hoffman* v. *U.S.*, 341 U.S. 479—1951.

Thus, although a witness is not excused from testifying "merely because he declares that in doing so he would incriminate himself," a claim of privilege will generally be sustained unless it is "perfectly clear, from a careful consideration of all the circumstances in the case, that the witness is mistaken, and that the answers cannot possibly have such a tendency to incriminate"—*Temple* v. *Commonwealth*, 75 Va. 892—1881.

The privilege is also available where an answer might divulge "links in a chain of evidence" required for the prosecution of the witness—*Councilman* v. *Hitchcock*, 142 U.S. 547—1892.

The privilege applies to production of records so long as they are the private property of the person claiming the privilege, or at least in his possession in a purely personal capacity—*Boyd* v. *U.S.*, 116 U.S. 616—1886.

A witness may waive the privilege, and it has been held that he must explictly claim it or he will be considered to have waived it—*Rogers* v. *U.S.*, 340 U.S. 367—1951.

This puts a witness in something of a dilemma at times, because he can never really know what questions he can safely answer without being held to have waved the privilege.

In any event, he is not the final judge of the validity of his claim, and the fact that he may raise it before a committee is no guarantee that he will not be cited for contempt with the ultimate determination of the question being made by the courts.

The cases cited have involved private citizens. The courts have not really had the opportunity to deal with the critical problem of the refusal of an executive branch officer to testify before a committee. Presidential prerogatives, including the making of a decision by the Department of Justice to prosecute an executive branch officer in such a case, would be involved. This is perhaps more of a political than a legal question and adjustments in such a situation, outside of the law, might be preferable.

In any event, standards have been developed as respects the purpose of investigations and the conduct thereof. The scope and conduct of congressional investigations have been subjects of controversy throughout our history. Their powers and procedures have been bitterly attacked and vigorously defended. Constitutional protections have slowly been devised, however, and abuses have led many committees to adopt codes of fair procedure along with that of the House of Representatives.

It is to be hoped and perhaps it can be said with growing certainty that the discrediting and harmful elements in investigations will continue to decrease, as they have for the most part decreased in recent years. They never did affect more than a minority of the committees, although they obtained a far greater proportion of public attention.

In spite of the furor that has sometimes been generated about investigations, it is equally important to view them in perspective and to consider their function in our system of government. Hardly anybody wants to abolish them because it is recognized that their role in our system of free government is

essential to the preservation of representative democracy.

In closing, I would like to quote from the work by Ernest S. Griffith entitled, "Congress, Its Contemporary Role"—1961, page 108—wherein the author sums up what we have been discussing tonight:

> In conclusion, we repeat that the investigation has not one role, but several. It is a process, an instrument, if you will, to carry out a number of functions. It has grown greatly in frequency and prestige, as the agenda of Congress has multiplied many times, and as the problems facing the Nation have grown in magnitude and complexity.
>
> Trends are observable, chiefly in the direction of perfecting its technique and safeguarding it against abuses. Skill in questioning, focusing upon the relevant, buttressing by research at both the preparatory and synthesizing stages, streamlining of press relations, increasing nonpartisanship, development of codes of fair and orderly procedure—these and other trends are making the congressional investigation a potent and dramatic instrument in governance. It is the major factor in legislative-executive relations, the major educator of the public in dramatizing issues (rivaled only by the President's press conference), one among several tools to serve as the basis for congressional decisions. We venture to predict that, as it makes further gains in responsibility and precision, it will appear more and more clearly as a vital part of the democratic process.

RESOLUTION OF THE PERUVIAN CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES ENDORSING THE VIEWS EXPRESSED BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT CONCERNING THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND THE UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD LATIN AMERICA IN GENERAL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Department of State has sent me a copy of a note from the Peruvian Ministry of Foreign Relations transmitting to the American Embassy in Lima the text of a resolution by the Peruvian Chamber of Deputies endorsing the views I expressed last fall concerning the Dominican Republic and United States policy toward Latin America in general. I have also received a transcript of the debate in the Peruvian Chamber on this matter, and I ask unanimous consent that the note and the transcript be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The RECORD should show that the four deputies who participated in the discussion represent the four major parties in the Peruvian Congress from both the Government and the opposition. Alfredo Garcia Llosa is a Christian Democrat; Andres Townsend Ezcurra is an Aprista—and also Secretary General of the Latin American Parliament; Ciro Alegria Bazan is a member of the Popular Action Party of President Belaunde Terry—and also a noted Peruvian author; and Jose Benza Picon is a member of the Odriista National Union. I am, of course, very gratified that my views found such a warm response in Peru, and I take this opportunity to express publicly my appreciation for the remarks which were made.

I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed in the RECORD translations of sundry newspaper editorials and columns from El Tiempo, of Bogotá; El Espectador, of Bogotá; and El Mercurio, of Santiago, concerning U.S. policy toward Latin America. I point out that all of these papers are highly respected and take a generally middle-of-the-road or conservative view of social and economic questions.

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

[Informal translation]

The Honorable EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CITY:

The Ministry of Foreign Relations presents its compliments to the Embassy of the United States and has the honor to transmit a resolution of the order of the day approved by the Peruvian Chamber of Deputies the 25th of the present month:

"The Peruvian Chamber of Deputies resolves to express its appreciation for the words of U.S. Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT with respect to the relations of his country with Latin America and to congratulate him for the effort he is making in order that the American people may be better acquainted with the problems of Latin America, which doubtless will result in an improvement in the friendly relations between the United States and Latin America."

The Ministry of Foreign Relations takes advantage of this opportunity to renew to the honorable Embassy of the United States of America the sentiments of its most high and distinguished consideration.

LIMA, *October 29, 1965.*

TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS MADE BY DEPUTIES GARCÍA LLOSA, ANDRÉ TOWNSEND EZCURRA, CIRO ALEGRÍA BAZÁN, AND JOSE BENZA PICÓN AT THE SESSION OF OCTOBER 25, 1965

GARCÍA LLOSA. Mr. Chairman, may I have the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the Deputy from the Department of Lima.

GARCÍA LLOSA. Mr. Chairman, the Saturday newspapers published a cabled report stating that the U.S. Senator from the State of Arkansas, Senator FULBRIGHT, has made some additional remarks in the Senate, requesting a revision of U.S. policy in Latin America, and asking that this important problem be debated in public so that the entire Nation may know about it.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that the complete text of Senator FULBRIGHT's remarks in the Senate on September 15 is in my hands, and I think that they are so important to the Latin American nations that they deserve a very careful analysis. Senator FULBRIGHT is chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and, as such, referred in his remarks chiefly to the situation in the Dominican Republic, but he took advantage of the opportunity to pass judgment also on U.S. policy in Latin America.

With respect to the U.S. action in the Dominican Republic, Senator FULBRIGHT reached three conclusions. The first was that U.S. policy in Santo Domingo lacked candor. Here, he was referring to the fact that when the Marines invaded Santo Domingo, the United States announced that it was sending them to protect American citizens residing in that country. Senator FULBRIGHT came to the conclusion that that statement lacked candor, because the truth of the matter was that the intervention by the U.S. Government in Santo Domingo was to prevent the victory of the rebel forces, which, it was believed, it was assumed, were strongly infiltrated by Communists. Senator FULBRIGHT makes an analysis in his statement, in which he comes to the conclusion that all those reports were exaggerated, and so this also lacked foundation.

Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to digress a bit in connection with this first conclusion of Senator FULBRIGHT, because precisely when I was in Venezuela a few weeks ago following the terrible, unfortunate events that occurred in Los Angeles, where there were a number of bloody incidents, a Venezuelan newspaper published a sensational column on its first page, which read approximately as follows: "We do not understand what the Latin American governments are waiting for before landing troops in Los Angeles to protect the Latin American citizens who are in danger in that troubled country." This digression is to the point, Mr. Chairman, because Senator FULBRIGHT's words demonstrate that the intervention by the United States in Santo Domingo was just as appropriate as the comment made by the Venezuelan newspaper.

The second conclusion reached by Senator FULBRIGHT is that such unilateral intervention was hasty, illegal, and therefore mistaken.

Third, he stated that with such intervention, the United States offended the dignity and self-respect that the Latin American peoples deserve, especially, he said, all those young and idealistic Latin Americans who trusted and hoped for another attitude by the United States. It should be said, then, that Senator FULBRIGHT's conclusions in connection with the problem of Santo Domingo are completely in harmony with the resolutions adopted by this Chamber.

The protest made here and in the Senate and in many parliamentary bodies of Latin America, and those that various governments in this part of the world have made, agree completely with Senator FULBRIGHT's line of thought.

However, Mr. Chairman, Senator FULBRIGHT went further. He said that in his opinion the United States is possibly the most conservative country in the world; and this is perfectly understandable in a country that has reached the stage of development that the United States has reached; that has a wealth and power about which it can feel satisfied; power, wealth, and prosperity that it wishes to preserve. Senator FULBRIGHT added that for that very reason, the nature of the social revolution in Latin America cannot be understood in his country. He added that for that same reason it is inexplicable that the United States should have adopted the attitude it has adopted in Santo Domingo, because in doing so, it has violated the Charter of the Organization of American States; and it is incomprehensible that a conservative country, whose stability and order are based fundamentally on respect for the law, should have violated the law. In this way, the doors are being opened for other countries, for others, also to violate the law and their international commitments.

This obviously is a great truth and demonstrates the serene, profound analysis Senator FULBRIGHT made of the situation in Santo Domingo.

But although, as I said a moment ago, the fundamental purpose of his remarks was to refer to the problem of Santo Domingo, perhaps the most important and fundamental aspect of his statement was the analysis he made of the relations between the United States and Latin America, that is to say, of U.S. foreign policy in Latin America. This indictment demonstrates not only a familiarity with, a thorough knowledge of the problems of Latin America, but a deep understanding of them, the consequence, undoubtedly, of his familiarity; a familiarity and understanding that, unfortunately, many U.S. leaders do not yet share.

Mr. FULBRIGHT has said in the United States what we Christian Democrats and many other Latin Americans have said, that is, that the future of Latin America is on the horns of a dilemma, not of communism or

a continuation of the status quo, but the dilemma, on the basis of an inevitable social revolution, of which of two roads to take, communism or social revolution accomplished by new democratic forces, such as the Christian Democratic movement and others that are struggling in Latin America to establish social justice. In other words, the dilemma is not communism or oligarchy, but communism or democratic revolution.

Senator FULBRIGHT quite rightly mentions that all these reform movements in Latin America usually receive Communist support, and that if the United States, for that reason alone, that is to say, because communism capitalizes on a reform movement in Latin America or endeavors to capitalize on it, is going to oppose it—to go further, is going to combat it actively—it will end up making itself a prisoner or an ally of the reactionary, unpopular, and corrupt oligarchies that wish to preserve the status quo in Latin America.

Referring to the United States, he says: "We cannot have it both ways: we must choose between the Alliance for Progress, which means the road of social revolution, and preservation of the status quo in Latin America, thereby making ourselves allies of the oligarchies."

Senator FULBRIGHT maintains that it is preferable to compete with the Communists in those reform movements in which they want to take part, those they wish to exploit; that is a thousand times preferable to giving them an open field. And he especially emphasizes that the most important thing—and he stresses this, Mr. Chairman—that the most important thing is that "economic development and social justice are themselves the primary and most reliable security against Communist subversion."

To sum up, Senator FULBRIGHT suggests that the United States-Latin American policy be revised, applying a greater knowledge of the causes and reasons for the social revolution in Latin America. He insists on the need that all this be known in order to understand better the reaction of the Latin American peoples, and therefore, that the U.S. policy should be formed in harmony with such knowledge.

He referred in his remarks to President Frei's trip to Europe, praising efforts to establish links between Europe and other continents and Latin America. And he concluded, Mr. Chairman, with a few sentences, which, if perhaps you will forgive any mistakes I may make in translation, I am going to read to you because I think that they are really important and should be known in their entirety in this Chamber, in this country, and in all the countries of Latin America: "I think further that it would be a fine thing if Latin American countries were to undertake a program of their own for 'building bridges' to the world beyond the Western Hemisphere—to Europe and Asia and Africa, and to the Communist countries if they wish. Such relationships, to be sure, would involve a loosening of ties to the United States in the immediate future, but in the long run, I feel sure, they would make for both happier and stronger bonds with the United States, happier because they would be free, stronger because they would be dignified and self-respecting as they never had been before."

These words, Mr. Chairman, show not only a profound trust in the peoples of Latin America but an unshakable faith in the strength of democracy that undoubtedly is sadly lacking in many McCarthyites both there and here.

It has been said that we Christian Democrats are anti-American; that has been said because we think, and have often expressed, the same things Senator FULBRIGHT has said. Can anyone believe that Senator FULBRIGHT is anti-American? Or perhaps we Christian Democrats are anti-American because we think the same as Senator FULBRIGHT, yet Senator FULBRIGHT is not anti-American although he thinks the same as the Christian Democrats?

These questions that I am asking myself can be applied not only to Christian Democrats but, as I said a moment ago, to the vast majority of Latin Americans who share Senator FULBRIGHT's ideas. All those who share this line of thought must be labeled anti-American.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who are familiar with the United States cannot be anti-American. I have visited the United States many times, I have perhaps traveled over most of the country; I have had the opportunity to talk with people at all social levels, of all origins, races, and religions, and when I did so, and after doing so, I came to the conviction that they are a healthy, democratic people who fully share the thoughts of Latin Americans. Unfortunately, what happens is that the American people are not familiar with the Latin American situation, they do not know what our problems are, do not know what our actual situation is. And that is why, first of all, they do not play a more active role in the Latin American policy; and that also explains why there is frequently a contradiction between the position of the Government of the United States and the thought and tradition of the people of the United States. What actually happens is that, whereas the American people are worried about the internal problems of their country and are worried to a certain extent about foreign problems relating to Russia and perhaps Europe, they have an almost total ignorance of the problems of Latin America. So it is that, whereas they have a decisive influence on domestic policy, and their opinion is taken into account in forming the foreign policy with Russia and Europe, the American people entrust their Government almost entirely with everything relating to the Latin American policy and have no influence on it with regard to that policy.

That is why Senator FULBRIGHT's statement is of extraordinary importance; it is important because, as I said a moment ago, he is asking not only a revision of U.S. policy toward Latin America, but he is conducting a genuine campaign in his country to have Latin American problems discussed fully in public debate; that is to say, he is asking everyone, all of public opinion in the United States, to take part in the discussion concerning the establishment, or rather, the revision of the U.S. policy line. Like me, Senator FULBRIGHT is convinced that when the American people become familiar with the problems of Latin America, when they know the causes of the social revolution in Latin America, they will be completely identified with his position, and it will then be necessary to revise U.S. policy in Latin America. And this is the tremendous importance of the constant presence in the Upper House of the United States of the words of Senator FULBRIGHT, demanding a revision of his country's policy toward Latin America.

This reminds us of the late, beloved President John F. Kennedy, who also understood the problems of Latin America and began to work to revise his country's policy toward it. Thus, a tribute to Senator FULBRIGHT is also a tribute to President Kennedy, who had the same deep interest as he has in Latin America's problems; a sincere and profound concern over the problems of our countries, since, once they understood them, they reached the conclusion that those of us who have criticized the policy of the United States have done so not because we are anti-American, but because we consider that policy mistaken and not in harmony with their own tradition at home or with the feelings of their own people.

And so, the statements of Senator FULBRIGHT deserve praise. It is fundamental that everyone in Latin America should be familiar with them; and it is also fundamental that he and those who, like him, are working to revise U.S. policy in Latin America should know that we are following their steps and are in agreement with such revision. In a word, it is necessary that they feel they are supported by those for whom he is demonstrating such concern.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that, in behalf of the Christian Democrat Parliamentary Group, I am going to submit to the Chair the following motion:

"The Chamber of Deputies resolves to express its approval of the words of U.S. Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT with respect to the relations between his country and Latin America and to congratulate him for the effort he is making so that the American people may be better informed regarding Latin American problems, all of which will certainly lead to an improvement in the friendly relations between the United States and Latin America."

I am absolutely certain that this thought is shared by all Members of this Chamber, and therefore, that this motion will be unanimously approved.

The CHAIRMAN. Although Deputy García Llosa has already done so, the reporter will read the document so that the Chamber may take due note.

(The reporter read the document indicated.)

Mr. TOWNSEND EZCURRA. May I have the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The Deputy from the Department of Lambayeque is recognized.

Mr. TOWNSEND EZCURRA. Mr. Chairman, the Aprista Parliamentary Group has listened with all due interest to the reasons for the motion just made by the Deputy from Lima, Mr. Alfredo García Llosa, and they express their agreement with these statements and with the text submitted and state that they will vote in favor of it.

The Aprista Parliamentary Group would in turn like to add a few remarks from its own ideological and political viewpoint concerning the topics that have been touched upon here by the Honorable Deputy.

First of all, they are familiar with Senator FULBRIGHT's statement as it appeared in the official version of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 15, 1965; and they are certain that his latest remarks of last week are as forceful, accurate, and opportune as was his statement last month.

We have followed with interest the career of Senator FULBRIGHT, one of those men who, in the dark period of 1952–54, was one of those most bitterly attacked by Senator McCarthy and whose lot it was to defend, with a wealth of arguments and ideas, the classic positions of American liberalism and democracy. We take pleasure in noting that at a time when, unfortunately for the hemisphere, retrogressive tendencies are aggressively reappearing and influencing the foreign policy of the United States, the eminent voices of the great liberals, as represented by Senator FULBRIGHT, are again fearlessly making themselves heard.

The address of this Parliamentarian, in its analysis of the Dominican policy and of the unforgivable error of unilateral intervention without consultation, committed in violation of the provisions of the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, is one of the most trenchant, penetrating statements that could have been made, from the standpoint of the United States, concerning the unfortunate occurrence in our sister republic in the Caribbean. His reflections regarding future relations between Latin America and the United States actually constitute broad constructive criticism and will have a profound influence on public opinion in the United States.

In reviewing the Latin American scene, after the impact produced on it by the landing of the Marines in Santo Domingo, Senator FULBRIGHT mentions as one of the catastrophes of American policy the fact that the friendly opinion of those democratic non-Communist and anti-Communist sectors of Latin America has been alienated, since they consider the intervention in the Dominican Republic the greatest gift that could have been given to Communist international policy.

In this matter of Santo Domingo, Senator FULBRIGHT emphasizes that it has caused confusion and protests among the progressive and leftist elements in Latin America, outstanding among which—as Deputy Alfredo García Llosa has noted—are the Christian Democrats but also APRA in Peru and the Democratic Action Party in Venezuela. In a subsequent paragraph, he emphasizes the importance of those movements, which he labels in general terms the democratic left; and he affirms that in facing up to the inevitable social revolution that must occur in Latin America, the United States is putting us in the predicament of choosing between communism and reaction. Then Mr. FULBRIGHT adds: "If those are the available alternatives, if there is no democratic left as a third option, then there is no doubt of the choice that honest and patriotic Latin Americans will make: they will choose communism, not because they want it but because U.S. policy will have foreclosed all other avenues of social revolution and, indeed, all other possibilities except the perpetutation of rule by military juntas and economic oligarchies." These are penetrating words which truly place hemispheric policy within its dramatic extremes. For these reasons, it appears to us that Mr. FULBRIGHT is deserving of a vote by this Chamber, which we hope will be unanimous among the democratic elements, congratulating him and declaring the statement he made in the U.S. Senate to be both opportune and courageous. We Latin Americans must not lose sight of the fact that the United States is not a monolithic state, in the manner of totalitarian countries, but a vast social and political experiment in a constant state of ferment, and that forces of advancement and retrogression, of progress and reaction, revolutionary and reactionary forces are constantly struggling to prevail, thus determining the fate of a country whose decisions influence the destinies of the world.

During the time of John F. Kennedy, the more positive forces of liberalism and social democracy won out in the United States. It is sad that the bullet, which on that fateful day in Dallas cut off the life of the great American President, should have cut off—as it actually seems to us it did—a policy of change, modernization, and democratization of the hemispheric system. A constructive policy between the United States and Latin America had been started. The great watchwords of the Alliance for Progress are still being proclaimed and disseminated, but we Latin Americans have the feeling that it is more words than deeds, and that if this Alliance for Progress exists, it has been directed recently through channels other than those conceived by its illustrious founder; and that if, in this matter of economic cooperation, the trend is backward toward formulas other than those conceived by Kennedy when he launched his idea before the Latin American diplomatic corps at the beginning of 1963 [sic], the retrogression in the matter of policy has been even more serious, for the unilateral intervention in Santo Domingo took us back quickly to the outmoded, unfortunate eras of Coolidge and Hoover. There are, therefore, forces of retrogression or reaction that have again become belligerent and acquired influence in the United States. This new adventure of the right in the United States, with its relapse to imperialism and armed action (tardily justified afterwards by an attempted multilateral intervention, which should have come before and not after the decision concerning Santo Domingo), led in turn to the mobilization of clear and enlightened minds that understand that the United States cannot convert itself into a bulwark of world reaction but that it must act as it always should act; as the first revolutionary country, historically speaking, of the world, as a force of acceleration and democratic progress for the underdeveloped countries, especially ours. These forces are vital, strong, and vigorous, and Senator FULBRIGHT's address confirms this. We would be truly inconsistent and ungrateful if we were to allow the opportunity afforded us by Senator FULBRIGHT's brilliant statement to pass without declaring our support and approval of the manner in which he has approached this problem, so critical at this time, of the relations between the United States and Latin America. It is important that a Senator of his stature and prestige define positions as he has done.

We cannot ignore the urgent need for public opinion in the United States to have a clear awareness with respect to Latin America. Haya de la Torre once said, in a very keen comment on public reactions in the United States, that ordinarily it could be maintained that with respect to European policy, or even Asiatic policy, the people of the United States, the common citizen, voter, and taxpayer of the United States, have certain definite opinions. They are isolationist and interventionist, let us say, in the matter of European or Asiatic wars, and their position definitely has an influence on the decisions of the State Department. In contrast—Haya de la Torre pointed out—in the matter of Latin American policy, quite the contrary happens. There is no sufficiently well formed public opinion in the United States regarding Latin America; instead, public opinion endeavors to be guided by the position taken by the Department of State, and, in turn, pressure groups and currents of diverse kinds influence the Department of State. Among these, we must express our support of the one represented by Senator FULBRIGHT as an expression of clarity and good sense in U.S. policy. My distinguished colleague from Lima, referring to an article in a Venezuelan newspaper, said that by invoking on a reciprocal basis the principle invoked by the United States for entering Dominican territory by force, the Latin Americans could—and he said this in jest—intervene in the matter of the riots in Los Angeles. I wish to recall here merely as an anecdote, because it has no bearing on either the doctrinary statement made by Mr. García Llosa or on mine, but as a little known interesting episode in our national history, that an attitude similar to this was adopted by Peru during the term of President Castilla. At that time, the Gold Rush era, many people went to work in the mines in California, and when San Francisco was a tough, violent port, where gunfire and danger were commonplace, a group of Peruvians asked the President of Peru to provide them with protection. President Castilla sent a warship to defend the safety of those Peruvian citizens who had no protection by American authorities. It was the first case of unilateral intervention in reverse which General Castilla, at a glorious time in our diplomatic and military history, ordered, and which has been somewhat forgotten in our history.

I wish to say something else in connection with this intervention. Making Latin American problems known in the United States is especially a problem of illuminating its leaders. The case of Senator FULBRIGHT and of other American legislators in both House and Senate who have had their eyes open and clear to our problems is important. But it would be truly a gigantic task if we were to attempt to change the mental attitude that permits resolutions such as that unfortunate Resolution 560, which was condemned by this Chamber, by practically all the legislative bodies of Latin America, and by the Executive Committee of the Latin American Parliament at its recent meeting. However, the publicizing of the protests that we must make and that have been made, as loudly and clearly as necessary, in order that the rashness of such a statement as that contained in Resolution 560 may not go unanswered, since it destroys the entire inter-American juridical system, requires complementary work, that is, we must change the attitude of the American legislators who were led to make such an unfortunate decision. I wish to mention, Mr. Chairman, that in the announcement made by the Executive Committee of the Latin American Parliament in Santiago, Chile, on October 10, after a statement of unity and a reaffirmation of all the specific, categorical protests that have been made in our legislative bodies against U.S. intervention and the influence of Resolution 560, it was stated that we Latin American parliamentarians, being sure as we were of the truth of our cause, were determined to defend and uphold it before public opinion in the hemisphere, before world opinion, and especially in open, frank dialog with legislators of the United States. The invitation has been issued, sir. It is now up to the Senators and Representatives of the United States to consider this possibility, to agree to open up a channel of communication between the United States and Latin America in order to debate, with the freedom of legislators who do not manage foreign relations, the problems peculiar to our hemispheric relationship. We shall not be able to arrive at decisions that are binding, and no one claims that, but there is no doubt that the moral force of any agreement that we could reach in constructive dialog between American parliamentarians and Latin American parliamentarians will make it possible to eliminate these vestiges of an outdated imperialist policy and an anachronistic system of ideas and procedures. Its influence on the decisions that will have to be taken, beginning with the Rio Conference, will be salutary.

We have hopes for that meeting, but those of us who have a mandate from the people, who advocate a program of inter-American relations, cannot wait passively for its results. Fortunately, the Chamber of Peru has a clean record in this matter. On April 19, a motion—which I had the honor of sponsoring—was unanimously approved by this Chamber, with the support of all the political sectors represented here. This motion set forth the views of the Chamber of Deputies concerning relations with other Latin American countries and the inter-American regional system. It preceded the Santo Domingo venture, but its essential lines are still valid, and it was strengthened and confirmed by the unanimous decisions adopted following the invasion of Dominican soil.

Therefore, sir, the Aprista Parliamentary Group will support the motion presented by Deputy García Llosa and considers that this is the time when our peoples, our representative bodies, should initiate an open dialog with the parliamentarians in the other America and establish a continuing democratic flow of communication regarding these great causes of freedom and social reform with the people of the United States, above, before, and after such ill-fated imperialist adventures that sully and jeopardize our hemispheric relations. That is all, Mr. Chairman. [Loud applause.]

Mr. ALEGRÍA BAZÁN. May I have the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the Deputy from the Department of Lima.

Mr. ALEGRÍA BAZÁN. Mr. Chairman, following the brilliant words of the two honorable Deputies who have preceded me, the members of the Popular Action Group, in whose behalf I speak, can only support them, but I also believe that I ought to say a few words expressing our views, which, in general, agree with theirs. The felicitous remarks of Senator FULBRIGHT have revived an old debate in the United States, as we who have been there and who have read the newspapers or listened to occasional speakers have seen and heard. It is quite a longstanding debate on the problem of improving relations with Latin America. It goes back almost to the time when the conferences convoked by Bolivar failed, but in order not to go back so far, I think that we should recall the good days of Roosevelt, now somewhat distant, and the good days of the Kennedy administration. These were two milestones in the political life of the United States in relation to the world, and to be more exact, to limit ourselves to the matter we are discussing, in relation to Latin America. I was there when, let us say, the New Deal era ended and the time of Truman began. Although that was not a violent change, it did signify moderation. Then came the time of Eisenhower, who made many mistakes in relation to Latin America, especially in his treatment of dictators, for example, Pérez Jiménez, whom he decorated. Then the New Deal reappeared in a new form and under a new title, the "New Frontier," with President Kennedy. Since Kennedy, it appears that there has again been a retrogression, an unfortunate retrogression, and there has even been a nearly mass dismissal of the high officials of the administration who had very precise ideas about what the New Frontier and the Alliance for Progress policy should be.

The way in which Senator FULBRIGHT has revived this debate is very opportune, in our opinion, at a time when there has been an intervention in Santo Domingo and when the results of the Rio Conference are being awaited. We join in the congratulations for Senator FULBRIGHT, and we express the hope for a new policy, based on the precedents set by Roosevelt and Kennedy.

It is our hope that Senator FULBRIGHT's voice will not be alone, but that it will have many echoes and broad support, because it is a voice that truly interprets the needs of the Latin American people. So, we express the wish that there may be a genuine Alliance for Progress for the sake of a truly just and free world.

Mr. BENZA PICÓN. May I have the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the Deputy from the Department of Junín.

Mr. BENZA PICÓN. On behalf of the National Odrista Union, I wish to support the motion presented, and at the same time I want to point out that it was the National Odrista Union that first raised its voice in protest the day following the invasion of Santo Domingo by American troops.

Deputy CARLOS BENIGNO CEDAÑO VILLALTA,
Secretary.

Deputy EULOGIO TAPIA OLARTE,
Assistant Secretary.

LIMA, *November 3, 1965.*

[From El Tiempo, Bogotá, Sept. 21, 1965]

A SERIOUS STEP BACKWARD

We do not wish to hide the seriousness of the resolution adopted by the Chamber of Representatives of the United States in establishing as valid the unilateral intervention of that country in the politics of the other American countries. We assumed that after the failure of the intervention in Santo Domingo, there was no longer a bold desire left in the United States to keep thinking along the lines of a policy so stupid and abusive.

Now the U.S. House embraces a thesis contrary to the principle of nonintervention. All in one step it destroys this principle and emphatically reestablishes the discredited and anachronistic Monroe Doctrine.

We are facing an infinitely transcendental fact that, having no force of law, breaks the continental solidarity that since the historic Conference of Montevideo, rests over the main arc of nonintervention.

The only thing to do is to wait for a spirit as liberal as that of Senator FULBRIGHT, whose extraordinary speech critical of White House policy in Santo Domingo is published today; to help make its wisdom prevail over the folly of the decision that destroys, in less than an hour, what men like Roosevelt and Kennedy have tried to create over years of intelligent and friendly work.

[From El Tiempo (Bogotá), Sept. 22, 1965]

RETURN TO THE BIG STICK?

The resolution adopted by the U.S. House concerning the unilateral intervention of the United States in Latin American politics, is so serious it will be necessary to return from time to time to this subject. This resolution from Washington indicates a policy about face in inter-American policy. The spirit of the resolution implies a return to the worst hours of the relations between that great country and the countries south of the Rio Grande. All of the good neighborliness of Roosevelt and the same spirit of the "Alianza" of Kennedy disappeared in one brutal slap, in a tremendous crisis, when Mr. Johnson resolved, alone and without consulting the OAS, to invade the Dominican Republic.

Yesterday we published the text of the splendid speech of Senator FULBRIGHT, in which he bravely analyzed the errors of the policy followed by the White House in the Dominican drama. Above all there was an evident abuse of international covenants that the United States should have respected, because the solidarity of the continent rests on them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT is correct when he asserts that the unwise decisions of Mr. Johnson rested on bad advice given by people who are determined to see Communist danger everywhere when there was no basis for seeing such danger in Santo Domingo. If there were such a danger, first of all there should be an appeal to the channels established by the regional system. This system is not, as is thought in the White House and in the Capitol, simply a piece of paper. There was a policy established; one could almost say, an ethic.

Today everything is in the air. Maybe the delayed Conference of Rio could and should convene and face the new situation brought about by the unusual resolution of the North American Chamber. This act has resulted in an urgent need for a deep and formal revision of relations between the two Americas unless it is desired that we submit ourselves, hands tied, to this new version of the big stick.

The judicial achievement that was made possible in Montevideo, when Secretary of State Cordell Hull accepted in the name of President Roosevelt the outlawing of intervention, replaced a truly intolerable situation.

The landings in Nicaragua and in the Dominican Republic itself were fresh in mind at that time, and Latin American feelings had been hurt. The "good neighbor" policy with its aftermath of "anti-intervention" modified the spirit and the coexistence of the hemisphere.

This was only yesterday in the history of our America. Why return to an ominous past?

[From el Espectador, Bogotá, Sept. 22, 1965]

PANGLOSS: THEMES OF OUR TIME

Once again Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has fallen out of line. Always in the minority, as is the case with those people who command respect, Mr. FULBRIGHT has made a recount of the Santo Domingo episodes to demonstrate, as if it were necessary to do so again, that the policy of the State Department was hasty or badly informed. He said that the United States, using as a basis only fragments of information, assumed from the beginning that the revolution was dominated by the Communists; or would end up being so dominated. He also noted, with reason, that any movement of reform is accustomed to having Communist backing. This is a fact that is usually passed over in making top level policy decisions in the United States, concerning the development countries and especially those in its orbit (as is said in the jargon of our time).

The analysis of Senator FULBRIGHT really says nothing that would not have been said by the liberal Latin American press. This is especially true with the Colombian press, which said all of this and more from the first day the gringo troops invaded the island. What is outstanding here is that it was said by such a prominent Member of the U.S. Congress. He was the same one who said similar things before the Bay of Pigs invasion, and with reason, and then was beaten down by the conservative wing of his own country who considered him little less than a spy for the comrades.

The House of Representatives, in a vote that does not obligate the President but does "reflect the thinking of the body," allows unilateral intervention by the United States in Latin American affairs, with the pretext of combating communism. Pravda immediately took advantage of the occasion to stress this attitude, that can be classified as imperialistic even though it is badly disguised. The comrades, who do not stop at trifles to intervene either when they so desire (as witness: Budapest, Tibet, and now almost the border of India), exploit to the maximum the errors, frankly unbelievable, of a country that has such a great influence and responsibility in the destiny of the world. The difference between one and the other is that the errors the gringos make come generally from naivete or inexperience and the excesses of the Communists are generally *deliberate*.

The difference also comes from another very important source: what David Wise and Thomas Ross call invisible government in a book that has just come out ("The Invisible Government," English edition Jonathan Cape, London, 1965). This is the intelligence service, that monstrous machinery which was invented by totalitarian states and later copied by the freedom-loving countries in a natural defensive reaction, but which can be converted into a blind instrument. The CIA is one of those elements of the invisible government, as is the FBI. Both are in the hands of persons who are, without doubt, honorable people, but invariably belong to the most reactionary sector of the country and have an obvious tendency toward holding power without restriction. By their own nature these activities are secret in themselves, and so is their budget, the amount of which is known only in the high spheres of the Executive. These activities do not come under any independent control and have come to be machinery for foreign intervention as was certainly the case in the overthrow of Arbenz in Guatemala, in the attacks on China from Formosa, in the coup against Mossadegh in Iran (1953), in backing the forces of the right against the neutral government in Laos, and in the rising to power of Ngo Dinh Diem in Vietnam 11 years ago, the final results of which we are now witnessing. Naturally included is the ruinous invasion of Cuba. The last feat seems to be the case of Santo Domingo, denounced, maybe fruitlessly, by Senator FULBRIGHT, who will naturally not think of spending the weekend in Dallas, Tex.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT AND THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate of the United States is one of the most important political organs of that country. It is comparable, for the influence it exercises on another plane, to the Supreme Court.

The Foreign Relations Committee of that high Chamber is of great importance, and Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, who now presides over it, not only exercises power within the committee and in the Senate itself, but in the Government and in the conduct of its foreign relations. His voice is heard with respect in the White House, his advice is sought and his opposition to a project or course of action makes the Government reflect or change position.

This is why attention is called to the speech the Senator has just given in which he criticizes openly the Government policy and its intervention in the Dominican Republic.

"We have committed an error," he said, "in the Dominican Republic as we committed one in the Bay of Pigs in Cuba in 1961; but one lone error of insight does not constitute a doctrine for the conduct of future policy and we shall continue to be dedicated to the objectives of the Alliance for Progress."

He attributed that error to wrong information from people in charge of briefing President Johnson on the situation produced in the Dominican Republic and he placed direct responsibility on the diplomatic representatives in Santo Domingo.

He believes that the Presidential decision was based on "exaggerated presumptions concerning the Communist influence in the rebel movement and on the displeasure at the return to power of ex-President Juan Bosch."

Referring to the social movement in Latin America, he said he was sure that the United States "was not and should not become an enemy of the social revolution in Latin America."

This is a declaration that will calm many of the fears of progressive public opinion in Latin America.

As is held by Senator FULBRIGHT, the United States will not oppose social reform in Latin America. It could be no other way because the Alliance for Progress created by the late President Kennedy is revolutionary in relation to the previous situation, or at least a step in the great transformation that Latin America needs to eradicate misery, ignorance, and sickness.

The keen observation of Senator FULBRIGHT that "one error of insight does not constitute a doctrine," is a demonstration of the North American honesty of recognizing its own faults and is a good promise for the future that action will proceed with a major gathering of information. It also indicates that it is not fair to judge a policy by an error that has the nobility of being confessed.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has been hard in his judgments, but it can be beneficial to the future of the relations of the United States with the countries of Latin America.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 9, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, March 8, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Joseph W. Keene, of Louisiana, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Louisiana for the term of 4 years.

John M. Imel, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. David P. Small, Jr., Fair-Park Baptist Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Scripture: During a period in Israel's history, when doubt and despondency was present, one of her prophets spoke these timely words of encouragement as found in Isaiah's prophecy, chapter 40: 31: *They who wait for the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings like eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint.*

With these words before us let us pray together.

Eternal God, we are here to pause in these brief moments to be reminded that Thou art the Creator of the universe and the Redeemer of man, man who is the crown of all of Thy creation. We know that if we lose our awareness of Thee, O God, we soon forget that man is Thy creation, made in Thine image and for Thy purpose.

By the power of Thy spirit lift us to Thy presence just now, that we may find forgiveness for our sins, strength and wisdom to be Thy servant in our respective task. We marvel, O Heavenly Father, that Thou hast dared to trust us with the duties and challenge of this awesome age. Amid the world's distractions, give us hearts tempered by the blessing of Thy indwelling peace.

O God, graciously abide with the officers, Members, and employees of this body of persons, selected to serve the cause of freedom and justice in our native land and throughout our world.

Through Jesus Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 7, 1966, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5831. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass and cement windows for Our Lady of the Angels Seminary of Glenmont, N.Y.;

H.R. 10185. An act amending certain estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939;

H.R. 11006. An act to extend the statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability;

H.R. 11007. An act to provide statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator, or during a vacancy in that office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11747. An act to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignations from committees:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please consider this letter as my resignation from the Committee on Banking and Currency in order to provide eligibility for appointment to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

In tendering this resignation, please be assured that this is in no way an expression of dissatisfaction with my present committee assignment, which I have enjoyed very much, but is in line with original request for committee assignment when first elected to the 89th Congress.

Thanking you for the many courtesies extended in the past, I am,

Respectfully yours,

EARLE CABELL.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1966.

Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with deep respect that I submit herewith my resignation to you as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, effective March 8, 1966.

Respectfully,

BOB CASEY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1966.

Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with deep respect that I submit herewith my resignation to you as a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, effective March 8, 1966.

Respectfully,

BOB CASEY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1966.

Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with great regret that I submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics effective today. It has been a great privilege for me to work with the many fine members of this committee during the 89th Congress, and it has been a great honor for me to serve under the chairmanship of the Honorable GEORGE MILLER, of California.

My association and participation in the deliberations of this group have been a pleasant and rewarding experience.

Sincerely yours,

BROCK ADAMS.