By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.J. Res. 1056. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.J. Res. 1057. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.J. Res. 1058. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation for the commemoration and observance of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 626. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Department of State and the Central Intelligence Agency; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H. Con. Res. 627. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Congressional Standards and Ethics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 816. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Basic Human Rights and Peaceful World Order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

445. By the SPEAKER; a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the merger of the Reserve Forces of the armed services into the National Guard units of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

446. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the construction by the Federal Government of the proposed Bradley Lake hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 14376. A bill for the relief of Francisco Acosta-Duarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 14377. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan Federico Antonio Lamas y Parra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 14378. A bill for the relief of Jose Maya-Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 14379. A bill for the relief of John R. McKinney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 14380. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 14381. A bill for the relief of Rolando de Aguiar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 14382. A bill for the relief of Donald James De Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14383. A bill for the relief of Dong Son Kim, his wife, Hyun So Kim, and their minor children, Jung Yul Kim, Bong Kil Kim, and Mae Young Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14384. A bill for the relief of Herman Hyman Sanderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14385. A bill for the relief of Moy Woon Man; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14386. A bill for the relief of Franca Zazzera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 14387. A bill for the relief of Zereda Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 14388. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain articles for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 1966

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 5, 1966)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Henry J. von Schlichten, B.D., Th. M., minister, Lutheran Church of Our Savior, Port Washington, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O God, the wisdom and strength of all who put their trust in Thee: grant unto these Thy servants, Members of the U.S. Senate, an abundance of understanding and courage that they may do that which is pleasing in Thy sight rather than that which is expedient in the eyes of men.

Together with our President and all others in authority, may they earnestly strive for peace and prosperity, liberty and justice for all.

Remove from among us all distrust, prejudice, and violence which would divide and weaken our Nation.

Fill the hearts of our people with a spirit of willing obedience that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in godliness and honesty.

Grant that, as Thy children, we may live and work together in peace and harmony for our own welfare, for the prosperity of our Nation, and for the betterment of the world. In Jesus' name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 5, 1966, was dispensed with.

DEATH OF LESLIE BIFFLE, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is with deep sadness and personal grief that I announce the death of one of the most distinguished and able former officials of this body.

The Honorable Leslie L. Biffle, who served the Senate so faithfully for many years in a number of responsible positions, including that of Secretary, passed away at 1:25 o'clock a.m., today at the Mar-Salle Convalescent Home in the city of Washington, following a lengthy illness which had incapacitated him for the past several months.

Mr. President, Mr. Biffle was a native of the State that I have the honor to represent. He was born in Boydsville, Ark., on October 9, 1889. He was educated at the Piggott, Ark., High School, and Keys Business Institute, Little Rock, Ark. He received an honorary LL.D. degree from Dartmouth College.

Mr. Biffle first came to Washington as secretary to Representative Bruce Macon, of Arkansas, in 1909. In 1913, the late Senator Joseph Robinson gave him a patronage job in the Senate folding room. Mr. Biffle stayed there for several years, except for a tour as a War Department auditor in France during World War I. He held various jobs in the Senate until 1933, when he became secretary for the majority. Mr. Biffle held this position until February 8, 1945, when he was unanimously elected Secretary.

In 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission, in which capacity he served until 1945.

At the 1944 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, he was elected acting sergeant at arms. When he became Secretary of the Senate, he also assumed the duties as secretary-treasurer of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, as well as sergeant at arms of the Democratic National Committee.

On January 3, 1949, Mr. Biffle was again unanimously elected Secretary of the Senate, at the beginning of the 81st Congress. He served in this capacity until he was succeeded, on January 3, 1953, by Mr. J. Mark Trice.

Mr. Biffle gained nationwide fame in 1948 when, disguised as a chicken farmer, he toured the Nation while conducting his own private poll as to political sentiments. His travels enabled him to correctly forecast the election of President Truman that year, even though every professional pollster predicted that Thomas E. Dewey would win by a large majority and, at the same time, lead the Republican Party to control of Congress.

The relationship which existed between Mr. Biffle and President Truman was extremely close. In fact, he was the first Secretary of the Senate ever to have a direct line between his office and the White House.

In 1952, while inspecting the Senate Library, which was under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Senate, he found approximately 100 historical manuscripts which had gone unnoticed for many years. The discovery included messages and other items—mostly routine matters such as nominations—signed by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Daniel Webster, John Adams, Zachary Taylor, and others. One was the nomination of John Marshall to be Secretary of War. Another was one of June 17, 1797, reporting on American tribute paid the Bey of Tripoli at a time when the Barbary Pirates were sailing from Tripoli to prey on American commerce. The tribute was extended in the hope of buying off the pirates.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

While it is not uncommon for the Secretary of the Senate to preside on occasion during Senate sessions, Mr. Biffle was the first Secretary of the Senate in history to preside for a period extending 2 days. He did so at the beginning of the 80th Congress when a dispute over Senator Bilbo's taking his seat held up the election of a new President pro tempore.

After retiring as Secretary of the Senate, in January of 1953, Mr. Biffle became a public relations consultant, maintaining his offices in downtown Washington.

Besides Mr. Biffle's widow, Glade, who resides at the Westchester Apartments, 4000 Cathedral Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., survivors include two sisters, Mrs. Charles Clark Hillman and Mrs. Blanche Sanders, both of Miami, Fla., and a nephew, Mr. Billy B. Sanders of Miami. Mr. Biffle was a Methodist and a Mason.

I had no better friend in this Nation's Capital than Leslie Biffle.

I am and shall always be eternally grateful to him for his many kindnesses to me. I often sought his counsel. When I first came to the Senate, I asked his advice and guidance on many problems which arose and was the beneficiary of much valuable assistance which he gave me. His counsel enabled me more effectively to meet and discharge my responsibilities as a Senator.

Everyone who knew Leslie Biffle appreciated his fine qualities, his gentleness, his understanding, and his loyalty, as well as his devotion to his work, to his friends, and to his country. He was the friend of all of us. I never heard anyone, any Member on either side of the aisle, speak unkindly of him.

Everyone praised and esteemed him.

He was a dedicated servant of this body. He was a true patriot and one of America's finest citizens.

He was my dear friend. He loved and was beloved by his fellow man.

Mrs. McClellan joins me in extending to his widow, Mrs. Glade Biffle, and his other relatives, our deepest sympathy and our prayers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly wish to join my colleague in tribute to Leslie Biffle. When I first came to the Senate he was one of the most active men as secretary of the majority. He was my friend and a help to all new Senators. Some of the most pleasant memories I have of my service in the Senate are those associated with the most thoughtful and cordial assistance he extended to me during those early years.

He was a great friend of Alben Barkley. I remember so well discussions, which were very informative and educational, that we had during those early years in the Senate.

It is with deep sadness that my wife and I note the passing of Leslie Biffle. I often visited with him in Piggott, where he was the first citizen there. I know that all people who knew him personally will share our grief in Les Biffle's passing. We express our deepest sympathy to his widow.

I had prepared a short statement expressing my sorrow about Les Biffle's death before I came to the Senate floor and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

It was with a heavy heart that I learned this morning from Skeeter Johnston of the death of another former and beloved Secretary of the Senate, Leslie L. Biffle.

Les was a native of Arkansas, but, during his service to the Senate of the United States, he was known, admired, and respected by Members of this body from every State in the Union.

Les Biffle served the people of Arkansas and the Nation in a career spanning almost 44 years dating from the day he was first appointed as secretary to Representative Bruce Mason of Arkansas, in 1909.

He was elected secretary to the Democratic majority in 1933; was elected Secretary of the Senate in 1945, in 1949, in 1951, and left the Senate in 1953.

The wise counsel and guidance Les Biffle gave to many of us in the Congress in our early days was invaluable. His respect and reverence for the Senate as an institution of our Government was unmatched, and it is because of dedicated and loyal persons personified by Les Biffle that our free democratic institutions can function. We will all miss Les Biffle, but we can all take consolation in the fact that he led a full and complete life. He was called to serve and he served well and ably, and he deserves any tribute we can pay him. To the people of Piggott, Ark., his home, to his wife Mary Glade, and to the other members of his family who survive him, I extend the sympathy of my wife Betty and myself. We shall always hold Les Biffle's memory dear to our hearts.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, my day started off very sadly this morning when I was informed of the death of my good friend, Leslie Biffle.

All of us knew that Les had been very ill for quite some time, but even with this knowledge his death came as a real shock because of our close friendship with him.

Few men have served in the Halls of this building and in this Chamber with the devotion and dedication Leslie Biffle had for his Government and for his Nation.

I came to know Leslie Biffle when he was Secretary of the Senate during President Roosevelt's administration, and from my first meeting with him I came to admire and respect him until his death. He served his Nation without fear, and although he was first, last, and always a Democrat, his country came ahead of everything else. For this reason he held the respect and admiration of all those who knew him, regardless of political party affiliation.

Those of us who knew him have lost a great friend and the country has lost a great patriot.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. HILL. I want to join the distinguished Senator from Arkansas in the beautiful tribute he has paid to Leslie Biffle. It was with great sadness that I learned today of the death of Leslie Biffle. He was my dear friend through the years. He helped me in so many ways and did so much for me.

There was no sweeter, finer character than Leslie Biffle. He was always so wise, so understanding, and so effective. He did so much to promote and strengthen the services of the Senate to our country. Leslie Biffle was indeed a most able and distinguished American. No man could have served our country with greater dedication or with finer service to this body.

I join in the expression of our deep sympathy to his lovely wife, Mrs. Glade Biffle, and pay my heartfelt tribute to this noble American.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am saddened, as I know many Senators, present and former, are saddened, by the death of Leslie Biffle, who had been ill so long, following a long period of service to the Senate. I know of no one who served as Secretary for so long as he did who showed greater respect for the institution of the Senate and its traditions. He was a friend and helper of every new Member. Secretary Biffle always helped break the ice of the unknown in the Senate and helped one into full-fledged membership in this body.

Probably there was no better forecaster of what the the Senate would do than Leslie Biffle, who understood deeply the sentiments of Members in legislative matters. He understood the political sentiments of the Members in legislative matters as a result of experience and observation of many years.

He was a beloved friend not only of many who had the privilege of working with him, but he was a friend and helper of many Presidents. We extend our sympathy to Mrs. Glade Biffle in her great loss.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suppose one could go from ocean to ocean, from the Dominion of Canada to the gulf, and he would not find another who was as effective and able and at the same time as self-effacing as Leslie Biffle. He served Members on both sides of the aisle.

If I had to search for a word to characterize his entire life, I think I could find no better word than "fidelity," because he had a fidelity to his friends, a fidelity to his country and to his party and, at the same time, he never let the fear of partisanship prevent him from being helpful to every Member of the Senate, regardless of his party affiliation.

I join our colleagues in expressing sadness at his passing and extending sympathy to Mrs. Biffle in her loss.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, of the many nonsenatorial, staff positions in this body, none is more important or more difficult than that of Secretary of the Senate. To the occupant of that high office falls the task of coordinating the activities of dozens of key employees and seeing that all phases of the legislative paperwork gets done correctly and efficiently.

The Senate has been particularly fortunate over the years to have had in this important post men of the highest caliber. One of the truly outstanding Secretaries of the Senate was Leslie L. Biffle, who held the post—with one interruption—from February 1945 to January 1951. The Senate, therefore, notes with sadness the death early this morning of Les Biffle, and with it, the end of a colorful career.

Coincidentally, Les Biffle's term as Secretary ended as I was being sworn into

the 83d Congress. But I had known him, and had valued his friendship, long before that time. Indeed, the entire Nation, and particularly the Democratic Party, was aware of this outstanding public servant. Starting from humble beginnings as a staff assistant in the House of Representatives in 1909, Les Biffle switched to the Senate side and moved rapidly up the ladder to secretary for the majority in 1933. While in that post, he performed a variety of services for his party and for President Roosevelt. When he became Secretary of the Senate in 1945—elected unanimously, I might add—he continued to perform important functions for the Democratic Party. In addition to being secretary-treasurer of the Democrats' senatorial campaign committee, he served as sergeant-at-arms of the Democratic National Committee.

His term as Secretary of the Senate was interrupted during the Republican-controlled 80th Congress. The interlude permitted him to undertake the now famous "chicken farmer poll" on the reelection chances of President Harry Truman. Disguised as a chicken farmer, Les Biffle toured the country sampling political opinions—and correctly predicted President Truman's subsequent victory.

After his tour of duty in 1953, he retired. Since then, he had been a business consultant here in Washington.

Mr. President, those of us who had the privilege of knowing this fine public servant are indeed sorry to learn of his passing. He performed his many tasks conscientiously and well, and he left a record as Secretary of the Senate to which his successors can aspire. Mrs. Mansfield and I extend our heartfelt sympathies to his wife in her hour of loss.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I was privileged to meet Mr. Leslie Biffle before I reached the double numbers. Mr. and Mrs. Leslie Biffle were close friends of my late father. On many occasions we visited at Oakington on the Chesapeake Bay. I would say one of his distinguishing characteristics was his gentleness and his complete warmth of friendship.

I can recall an occasion when I was a sophomore in high school. My sister was 4 years younger. My father and mother had promised to take us on a vacation to Bermuda with the Biffles. At the last minute my father and mother could not go. Mr. and Mrs. Biffle undertook to take care of both my sister and me, which was no easy job in those days, without a murmur.

I can remember later when I was in the Maryland Legislature. No matter was too trivial for Mr. Biffle to give me the benefit of his advice and counsel, even when he had great matters of importance to the world and the Nation with which to be concerned.

I can recall an instance when I, as a member of Maryland's Young Democrats, could not get into the Democratic Convention in Chicago. This was after my father had retired. I remember Mr. Biffle took the time, effort, and trouble to get jobs as assistant doorkeepers at the Democratic Convention for me and three other young Democrats.

He, indeed, was a great man because one of the characteristics of greatness, I think, is humility and a readiness to help those who perhaps one need not help, when one is in a position to help, where the ordinary person would not.

I am deeply saddened, as are my mother and family, with the tragic passing of Mr. Biffle.

I take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and other Senators who have commented on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Leslie Biffle was a friend. When I first came to the Senate, he was gracious and helpful. Often he invited me to his office to visit with him and lunch with him.

He was proud of his position as the Secretary of this body. While he was partisan, he never was so partisan as to be personal. He knew the value of the Senate as an institution. He recognized its Members as friends.

My friendship with him was one for life. I shall miss him and his pleasant, friendly smile and his graciousness. I shall always remember those qualities which he possessed.

Mr. President, we shall all consider Leslie Biffle as a member of this body of whom we were proud.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened to learn this morning of the passing of Leslie Biffle. He was one of the first persons I came to know when I first came to the Senate 21 years ago. No one was more helpful to me than he, even though I am a Republican and he a Democrat.

At times when I would be at my home in North Dakota, I would call him for information, assistance, and advice. I do not know of any servant of the Senate who was more respected than he was. He was a kind and friendly person. We shall miss him deeply. He was one of the best friends I ever had.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and his family.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Leslie Biffle was a gentle person. Leslie Biffle, in the truest sense, was a servant of the Members of the Senate. Leslie Biffle, in the highest sense, was a fine American.

It was my privilege as a Member of the House of Representatives to cherish the friendship of Leslie Biffle before I shared membership in this body. It continued here.

Mrs. Randolph and I enjoyed a personal friendship with the Biffles. His widow, Mary Glade Strickling, is a West Virginian, and we had the opportunity to be with them very often. Les also came into our hills and people liked him greatly.

The Senate, as an institution, will remember the character of his service here. He was a counselor of Senators. His help was cheerfully given as he quietly, yet effectively, carried on his duties. Members, including the Senator from West Virginia who now expresses tribute, will remember him as a good and generous aid.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join with Senators in expressing my grief at the death of Leslie Biffle and my word of appreciation for him and the tremendous service he has rendered this body during the years he served here.

Leslie Biffle was one of the most efficient, effective, and helpful persons that I ever knew. He made a very fine Secretary of the Senate, and he served in other capacities. He always did his work well. I regret his passing.

We, of course, have missed him since he has been away from the Senate and we shall miss him even more. Mrs. Sparkman and I wish to extend our sympathy to his widow.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, the news of the death of Leslie Biffle brought to me a deep sense of personal sadness.

It was my pleasure to have been associated with him from the time he served as secretary to the majority until the time he ceased his services to the Senate of the United States.

I shall always treasure many very pleasant memories of our association.

Mr. President, despite his apparent and real humility, few men have ever been as valuable servants to the Senate of the United States as Leslie Biffle. He believed in the Senate. He was dedicated to his work. He was the confidant of Senators on both sides of the aisle. He was the confidant of Presidents and high officials in the executive branch of the Government.

I doubt that any man in this present era has known more of the secrets of official Washington and has preserved them as inviolate as did Leslie L. Biffle.

Leslie Biffle had been ill for a long time. He suffered greatly. He deserved well at the hands of the people of this country that he served so well.

I shall always treasure the memories of the many kindnesses that he extended to me, and one of them in particular that was way beyond and above any call of his duty as Secretary of the Senate.

I extend my most profound sympathy to all members of his family.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to take just a moment to join with those who have heretofore paid tribute to Les Biffle. He was truly one of the great public servants of this Nation.

I first knew him in 1933, when I was fortunate enough to secure employment running an elevator on the Senate side of the Capitol. A few months thereafter, I came to know him better when working out of the Sergeant at Arm's office, at a time when he was the secretary to the majority. Our acquaintance and friendship ripened during the 32 years intervening.

Les Biffle was one of the warmest friends I ever had, and one of the most helpful. I know of the problems that he has had in the last several months, and wish to extend to his widow, on behalf of Mrs. Bible and myself, our deepest sympathy.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 5, 1966,

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported favorably, with amendments, on April 5, 1966, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 149) to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people, and submitted a report (No. 1101) thereon, which was printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, withdrawing a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

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, without amendment, the bill (S. 1049) to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H.R. 2752. An act for the relief of Kock Kong Fong;

H.R. 2938. An act for the relief of Przemyslaw Nowakowski;

H.R. 2939. An act for the relief of Manojlo Verzich;

H.R. 3875. An act for the relief of Mrs. Panagiota Vastakis and Soteros Vastakis;

H.R. 4743. An act for the relief of Ralph Tigno Edquid;

H.R. 6112. An act for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park); and

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Ki Sook Jun.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7813) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 139. An act to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland;

H.R. 10357. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Secret Service;

H.R. 10476. An act to retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over Haskell Institute;

H.R. 13365. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13369. An act to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13371. An act to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13578. An act to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13580. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13663. An act to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile; and

H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 597. Concurrent resolution relating to the Centennial Year of Prospect Park of the city of New York, Borough of Brooklyn; and

H. Con. Res. 625. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966.

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:

S. 1488. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile;

S. 2573. An act to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes;

S. 2719. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia; and

S. 2831. An act to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 139. An act to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland; and

H.R. 10357. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Secret Service; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10476. An act to retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over Haskell Institute; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13365. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13369. An act to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13371. An act to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13578. An act to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13580. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 13663. An act to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to support U.S. participation in relieving vicitims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people; placed on the calendar.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 597) relating to the centennial year of Prospect Park of the city of New York, Borough of Brooklyn, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, withdrawing the nomination of Wayne A. Wray, to be postmaster at Barnes, Kans.

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

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966—COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 220) to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 transmitted to the Congress by the President on February 10, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, it is ordered that the Senate proceed to vote on Senate Resolution 220, to disapprove

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, at 12 o'clock noon, Wednesday, April 6, 1966, and that the hour between 11 o'clock a.m. and the vote be equally divided, and controlled by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], respectively.

Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged equally to the two sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, without setting a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be considered as ordered on the pending resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, the situation with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 1 is rather unique, because the original intent of the Congress was very clearly to make the Community Relations Service an independent agency. Now the claim is made that the passage of time requires a change. Therefore I believe, in all fairness, that the burden is on those who assert that there should be a change, as the legislative intent is very clear.

By way of introduction, Mr. President, there are some very interesting factors involved in the proposed transfer and the pending resolution of disapproval.

For one, the civil rights groups, were originally very much opposed to the proposed transfer, but many of them—though they are by no means unanimous—now say that they are for it. Interestingly enough, a number of conferences have taken place at the White House involving these individuals and groups; and apparently this is what has brought about a change of mind.

It is also interesting to me that if Congress refuses to go along with the President, Congress will in this case be acting independently and using its own judgment, as I believe it should.

Another interesting factor is that there are joined in the objections to the proposed transfer Senators who have been strong in favor of civil rights legislation and Senators who have been equally strong in favor of civil rights legislation, and have in fact been some of its most ardent defenders on this floor. And the reason, Mr. President, is very interesting. The reason is that the Community Relations Service is an instrument which was intended to accomplish exactly that purpose. The Community Relations Service was designed for the purpose, essentially, of conciliation and mediation, and therefore was intended to enlist the interest and the support both of those who were against and those who were for the civil rights laws.

It seems to me that the most clear confirmation of the rightness of what this resolution, of which I am the author, seeks to do, is the very fact that the strong opponents of the civil rights laws, as well as the strong proponents of the civil rights laws, favor keeping the Service where it is.

Mr. President, it seems to me that, first and foremost, we should consider the administrative aspects involved.

What is wrong with keeping the Service in the Department of Commerce? Why should it go to the Department of Justice? The reason for the reorganization plan, as explained to us by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], is that the President has given Attorney General Katzenbach the authority to coordinate all civil rights matters and, therefore, in order to coordinate effectively he must have the Community Relations Service in his office.

Well, Mr. President, if that be true, then the Attorney General should have in his office every agency which he coordinates. He does coordinate the Community Relations Service now. Indeed, the testimony is that he coordinates it with great success. The Attorney General states that it has worked out fine, and so do the persons who head the Community Relations Service, notwithstanding the fact that the Community Relations Service is not in the Attorney General's department.

(At this point Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Attorney General also coordinates the activities of the Federal Government under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which deals with the cutting off of Federal funds from Federal-State programs where there is discrimination.

By that standard, then, if the Attorney General needs in his office every agency that he coordinates, then he should have every department of Government in his office, because practically every department of Government is concerned in title VI.

Accordingly, I believe that argument to be invalid. The essential aspects of it are that for all practical purposes, the Community Relations Service is in the Department of Commerce only as a matter of administrative convenience. The testimony clearly indicates that it operates independently and that the Department of Commerce does not have much more to do with it than housing it.

The Attorney General coordinates with the Service and it has worked very well, so far, in every way.

What is the reason for the change; and will the change be prejudicial?

I have pointed out that the idea of making the change because it requires closer coordination is invalid, for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. President, will the change hurt?

The main point of my argument today is that the change will affirmatively hurt. The key to that broad argument is contained in the concept of the difference between a pattern of conflict in civil rights and a case in which there is a conflict in civil rights.

In other words, where we are dealing with an effort to cope with the problems of a community in trouble, there we have a pattern that may long precede a case.

Indeed, there may be no case, but it is, nonetheless, a situation to which the Community Relations Service must address itself, in order to avoid tensions which could break out in violence, or in other ways; whereas the job of the Attorney General is the job of dealing with a case.

Mr. President, there is very strong support in the RECORD for the statement I have just made. For example, on page 63 of the hearings there will be found the letter of the Director of Federal Programs Division of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission which, incidentally, is independent and which operates that way and is not in the Department of Justice.

The letter states as follows:

> The term "conciliation" as used in the State legislation is applied to a situation somewhat different from that of interest to the Federal Community Relations Service. Conciliation in the former context is primarily a first step in the resolution of a complaint—thus, it is directed at the resolution of the problems presented in individual cases. On the other hand, seldom is Community Relations Service concerned with the investigation or the resolution of an individual case, but rather it is concerned with patterns of conflict.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that when this idea was first broached to us, which goes back to President Kennedy's proposals in the 1960's, it was broached as an independent agency. Indeed, the great point was made that it should be independent, that it should not—specifically not—be in the Department of Justice.

In that respect, I refer to the quotation which will be found on page 11 of the hearings in which President Kennedy stated, in sending us a message on civil rights, as follows:

> The problem has grown beyond the time and energies which a few otherwise burdened officials can make available—and, in some areas, the confidence of all will be greater in an intermediary whose duties are completely separated from departmental functions of investigation or litigation.

Then, just to buttress the point, he went on as follows:

> It is my intention, therefore, to establish by Executive order (until such time as it can be created by statute) an independent Community Relations Service.

My colleague, Senator KENNEDY, of New York, who was Attorney General of the United States at that time, went on to say in respect to this matter—

> The administration's efforts will continue. But they cannot adequately substitute for the work of a regularly constituted organization which could devote its full energies to mediation in seriously troubled areas.

Mr. President, the Blue Book, which was issued by the Department of Justice in February 1964, as an aid to the Senate

floor managers of the 1964 civil rights bill makes this statement—and this is the Department of Justice:

However, it is apparent that neither the Department of Justice nor any other existing Government organization can accomplish what is needed in the field of mediation.

Thus, first, it was very clear that the Community Relations Service was to be an independent agency, and no reason has been advanced to change it.

Second, there is a substantive difference between the question of dealing with patterns of conflict and the problem of dealing with individual cases, which clearly distinguishes the Community Relations Service from the work of the Department of Justice.

Third, the Department of Justice itself asserted in that memo that the Community Relations Service should not be—I emphasize not—be in the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, two final facts are, in my judgment, extremely important.

The Attorney General himself admits that this transfer will invalidate a section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; namely, section 204(d), which expressly gives the Community Relations Service conciliation authority in a case in which the Attorney General is suing.

How the Attorney General can prosecute with his left hand and conciliate with his right hand is impossible to understand.

It is very clear that he personally admits it is very unlikely that the authority given to the Community Relations Service by section 204(d) can really be used.

I should like to read his testimony.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Attorney General had intervened in such a case, the Attorney General himself stated at page 43 of the record:

Despite separation in the Department of Justice, it (sec. 204(d)) would cause some difficulty.

Mr. President, actually, there have been very few cases in which the Community Relations Service has had this matter referred to it; but, few cases or not, the intent of Congress that it be an independent agency and that it shall function as a conciliator in public accommodations cases, under section 204(d), will have been thwarted and nullified by this transfer.

Finally, and the most crushing point, is the issue of confidentiality.

On this point, I respectfully submit that the administration's case absolutely falls to pieces.

Congress was extremely careful to provide three tests in this area. One, that the information which the Community Relations Service obtained would be confidential. The word "confidential" is not my word. It actually appears in the statute.

The second test is that it shall be held in confidence and not made public.

The third test is that no employee of the Community Relations Service should engage in any activities of prosecution.

Now, the theory is that the Community Relations Service could then go into communities and inspire confidence, to have people come and talk freely—and this is the essence of its work.

But no matter what the technical legality may be—and the Attorney General made some argument on that, and I have little doubt that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] will also do so as well—the reality of the situation will be that if it is transferred, the Community Relations Service will have lost one of its primary and necessary attributes—neutrality in the minds of the people with whom it must deal.

Mr. President, on that point, the evidence comes directly from Attorney General Katzenbach.

I refer to page 36 of the record, which shows that I asked him as follows:

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Attorney General, if you were a business executive and a man sent his card in and said, "I am from the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice. Tell me everything you know in confidence" how would you feel about it?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. I would think they had employed an idiot in that Service. I would think anybody that came in and said, "Tell me everything you know in confidence" would not be a very sensible way to approach it.

That is the whole ball game. The fact is, if one comes in from the Department of Justice, he comes in as the representative prosecuting agency in antitrust, civil rights, and tax matters. No businessman, and certainly no man who harbors prejudice himself, is going to talk as freely as he would to a conciliating agency, when he is assured that what he might say will be taken in confidence.

Whatever ambitious tautology the Attorney General may try to spin out, to wit, that there can be disclosure from the Internal Revenue Service, et cetera, the fact is that these are matters which will not be given in confidence. The Attorney General would destroy with the left hand what he receives with his right hand. I think the transfer would destroy—and I say this advisedly—the Community Relations Serivces.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

And we need to continue this useful service in dealing with discrimination and prejudice and the areas covered under the Civil Rights Act.

Unparalleled efforts from high places have been made to lobby Senators to defeat this resolution. It is an indication that when a bureaucracy wants something, it will fight like a tiger to get it, whether it is right or wrong. I believe it is wrong. It would be a salutary and refreshing exercise for us to indicate to the Presidency and the bureaucracy that we look at these things independently as Congress should, that we are willing to act on our own, and do what we think is right. It seems to me that is basic to the proposition before us.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

On February 10, 1966, the President of the United States sent to Congress a reorganization plan which would transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice. This transfer was proposed as one of several measures designed to strengthen the effectiveness of our civil rights programs.

I see no compelling reason to oppose this transfer. Indeed, in the light of changing conditions there is ample justification for any step designed to simplify and clarify executive branch responsibilities in this vital area.

When Congress established the Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce under title X of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, it was widely assumed that there would be a most urgent need for conciliation efforts arising from the public accommodations title of the act. There was some logic to support the contention then that a Government agency whose principal activity would be dealing with businessmen should be located in the Department of Commerce.

We should all be grateful that the need for this kind of conciliation was largely removed because of a ground swell of voluntary compliance. Concern over compliance with the public accommodations section of the bill has now given way to an awareness that civil rights difficulties in a given community usually involve a broad range of interlocking discriminatory problems, including voter registration, fair employment practices by both private and public entities, de facto school segregation or housing discrimination, police-community relations, and inadequate law enforcement.

I find it difficult to comprehend why the Commerce Department should continue to be regarded as the logical home for conciliation activities in these varied areas. The statutory functions of the Department of Commerce are to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, the manufacturing and shipping industries, and the transportation facilities of the United States.

Never before, to my knowledge, has the Department of Commerce been called upon to extend its activities into such a subtle and vital aspect of human affairs. And why should it? Why should a Federal department which has traditionally been associated with the promotion of trade and transportation, which has housed the Census Bureau, the Patent Office, and the Bureau of Public Roads—why should such a Federal department as this be forever regarded as the natural repository of the deep problem of civil rights?

It would be encouraging to find that the deep effects of discrimination and racial inequality could be removed from this Nation with the simple issuance of a departmental bulletin. Unfortunately, the cause of true justice has been best served by the complementary forces of suasion and sanction.

This has been true in the past, and promises to be increasingly true in the

future. And if we are to gain the fullest measure of benefit from this complementary relationship, then suasion and sanction should properly be brought together under the direction of the one Cabinet officer most deeply, most intimately, and most continually involved in matters relating to civil rights.

If anyone wished to argue that the Attorney General should not be given the responsibilities he now bears with respect to this vital area of our national life, then the time to make himself heard was in 1964. The Congress, in its wisdom, has chosen to require that the Attorney General seek voluntary compliance with civil rights legislation. It has gone so far as to authorize the Attorney General to use grants-in-aid to assist State and local authorities to improve their efforts in the sensitive area of police-community relations.

Why should the Congress hesitate to give the Attorney General the expert and experienced staff resources of the Community Relations Service to help him fulfill his demanding responsibilities?

We have been assured by the Director of the Community Relations Service, a man who has been actively engaged in the front-line struggle for equal rights, that this proposed transfer can only serve to enhance a de facto coalition of effort that exists, of necessity, between Justice Department and CRS workers in the field.

The working relationship which has proved successful in dozens of smaller communities in the South will increasingly be tested in other larger towns and cities across the Nation. The expanding range of CRS activities, including those in northern urban centers, inevitably demands the closest possible harmony between the Community Relations Service and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

I am speaking here of harmony in the fullest sense—not merely an absence of friction, not merely keeping out of one another's way—but a blending together of efforts to seek a compassionate resolution of problems without recourse to enforcement procedures. The Department of Justice is not simply the prosecuting arm of the Federal Government. As the Attorney General has said:

> It has always been the function of the law and the good lawyer to keep tempers down, to find satisfactory agreement and to settle cases, wherever possible, out of court.

One can argue that the Attorney General needs the Community Relations Service to provide himself with the broadest kind of conciliatory capacity. He needs it to deal with problems that cannot be met with law enforcement and yet are intimately tied up with his responsibility to further the cause of civil rights.

And the Community Relations Service needs the Attorney General. CRS is uniquely suited to serve as a catalyzing agent in bringing a broad range of Federal programs to bear on a racially troubled community. These programs fall within the jurisdiction of no single department of government. They arise from many departments, no one of which has a field organization geared to respond specifically to the special requirements of a community on the verge of racial strife.

The Community Relations Service can perform best under the jurisdictional protection, if you will, of the Cabinet officer specifically charged with responsibility for coordinating the Federal Government's response to the kind of crisis situation represented by Watts, Harlem, and Chicago's South Side.

Let us get down to brass tacks. Are we ready to go on record as favoring a business as usual response to Watts? Are we going to look the other way—or are we going to insist that the executive branch face up to the crisis of racial unrest? The President has told the Attorney General—All right. You are responsible. You are in charge. Now get the job done. Can we in Congress now deny the President the organizational structure which he feels the Attorney General needs to do the job?

The Attorney General and the Director of the Community Relations Service believe they can carry on a more effective effort by working closely together—by legalizing the reality already in effect in dozens of communities around this country where CRS conciliators and Justice Department officials were striving for a common goal.

Mr. President, I see no reason to deny them a congressional blessing.

Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I listened to the statement of my beloved colleague and friend, with great interest.

He induces in my mind a few additional facts. One, I said this is a question of whether we are going to deal with cases or patterns of discrimination.

The Community Relations Service deals with patterns of discrimination rather than individual cases. That is why the Attorney General was able to say, "I mediate and conciliate," but he does that in cases, not where whole communities and patterns of discrimination are concerned.

I would like to point out that that is what the Community Relations Service does.

At page 91 of the record, the annual report of Community Relations Service we find just what it does. It is very clear they serve communities. The report shows, for example, that during the 12-month period ending December 30, 1965, they served 178 communities. The report does not speak of cases, but of communities. It points out that the Service was still needed in 73 of the communities.

That is what we are faced with. We are not faced with cases. We are faced with patterns of discrimination in communities.

The Senator from Connecticut, asks Why leave it in the Department of Commerce, which is essentially a business agency? First, it is not our burden to prove why it should be left in Commerce. It is an administration burden to prove why it should be put in the Department of Justice.

Aside from that, the reason for placing it in the Department of Commerce is that it was a neutral agency which would inspire confidence on the part of those sought to be conciliated.

I think that good evidence was offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] in writing to the President expressing his opposition to the reorganization plan. The letter is printed at page 75 of the record.

Senator ERVIN said:

> Southerners as well as all other Americans, have traditionally had excellent relations with and complete confidence in the Department of Commerce. Most of us look to this Department for impartial and expert advice and assistance. We look upon it as neutral in its approach to human problems as well as economic problems. This is exactly the same function that the Community Relations Service should perform and was intended to perform.

Again, Mr. President, I point out that the Attorney General was never dissatisfied with this arrangement. On the contrary, he makes a big thing of the great cooperation in the Bogalusa matter between the Community Relations Service and himself.

Finally, there are many agencies in the States variously called human relations agencies or commissions on civil rights or commissions against discrimination.

We have facts and figures on that and we find the idea that any conciliation activity of this kind ought to be in the prosecutor's office is invalidated by the experience of the States themselves.

I point out, for example, page 63 of the record, where we have a letter from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights which at our request surveyed State agencies.

They say:

> Data available to us show that there are 38 State agencies with programs in one or all of the following areas: employment, housing, public accommodations, police-community relations, education, or general conciliation of issues. Twenty-five of these are independent agencies. Of the remaining 13 (each of which is part of a large department) only two are located within the office of the State attorney general.

Now, Mr. President, that is State experience and I am sure it does not bear out what is to be done here.

Finally, and very importantly, no answer is made whatever to the fact, first, that this transfer will invalidate the activities or capability of action of the Community Relations Service with regard to the public accommodations section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As I pointed out before, by reason of the testimony of the Attorney General he practically admits that himself. Second, no affirmative case is made, and in my opinion none can be made, certainly not in the face of the evidence of southerners like Senator ERVIN, who is representative of the people who have to be conciliated.

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

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

No effort is made to meet the challenge that when a representative of the Service goes into a community this should be strictly personal business. That is why we all liked so much the appointment of

Mr. Collins. Mr. Wilkins' appointment is fine with me. I approved it. In my judgment he was taken on with the agreement that he would go to the Department of Justice. Naturally, he is committed to the transfer. I assume he is a sincere man though I thoroughly disagree with him.

To summarize, the first point is the question of invalidating section 204(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The second is that when a representative comes in to see a person to be conciliated, the factor of suspicion, of alarm, of reserve, of concern is added, which is completely unnecessary. Third, the Attorney General is doing a fine job of coordination already. Why then, is this transfer necessary? It should not be put with the prosecutor. Why run that risk, when the agency is running well? Under these circumstances, Congress ought to reassert its independence and authority.

Finally, I am not taken aback too much by the fact that a number of civil rights agencies have telephoned to Members of Congress and sent telegrams urging them to vote in favor of this reorganization plan and against this resolution, or by the fact that there has been a large amount of high-level lobbying. Every once in a while—and this proposal is a good example of it—it is good for people to realize that Senators and Representatives have heads of their own; that we are not vote comptometers, trying to figure out which way the votes will come out; but that we use our own judgment, truly independent of the executive arm.

This is an excellent opportunity for the Senate to say that the administration has failed to make a case; that its proposal is most unwise.

I am a strong and sincere advocate of civil rights, but I am here proposing that the Senate should not agree to this reorganization proposal.

I am very glad that southern Senators, who oppose civil rights legislation, are joined with me in opposing this plan, because this is what conciliation is all about. It is supposed to have an appeal to them and an appeal to me. The joint appeal that we make and which we reflect is that this reorganization plan be rejected. I hope the Senate will do so.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I am strongly persuaded by what the distinguished senior Senator from New York says. We are working out more conciliation—whatever might be worked out—in some other parts of the city, under the same circumstances. I think that is desirable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy. It is desirable that the resolution offered by the Senator from New York prevail. My own voting record on civil rights is well enough known to preclude further explanation here. I simply feel that there is a danger in moving so much power into a given agency so as to permit the temptation to use it at times when the greatest sagacity might warrant otherwise.

Therefore, although I am sympathetic to the viewpoint of the Director of the Community Relations Service, and have considerable confidence that he will do a good job, at the same time I think it is wiser, every now and then, that Congress rise up and assert its prerogatives and advise the President that we just will agree not to every suggestion that comes to us for a reshuffling of Government agencies and functions. This is a good place to begin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I believe the Senate ought to be a separate, independent portion of the Government. Only yesterday, for example, I made some remarks in criticism of some aspects of the President's legislative proposal to establish a Department of Transportation.

But, I find it a rather weak argument to say that every now and then we ought to pick out some proposal, right or wrong, and reject it, merely to show our independence. This is not a very good argument, unless the proposal is wrong. The President is right in his proposal of Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator from Oklahoma must have misunderstood my statement, if he was referring to me. I happen to believe that the Javits resolution is correct in saying that the Community Relations Service, an agency of mediation and conciliation, does not belong in the Department of Justice, a prosecutive and coercive agency. It is salutary and right for us to tell the President that, much as we love him, he is not the only person to determine the correctness of the reshuffling of Government functions.

Mr. HARRIS. I perhaps misunderstood the Senator from Pennsylvania; I believe the President's proposal is right, and for that reason I do not see any occasion at this time for us to jump up and, willy-nilly, show our independence, right or wrong.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 for the transfer of the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice is an important part of a general reorganization of the Government's operations in the civil rights field.

The general reorganization, and this plan, stem from Vice President HUMPHREY's report of September 24, 1965, to President Johnson concerning the need for reassignment of the civil rights activities being carried on by interagency committees and the Community Relations Service. On the basis of a painstaking review of those activities, the Vice President concluded that there was an undesirable diffusion of responsibility. He recommended that operating functions be concentrated in the major departments and agencies which have clearly defined civil rights responsibilities.

The President agreed with the recommendation of the Vice President and issued Executive Orders Nos. 11246 and 11247 to carry it out as far as his own authority permitted. The first order abolished the President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity and placed its programs in the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Labor. The second order abolished the President's Council on Equal Opportunity and transferred to the Attorney General its governmentwide responsibility of assisting and coordinating the activities of the departments and agencies in the enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Commerce Department to the Department of Justice, as provided for in the pending reorganization plan, is the final action proposed by the Vice President. This transfer is another step in the direction of centralizing and sharpening the efforts of the Government to make certain that all our citizens are equal in the enjoyment of their rights under the law. And, just as important, it reflects the mutual interest and concern of the Department of Justice and the Community Relations Service in the resolution of the racial problems that arise in many communities throughout the country.

The broad mission of the Service is to assist communities in reducing racial friction and taking action to promote the observance of civil rights by and for all their citizens. It seeks to educate our communities and their leaders so they will accomplish what otherwise may have to be done in the courts. The Department of Justice has the very same goal. It seeks the assurance of respect for the civil rights of all our people, preferably on a voluntary basis but by pressure of the law if necessary. There is a natural attraction between the work of the two agencies.

In its annual report to the Congress for the fiscal year 1965, the Community Relations Service pointed out that typically the cities or areas to which it provides assistance have a broad range of interlocking problems. These frequently include voter registration difficulties; discrimination in employment; school segregation; discrimination in public accommodations and publicly owned facilities; unsatisfactory police-community relationships and inadequate law enforcement techniques. Each of these is a problem of immediate concern to the Department of Justice by reason of its obligations and functions under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes. Because of their overlapping interests and responsibilities in connection with these problems, the Department of Justice and the Service of course find themselves working side by side on many occasions. The Service pointed out this fact in its annual report by remarking that the Department of Justice is the Federal agency with which it has worked

most frequently and continuously. This recurring association of the two agencies, it seems to me, virtually demands that they be brought together under the leadership of the Attorney General. It is one of the main reasons why the President's reorganization plan should go into effect.

For a number of years going back to a time before the Service was established, the Department of Justice has itself put forth a great deal of effort in explanation, persuasion and negotiation intended to quiet or resolve civil rights controversies. Thus, like the Service, it has a good deal of experience in the mediation of civil rights conflicts and a good deal of knowledge concerning communities where racial friction persists. The combination of experience, information and resources of the Justice Department and the Service, put to use under a common leadership, is bound to strengthen the hand of the Government as a conciliator.

It is inevitable that the Attorney General is called upon to take action in relation to most of the important civil rights problems that arise throughout the country. It makes little difference whether or not these problems are framed in terms of legal requirements or the possibility of litigation. They come to him in any event.

The Attorney General has testified that he spends about half his time on civil rights matters of all kinds. This burden will undoubtedly continue. Its magnitude, it seems to me, compels the conclusion that he should be in a position to use the facilities of the Community Relations Service to the best advantage. The President's plan would put him in that position.

The location of the Service in the Justice Department is also bound to be helpful to the Service. It obviously will be able to obtain greater cooperation from people and organizations in and out of the Government when it is under the direction of the Cabinet officer who has the primary civil rights responsibility in the Government.

The reasons for the transfer of the Service to the Justice Department boil down to one simple proposition: the two will be able to accomplish more together under common direction than they can while apart and operating under separate direction. The work of the Government will be done better and the country will benefit.

I urge that the Congress allow the pending reorganization plan to go into effect.

Mr. President, it has been stated in argument today and also elsewhere that this transfer under Reorganzation Plan No. 1 would affirmatively hurt the Community Relations Service. I think this is purely a matter of conjecture, because no one connected with this matter in the administration feels that this would be so.

The Vice President of the United States recommended this change by memorandum to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from that memorandum on page 19 of the hearings before our subcommittee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The Community Relations Service was located in the Department of Commerce by the Congress when it enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1964 on the assumption that the primary role of the Service would be the conciliation of disputes arising out of the public accommodations title of the act. The acceptance of the public accommodations provisions by businesses—even in those areas of the country where they constituted a reversal of generations of custom and practice—exceeded our most optimistic predictions. I believe, therefore, that the basis for the original decision to place this program in the Department of Commerce, which, while appropriate at the time, no longer exists.

With the disappearance of its primary function, the conciliation service has undertaken a number of productive efforts in the field of race relations. Many of these should be continued. But the Secretary of Commerce agrees with me that they could be more effectively and efficiently carried on within agencies which have responsibility for substantive programs which can help eliminate racial disputes and bias. Thus, disputes which involve school problems should be handled by the Commissioner of Education and his staff; disputes which involve housing should be dealt with by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; disputes which involve employment should be dealt with by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, etc.

The Department of Justice has had deep and broad experience in racial matters and possesses information on a nationwide basis. I recommend, therefore, that the Community Relations Service be transferred to the Attorney General so that when necessary he can call upon the appropriate department with expert knowledge and positive programs to conciliate disputes.

The clearinghouse and data-gathering functions which are currently being performed by the Community Relations Service should be undertaken by the Civil Rights Commission, which already has similar responsibilities.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the President of the United States concurred in that recommendation. The Secretary of Commerce has also concurred in it. The Attorney General of the United States, the man vested with most responsibility in the field of civil rights, also concurs in it. The Director of the Community Relations Service, Mr. Wilkins, testified before our subcommittee. He was very strongly in favor of this plan.

Mr. Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau of the NAACP, sent a telegram to our subcommittee approving the reorganization plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that telegram printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 21, 1966.

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

We support President Lyndon Johnson's plan to transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice. In these times there is great need for close coordination of the activities in the area of civil rights. We have explored the issues connected with the transfer and it is our considered judgment that the President's proposal will enable the Community Relations Service to function effectively and expeditiously. It is our understanding that the Director of the Service will have the rank of Assistant Attorney General under the new arrangement. We are further advised that the administration hopes to expand the staff and duties that the Service is called upon to perform. Therefore, we respectfully urge that your committee give a favorable report on Reorganization Plan No. 1. We request that this telegram be made a part of the hearing record on the reoganization plan.

CLARENCE MITCHELL,
Director, Washington Bureau, NAACP.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, it has been said that the Community Relations Service is involved with communities and with patterns of discrimination, rather than with cases. If that is so—and I think there is merit in that—that would still be true after this transfer, as well as before. The Community Relations Service will still have its own identity. It will still be a legal entity. It will still be headed by a Director, appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Conditions have changed with reference to the difficulties which were expected in the enforcement of the public accommodations section of the law.

It was pointed out by the Vice President in his memorandum, it is logical that this service now be transferred to the Justice Department. The Attorney General stated before our subcommittee, as shown on page 49 of the hearings, that the activities of the Department of Commerce really have very little to do with racial tensions in communities around the United States, rural and urban. The Department of Justice is the logical place for this activity.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as was pointed out in response to questions by me, the Community Relations Service will actually have higher status in the Justice Department than it has in the Department of Commerce. This was the testimony of the Attorney General as shown on page 49 of the hearings. It will be in a department with primary responsibility in the civil rights field, and it will be headed by a Director with the status of an Assistant Attorney General.

We need only look at the table of organization of the Department of Commerce to see that the Community Relations Service now is indeed an orphan. It is not really in the line of command in that Department. It is not under an Assistant Secretary. It is equated in the chart with the U.S. Travel Service, with the Area Redevelopment Association, and with the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

I submit that the Community Relations Service, headed by a man who would rank, under this plan, as an Assistant Attorney General would have the proper status, position, and organization in the right department to carry forward the great aim of this country toward the elimination of all types of discrimination in our national life.

I point out that the Community Relations Service will not lose its identity because it would continue to be headed by a director who would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It would still have its independent status and conciliation role. It would still have its confidential relationship with those with whom it deals.

I submit that the plan would further the cause of the elimination of discrimination. The resolution ought to be rejected and the plan allowed to become effective.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to summarize my argument now that more Senators are present in the Chamber.

The Community Relations Service was represented to us as an independent agency. That is the reason that we dealt with it as we did and placed it within the Department of Commerce for administrative purposes. This is borne out by the testimony of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] before our subcommittee, in which testimony he stated that, as one of the Senators in charge of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, he went to the floor day after day and made the point that the agency was not to be in the Department of Justice. The representatives of the Department of Justice also said this in the blue book which was the basis of the administration's case for the 1964 act.

The Attorney General admitted that this transfer would invalidate section 204(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which gives the Community Relations Service an independent role with relation to public accommodation cases before the courts.

The confidentiality provisions of the Community Relations Service under title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, would very likely be circumvented if the agency were placed within the Department of Justice. That requirement is borne out not only by the statutory provision that such information as the Community Relations Service receives shall be held confidential, but also by the express provision that no officer or employee of the Service shall engage in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions of any agency or defendant in any litigation arising out of disputes in which he had acted on behalf of the Service. That is section 1003(b). We are trying to protect this provision by keeping the Service out of the prosecution department.

The clinching argument is that the Attorney General himself said that if a man sent a card to a fellow whom he was trying to conciliate and said, "I am from the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice. Tell me everything in confidence," a fellow would have to be an idiot to comply with such request.

I do not want to characterize us, but we would be very unwise if we were to do what the President is asking us to do.

Southern Senators who were opposed to civil rights engaged in a filibuster against such legislation. Senators such as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and myself, who are very ardent supporters of civil rights legislation, are on the same side of this issue. That proves the point. That is what conciliation is. It is intended to bring us together. The action we propose would bring us together. The Senate ought to support our position because this is the real character of Community Relations Service.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I summarize the administration's reasons for the placement of the Community Relations Service in the Department of Justice.

First. In an exchange of memorandums on September 24, 1965, the Vice President recommended and the President concurred in the transfer to prevent inefficiency, duplication, and delay.

Second. The Attorney General has primary overall responsibility in civil rights matters and in the implementation of the 1957, 1960, and 1964 Civil Rights Acts, as well as the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

Third. The Attorney General and his staff have developed broad experience in the conciliation of civil rights disputes in school, employment, and other fields.

Fourth. The Attorney General is the principal Cabinet officer to whom the President and agencies of Government look for advice and judgment on civil rights issues.

Fifth. By Executive Order No. 11247, dated September 24, 1965, the Attorney General has already been designated coordinator for the enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, relating to nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs.

Sixth. The Community Relations Service will be an integral part of the Cabinet department whose functions are paramount in the civil rights field. It will be a separate unit in the organizational structure on a par with the other divisions, bureaus, and services.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, do I understand the situation to be that if one is for the transfer of the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice, he should vote "no" on the resolution of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If one is in favor of the reorganization plan, he should vote "no." If he is opposed to the reorganization plan, he should vote "aye."

Mr. RIBICOFF. A "no" vote means that one is for reorganization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is a parliamentary inquiry in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A parliamentary inquiry is not in order.

(The VICE PRESIDENT assumed the chair at this point.)

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Georgia would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 42, as follows:

[No. 61 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Aiken	Fulbright	Russell, S.C.
Boggs	Hill	Russell, Ga.
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Saltonstall
Carlson	Javits	Scott
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Simpson
Cotton	McClellan	Smith
Curtis	Miller	Sparkman
Dirksen	Mundt	Stennis
Dominick	Murphy	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Pearson	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Prouty	

NAYS—42

Bass	Hartke	Monroney
Bayh	Inouye	Montoya
Bible	Jackson	Moss
Brewster	Kennedy, Mass.	Muskie
Burdick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Nelson
Byrd, W. Va.	Lausche	Neuberger
Cannon	Long, Mo.	Pastore
Church	Magnuson	Pell
Clark	Mansfield	Proxmire
Dodd	McCarthy	Randolph
Douglas	McGovern	Ribicoff
Gore	McIntyre	Tydings
Gruening	Metcalf	Yarborough
Harris	Mondale	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—26

Allott	Hayden	Morton
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bartlett	Hruska	Smathers
Bennett	Jordan, Idaho	Symington
Case	Kuchel	Talmadge
Eastland	Long, La.	Thurmond
Ervin	McGee	Tower
Fong	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Morse	

So the resolution (S. Res. 220) was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Reorganization [Mr. RIBICOFF] is to be commended for his skillful advocacy in leading the opposition to the resolution. His clear and compelling support of Reorganization Plan No. 1 served greatly to win Senate approval. We are grateful for his strong efforts in achieving this success.

Also, we thank the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] for his splendid assistance in obtaining favorable action against the resolution. For he, too, backed Reorganization Plan No. 1 with the strong and compelling reasons which assured its approval.

While the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] capably, sincerely, and articulately urged his views opposing the reorganization plan, the Senate was permitted to work its will in no small part due to his cooperation. The leadership is thankful to the Senate as a whole for their cooperation in expediting this matter.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is at the desk House Concurrent Resolution 625. I ask that it be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be stated by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625), as follows:

H. CON. RES. 625

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

In line 4, strike the period, and insert a comma and the following language: "and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966 it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Wednesday, April 13, 1966."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this concurrent resolution will permit the House to take its Easter recess from the conclusion of business tomorrow until noon April 18, 1966. Without the concurrent resolution it would be necessary for the House to meet every 3 days as prescribed in the Constitution. The amendment I have offered will permit the Senate to take its announced Easter recess from the conclusion of business tomorrow until noon Wednesday, April 13, 1966. By adopting this amendment, it will not be necessary for the Senate to have a pro forma session next Monday to meet its constitutional obligations. The amendment is one intended for the convenience of the Senate as a whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625), as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Concurrent resolution establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966, and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Wednesday, April 13, 1966."

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES; FOR VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN MEASURES; AND FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following the completion of business tomorrow and until next Wednesday, April 13, 1966, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions; and that committees be permitted to file reports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, April 6, 1966, he had signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 3349. An act for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; and

H.R. 8647. An act for the relief of the Troubadours Drum and Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The Chair announces the appointment of Senators MONTOYA and SIMPSON to be congressional advisers to the Sixth World Forestry Congress to be held in Madrid, Spain, June 6 through 18, 1966.

The Chair announces the appointment of Senators KENNEDY of Massachusetts and JAVITS to be congressional advisers to the 25th session of the Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration, to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, May 9 through 14, 1966.

Pursuant to Public Law 372 of the 84th Congress, the Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to be a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

Pursuant to Public Law 420 of the 83d Congress, the Chair appoints the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] to be a member of the board of directors of Gallaudet College in lieu of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] resigned.

The Chair announces the appointment of Senators TYDINGS and SMITH to be congressional advisers to the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

Pursuant to Public Law 42 of the 86th Congress, the Chair appoints the following Senators to the 9th Canada-United

States Interparliamentary Group Meeting to be held in Washington, D.C.-Oak Ridge, Tenn., May 18 through 22, 1966: MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MUSKIE, BASS, METCALF, INOUYE, AIKEN, HICKENLOOPER, SMITH, COTTON, JORDAN of Idaho, and SALTONSTALL.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "CATALOG OF FEDERAL AIDS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS—SECOND SUPPLEMENT, JANUARY 10, 1966"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 84); which under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 84

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed one hundred thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments—Second Supplement, January 10, 1966," Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, for the Senate Committee on Government Operations, of which forty-four thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and fifty-six thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3189. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alonso Portuondo; and

S. 3190. A bill for the relief of Dr. Enrique Alberto Rojas-Vila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS:

S. 3191. A bill for the relief of Harry V. Cost; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 3192. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain sick leave as creditable service for annuity computation under such act; and

S. 3193. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3194. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to improve the safety and reliability of drugs:

S. 3195. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the purpose of strengthening and facilitating mutual cooperation and assistance, including training of personnel, in the administration and enforcement of that act and of State and local laws relating to food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics, and for other purposes; and

S. 3196. A bill to protect children and others from accidental death or injury by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to aspirin intended for children, safety closures on drug containers, and cautionary labeling of containers of articles subject to the act where necessary to that end; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3197. A bill to amend section 416 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; and

S. 3198. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts):

S. 3199. A bill to amend section 213(a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to claims of certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 3200. A bill to provide a uniform closing time for polling places in certain Federal elections; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3201. A bill to strengthen the coordination of economic opportunity programs with the activities of the U.S. Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3202. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the opening of Chisholm Trail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3203. A bill to amend section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act to protect the rights of employees conscientiously opposed to membership in a labor organization; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York (for himself and Mr. MCGEE):

S. 3204. A bill to authorize a separate sleeve insignia for Merrill's Marauders, a volunteer unit of the U.S. Army that served in the China-Burma-India theater of operations during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "CATALOG OF FEDERAL AIDS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS—SECOND SUPPLEMENT, JANUARY 10, 1966"

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 84) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments—Second Supplement, January 10, 1966," which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MUSKIE, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

A BILL TO ALLOW FEDERAL EMPLOYEES CREDIT FOR UNUSED SICK LEAVE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide a formula by which civil service employees may have granted as creditable service accumulated unused sick leave in computing retirement annuities. This measure is identical to H.R. 13754 championed in the House of Representatives by the able Representative, ROBERT B. DUNCAN, of Oregon.

Under the present system Federal employees are allowed 13 days' sick leave annually. Those who have enjoyed good health throughout their careers find by retirement time they have saved up to 3,000 or more hours of unused sick leave. Currently, no form of compensation or credit is granted to loyal workers who retire with surplus sick leave.

While I am confident that the majority of Federal employees do not abuse sick leave privileges, those who do, cause an unnecessary expense to the Government and create dissension among employees. Each day of sick leave taken when not justified is a loss to the Government of that employee's pay for that day. The Government must act to curb unnecessary absences by taking positive steps to encourage employees not to use sick leave except in cases of actual illness.

Similar measures have been introduced in this Chamber which provide the employee with an option of having accrued sick leave added to the length of service in computing his annuity, or he may receive one-half of the amount of accrued sick leave at retirement to be compensated for in cash as severance pay.

I would like to point out my reasons for favoring a program which offers a more permanent form of compensation. An employee's years of accumulated sick leave should have a residual value as opposed to an immediate cash benefit. An extra boost in annuity payments has a lasting value and is a proper recognition of an employee's many years of dedicated service. A program offering a cash settlement may prove harmful to those employees who, in hopes of receiving a larger cash payment, may neglect their health by working when they should be home in bed.

Under my bill, an employee shall receive credit for his unused sick leave at the rate of one-twelfth of 1 year for each full period of 173 hours of his unused sick leave. For example, an employee with 2,100 hours of sick leave to his credit at retirement would receive an additional annuity which would be approximately 2 percent of his high 5-year average salary for each year of his life after his retirement. This is less than half what it would cost the Government if each employee used all of his sick leave during his working life.

Enactment of my bill would cut down on the incidence of sick leave abuses by providing an equitable means of compensation for employees who retire with accumulated sick leave hours, yet the estimated cost to the Federal Government would be nominal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3192) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain sick leave as creditable service for annuity computation under such act, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

URGENT NEED FOR LIBERALIZATION IN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SURVIVORSHIP

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in 1963 I sponsored legislation to alleviate a hardship in the survivorship program by permitting an annuitant retiring on a reduced annuity to designate a second spouse to receive survivor annuity benefits in the event of death or divorce of the former spouse.

Presently when a person retires with a reduced annuity under the survivorship annuity provision, the survivorship benefits cover only the spouse living at the time of retirement. If this spouse should die prior to the death of the annuitant, there is no way in which survivorship benefits, under present law, can be extended to a new husband or wife. This is cruel, and often creates extreme hardship.

I cited examples of heartrending letters from all parts of the country pointing to this hardship situation. The flow of mail continues, and the need is as urgent as ever.

The bill I am introducing today is similar to S. 1058, which I authored in the 88th Congress.

Other governmental retirement laws, such as social security and railroad retirement, provide adequately for survivorship, without the restrictions inherent in the civil service retirement system. Congress should act to correct this inequity.

The present civil service survivorship program is unduly restrictive and primarily causes grievous injury to widows who are oftentimes left destitute in old age.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities.

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

The bill (S. 3193) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 416 OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 416 of the Federal Aviation Act. The need for this amendment is urgent in order to protect and promote the U.S. international air transportation system and to eliminate a built-in procedural advantage enjoyed by foreign airlines serving the United States.

The speed and flexibility of the jet airplane has brought about miraculous changes in the air commerce of the world, none of which were envisaged when the Civil Aeronautics Act was first enacted in 1938 or when it was reenacted in the Federal Aviation Act in 1958. Unfortunately, however, our statutory procedures have not kept pace with these changes and as a result our U.S.-flag carriers are often placed at a serious disadvantage in seeking to compete with foreign airlines for traffic to and from the United States.

To meet the eruption of foreign air travel brought on by the jet plane, the United States, acting through the State Department and the Civil Aeronautics Board, has granted numerous foreign countries important air routes to and through the United States in exchange for reciprocal routes for American-flag carriers. These exchanges are made through bilateral air transport agreements negotiated between the United States and foreign governments. Once an agreement is signed calling for an equitable exchange of routes, a procedural anomaly takes place. Under the present act, the foreign government is able to implement its route promptly whereas the United States, because of its own internal procedures, must often delay years before permitting an American-flag carrier to operate the reciprocal route.

In order to place in operation the route granted by a bilateral air transport agreement, a foreign airline must file with the CAB an application, under section 402 of the act, for a foreign air carrier permit. This is a simple proceeding involving only the one foreign air carrier applicant. Since the route applied for has already been included in a bilateral agreement, the hearing is pro forma and generally uncontested. The President approves the Board's recommended decision almost as a matter of course and a foreign air carrier permit issues promptly, often within a matter of 60 to 90 days after the filing of the original application. Once the permit is issued, the foreign airline is free to start operations.

No such simple or expedited procedure is presently available to permit an American-flag carrier to operate the reciprocal route. Under the present act, the President is often required to wait years, notwithstanding the important foreign relations or national defense considerations which may be involved, before the CAB is able to submit to him for approval a recommended decision covering certification of an American-flag carrier over the route in question. It is this situation to which the bill I have introduced is addressed.

Under the existing law, American-flag carriers may obtain new operating rights by one of two methods:

First. By a lengthy certificate proceeding under section 401 of the act, including notice and hearings, or

Second. By an exemption under section 416 of the act, applicable in certain very limited situations.

Under the certificate method, the Civil Aeronautics Board has adequate power to grant the necessary operating rights, but the decision in *Ashbacker* v. *F.C.C.*, 326 U.S. 327 (1945) has been held to control CAB certificate proceedings. *Delta Air Lines* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board*, 228 F. 2d 17 (D.C. Cir. 1952). This requires all applications seeking the same or similar rights to be heard in the same proceeding. As a result, the certificate proceedings involve numerous applicants and they are necessarily slow and cumbersome, normally consuming several years before completion.

Under the exemption method, the proceeding can be fast enough but the present statutory provision as interpreted by the courts severely restricts the power of the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant relief. The requirement in the statute that the Board find "an undue burden" on the air carrier applying for relief "by reason of the limited extent of the operations of such air carrier" or "by reason of unusual circumstances affecting the operations of such air carrier," is interpreted by the courts to require a showing of something more than loss of potential revenue pending completion of the certificate proceeding. *American Airlines* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board*, 235 F. 2d 845 (D.C. Cir. 1956), *Pan American World Airways* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board*, 261 F. 2d 754 (D.C. Cir. 1958). Whatever may be said for the wisdom of this result in a domestic route situation where the competition consists only of other U.S. carriers—the situation for which the provision was primarily designed—the result is clearly undesirable where the traffic is lost to foreign competition and where the development of the U.S.-flag international air transportation system is accordingly delayed. The present exemption provision gives neither the Board nor the President authority to act in cases where public interest considerations alone require temporary authorization of one or more U.S. air carriers pending the completion of certificate proceedings. As a result, the U.S. carriers are relegated to lengthy certificate proceedings as the only method of relief.

A few examples are in order. Years ago two American-flag carriers—Braniff and Panagra—applied to have their routes extended to New York so as to provide the first U.S.-flag one-carrier through-service between New York and the west coast of South America. These applications, together with those of numerous other applicants were later consolidated in the United States-Caribbean-South America case. After 4½ years this case is still at the examiner hearing stage. In the meantime, two foreign carriers—BOAC and Lufthansa—already are operating, by virtue of permits issued by the CAB and the President under section 402, the only one-carrier through-services between the United States and the west coast of South America. The two U.S. carriers are at an obvious competitive disadvantage and can obtain no relief until the United

States-Caribbean-South America case is decided some years hence.

A second example occurred some years ago when Trans Canada Airlines started operating a through-service between Cleveland and Europe via Toronto. TWA, which serves Cleveland on its domestic network, did not at that time have effective authority to operate through-service between Cleveland and Europe on its transatlantic service. An amendment of its certificate was necessary, but this could not be accomplished until the so-called Cleveland-New York nonstop case was finally decided. This case involved a large number of domestic carriers and took several years before TWA finally obtained the necessary authority to compete with Trans Canada for Cleveland-Europe passengers. The point is that, solely as a result of the CAB's and the President's lack of authority to cope with the problem expeditiously, Trans Canada obtained a several-years lead on TWA in this purely U.S. traffic market.

Another example is found in the current Transpacific Route case in which the CAB is confronted with the enormous task of passing upon the applications of 23 U.S. airline applicants for routes throughout the Pacific Basin area. The current proceeding is a continuation of a proceeding which first began in 1959 and after suspension in 1961 was reopened in 1965. It will take years for the Board to sort out these conflicting applications. Meanwhile, two foreign carriers—Qantas and BOAC—by virtue of the expeditious section 402 procedures are already providing transpacific services to and through the United States identical to those which are in issue in the Transpacific Route case. In December 1965 the United States concluded a new air transport agreement with Japan whereby a Japanese airline was granted the right to operate from Japan across the Pacific to California and across the United States to New York and beyond to Europe and around the world. JAL has now applied for a section 402 permit for this route. No American-flag carrier is permitted at present to offer such a service, although the national interest in providing it was recognized by the CAB as long ago as 1960. Nor will any be able to operate it—even on a temporary basis—until the Transpacific Route case is decided years from now. Thus, the national interest is frustrated by procedural deficiencies.

The problem presented is not a temporary one. The cases mentioned are a portent of the future. They indicate that the same type of competitive disadvantage is likely to arise when new equipment requires changes in the international route pattern, and when new international routes are exchanged by bilaterial agreement between the United States and foreign governments. Under present procedures, the foreign-flag carriers will be able promptly to secure operating rights under section 402, whereas the U.S. air carriers will again be involved in lengthy and cumbersome certificate proceedings.

Obviously some revision in the controlling statute is needed. The bill which I have introduced is intended to provide this relief.

The bill broadens the exemption power of the CAB to permit it to cope with situations such as I have described. It authorizes the CAB, pending decisions on applications by U.S.-flag carriers under section 401 of the Federal Aviation Act, to exempt a carrier from enforcement of section 401—thus permitting it to operate—for a temporary period if the CAB finds that the carrier "is placed at a competitive disadvantage" with respect to foreign carriers and that the national interest is thereby "adversely affected." The Board's action is subject to approval by the President which assures that the President's constitutional prerogative in the conduct of foreign policy is fully respected.

If enacted, the present procedural inequity will be removed, the CAB and the President will be able to grant interim operating rights to U.S. air carriers in timely fashion to enable them to compete on even terms with foreign air carriers who receive rights under the expedited procedures now available to them, and the sound development of the U.S.-flag international air transportation system will be promoted.

In short, the bill will permit the CAB upon a proper showing to clear away some of the procedural underbrush which has been allowed to frustrate the national interest. The effect will be to put the CAB and the President in a position promptly to place U.S.-flag carriers in a position of competitive equality and permit them to make their full contribution to the commercial interests of the United States and the important balance-of-payments objectives which must be attained.

The bill also provides that any exemptions involving overseas or foreign air transportation and which may be granted by the CAB under the existing section 416 shall also be subject to approval by the President. This is consistent with section 801 which requires approval by the President of any certificate authority granted by section 401 involving overseas and foreign air transportation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3197) to amend section 416 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3197

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

SEC. 2. In subsection 416(b) relating to exemption of air carriers, amend paragraph 1 by adding at the end thereof the following: "In addition, if an air carrier has filed an application under section 401 to engage in overseas or foreign air transportation, the Board may exempt the carrier from the enforcement of section 401 with respect to air transportation covered by the application, for a temporary period to continue not longer than sixty days after the final decision by the Board on the application filed under section 401, if it finds that pending hearing and final decision on its application under section 401 the carrier is placed at a competitive disadvantage with respect to a foreign air carrier or carriers serving the United States pursuant to permits issued under section 402 and approved by the President under section 801, and that the development and promotion of the United States flag international air transportation system is thereby adversely affected. No exemption shall be issued under this paragraph (1) which involves overseas or foreign air transportation without the affirmative approval of the Board and the President."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 402 OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there has been much discussion in recent years, both at home and abroad, about the authority, or lack of authority, of the Civil Aeronautics Board to deal directly and appropriately with foreign air carriers when and if their governments arbitrarily restrict U.S.-flag air carriers' operations to, from, through or over their territories. Since the problem has arisen in the past, and undoubtedly will arise again in the future, any question about the Board's authority to respond in kind ought to be settled.

There are many who believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board now possesses adequate authority under section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act to condition or otherwise limit foreign air carrier operating permits where required by the public interest in such cases. But questions and debate about the extent or limitation of the present authority have depreciated its value and usefulness. In fact, the publicly expressed differences of opinion here about this authority probably have weakened our bargaining position abroad, and may even encourage the imposition of restrictions on U.S.-flag air carriers by foreign governments in their absence of concern over the objections of, or retaliation by, the U.S. Government.

This bill is introduced to stimulate the necessary discussion and review of the Board's authority in this connection. Its purpose is to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 if it is found necessary to make clear that the CAB has the authority to take action against foreign carriers when their governments arbitrarily restrict or limit U.S.-flag airline operations.

Scheduled international air service is conducted by U.S. and foreign-flag airlines largely pursuant to one of two foundations—bilateral agreements or the principle of reciprocity. In either case, the right to provide this vital communication between any two nations requires the agreement, written or tacit, of both sovereign governments. And once agreement has been reached and rights granted, such rights should be fully and faithfully recognized. This Government should have powers over foreign air carriers no less than other governments have over our carriers, both to insure adherence to the letter and spirit of the rights granted, and to permit the taking

of action short of actually terminating air service.

This bill would clear the air in that area once and for all. It would spell out the power of the Board, in section 402(f) of the act, to take reciprocal action against carriers of foreign nations whose governments impair, limit, terminate, or deny the agreed-upon operating rights of U.S. airlines to fly to, from, through, or over the territory of those countries. Moreover, this bill would deal with another problem mentioned in the past by some who believe the existing statutory machinery contemplates a hearing process too long and too involved to be effective. In the face of swift, arbitrary unilateral action with little or no notice by foreign governments, they have felt our present machinery is unwieldy and ineffectual. This bill eliminates the notice and hearing requirement to permit the suspension of foreign air carrier permits for these extraordinary circumstances.

Lastly, this bill will preclude avoidance of the intent and effects of the authorized sanctions by such devices as the substitution of service by a foreign air carrier of a third country in the guise of a pooling or similar intercarrier cooperative arrangement.

Early discussion of, and settlement of, any questions of doubt about the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board over foreign air carriers would be most beneficial. Perhaps the future would then hold fewer and fewer instances of arbitrary unilateral action being taken against our airlines, and a healthier atmosphere for the continued growth of international air transport in the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill, together with the text of the bill, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3198) to amend section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3198

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (f) of section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1372 (f)) is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately atfer "(f)" and adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Whenever the Board finds that the government or aeronautical authorities of any foreign country have, over the objections of the Government of the United States, taken action which impairs, limits, terminates, or denies agreed-upon operating rights of any air carrier designated by the United States to conduct flight operations to, from, through, or over the territory of such foreign country, the Board may, without notice or hearing, suspend and, after notice and hearing, cancel or revoke the permits of foreign air carriers of such country, or alter, modify, amend, or limit operations under such permits, for the purpose of imposing sanctions of like or similar nature, if it finds such action to be in the public interest. The Board may also, without notice or hearing, to the extent it determines necessary to make the operation of this paragraph effective, restrict operations between such foreign country and the United States by any foreign air carrier of a third country notwithstanding the provisions of any permit or agreement."

The analysis presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF A BILL "TO AMEND SECTION 402 OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958"

Section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act pertains to the requirements for, and the issuance, terms and conditions, validity, modification and revocation of foreign air carrier permits. Under subsection (f), the Civil Aeronautics Board is authorized to alter, modify, amend, suspend, cancel or revoke foreign air carrier permits, after notice and hearing, whenever such action is found to be in the public interest.

The amendment would authorize the Board to suspend a foreign air carrier permit without notice and hearing and, after notice and hearing, to alter, modify, amend, cancel or revoke a foreign air carrier permit whenever it finds that the Government or aeronautical authorities of any foreign country have, over the objections of the Government of the United States, taken action which impairs, limits, terminates, or denies agreed-upon operating rights of any air carrier designated by the United States to conduct flight operations to, from, through or over the territory of such foreign country. The amendment further provides for the restriction of operations between such foreign country and the United States by any foreign air carrier of a third country in order to preclude avoidance of the intent and effects of the authorized sanctions by substitute foreign air carrier service brought about by foreign air carrier pooling or similar foreign intercarrier cooperative arrangements.

AMENDMENT TO WAR CLAIMS ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself, a bill to amend the War Claims Act so as to give nonprofit social welfare, religious, charitable, and educational organizations the same payment priority now given to small business concerns. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 3199) to amend section 213(a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to claims of certain nonprofit organizations, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the War Claims Act provides for the payment of claims of U.S. nationals for certain losses arising out of World War II. Awards are to be paid out of the War Claims Fund. Since the funds available may not be sufficient to discharge all claims in full, the law provides for certain priorities, and thereafter a pro rata payment distribution scheme.

Section 213(a)(1) of the act provides:

Payment in full of awards * * * to any claimant certified to the Commission by the Small Business Administration as having been on the date of loss, damage or destruction, a small business concern, within the meaning now set forth in the Small Business Act, as amended.

The purpose of this provision, as described in the Senate debates, was "to put small business ahead of big business." It was the feeling expressed in the Senate that since large corporations have in effect already "been repaid as a result of tax deductions and other businesses they operated" it would be just to now give priority to small businesses "which thus far have not had any concessions whatever in respect to the claims."

A number of American agencies organized primarily for social welfare, religious, charitable, or educational purposes have filed claims under the War Claims Act for the destruction of their properties in Europe. These include church groups, B'nai B'rith and others. It is felt that these claimants should not be put in a worse position than small business concerns.

The reasons which moved Congress to give priority to small businesses are at least equally compelling, if not more so, regarding the claims of nonprofit organizations serving the public interest. Such organizations have never been able to recoup their war losses by deductions from U.S. taxes or by offsets against other businesses abroad. Their combined claims will probably not equal the $5 million estimated as small business claims when the provision to favor small business was enacted.

Failure to grant nonprofit agencies at least the same priorities given to small business concerns which are conducted for personal profit would be inequitable. This measure seeks to correct that situation.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT TO PROVIDE FOR A "CONSCIENCE CLAUSE"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to insure that anyone whose objection to joining or paying dues to a union is based upon religious belief will not be forced to violate such religious belief.

This measure is identical to the amendment adopted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare last year when we were considering H.R. 77, the bill to repeal section 14(b). And that amendment was adopted with the concurrence of the AFL-CIO, with the concurrence of the representatives of those religious groups which would be directly affected, and with substantial bipartisan support.

I recognize that there has been, and no doubt will continue to be, some controversy concerning the precise language which should be used in such a "conscience clause." My colleague, Senator DOMINICK, has recently introduced a bill which differs in certain respects from this measure, and there have been proposals made in the House of Representatives which differ in other respects. But the one proposal which has already

been through the crucible of public hearings and extended discussion in executive sessions of the Labor Committee is this one. If it was worthy of general support as an amendment to H.R. 77, it seems clear to me that it is equally worthy of consideration on its own merits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this measure be printed in the RECORD, and that it be held at the desk for 1 week for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk for one week for cosponsors as requested.

The bill (S. 3203) to amend section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act to protect the rights of employees conscientiously opposed to membership in a labor organization, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3203

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by striking the semicolon at the end thereof and adding the following:

", or (C) if he has reasonable grounds for believing (i) that such employee has been issued a certificate by the National Labor Relations Board either that he is a member of a religious sect or division thereof, the established and traditional tenets or teachings of which oppose a requirement that a member of such sect or division join or financially support any labor organization, or that, even though he is not a member of such a religious sect or division thereof, he holds conscientious objections to membership in any labor organization based upon his religious training and beliefs in relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, and (ii) either that such employee has timely paid, in lieu of periodic dues and initiation fees, sums equal to such dues and initiation fees to a nonreligious charitable fund exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, designated by the labor organization, or that the labor organization has failed upon request to designate such a fund or waives such payment, or (iii) that such employee has complied with alternative arrangements mutually agreed upon by such employee and such labor organization;".

INSIGNIA FOR MERRILL'S MARAUDERS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I introduced today on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] and myself, a bill authorizing a separate sleeve insignia for the U.S. Army's unit known as Merrill's Marauders.

This volunteer unit, unofficially known as Merrill's Marauders, served with great distinction in the China-Burma-India theater during the Second World War. In recognition of its valor and accomplishments, the unit was awarded the Army's Distinguished Unit Citation on July 5, 1944.

While engaged in operations between February and May of 1944, the men of the 5307th Composite Unit won the following awards for personal valor:

Six Distinguished Service Crosses.

Forty-one Silver Stars.

Three Oak Leaf Clusters to Silver Stars.

These awards were won in 5 major and 30 minor engagements during the process of driving toward the town of Myitikyina in Japanese-held Burma, capturing Myitikyina and its important airfield.

The Marauders suffered casualties in this operation. A total of 93 men were killed in action; 8 were missing in action; and 293 were wounded in action. In addition, a total of 1,970 suffered from jungle diseases such as amoebic dysentery, typhus fever and malaria.

As a sign of their unit spirit and their pride in their accomplishments, the men of Merrill's Marauders wore a distinctive shoulder patch.

The patch consists of a blue shield with the words, "Merrill's Marauders" inscribed across the top of the shield in red. An inner shield outlined in red is divided into four parts. In the upper left section is the white star of the Republic of China on a blue background. In the lower right section is the white star of India on a blue background. A red thunderbolt runs diagonally across the upper right and lower left sections of green.

Although the men of the 5307th Composite Unit wore the shoulder patch described above, it has never been officially designated as the unit insignia. Merrill's Marauders were disbanded upon the successful completion of their long range penetration mission and the battle honors of the unit have been transferred to the 75th Infantry Regiment of the U.S. Army. The unit was never reformed and is unlikely to be reformed as an organization of the Army.

However, some veterans of the Marauders are serving with the U.S. Army or its Reserve components today. Under current Army regulations, they are not permitted to wear this shoulder insignia.

The Merrill's Marauders Association, composed of former members of the unit, have asked me to introduce legislation to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to prescribe as the approved insignia of the 5307th Composite Unit, Provisional, the shoulder sleeve insignia worn by members of this unit while serving in the China-Burma-India theater of operations during World War II.

I am pleased to introduce this legislation today.

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

The bill (S. 3204) to authorize a separate sleeve insignia for Merrill's Marauders, a volunteer unit of the U.S. Army that served in the China-Burma-India theater of operations during World War II, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of New York (for himself and Mr. MCGEE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966 AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 510 TO 513

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for myself and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], I submit, for appropriate reference, a series of amendments to S. 3005, the Traffic Safety Act of 1966.

MANDATORY MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS

The first amendment would make mandatory the setting of motor vehicle safety standards within 1 year after enactment of this act, and would cause those standards to become effective no sooner than 180 days nor later than 1 year from the date on which the standards were issued. The amendment also provides for annual review and appropriate revision of these standards as the Secretary deems necessary.

As presently drafted, S. 3005 leaves the setting of motor vehicle safety standards to the discretionary judgment of the administering Secretary. It provides that 2 years after enactment, the Secretary of Commerce, after making certain findings, would be authorized to set safety standards for motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment, which would become effective no sooner than 180 days and not later than 2 years after issuance of the standards.

Mr. President, the Federal Government's response to the shocking problem of traffic safety in America has been slow in coming. With each passing year, the toll of death and injuries—the fantastic economic loss—has mounted with alarming speed. We cannot speak now of discretionary authority and years of delay in setting standards for motor vehicle safety without thinking of the human price that must be paid.

Nor can we rely on the voluntary approach advanced by the industry. The question of public health and safety is not to be left to private policy makers.

If present accident rates continue we will be losing 60,000 Americans each year in traffic accidents by 1972. How many must die and be maimed before we begin to see the problem of highway safety as a major social calamity which deserves prompt and effective remedial action? We in Congress have a responsibility to make affirmative national policy in this vital area. To adopt the language of the present bill would be to see 40 or 50 million new cars roll off the assembly lines free of any safety regulation.

If we want this law to be a potent, effective, and timely instrument for the protection of the traveling public and the pedestrian we must legislate firm policy guidelines for action by the Secretary of Commerce. In the recently passed tire safety bill we did not leave the question of setting standards to the

discretion of the Secretary. We directed him to issue them by a certain date. We should do the same with respect to safety standards for motor vehicles.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 510) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 3, beginning with line 20, strike out all down through line 18 on page 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 102. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary shall, within one year after the enactment of this Act, establish and issue by order, in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act, Federal motor vehicle safety standards for motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment. Such standards shall be published in the Federal Register."

On page 4, line 23, strike out "two" and insert in lieu thereof "one".

On page 5, beginning with line 13, strike out all through line 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The Secretary shall annually review and, to the extent he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, by order revise, in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Federal motor vehicle safety standards issued pursuant to this section. Such revised standards shall be published in the Federal Register and shall be effective on the date specified by the Secretary in the regulations prescribing such standards which shall be no sooner than 180 days nor later than one year from the date on which such standards are issued, unless the Secretary finds, publishing his reasons therefor, that an earlier or later date is in the public interest."

PROTOTYPE SAFE CAR PROGRAM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, my second amendment would direct the Secretary to undertake a program to construct and test a prototype safe car and authorize him to fund up to 90 percent of the cost of construction and testing of a prototype safe car produced by a State. The senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] joins in sponsoring this measure.

The current language of the bill could be interpreted to authorize such action by the Secretary. However, I view this as so essential a part of any effort to arrive at proper safety standards for motor vehicles that I believe it deserves to be spelled out.

Prototype safe cars are not engineering forays into the world of tomorrow. They are a practical and efficient means of advancing automotive technology and providing benchmarks for measuring the relative safety and safe performance of assembly line products. Without an adequate prototype safe car program, the Secretary will be handicapped in his efforts to obtain data on which to base the promulgation of standards. This amendment would provide for the construction of more than one prototype safe car in order to assure a variety of approaches and a degree of competition in the search for safety motor vehicles.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 511) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 10, between lines 15 and 16 insert the following:

"DEVELOPMENT OF PROTOTYPE SAFE MOTOR VEHICLES

"SEC. 105. (a) In order to reduce traffic accidents, and deaths, injuries and property damage resulting from traffic accidents through the development of safety designs, characteristics and features for motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment, and to assist the Secretary in prescribing Federal motor vehicle safety standards pursuant to section 102, the Secretary is authorized to carry out a program to research, develop, construct and test fully operational passenger motor vehicles in prototype quantities embodying such safety designs, characteristics and features and technical approaches as he deems necessary. Such program shall not be limited to traditional methods of automobile design, styling, testing, production or sales practices and methods.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) acquire by purchase, license, lease for a term of years or less, or donation, secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, copyright applications, patents, copyrights, irrevocable nonexclusive licenses, and other rights and licenses under patents and copyrights granted by this or any other country;

"(2) negotiate research contracts, procure trade journals and technical information, and employ experts and consultants who shall be compensated at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time, and while so employed away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently; and

"(3) consult with any individuals, public or private agencies or organizations from which sound data, recommendations and evaluations may be obtained.

"(c) In order to carry out the purposes of this section and upon application by a State, the Secretary is authorized to make a grant pursuant to the provisions of this subsection for the payment of up to 90 per centum of the cost of a program to design, develop, construct and test fully operational passenger motor vehicles in prototype quantities embodying such safety designs, characteristics and features as the Secretary, after consultation with such State, shall prescribe. Such application shall—

"(1) designate, to carry out such program, a State agency that has demonstrated competence in the design, development and construction of such passenger motor vehicles;

"(2) set forth a detailed and comprehensive analysis of such program, including a cost analysis and a feasibility study;

"(3) contain assurances that the designated agency has authority to carry out such program in conformity with this subsection and the application, and that such State will pay from non-Federal sources the remaining cost of such program;

"(4) provide such fiscal control, fund accounting, and reporting procedures as the Secretary deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States; and

"(5) contain such further information and assurances as the Secretary may by regulation require.

"The Secretary may approve any application which he determines conforms to the requirements of this subsection."

On page 8, line 6, strike out "section 113" and insert in lieu thereof "section 114".

On page 10, line 17, strike out "SEC. 105" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 107".

On page 11, line 6, strike out "SEC. 106" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 107".

On page 12, line 7, strike out "SEC. 107" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 108".

On page 12, line 19, strike out "section 11(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 112(b)".

On page 14, line 2, strike out "SEC. 108" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 109".

On page 14, lines 2 and 3, strike out "section 107" and insert in lieu thereof "section 108".

On page 14, line 5, strike out "section 107" and insert in lieu thereof "section 108".

On page 14, line 16, strike out "SEC. 109" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 110".

On page 15, line 13, strike out "SEC. 110" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 111".

On page 15, line 15, strike out "section 107" and insert in lieu thereof "section 108".

On page 18, line 19, strike out "SEC. 111" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 112".

On page 19, line 23, strike out "SEC. 112" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 113".

On page 20, line 11, strike out "SEC. 113" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 114".

On page 20, line 17, strike out "SEC. 114" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 115".

On page 20, line 22, strike out "SEC. 115" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 116".

On page 20, line 24, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$13,000,000".

PUBLIC NOTICE OF SAFETY HAZARD DEFECTS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, my third amendment would provide an essential improvement in the recordkeeping section of the Traffic Safety Act by requiring that the Secretary be furnished with copies of all notices, bulletins, and other communications sent by auto manufacturers to their dealers or customers concerning the operation or defects of any motor vehicle or piece of motor vehicle equipment. If the Secretary determines that the public safety and convenience will be served he may take appropriate action to alert the public, based on information received through these bulletins or arrived at independently by the Secretary.

Mr. President, the air of confidentiality adopted by auto manufacturers with respect to defects or deficiencies in their products constitutes what might almost be called a betrayal of public trust. Just a day or two ago, General Motors confirmed that it is recalling more than a million 1964 and 1965 cars for corrective modification of a safety hazard. One can reasonably ask why it took so long for GM to act. I am asking the four auto companies to furnish my subcommittee with a complete list of product defect warnings issued since 1960.

A national magazine recently reported that the Ford Motor Co. has called in 1965 Lincoln Continentals because it had

been found that the brake fluid used in these cars would not stand up to heat. Purchasers of certain models of Chrysler Corp. cars received a letter early in February from the service manager in Detroit urging them to have the wheels on their cars inspected by their local dealer. The letter spoke of seeking to assure the customer of maximum satisfaction but made no mention of any safety hazard despite a clear implication that wheels bearing certain identification marks were deficient and should be replaced without delay.

Experience makes it all too clear that manufacturers cannot be relied upon to take aggressive steps to inform the motoring public candidly and quickly of potential defects or hazards in their products. If an unsafe condition is uncovered in a particular make or model of automobile, the public deserves to know about it immediately, not simply when it suits the convenience of the dealer or manufacturer, and in the form of an honest warning—not a product improvement flyer.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 512) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 19, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Every manufacturer of motor vehicles shall furnish to the Secretary a true copy of all notices, bulletins and other communications to the dealers of such manufacturer and purchasers of such manufacturers' products regarding the operation of any motor vehicle or any motor vehicle equipment sold or serviced by such dealer or regarding any defect in such vehicle or equipment. The Secretary shall disclose so much of the information contained in such notice or other information obtained under subsection (a) to the public as he deems will assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act, but he shall not disclose any information which contains or relates to a trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code unless he determines that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, my last amendment would require the Secretary to submit an annual report to Congress on the efforts of his department in promoting traffic safety. Mr. President, it is vitally important that Congress be kept thoroughly informed about how this bill is being administered and with what effect. Serious charges have been aired abroad which suggest that the Federal Government has not been adequately concerned about the safety of the traveling public on our highways—that a kind of conspiracy of silence has prevailed between the Government and certain elements of our vast highway transportation system.

We must end forever any suspicion in the public mind that economic interests have priority over highway safety. Moveover, we need to recognize that improving traffic safety is a complex matter and that there are areas where we need to gather far more information than is presently available. If the Secretary needs additional resources to conduct research or to administer this program properly, then we should learn of it promptly.

Finally, we need a detailed annual report from the Secretary to determine whether this legislation needs to be revised and strengthened. The problem of traffic safety must not be allowed to slide off into some dark corner—there to be ignored until once again the American public cries out for protection from this brutal but essential instrument of our society.

I say "cries out again" because today the public is aroused; indeed, is deeply disturbed by this problem. The highway statistics are reaching out to touch with tragedy literally millions of American families. Half of all the new cars built each year end up with blood on them—involved in some kind of injury-producing accident in the course of their inevitable trip to the junkyard.

Each year that passes brings more cars and more drivers to our overloaded highway system, increasing the chances for accident involvement. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this final amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point, and I urge my colleagues to give their support to a strengthened and amended version of the Traffic Safety Act of 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 513) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 20, line 16, strike out "REGULATIONS" and insert in lieu thereof "REGULATIONS AND REPORT".

On page 20, line 17, insert "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 114."

On page 20, between lines 20 and 21 insert the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Congress in January of each year a comprehensive and detailed report on the administration of this Act during the preceding calendar year which shall contain an evaluation of the national traffic safety situation."

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, we have an opportunity to adopt the most vitally needed piece of consumer protection legislation that has come before this body in many years. We have an opportunity to help protect the American citizen from a machine he has yet to learn to master and yet cannot do without.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD an article from yesterday's New York Times on this subject.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 4, 1966]

ONE AND ONE-HALF MILLION CARS CALLED IN FOR CHEVROLET MODIFYING

(By Walter Rugaber)

DETROIT, April 4.—The General Motors Corp. said today that about 1.5 million of its Chevrolet models now on the highways would be recalled to correct a throttle that sticks under certain conditions.

The two models involved will be called in by Chevrolet dealcrs to have the improvement installed free, the company said. The models are:

The 1965 standard-sized Chevrolet—including the Caprice, Impala, Biscayne, and Bel Air models—with Power-Glide transmissions.

The 1964 and 1965 Chevelle—including the 300, the Malibu, and the de luxe—with Power-Glide transmission.

Chevrolets and Chevelles equipped with either a manual transmission or a Turbo-Hydra-Matic transmission will not be required to have the improvement, the company said.

A Chevrolet spokesman said that the division knew of five instances when the throttle had jammed on cars with the Powerglide feature.

This occurred, the spokesman insisted when the autos were operated at a steady, sustained speed in a heavy, wet snowstorm.

It is possible for snow to pack tightly about a linkage rod and freeze at temperatures around 32 degrees if the throttle is held steady for a time, the Chevrolet official said.

Chevrolet intends to install a shield about 6 by 10 inches in size that will fit over the carburetor-transmission linkage.

The GM division mailed out letters to its 6,500 dealers several months ago in which the improvement was ordered.

Each shield will reportedly cost the company about $2, so that the entire project would involve about $3 million. About 30,000 shields have been installed so far, it was estimated.

An official said "every effort" would be made to find the rest of the owners of cars involved and that registered letters would be sent to them if necessary.

He conceded, however, that the dealers could not be forced to continue their efforts if the initial attempts failed. The dealers are "independent businessmen," he pointed out.

The Chevrolet spokesman also said that in many areas of the country it snowed only rarely, if ever, and that elsewhere the freeze-ups occurred only under special snow conditions.

When asked why the throttle problem was not encountered during tests at the General Motors proving grounds at Milford, Mich., he said the division "didn't happen to run into that kind of snow out there."

LINKAGE ROD AFFECTED

The carburetor, which sends a mixture of fuel and air into the engine, is connected to both the accelerator pedal and the automatic transmission.

The linkage rod that is subject to freeze-up, the spokesman explained, is one that runs between the carburetor and the transmission.

With this frozen, it was said, the accelerator pedal would in turn be held immobile. In effect, the car would keep going even when the motorist took his foot off the gas pedal.

The Chevrolet spokesman said there had been no injuries in any of the five freeze-up incidents about which the division said it had learned. He said he did not know if accidents had resulted.

"Usually they (the drivers) managed to get it (the car) under control some way," the spokesman said.

Sometimes kicking the accelerator pedal would dislodge the throttle, he explained, and in other instances drivers stopped the cars by turning off the ignition.

Major manufacturers have all recalled cars to dealers for design improvements or to correct defects in the manufacturing process.

A source at General Motors said it happened there "occasionally."

In most cases the changes are made as quietly as possible. The industry's critics have cited past changes in the vehicle as obvious evidence that the cars could be improved generally.

[By United Press International]

WASHINGTON, April 4.—Ralph Nader, the auto critic, called today for Federal legislation to require automobile makers to specify how safe their cars are and recall any defective vehicles.

Mr. Nader, author of "Unsafe at Any Speed," testified before the Senate Commerce Committee at hearings on proposals by President Johnson that could lead to Federal regulation of automobile safety.

He told the committee that Chevrolet had begun to recall 1964–65 Chevelles and all 1965 Chevrolets with Power Glide transmissions for a safety alteration. He said the General Motors Corp. had acted only because of the current controversy over auto safety.

Mr. Nader, in calling for much stronger auto safety legislation than President Johnson has proposed, declared:

"Automakers will not tell the motorist such important facts as brake stopping ability."

He said they were equally silent on such points as seat strength, dash panel, and windshield cushioning ability, door latch and hinge strength, roof-collapse strength, tire blowout and skid resistance, and the rearward displacement of the steering column under crash conditions.

"If 20 years ago the public knew that the so-called safety windshield in their cars could be penetrated at an impact as low as 12 miles an hour—which was true through 1965—it might not have taken two decades for improvements to be made," Mr. Nader said.

He also said many thousands of 1961 Pontiac Tempests were defective because of a "front cross member design without a skid plate and with low road clearance."

He said that "this exposed the vehicle to hanging up on elevations in road surfaces such as railroad grade crossings."

CITES GM LAWSUITS

"Dozens of claims by injured people whose Tempest stopped in this manner while occupants kept going against windshield, dash, or steering assembly were paid by the General Motors Corp., who admitted responsibility for such mishaps," Mr. Nader testified.

Other testimony brought out that an auto safety research program costing $700,000 in Federal funds had "produced unreliable and inaccurate" conclusions.

Dr. Paul Joliet, Director of the Accident Prevention Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, made the statement after Mr. Nader had testified that Department officials had refused to say why the study, made by the Harvard Medical School, had been prematurely terminated.

The proposed bill would impose Federal standards for auto construction at the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce. It would also finance Federal studies of safety needs in cars and underwrite a portion of State safety research work.

OTHER CASES RECALLED

DETROIT, April 4.—Chevrolet is not the first automaker to recall cars for adjustments.

A recent case involved some adjustments made in the rear braking system of 500 of the 14,496 Le Sabres built during the 1965 model run by GM's Buick Division. An investigation showed the difficulty was caused by a gasket that was several thousands of an inch thicker than specifications and that might cause certain nuts in the braking system to work loose after 25,000 miles or more of driving.

Buick determined 500 cars had been built with the faulty gasket and called them in for repair.

The Ford Motor Co.'s Lincoln-Mercury Division is currently winding up a program to recall 40,000 of its 1966 Lincoln Continentals.

A spokesman said disk brakes on the front wheels heated up if people "rode" the brake pedal. He said the recalled cars had their brake fluid changed for a type with a higher resistance to heat.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am glad to have the opportunity to cosponsor these four amendments to S. 3005 introduced by Senator RIBICOFF today. I think that their adoption by the Senate Commerce Committee and the Senate will materially improve the traffic safety bill.

I think that the amendments to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue safety standards for motor vehicles rather than leave it to his discretionary authority is a necessary change in this bill. As I stated the other day, it would be an inappropriate delegation of Congress' authority to ask the Secretary to determine whether safety standards should be issued. The Secretary should be required to issue standards; his discretion should extend only to the question of which standards to require.

I also believe that the Federal Government has enough information on safety standards to issue requirements within 1 year, and additionally require that the automobile industry comply with these requirements within a year from that date. If safety standards are not issued until 1970, as recommended in the current version of the bill, over 40 million additional cars will be placed on the highways without the benefit of these safety standards; and each one can be expected to be on our highways for 6 to 8 years.

I am also supporting an amendment to the language in S. 3005 to require that motor vehicle manufacturers provide the Secretary of Transportation with copies of all their communications with their dealers on the operation of motor vehicles or defects in the cars that they have sold. It is particularly important that the purchaser of a car be informed of any safety hazards that might have been overlooked or that develop in the car that he buys. This provision would insure that the consumer is informed of such defects.

The amendment requiring the submission of an annual report on auto safety by the Secretary of Transportation is a necessary one. Such a document could be highly useful to both the consumer and the auto industry. It would fully describe the decisions made on safety standards during the year; the major safety problem areas confronting the industry; the ways in which research and test knowledge is being translated into applicable safety and the ways in which the information developed by the agency is made available to the public. It is highly necessary that such an agency provide full information to the consumer; this report can accomplish this.

I am also supporting an amendment to clarify the language in S. 3005 relating to the development of prototype safe motor vehicles. The original language of the bill did not make it clear that the Secretary was authorized to carry out a program of research, development, and testing on new prototype vehicles and components. It is difficult to get new safety ideas adopted by major motor vehicle manufacturers, for the cost of change is great. Testing and development of new ideas both in the form of vehicle and vehicle components can be useful in highlighting new approaches to safety problems.

I hope that the Senate Commerce Committee will have an opportunity to consider these amendments in detail. Their adoption will benefit all who drive cars.

HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 514

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I submit, for myself and Senator HARRIS, of Oklahoma, and Senator NELSON, of Wisconsin, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 3052, the "Highway Safety Act of 1966."

This amendment would authorize grants to States to help pay up to half the cost of developing, establishing or improving State programs for motor vehicle inspection and driver education and training.

I am submitting this amendment with a clear understanding that it will mean a substantial increase in Federal expenditures for traffic safety. It will, in fact, add $525 million to the cost of the administration's proposed highway safety program over a 6-year period.

There is one simple and irrefutable basis for this amendment—the administration's existing proposal is simply inadequate. A serious social problem that is costing the United States 49,000 people killed, 4.5 million injured, and $8.5 billion in economic loss cannot be overcome by distributing $70 million a year among all 50 States for a broad range of "program" grants. These limited funds would have little or no impact on the two areas of State activity that have proven effective in promoting highway safety—vehicle inspection and driver training.

I am not suggesting that the other areas cited in the administration's bill should be ignored. Better highway design and traffic control, effective accident recording systems and expanded spot-improvement programs all warrant Federal support. But we know from past experience that little can be achieved by spreading too little money over too wide an area.

An investment in driver training programs can help produce a generation of younger drivers who will carry safe driving habits with them the rest of their lives. Yet today only 45 percent of eligible students are enrolled in driver training courses in our secondary schools. To raise that figure to 100 percent, the Federal Government should be prepared to assume half the cost—or $60 million annually.

Mr. President, the average passenger automobile on the road today is 6 years old, yet only 20 States and the District

of Columbia require periodic inspection of motor vehicles. To encourage the other 30 States to adopt inspection programs, and to enable those which now require inspection to expand and improve their programs, I recommend a $45 million matching grant program. After an agreed period of time, these programs would operate on a self-sustaining basis.

It is time we recognized the fact that traffic safety is expensive. There is no cheap solution to this problem which we have ignored so long that it has now become a shocking disgrace.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 514) was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

On page 1, after line 7, strike out "404. National driver register" and insert in lieu thereof:

"404. Grants for State motor vehicle inspection programs.

"405. Grants for State driver education and training programs.

"406. National driver register."

On page 4, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new sections:

"§ 404. Grants for State motor vehicle inspection programs.

"(a) From sums appropriated pursuant to the Highway Safety Act of 1966 to carry out the provisions of this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 and for the four succeeding fiscal years, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to States to pay up to 50 per centum of the cost for the development, establishment or improvement of State programs for motor vehicle inspection in accordance with the provisions of this section. The Secretary shall determine the amount of the Federal share of the cost of such programs for each fiscal year based upon the funds appropriated therefor for that fiscal year and the number of participating States.

"(b) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this section shall designate or create an appropriate State agency for the purpose of this section, and submit, through such State agency, a State plan which shall—

"(1) set forth a program for establishing, or improving (in the case of a State which already has in operation a State administered motor vehicle inspection program), State supervised motor vehicle inspection at garages or other suitable facilities certified by the State for that purpose;

"(2) agree to accept and apply such minimum standards for highway traffic safety with respect to inspection as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe;

"(3) provide that the State will pay from non-Federal sources the cost of such program in excess of amounts received under this section;

"(4) set forth provisions for the financing of such plan without Federal assistance beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973;

"(5) contain satisfactory evidence that the State agency will adequately supervise such program;

"(6) provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require; and

"(7) provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting of funds received under this section.

"(c) The Secretary shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (b).

"§ 405. Grants for State driver education and training programs

"(a) From sums appropriated pursuant to the Highway Safety Act of 1966 to carry out the provisions of this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 and for the four succeeding fiscal years, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to States to pay up to 50 per centum of the cost of developing, establishing, and improving programs for driver education in accordance with the provisions of this section. The Secretary shall determine the amount of the Federal share of the cost of such programs for each fiscal year based upon the funds appropriated therefor for that fiscal year and the number of participating States.

"(b) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this section shall designate or create an appropriate State agency for the purpose of this section, and submit, through such State agency, a State plan which shall—

"(1) provide for the initiation of a State program for driver education or for a significant expansion and improvement of such a program already in existence:

"(2) include provisions for the training of qualified instructors and their certification;

"(3) provide for adequate research, development, and procurement of practice driving facilities, simulators, and other similar teaching aids;

"(4) include provision for financial assistance by the State to institutions of higher education for research in driver education testing, curriculum, and methods of instruction;

"(5) provide that the State will pay from non-Federal sources the cost of such program in excess of amounts received under this section;

"(6) provide adequate State supervision and administration of such driver education; and

"(7) provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting of funds received under this section.

"(c) Prior to prescribing regulations under this section the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(d) The Secretary shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (b)."

On page 4, line 17, strike out "§ 404" and substitute "§ 406".

On page 7, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new sections:

"SEC. 105. For the purpose of carrying out section 404 of title 23, United States Code, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the highway trust fund, the additional sum of $45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each of the succeeding four fiscal years.

"SEC. 106. For the purpose of carrying out section 405 of title 23, United States Code, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the highway trust fund, the additional sum of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each of the succeeding four fiscal years."

On page 7, line 3, strike out "SEC. 105" and substitute "SEC. 107".

On page 7, line 10, strike out "SEC. 106" and substitute "SEC. 108".

On page 7, line 17, strike out "SEC. 107" and substitute "SEC. 109".

On page 8, line 8, strike out "SEC. 108" and substitute "SEC. 110".

AMENDMENTS TO EMPLOYMENT SERVICE AND POVERTY BILLS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 515 THROUGH 518

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a continuing concern of many observers of the war on poverty is the duplication and deficiency in effective coordination among its various programs and other Federal programs, particularly in the field of manpower training. The current hearings before the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am the ranking minority member, highlight the need for much more concentrated effort at coordination of training programs around the existing network of Employment Service agencies administered by the States with Federal funds.

Accordingly, I am today introducing for reference to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, parallel amendments to the pending bill to amend the Employment Service Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, S. 2974, and to the Economic Opportunity Act to achieve coordination of the Federal training programs with the Employment Service.

I am also introducing three additional amendments to the Employment Service bill:

First, establishing a program of relocation assistance to increase the mobility of unemployed individuals;

Second, broadening the provision of S. 2974 for training of Employment Service personnel to include, on a reimbursable basis, employees of private employment agencies; and

Third, increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee to include two representatives of the private employment agencies.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill and amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments and bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 515) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

On page 10, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary through the national manpower services system shall—

"(1) recruit, counsel and refer to the appropriate office or agency individuals who are in need of and eligible for training under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2571–2620), for the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, work training, work-study or work experience programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2701–2981), for vocational training under the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, and the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 11–35n), or for any other training program or combination of programs designed to improve or restore the employability of individuals financed in whole or in part with Federal funds; and

"(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the head of any other Federal agency administering a pro-

gram referred to in the preceding paragraph, such employment information concerning such individuals as he determines will facilitate their placement.

In order to facilitate the furnishing of coordinated manpower services to such individuals, the Secretary shall make such arrangements as he deems practical to have local offices administering any program referred to in paragraph (1) located in close proximity (in the same building, if possible) with the relevant manpower service center."

On page 10, line 17, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)".

On page 10, line 20, strike out "subsection (a) of".

The bill (S. 3201) to strengthen the coordination of economic opportunity programs with the activities of the U.S. Employment Service, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3201

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 611 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) In order to insure the maximum coordination of programs and activities authorized by this Act with the programs and activities carried out by the United States Employment Service, the Director and the Secretary of Labor shall, by joint regulation, provide for such coordination at the local level in public employment offices throughout the country. The Director shall include, as a part of the annual report prescribed by section 608, a detailed and comprehensive description of the activities and actions taken pursuant to this subsection."

The amendment (No. 516) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 2974

On page 7, line 15, insert "(a)" immediately after the section designation.

On page 8, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) Based upon the results of the labor mobility demonstration projects conducted pursuant to section 104 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Secretary of Labor shall carry out a program to increase the mobility of unemployed individuals by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. In carrying out such a program the Secretary may provide such assistance, in the form of grants or loans, or both, only to involuntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, have bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment), and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed. Loans or grants provided under this subsection shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, with loans subject to the following limitations:

"(1) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

"(2) the credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

"(3) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

"(4) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (A) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (B) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Secretary may determine to be consistent with its purposes; and

"(5) the loan is repayable within not more than ten years.

Of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out this Act, not more than $——— may be used in such year for the purposes of this subsection."

The amendment (No. 517) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

On page 11, between lines 23 and 24, add the following new sentence: "The Secretary may make such training programs available to employees of private employment agencies on a reimbursable basis."

The amendment (No. 518) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

On page 17, between lines 22 and 23 insert the following:

"(b) Section 205(a) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by adding after the first sentence thereof the following: 'Two additional members to serve on the National Advisory Committee when such committee carries out its function with respect to the Manpower Services Act of 1966 shall be appointed by the Secretary from persons representing private employment agencies.'"

On page 17, line 23, strike out "(b)" and substitute "(c)".

On page 18, line 4, strike out "(c)" and substitute "(d)".

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 519 THROUGH 528

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit sundry amendments which I intend to propose to the pending bill for foreign assistance, Senate bill 2859, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with explanatory statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments and the accompanying explanations will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 519) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 2, after line 2, insert the following:

"SEC. 102. Section 201(b), which relates to general authority of the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

"(a) In the second sentence, strike out 'and' the last time it appears, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and insert a comma, and add the following: '(7) the degree to which the recipient country is making progress toward respect for the rule of law, freedom of expression and of the press, and recognition of the importance of individual freedom, initiative, and private enterprise, and (8) whether or not the activity to be financed will contribute to making the recipient country self-sufficient.'

"(b) At the end thereof, add the following new sentence: 'Funds made available under this title, except funds made available pursuant to section 205, shall not be used to make loans in more than ten countries in any fiscal year.'"

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 519 is as follows:

This amendment makes two changes in the authority for development loans.

First, it adds two new criteria to the factors to be taken into account in making such loans. These criteria, which are spelled out in the amendment, were included in last year's Senate foreign aid bill as principles to be taken into account in shaping a new foreign aid program.

Second, the bill limits to 10 the number of countries where development loans may be made in any fiscal year except through the World Bank and its affiliates as provided in the transfer authority of section 205.

AID plans to make loans to only 10 countries in fiscal 1967 plus an undistributed amount of $18.2 million for several unspecified African countries. Loans of this latter type would be particularly appropriate for multilateral administration. In addition AID lists three other countries as "eligible for development lending."

The argument for this amendment is that it would force AID to concentrate its efforts. To the degree that AID desired to disperse its efforts, it would have to do so through multilateral channels.

The amendment (No. 520) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 2, after line 18, insert the following:

"(a) Sec. 211(a) which relates to general authority for technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

"(a) In the second sentence, strike out "and" the last time it appears, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and insert a comma, and add the following: "(7) the degree to which the recipient country is making progress toward respect for the rule of law, freedom of expression and of the press, and recognition of the importance of individual freedom, initiative, and private enterprise, and (8) whether or not the activity to be financed will contribute to making the recipient country self-sufficient."

"(b) At the end thereof, add the following new sentence: 'The authority of this title shall not be used to furnish assistance to more than 40 countries in any fiscal year.'"

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 520 is as follows:

This amendment makes two changes in section 211(a) which contains the general authority for technical cooperation and development grants.

First, it includes among the criteria to be considered the factors which are listed in the amendment and which are self-explanatory. These factors were in the Senate foreign aid bill last year as principles to be taken into account in formulating future foreign aid programs.

Second, the amendment limits to 40 the number of countries which may receive technical cooperation and development grants in any one year. This is also consistent with the Senate's 1965 aid bill which suggested a limit of 50 countries receiving all types of assistance. Upon reflection, it seems that a better way to impose limits is by the type of assistance furnished, and that is what has been done in this series of amendments.

The limit of 40 countries proposed by the amendment compares with 47 in which AID proposes technical cooperation or development grant programs in fiscal 1967—plus 6 regional programs. Of the 47 country programs proposed, 19 are for less than $1 million.

The amendment (No. 521) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 4, after line 17, insert the following:

"(a) Sec. 251(b), which relates to general authority for the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

"In the second sentence, strike out 'and' the last time it appears, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and insert a semicolon and the following:

"'(5) the degree to which the recipient country is making progress toward respect for the rule of law, freedom of expression and of the press, and recognition of the importance of individual freedom, initiative, and private enterprise; (6) whether or not the activity to be financed will contribute to making the recipient country self-sufficient; and (7) the extent to which the activity to be financed will contribute to the economic or political integration of Latin America.'"

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 521 is as follows:

This amendment writes three new criteria into the list of things to be taken into account in furnishing assistance under the Alliance for Progress.

The criteria numbered five and six in the amendment are taken from the Senate version of the foreign aid bill last year which included them among the principles to be taken into account in formulating future foreign aid programs.

The remaining point in the amendment concerning the economic or political integration of Latin America is suggested on its own merits. It is, incidentally, consistent with the resolutions of the Rio Conference of OAS Foreign Ministers last November.

The amendment (No. 522) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 4, after line 22, insert the following:

"(b) Sec. 251, which relates to general authority for the Alliance for Progress, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) Loans may be made under authority of this title only to support national economic plans which have been approved by the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. Whenever the President determines that the purposes of this title would be better served thereby, he may make available, in addition to any other funds available for such purposes, on such terms and conditions as he determines, not to exceed 15 per centum of the funds made available for this title to the Inter-American Development Bank, or to any of the institutions named in Sec. 205, for use pursuant to the laws governing United States participation in the said Bank or in such institutions and the governing statutes thereof and without regard to section 201 or any other requirements of this or any other Act.'"

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 522 is as follows:

This amendment would introduce two new elements into the Alliance for Progress, both designed to move it further in the direction of multilateralism.

First, it would provide that Alliance for Progress loans may be made only to support national economic plans approved by the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress (CIAP). The effect would be that before a country could participate fully in the Alliance it would have to make a national economic plan which would be approved by the Alliance's international body. CIAP would not be given the power to control American aid; it would be given only a limited veto in the sense that if it did not approve a country's plan, that country could receive no U.S. loans. CIAP, consisting of six distinguished Latin Americans and one North American, is in a better position than AID or the State Department to insist on rigorous Latin American compliance with the standards of the Alliance. (Note, however, that the amendment would not apply to grant aid; i.e., to technical assistance or to emergency assistance to meet unforeseen contingencies.)

Second, the amendment would authorize the transfer of up to 15 percent of Alliance for Progress funds to the Inter-American Development Bank or to the World Bank or its affiliates. This is analogous to the authority presently existing in Sec. 205 for the transfer of development loan funds to the World Bank or its affiliates.

The amendment (No. 523) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 9, after line 1, insert the following:

"SEC. 109. Section 401 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general authority for supporting assistance, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That not more than 10 countries may receive assistance under the authority of this chapter in any fiscal year.'"

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 523 is as follows:

This amendment would limit to 10 the number of countries receiving supporting assistance.

The administration proposes 13 countries for fiscal 1967.

The amendment (No. 524) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 10, after line 4, insert the following:

"CHAPTER 6—ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES HAVING AGRARIAN ECONOMIES

"SEC. 111. Amend chapter 6 of part I, which relates to assistance to countries having agrarian economies, as follows:

"(a) Amend the title to read, 'Assistance to Non-Industrialized Countries'.

"(b) Add the following new section:

"'SEC. 462. Assistance for population control.—Funds made available for use under this part may be used, when so requested by the recipient country, to furnish technical and other assistance for the control of population growth.'"

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 524 is as follows:

This amendment specifically authorizes the use of economic assistance funds, on request, to furnish technical and other assistance for the control of population growth.

The law now specifically authorizes the conduct of research into the problems of population growth. By implication, it authorizes more active population control programs. The amendment would make this authority explicit.

The amendment would thereby overcome some lingering timidity on the part of AID lawyers and administrators to embark on a serious effort to solve the underdeveloped world's most crucial problem.

The amendment (No. 525) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 10, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

"(b) Section 614(c), which relates to special authorities, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The President shall promptly and fully inform the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of each use of funds under this subsection.'"

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 525 is as follows:

This amendment would require the President to report to the Speaker of the House and to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on his use of the confidential funds which are now authorized in the amount of $50 million by section 614(c). Under the administration's proposal, the authority under section 614(c) would be reduced to $25 million, and similar authority for $25 million would be added in the proposed Military Assistance and Sales Act.

The law authorizes the President to use these funds "pursuant to his certification that it is inadvisable to specify the nature of the use of such funds, which certification shall be deemed to be a sufficient voucher for such amounts."

This is the only important provision of the act on which the President is not required to make some kind of report to Congress. Most of these reports, many of which are classified, are made to the Speaker of the House and to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate. In view of the sensitivity of the subject matter, the proposed amendment would require reports on the use of confidential funds only to the Speaker and to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There ought to be some congressional check on these funds, and this is certainly a minimal one.

The amendment (No. 526) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 11, lines 5 through 9. Strike out subsection (a) and insert the following:

"(a) Section 622(b), which relates to coordination with foreign policy, is amended by striking out '(including any civic action and sales program)' and inserting '(including civic action) or sales programs'."

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 526 is as follows:

This rather technical amendment to the administration's economic aid bill would have the effect of preserving the requirement of existing law that recommendations pertaining to military assistance be coordinated with political and economic considerations.

The administration bill makes two changes in the existing law (section 622(b)).

First, it makes a technical change designed to emphasize the concept of a separation between military assistance and military sales programs. This change is retained in the amendment here proposed to the administration bill.

Second, the administration bill would require that recommendations of the U.S. country team pertaining to military assistance and economic assistance be fully coordinated. This is to be compared to the existing law which requires military assist-

ance recommendations to be coordinated with political and economic considerations.

Political and economic considerations should continue to be taken into account in determining military assistance programs, and this requirement should remain in the law.

The amendment (No. 527) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 10, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

"(b) Sec. 619, which relates to assistance to newly independent countries, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 619. Multilateral Organizations and Plans.—Assistance under this Act and under the Military Assistance and Sales Act shall, to the maximum extent appropriate in the circumstances of each case, be furnished through multilateral organizations or in accordance with multilateral plans, on a fair and equitable basis with due regard to self-help.'"

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 527, is as follows:

This amendment is intended to broaden the directive in existing law that economic assistance to newly independent countries be furnished on a multilateral basis.

The amendment would apply to all countries receiving assistance and would apply to military as well as to economic assistance. The amendment would retain the existing language that assistance be furnished through multilateral organizations or in accordance with multilateral plans "to the maximum extent appropriate in the circumstances of each case."

The purpose of the amendment is to take one more step toward shifting the emphasis of the program, in both its economic and military aspects, from a bilateral to a multilateral basis.

The amendment (No. 528) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 10, between lines 13 and 14 insert the following:

"(b) Section 620(k) which relates to a prohibition against furnishing assistance to certain countries, is amended to read as follows:

"'(k) Without the express approval of Congress, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise, nor shall any assistance be furnished under Chapter 2 of the Military Assistance and Sales Act to any country for carrying out any program, with respect to which the aggregate value of assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed $100,000,000. No other provision of this or any other Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.'"

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 528, is as follows:

This amendment would broaden and make permanent a temporary prohibition in existing law against the initiation of very large projects.

This prohibition, which is found in section 620(k), had its origin in 1963 in the concern of Congress over the proposed Bokaro steel mill in India. As originally enacted in 1963, the subsection reads as follows:

"Until the enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 or other general legislation, during the calendar year 1964, authorizing additional appropriations to carry out programs of assistance under this Act, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise with respect to which the aggregate value of such assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed $100,000,000. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection."

In 1964, this prohibition was extended to 1965; but it has not been again extended and has not been operative since September 6, 1965, the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of that year

The proposed amendment would require, from now on, the express approval of Congress for the initiation of these very large projects.

The amendment would also broaden the existing law to include grant military assistance programs which will amount in aggregate to more than $100,000,000. The purpose is to attempt to provide an additional safeguard against programs which begin small and grow to major commitments.

FOREIGN MILITARY ASSISTANCE—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 529 THROUGH 535

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit sundry amendments which I intend to propose to the pending bill (S. 2861) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward internal and external security. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with explanatory statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments and the accompanying explanations will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 529) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 13, after line 4, add the following:

"(3) In furnishing assistance to any economically underdeveloped nation under this Act, the President shall take into account the percentage of the recipient country's budget which is devoted to military purposes, and its capacity to meet any additional budgetary costs which might be occasioned by the assistance in question to the end that military costs do not unduly burden its economy."

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 529, is as follows:

This amendment would add a new paragraph to the subsection of the administration's military assistance bill dealing with restrictions on such assistance to economically developed countries.

The amendment, which is self-explanatory, is intended to impose some restraint on furnishing military assistance to underdeveloped countries which might better devote their limited resources to more productive purposes.

The amendment (No. 530) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 19, after line 7, insert the following:

"(k) The total number of countries receiving assistance under authority of this chapter in any fiscal year shall not exceed 45."

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 530, is as follows:

This amendment limits to 45 the number of countries to which military assistance may be furnished in any fiscal year.

The administration proposes 53 countries for fiscal 1967.

The amendment (No. 531) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 21, line 8, strike out "value of grant programs of defense articles" and insert "total value of military assistance and sales (other than training) under this Act or in accordance with section 7307 of title 10, United States Code,".

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 531 is as follows:

This amendment tightens the limitation on military assistance to Latin America.

Section 23(a) of the administration's military assistance bill reenacts section 511(a) of the existing law, which puts a limit of $55 million a year on grant military assistance (other than training) to Latin America.

The amendment would leave the limit at $55 million but would count against the limit not only grant programs but also sales and ships loaned under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 7307. Training would continue to be exempt.

The importance of applying the limitation to all kinds of assistance except training is shown by the proposed program for fiscal 1967. The total in grants is $72 million, of which only $50.4 million counts against the $55 million ceiling. In addition, sales are contemplated of $55.5 million. Finally, substantial additional amounts of military assistance are put into Latin America under 10 U.S.C. 7307 which provides, in part:

"(b) Without authority from Congress granted after March 10, 1961, no battleship, aircraft carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine that has not been stricken from the Naval Vessel Register under section 7304 of this title, nor any interest of the United States in such a vessel, may be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of under any law (Aug. 10, 1956, ch. 1041, 70A Stat. 452)."

Congress has frequently authorized these transfers, most recently in October 1965 with respect to destroyers for Brazil and Argentina.

The amendment (No. 532) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 22, line 8, strike out "value of grant programs of defense articles" and insert "total value of military assistance and sales (other than training) under this Act or in accordance with section 7307 of title 10, United States Code,".

Line 11, strike out "chapter" and insert "Act".

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 532 is as follows:

This amendment tightens the limitation on military assistance to Africa.

Section 23(b) of the administration's military assistance bill would make permanent the limitation of section 512 of existing law. This limitation is that, unless the President determines otherwise, grant military assistance may be furnished to Africa only for internal security or civic action requirements, and that in any case the value of grant programs of defense articles for Africa may not exceed $25 million in fiscal 1966.

The amendment would also make the limitation permanent. But whereas under existing law, only grants of defense articles count against the $25 million limit, under the amendment military sales would also count, as would the loan of ships under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 7307. Training would continue to be exempt.

Title 10 U.S.C. 7307(b) provides: "Without authority from Congress granted after March 10, 1951, no battleship, aircraft carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine that has not been stricken from the Naval Vessel Register under section 7304 of this title, nor any interest of the United States in such a vessel, may be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of under any law. (Aug. 10, 1956, ch. 1041, 70A Stat. 452.)" This authority has frequently been granted.

The reason for the amendment is that the United States ought to discourage the countries of Africa from spending their scarce resources for military purposes and, further, that the United States ought not to increase their military expenses by lending them ships which will be expensive to maintain and operate.

The amendment (No. 533) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 40, line 5, add the following new sentence: "The President shall promptly and fully inform the Speaker of the House and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of each use of funds under this subsection."

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 533 is as follows:

This amendment would require the President to report to the Speaker of the House and to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on his use of the confidential funds which are now authorized in the amount of $50 million by section 614(a). Under the administration's proposal, the authority under section 614(a) would be reduced to $25 million, and similar authority for $25 million would be added in the proposed Military Assistance and Sales Act.

The law authorizes the President to use these funds "pursuant to his certification that it is inadvisable to specify the nature of the use of such funds, which certification shall be deemed to be a sufficient voucher for such amounts."

This is the only important provision of the act on which the President is not required to make some kind of report to Congress. Most of these reports, many of which are classified, are made to the Speaker of the House and to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate. In view of the sensitivity of the subject matter, the proposed amendment would require reports on the use of confidential funds only to the Speaker and to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There ought to be some congressional check on these funds, and this is certainly a minimal one.

The amendment (No. 534) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 39, line 13, strike out the proviso.

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 534 is as follows:

Section 92(a) of the proposed Military Assistance and Sales Act would authorize the use of up to $125 million a year without regard to the provisions of that and certain other acts when the President determines that this is important to the security of the United States. Not more than $50 million may be used in any one country in any year. This authority is the same as that now contained in section 614(a).

The administration's military assistance bill, however, contains a proviso that the limitation of $50 million for any one country "shall not apply to any country which is a victim of active Communist or Communist-supported aggression."

It is this proviso which the proposed amendment would strike.

The exception made by the proviso has never been in the law, and the administration has never been hampered by the lack of this exception. Furthermore, whether or not a country is a victim of "active Communist or Communist-supported aggression" is not always susceptible to objective determination. The administration's actions in the Dominican Republic do not inspire confidence as to how it would make such a determination in other circumstances.

The amendment (No. 535) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 24, line 3, after the section heading insert "(a)".

On page 24, after line 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) This chapter shall be administered so as to encourage regional arms control and disarmament agreements and so as to discourage arms races, especially among less developed countries. In the administration of this chapter with respect to less developed countries, special account shall be taken of the capacity of the country to pay and of the record of the armed forces of such country with respect to civilian constitutional government."

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 535 is as follows:

This amendment would add a new subsection to the section on objectives of the chapter of the administration's military assistance bill dealing with sales, barter transactions, and leases.

The provisions of the amendment are self-evident. The principal reason for it is to restrain any tendency that might exist in the executive branch to push sales of military equipment in countries which really cannot, or should not, afford it.

EXCLUDE CERTAIN REIMBURSED MOVING EXPENSES FROM TAXABLE INCOME

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] introduced S. 3181, a bill which would exclude from taxable income certain reimbursed moving expenses.

As American business has grown across the country it has accepted the responsibility of moving an employee and his family when it becomes necessary to change job locations. Yet, the Federal Government has failed to do its part in that it imposes an unfair tax liability on a great part of these reimbursed expenses.

Under the present law an employee may be reimbursed without payment of any income tax only for his actual travel costs and those of his immediate family as well as the costs of moving household goods from the old to new place of employment. The line is drawn at this point in spite of the fact that the expenses I have just mentioned do not come close to meeting the total cost burden to a moving employee. S. 3181 would recognize what I believe to be a more realistic approach to what should constitute nontaxable moving expenses by adding to the expenses which already receive tax-free treatment the following reimbursements:

First, the expenses of a house-hunting trip for the employee and his or her spouse;

Second, temporary living costs at his new location while he and his immediate family await the arrival of their household effects;

Third, the fees and other costs of selling his old house;

Fourth, expenses attendant on the purchase of a new house, such as attorney fees and other closing costs; and

Fifth, the numerous items commonly considered as a lump sum or miscellaneous figure, including appliance connections, licenses, size adjustments, and other incidentals.

When it comes to reimbursement for moving, Federal employees are at a disadvantage compared to most private industry employees. The Federal employee is presently reimbursed only for the cost of moving himself and his family and the expense of moving his household goods whereas the employee of private industry is usually reimbursed for the five items mentioned above as well. Last week the House passed legislation—H.R. 10607—which would allow the Federal Government to reimburse a moving employee for these five items as well. I shall actively support this measure when it comes before the Senate.

It seems inconsistent to me that we should recognize—as the House has already done—that these five expenses should not be a burden placed upon the employee but yet continue to treat reimbursement for them as taxable income. Certainly this present tax policy imposes an impediment to economic mobility and progress. It is estimated that American industry transfers some 400,000 families from State to State each year. The benefit of reimbursement becomes seriously diminished to an employee who must treat it as ordinary income. The Supreme Court denied a review to a taxpayer who believed that he should be permitted a deduction for reimbursement, but it should be noted that the Attorney General stated in his brief that it was for the Congress and not the Court to make any such policy decision.

I propose that the Congress should make such a determination and therefore I urge my colleagues to join together in rectifying this present inequity in our Federal tax structure.

I had prepared and intended to introduce a bill along the same lines but did not do so yesterday because of the religious holidays.

I am very pleased to join in cosponsoring the measure introduced by the Senator from Minnesota which is being held at the desk for additional cosponsors, and I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor of S. 3006, to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 so as to prohibit the use for political purposes of certain funds collected by labor organizations from their members, and for other purposes.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON H.R. 6277 TO ESTABLISH SINGLE PERSONNEL SYSTEM FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to announce that hearings will be held April 19 and 21 by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations on H.R. 6277, a bill which would authorize the establishment of a unified foreign affairs personnel system for the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and the U.S. Information Agency. The subcommittee will also consider the nomination of 723 USIA officers who have been named for appointment as Foreign Service officers.

Administration witnesses will be heard on April 19, and public witnesses on April 21. The hearings will begin at 10 a.m. each day in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building.

The other members of the subcommittee are Senator LAUSCHE, Senator PELL, Senator MCCARTHY, Senator HICKENLOOPER, and Senator CARLSON.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 6, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1488. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile;

S. 2573. An act to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes;

S. 2719. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia; and

S. 2831. An act to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 518) for the relief of Joanna K. Georgoulia, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3059. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon;

H.R. 4602. An act for the relief of Maj. Donald W. Ottaway, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 5003. An act for the relief of Evangelia G. Latsis;

H.R. 5533. An act for the relief of Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhofer;

H.R. 8219. An act for the relief of Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee; and

H.R. 8833. An act for the relief of Sarah Antoinette Cappadona.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 3059. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon;

H.R. 4602. An act for the relief of Maj. Donald W. Ottaway, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 5003. An act for the relief of Evangelia G. Latsis;

H.R. 5533. An act for the relief of Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhofer;

H.R. 8219. An act for the relief of Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee; and

H.R. 8833. An act for the relief of Sarah Antoinette Cappadona.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement by him on the 100th anniversary of the opening of Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn., to educate Negroes.

EMERGENCY FOOD RELIEF FOR INDIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 149, emergency food relief for India, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Senate Joint Resolution 149, to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India, and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word "by", to strike out "selling" and insert "making available", and after line 20, to insert:

The Congress urges that to the extent necessary the food made available by this program be distributed in such manner that hungry people without money will be able to obtain food.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress endorses and supports the President's initiative in organizing substantial American participation in an urgent international effort designed to:

(a) Help meet India's pressing food shortages by making available to India under Public Law 480 agricultural commodities to meet India's normal import needs plus added quantities of agricultural commodities as the United States share in the international response to the Indian emergency;

(b) Help combat malnutrition, especially in mothers and children, via a special program;

(c) Encourage and assist those measures which the Government of India is planning to expand India's own agricultural production.

That the Congress urges the President to join India in pressing on other nations the urgency of sharing appropriately in a truly international response to India's critical need.

The Congress urges that to the extent necessary the food made available by this program be distributed in such manner that hungry people without money will be able to obtain food.

DE GAULLE SHOULD PAY UNITED STATES FOR CONFISCATED NATO PROPERTY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we shall shortly be compelled to withdraw our Armed Forces from French soil. The purpose in keeping our men in France in the first place was not to aggrandize ourselves, not to subordinate anyone to our domination, as President de Gaulle maintains, but to help defend France—at her request, I might add—from potential attacks from the East. But this is now beside the point. We are not welcome. De Gaulle wants us to leave and few of us would be unhappy if 30,000 less Americans had to go overseas. It certainly would take the strain off the youth of our Nation now faced with increased draft quotas.

But leaving France means more than pulling our troops out. We would leave behind a costly network of installations including barracks, private houses, headquarters units, airfields, pipelines, improved ports, and a myriad of other properties. Reliable information fixes the cost of these properties at around $2 billion—many say $2.5 billion. The French nation will naturally inherit these properties which will add to the French national wealth—already enhanced by the spending of American GI's and their families at around $150 million a year.

It is only proper that the French should compensate us for these real properties and should not be allowed to take them over without compensation. While I do not know the terms of the secret treaties under which they were constructed, I cannot believe that there was any authorization for the French to confiscate these immensely valuable possessions without compensation. I would suggest, therefore, that we file a claim with General de Gaulle's government asking the following: First, payment for these properties on the basis of present value; second, moving costs for any property not left on French soil; and, third, if this matter is not settled within 60 days after our departure, that it be referred to the International Court of Justice at The Hague for decision.

General de Gaulle would thus be brought under the universal reign of the

law instead of proceeding in an anarchic fashion. And, if he should refuse to abide by the Hague Court's decision, France would be put in an unfavorable light in the public opinion of the world.

In addition, if General de Gaulle confiscates $2 to $2.5 billion of American assets in France, I believe the Treasury and State Departments should give prompt consideration to reducing any French claims for U.S. gold by the value of the property which De Gaulle and the French confiscate.

I take the liberty, therefore, of suggesting this policy to our State Department and executive branch.

HOODLUMISM IN AMERCA

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, sometimes I think that we Americans make a mistake of looking too much outwardly—of worrying about trouble in other areas of the world, thousands of miles away, so much that we fail to see what is right under our own noses right here at home in our own Nation, in our own State, in our own city or town, and even in our own community.

We worry about our boys who are killed and injured in Vietnam—and rightly so. But in that worry we tend to pay little attention to the killings and injuries in our own cities and towns. We are not sufficiently concerned about the increasing crime rate here. About the most that we do is to bemoan it and then try to lock ourselves in our homes at night and let George do the job of trying to stop crimes, arrest criminals, and prevent crimes.

It seems to be the old story of not wanting to get involved. And that is not only a physical cowardice; it is a moral cowardice. Maybe when enough of us have been hurt we will really rise up and do something about it. Maybe we will inject enough citizen firmness in our everyday life to reduce the number of young hoodlums who constitute the hard core of the alarming increase in crime.

I have experienced being a victim of crimes. Fortunately, I have not been attacked or bodily injured. But I have been the victim of a robbery and a bombing. There is even very little security in the new Senate Office Building where a couple of years ago a fairly heavy television set was stolen from my office and the thief was never apprehended. And a couple of years ago the mailbox in front of my house was bombed.

More than 50 percent of the houses in the block where I reside have been robbed—5 out of 8. But none of the thieves have been apprehended.

Yes, I have been lucky that I have not been a greater victim of crime—that I was not in my office in the Senate Office Building when my television set was stolen or I might have been injured like Representative CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, was in his House Office Building office—that I was not near my mail box when it was bombed and destroyed—that my house has not been robbed.

But I wonder just how much longer my good fortune will last—and I think about the thousands of Americans who are murdered and maimed each year by the young hoodlums who are just out for kicks.

It is with this background that I am deeply impressed with a truly magnificent piece of journalism—an article in the March 28, 1966, issue of the Christion Science Monitor by the distinguished journalist Josephine Ripley, staff correspondent of the Monitor. It is entitled "Crime Apathy Scathed." I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point, and I seriously urge every Senator and Representative not only to read it but to study it.

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

CRIME APATHY SCATHED

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—It was October 13, 1961.

A group of tourists had just concluded a trip through the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington. One member of the party, a woman, hestitated, then turned back to the FBI guide with a puzzled expression on her face.

"I may be completely mistaken," she said almost apologetically, "but I'd like to go back and take another look at those photographs of your 10 most wanted criminals.

"I'm not sure—but I think I recognize one of them. He looks like a man who lives in the same apartment house that I do—in St. Paul."

PUBLIC APATHY HIT

A second look confirmed her impression. She pointed to the photograph of Hugh Bion Morse, wanted for burglary, assault with intent to commit murder, and for various sex offenses.

FBI agents were quickly dispatched to St. Paul. The woman's identification was correct. The man was arrested.

This incident may make crime detection sound simple. It isn't. There are some 80,000 wanted, dangerous, or potentially dangerous, criminals walking the streets or riding the highways, undetected, at this very moment.

The average citizen is not as alert as this sharp-eyed tourist. Even if they do spot a criminal, many are afraid to speak up.

Too many are apparently resigned to regarding crime as something they have got to live with. It has become commonplace. Crime today doesn't even make headlines unless it's particularly heinous.

"In Fairfax County, Va., a daylight burglary would have created a sensation 3 years ago," said the police chief, Major William Durrer, in an interview.

DEFENSIVE RESISTANCE

"Now burglaries occur almost daily. They are no longer news. The story runs on an inside page of the paper."

Public resistance to crime, in general, consists of a new safety lock for the door, a tear-gas pen, a gun, or a watchdog. People keep off dark streets at night.

Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach has faith that citizens will soon begin to approach the crime menace more positively. But he admits that their idea now of "doing something about it" is to barricade themselves.

"I don't think that will continue to be the case," he told this newspaper.

"Take the schools. You have a poor school system if the public is indifferent to it. When people become aroused, they insist on better schools.

"When people become aroused about crime they will do something about that, too."

Public apathy is reflected, also, in the lethargic reception of repeated warnings from the FBI.

If its crime reports were transmitted in signals from the roof of the Department of Justice, their severity would send blinding red signals flashing across the Nation.

Sending out those signals is "Mr. FBI" himself, J. Edgar Hoover, its Director.

Mr. Hoover is not an optimistic fellow when it comes to crime rates. Not even though latest FBI crime statistics show a 5-percent increase in crime in 1965, compared to the 13-percent increase between 1963 and 1964.

"Isn't this somewhat encouraging?" I asked hopefully.

Mr. Hoover answers questions crisply, tersely, bluntly.

"Any decrease in serious crime would be encouraging," he replied. "But we did not have a decrease in 1965, although preliminary figures indicate a drop in the percentage of increase."

It's like this: "A 5-percent increase of crime as indicated in 1965 means 130,000 more serious crimes were committed in 1965 than in 1964, or a 1965 total of over 2,700,000. This is hardly encouraging."

Crime has been on the upswing continuously since 1958, he points out.

Population has increased, too, but the rate of crime is six times that of the population growth.

Crime today is vicious and violent. And increasingly, the face of crime is a young face—a boy's face. More and more teenagers and juveniles are involved in crime.

"Violence is on the increase," the FBI Director confirmed. "Crimes of violence have steadily risen for the last 5 or 6 years."

Much of the violence is senseless, "perhaps motivated by nothing more than a desire to rebel openly against society," comments Mr. Hoover. It is also related to "the easy accessibility of firearms."

The young criminal today often beats as well as robs his victim, and lesser crimes thus become bigger crimes, sometimes involving murder as well as robbery.

WAITING FOR ANYBODY

This happened in the case of Mixa Merson, a musician in the National Symphony Orchestra in Washington.

It was evening in early March in 1962. Mr. Merson had gone to the store for groceries. He was returning to his parked car with his packages.

Three boys were hidden behind a tree nearby. They were not waiting for Mr. Merson but just anybody.

They picked up a large tree branch as a weapon, struck the musician with such violence that he fell to the sidewalk. His groceries were scattered around.

The boys, aged 20, 17, and 14 took his wrist watch and $90. Mr. Merson was so badly injured he did not recover.

Crime is a parasite. It goes where people are. It follows the crowd. Today the surge of population is into the suburbs.

"One of the pertinent developments in today's crime trend is its increase in suburban areas," Mr. Hoover reports. "The greatest criminal increases occur in those areas which experience the most rapid population growth."

SUBURBAN CRIME SOARS

Crime in the suburbs shot up 8 percent in 1965, compared to the 4-percent rise in cities.

Fairfax County, Va., 16 miles from Washington, is an example. It is a fast-growing community. Its residents in general are upper middle class. They work in the District.

Its police department is housed in a new, modern building. Mayor Durrer is young, earnest, articulate.

He is very concerned with the rise in crime in the county. The criminals which

invade it are mainly transients. They come from other areas, generally from the District.

They are steal-and-run burglars, mostly. It happens quickly and in the daytime when many homes are vacant.

The chief of police cited a case in point:

"About 3 weeks ago a woman was upstairs in her sewing room on the top floor. She heard noises downstairs, looked out the window, and saw a strange car parked outside.

HIGHWAY AIDS CRIME

"She had a telephone up there, so she immediately called the police. We contacted a prowl car in the area. The officers arrived in 3 or 4 minutes.

"By then the burglars had taken the television set and the silver and vanished."

They had a surprising ally in their escape. The Capital Beltway.

The Beltway superhighway swings around the Nation's Capital in a 65-mile arc, sweeping through Fairfax and Arlington Counties in Virginia; Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland.

It affords the criminal easy access to the suburbs and a quick means of escape in committing burglaries. He can swing off the Beltway, hold up a bank in one of the suburbs, and be back in the District in 20 minutes.

SUBURBS ATTRACTIVE TARGETS

Major Durrer reports that the Beltway has greatly increased his problems.

"Now a person committing a crime in Fairfax County can hit the Beltway, swing over into Maryland in 5 minutes. And in 10 minutes he could be in southeast Washington—bypassing the bridges. Once he is back in Washington, he is in another jurisdiction," the police chief explained.

This is a common problem around the country. Mr. Hoover confirms it.

"New, high-speed highways cut through newly developed suburbs which often are particularly vulnerable to criminal activities due to the thinner lines of police protection.

"Many criminals are driving into the suburbs, committing their crimes, and fleeing back into the cities."

A useful tool of the criminal as well as police is the walkie-talkie.

CRIMINAL TOOLS LISTED

A lookout with a small walkie-talkie can be stationed outside a bank or a house that is being burgled, and quickly alert his conspirators inside by means of this gadget.

Attorney General Katzenbach, in an interview, listed more of these modern conveniences which play into the hands of the criminal.

"Credit cards, for one," he said. "They are very useful today. But credit cards have presented a new opportunity to commit a new kind of crime—stealing credit cards. It ups the crime rate."

The increase in branch banks is another, especially banks in suburban shopping areas. "There are more bank robberies now as a result."

There is talk of mobile banks. The Attorney General foresees that while this may be a convenience to the public, it invites further crime.

The age at which a person can obtain an automobile license can make a difference in crime. If the age limit were raised to 21 "it would reduce crime a lot," in the Attorney General's estimation.

CONCERN MOUNTS ON YOUTHS

Not that he is suggesting this. Nor is anyone else. "But the facts indicate that the age at which young people may obtain a license to drive a car does have a relationship to crime," he said.

The increasing involvement of youth in crime is of deep concern to the director of the FBI.

It shows up in all statistics. Adult arrests rose 1 percent during 1965. Arrests of persons under 18 increased 3 percent.

"Youthful criminals are not only becoming involved in more crimes, but also are participating in more violent and heinous depredations than before," he replied in response to a question.

This is not only today's problem, but that of tomorrow, too, as Mr. Hoover views it.

He states it bluntly and with the logic of a man who has traced the ugly pattern of crime for many years:

"The members of juvenile street gangs, the teenage yokers, and the youth assailants who attack law-enforcement officers compose the cadre and reservoir of tomorrow's crime problem."

MORAL VALUES CHANGE

What is happening that all this is so? The average citizen wonders.

Quinn Tamm, executive director of the International Association of Police Chiefs thinks that "Somehow we have lost our sense of proportion—of respect for law and humanity. It is the time and age in which we are living."

Mr. Hoover places the blame more specifically.

"Our young people are being brought up in the midst of new notions of happiness and new ideas of values. Too many children and adolescents have absorbed false attitudes and notions of law and order.

MORE POLICE NEEDED

"The important periods of childhood and adolescence have suffered greatly from the lack of sufficient character training and parental leadership, guidance, and example."

As for the often-heard charge that crime has its origins in the slums, authorities say "no." It has many causes.

There should, of course, be more police. They should be better paid. Almost everyone seems to agree on this.

There has been a population explosion and a crime explosion, but the police-force explosion is hardly more than a pop in comparison.

Nationwide, there are about 300,000 people in the police departments. This includes janitors and clerks. It boils down to 280,000 working police, charged with protecting 200 million people.

No policeman works 24 hours a day. The men work in three shifts. This means that only one-third of that number is on duty at any one time.

That is, about 90,000 on the job. "This is comparatively few police to protect this huge country," in Mr. Tamm's opinion.

PROBLEMS OF A CHIEF

On a national average, the number of policemen per thousand people is 1.9. In 1958, the average was 1.8.

The problem of local police departments is typified by the situation in pleasant and prosperous Fairfax County.

There are 400 square miles in the county to police, with 250 men for the job. It works out to 0.75 man per thousand of the population.

Major Durrer would like to have one policeman for every thousand. That, he thinks, "would do the necessary job."

But he finds recruitment difficult. Low pay is one reason. His standards of recruitment are high. He could lower them and probably get more men.

"But I would rather have one good man on the street than five I was unsure of," he said.

COURT RULINGS RESTRICTIVE

The starting pay for a policeman in Fairfax County is $5,750 a year. Major Durrer has asked for authority to raise this amount. If it is granted, he expects to be able to attract more men into police work.

Ironically, one of the reasons policemen are low paid and the forces understaffed is that citizens generally are more interested in supporting the school system than the police force.

More than 85 percent of the tax dollar in Fairfax County goes into the schools. The rest is divided among other departments.

Another break on law enforcement, in the opinion of FBI Director Hoover, results from recent court decisions.

"There can be no doubt," he stated, "that law enforcement has been hindered by some recent court decisions. Rigid legal restrictions have steadily encroached on the power of law enforcement to operate quickly and decisively.

SOCIETY AT DISADVANTAGE

"Law enforcement does not ask an advantage in its struggle with the lawless. It asks only that the scales of justice be balanced. The cause of justice is not served when hardened criminals are allowed to go free through legal technicalities.

"Some courts, I believe," said Mr. Hoover, "lean too far on the side of the accused and give no thought to the rights of society."

Mr. Tamm, the IACP head, agrees. He feels police should have sufficient time to interrogate suspects and that confessions should be admissible within reasonable time limits. He cites the "model law" recently proposed by the American Law Institute.

BRIGHT SPOTS GLOW

These are the problems, the handicaps, the burdens under which the police of the Nation operate today.

The picture is dark, but by no means hopeless. There are signs of a growing mobilization against crime and its causes, such as these:

The President, in his crime message to Congress, proposed a national strategy to combat crime, a united front "welding together the efforts of local, State, and Federal Governments."

In a three-stage approach, the Federal Government would help improve methods of crime prevention and detection; increase appropriations for grants to States and cities to provide for better police training; and, last, make law enforcement in the District of Columbia a model for the Nation.

CRIME CENTER PLANNED

The President's Crime Commission and the District of Columbia Crime Commission are investigating the causes of crime and the adequacy of law enforcement now. A report and recommendations are due by the first of next year.

The Attorney General has invited each State to form a planning committee on crime and law enforcement. Some States already have such a committee.

The FBI recently announced plans for a revolutionary new system to catch up with the criminal electronically.

It will set up a national crime information center from which information on wanted criminals and stolen property can be transmitted instantly across the Nation. Computers will store the data. All police will have to do is "ask the machine."

The center will be in operation by January, 1967. It should help vastly in cutting down the mobility advantage of the modern criminal.

SCOOTERIZED POLICE

Local law enforcement authorities are speeding up communications within their own boundaries. In Chicago, a new communications system has been fantastically successful in cutting down the time it takes to reach the scene of a crime after it has been reported.

Motor scooters are coming into use as the mode of transportation speeds up. Police cars in many cities are being repainted in vivid colors.

"The most visible police car we can get," is the way they describe the new blue and white cars in the District of Columbia.

Many cities are applying for Federal grants under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. These grants provide technical assistance and training for law-enforcement officers.

PRACTICAL TRAINING PUSHED

"Law-enforcement training is recognized as one of the real answers to the crime problem," according to one authority. "You can't give a man a badge, a gun, and a billy club and say 'go out and enforce the law.'"

There is a great push now for practical training.

Plans are underway to expand the FBI National Academy to provide for the training of 1,200 a men a year instead of 200 as at present. The academy is located on the Quantico, Va., Marine Base.

On the congressional front, the President is pressing for passage of the Dodd bill which would prohibit the sale of guns, willy-nilly, by mail order.

There is hope it will be reported out of the Senate Commerce Committee, where it has been blocked for several years, and passed by the Senate.

Last October, Congress formed a special subcommittee on criminal law and procedure. It is holding hearings on various bills to curb organized crime—the syndicates which thrive on gambling and all forms of vice.

Around the country, more and more civic organizations are joining in the campaign against crime. They are conducting effective campaigns for higher police pay, better equipment, stronger law enforcement.

The ranks are forming. The drive is on. It is making headway. But it has a long way to go.

DWIGHT GRISWOLD LECTURE IN POLITICAL SCIENCE BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL AT NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, one of the distinguished public servants from my State of Nebraska was the late Dwight Griswold. Dwight Griswold served in this body with distinction, and his career was sadly ended by his untimely death in 1954.

The widow of the late Dwight Griswold, Mrs. Erma Griswold Bomgardner, has established at Nebraska Wesleyan University the Dwight Griswold Memorial Lectures in Political Science. This year the first of those lectures was delivered.

It was my privilege to extend to one of the outstanding Members of this body an invitation to deliver that lecture and to appear before the students in a question-and-answer period that followed. The invitation went to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Senator SALTONSTALL has served continuously in public life since 1920. He is a devoted public servant. It was most fitting that he should speak to the interested student body of Nebraska Wesleyan University on the subject of political science and on the subject of public service.

It was also fitting for another reason. We were assembled that day to honor Dwight Griswold. Senator SALTONSTALL received his bachelor of arts degree from Harvard University in 1914. Former Senator Griswold was graduated from the University of Nebraska in 1914. Their lives were similar in many instances.

Senator SALTONSTALL served as a first lieutenant with the 301st Field Artillery in France during World War I.

Senator Griswold served as a first lieutenant, and later as a captain, with the 127th Field Artillery in 1917 and 1918.

Both Senator Griswold and Senator SALTONSTALL were Masons, and both were members of the American Legion. Both enjoyed golf. Both were Republicans. Both were Governors of their States. Senator SALTONSTALL was elected in 1938 and served as Governor until he was elected to the Senate in 1944.

Senator Griswold was elected Governor in 1940, 1942, and 1944. He served until January 1947.

Both served in their State house of representatives.

Senator SALTONSTALL served in the Massachusetts House from 1923 until 1937.

Senator Griswold served in the Nebraska House of Representatives in 1921, and was a member of the State senate from 1925 to 1929.

Both served in the U.S. Senate. Senator SALTONSTALL was elected to the Senate in November 1944, to fill the unexpired term of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., who had resigned his Senate seat to enter the armed services. Senator SALTONSTALL still serves as one of the most valued Members of this body.

Senator Griswold was elected to the Senate on November 4, 1952, to fill the unexpired term of the late Kenneth S. Wherry. Unfortunately, Senator Griswold died in the spring of 1954.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my introduction of Senator SALTONSTALL at Nebraska Wesleyan University on April 1, 1966.

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

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL BY SENATOR CARL T. CURTIS AT NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, APRIL 1, 1966, UPON ESTABLISHMENT OF DWIGHT GRISWOLD MEMORIAL LECTURESHIP IN POLITICAL SCIENCE, LINCOLN, NEBR.

I can understand why introductions are sometimes too long. Today I face the temptation to make a long introduction. I shall resist that temptation, however.

We are grateful for the generous gift of Mrs. Erma Bomgardner that will make it possible to carry on these annual lectures at Nebraska Wesleyan as a memorial to Dwight Griswold.

Dwight Griswold is deserving of this memorial. Sturdy Nebraskan, man of character, man of decision, man of accomplishment, athlete, businessman, editor, soldier, State legislator, Governor, director of military government, AID Administrator and U.S. Senator—describe Dwight Griswold. He was my friend.

Here today to speak is another distinguished American. Sturdy New Englander, athlete, businessman, farmer, soldier, State legislator, Governor, U.S. Senator, man of character, man of decision, man of accomplishment, apply to our speaker. He, too, is my friend.

Because of our speaker's friendship, respect and affection for Dwight Griswold, he is here today. It is my happy privilege to present to you the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the speech delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL covered many important public issues. It also conveyed to the student body the views of one of America's finest public servants. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the lecture delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, DELIVERED AT THE FIRST ANNUAL DWIGHT GRISWOLD LECTURE IN POLITICAL SCIENCE AT NEBRASKA UNIVERSITY, LINCOLN, NEBR., APRIL 1, 1966

President Rogers, Mrs. Bomgardner, Senator CURTIS, members of the board of trustees, faculty, students, and friends of Dwight Griswold, I am pleased that my friend and colleague CARL CURTIS could be with me today. Senator CURTIS is one of the most conscientious, frank, and politically courageous Members of the Senate.

He carries successfully one of the heaviest committee loads in our body, serving on the Finance Committee where he is an acknowledged expert on social security matters, on the Space Committee, Government Operations Committee, Rules and Administration Committee, and Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. His colleague, ROMAN HRUSKA, is another hard working and highly respected Member of the Senate, and he is very helpful on the Appropriations Committee where I work with him. Another great Nebraskan, Kenneth Wherry, was a good friend, too. I served as party whip when Ken Wherry was party leader, and came to know him well and to respect him. Senator Butler was another Nebraskan with whom I worked. So this Massachusetts Yankee is here to say that you Nebraskans have been sending men of stature and ability to the U.S. Senate.

It is an honor for me to be asked here today to give the first of the Dwight Griswold lectures in political science, an area of study that has increasing impact on the lives of each of us. But this invitation has a special meaning to me because of my friendship with and respect for the man in whose name the lectureship has been established.

Dwight Griswold and I were Governors together and later we were Senators together. Mrs. Saltonstall and I had the privilege of entertaining Governor and Mrs. Griswold in Massachusetts at the first Governors' conference they attended. Afterward I visited him in your capital at Lincoln, and we drove to Omaha together to the American Legion convention. I recall, too, my visit with him in Athens, Greece, when he was administering the Marshall plan in that wartorn country.

Some years later we were Senate colleagues until his untimely death. He was a man of high ideals and principles, a thoughtful public official concerned about the role of goverment and the freedom of the individual. It is especially fitting that this testimonial to his contribution to his State and Nation should be local on this campus where he began his college education. The nature of the memorial is appropriate, too—the Dwight Griswold Lectureship in Political Science—because of his deep involvement in and commitment to both politics and education—politics as an elected official and education as a Nebraska University regent for a number of years.

Dwight Griswold served in the State legislature, then became Governor, took an important post abroad, and finally went to Washington as a Member of the Senate. I started as an alderman in my home town, then became assistant district attorney of my county, then went on to the State legislature—speaker, Governor, and Senator. So in

different States, but in the same political party, our careers are much alike. Moving up the political ladder as we did equipped us better to understand the other fellow's point of view and some of the special difficulties that face officeholders at the various levels of government.

One's political career is often shaped by events he cannot anticipate. For example, Mrs. Saltonstall and I had decided to retire after my term as Governor was concluded, when one day I received a phone call from Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, now our Ambassador to Vietnam, asking me whether I could stop by to see him on an important matter. I did so and he told me of his decision to leave the Senate to go on active duty in the Army. His resignation meant that as Governor I would have to appoint a successor. I decided to ask Sinclair Weeks, who told me he would complete Senator Lodge's term but that he would not run for election the next November. Mrs. Saltonstall and I talked it over and decided that I should run for the seat, largely because of the war. So now I come today to visit with you as a U.S. Senator—22 years later.

Most of you are students. You are approaching the end of your formal education, and soon the responsibility for the progress and future of this country will be in your hands. You move closer to the center of the stage in a troubled and challenging world, but a world of opportunity. It will be your job to make our community, our country, and the world itself a better place in which to live. You are in a position not only to participate yourself, but to stimulate others to assist also. I urge you to accept the challenge—prepare yourself to serve your community and your country, and then do so. For, as Tom Paine, writing in 1777 in the midst of the Revolutionary War, said: "Those who expect to reap the blessing of liberty must undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

Gaining an understanding of our problems and opportunities in college, an awareness of the turbulent, fast moving, and difficult, yet exciting, time in which we live, is not enough. Far more important is to develop the desire to keep on learning, the desire to understand and appreciate your fellow man, and the will to contribute to the advance of our national well-being and, in fact, to that of humanity itself. The problem is to discover where your particular talents can best be put to use to carry forward that advance.

In recent years we have seen tremendous scientific and technological advances which have had important effects on our lives. Now our job is to match those advances with progress in the humanities, the arts, and in human understanding. We are living in an age where individual freedom is fundamental to our way of life—but we realize that individual freedom must be tempered by concern for others, that it must be moderated by respect for the integrity, the viewpoints, and the talents of others. We know, too, that international competition must be regulated by international understanding.

The late President Kennedy—my one-time Senate colleague and friend—once said, "One man can change the world and every man should try." This involves knowing the past and studying the present, desiring the best and doing what one can to make it come to pass. Today, far more than in the early days of Dwight Griswold and myself, we all feel the impact of government upon us. So we have an obligation to ourselves as well as our country to make our own impact felt.

If you remember but one word of what I say to you today, I hope it will be the word "participate." There are many ways, of course, to take part in government. You can become professors and teach government so that others will really come to understand it. You can become journalists, authors, or commentators in the tradition of Walter Lippmann or James Reston and write about government so that your readers will learn more about what is going on.

You can become civil servants in public health or other technical service and participate in government by working directly for it. You can participate in community activities through your church and neighborhood associations, or community fund drives, and thus gain the friendship and confidence of your neighbors and stimulate their interest in public affairs. Finally, you can run for office yourself and become elected public officials, responsible to the people you represent, as Senator CURTIS and I try to do, and as Dwight Griswold did so well.

Today government enters our homes, our business activities, and the education and bringing up of our children. It may come in the back door or the front, but it comes. Albert Einstein was once asked how he explained the fact that outstanding progress could be achieved in the complicated world of physics when there appeared to be so little progress in politics and government. He responded by saying simply, "Physics is easier." I never studied physics in school or college, but I certainly have had to try to understand the background of atomic power, the difference between atomic and nuclear physics, and how thrust is formed to push a satellite into space. These are complicated, technical matters.

To say that government is more complicated than physics is to say that government is complicated indeed, but Einstein spoke the truth. The once relatively simple functions of government—protection from external enemies, protection from internal forces, and the raising of taxes to pay for these two services, as in the early Mayflower days—have been expanded to a bewildering and complex variety of activities.

We are not a nation of numbers, statistics, and IBM computers. We are a nation of people—with goals, needs, and capacities. What we want to do is to make certain that every American has the fullest opportunity to develop, to make the maximum contribution to society, and to insure that he retains his individuality, initiative, and freedom in the process.

As a nation we must move forward. But we want to make certain when we do move forward what the direction is in which we are going. Gov. Dwight Griswold stated it well when he wrote in 1943, and I quote:

"Change is the law of our national life and although we respect tradition we have a much greater respect for our destiny as a people. We can never expect to go back precisely to where we were before.

"It does not follow, however, that all change is improvement simply because it has the shining face of something new. We must always ask ourselves some very practical questions when we consider adopting a new idea or technique of government. Does it square with our fundamental American patterns; does it broaden and lengthen the avenue of opportunity for each of us and for all of us; does it enlarge or restrict the field of private enterprise; does it add or diminish the rights of the American man; is it fundamentally fair and decent or does it seek to whip one group at the expense of another? Then we must ask ourselves one more question: Will it work?"

These were the words of your Governor in 1943; they are as applicable today as they were then.

We all want better education for our young people, better housing, better highways, cleaner air, and cleaner rivers. We all want our slums eliminated and our cities redeveloped. No thoughtful citizen objects to these goals. The great questions are: How fast are we going to accomplish those results? Who is to administer the programs? How are we going to pay for them? We have a responsibility to keep our feet on the ground, to move forward in a realistic, sensible way that will permit the individual to exercise his freedom of choice and his initiative and still keep government close to home.

We know one thing for sure—there is never going to be enough public money to do everything that everyone wants his government to do for him. Somewhere a line has to be drawn between what we'd like and what we can have. We have to have priorities. We must remember, too, that money appropriated for new programs when they are started is just a drop in the bucket compared to their eventual cost. That is not to say that new programs are not necessary. You and I know that there are many people in our towns and cities who need a boost and we want to see to it that they get it. When we are doing so much for the people of other countries we cannot ignore the needs of our fellow Americans.

What we in the United States want is not a handout but an equal opportunity to get ahead, to rise as far as our abilities can take us, to make things as comfortable as possible for ourselves and our families by our own initiative and hard work.

We all want the Great Society, if what is meant by that is a land free from want, from unemployment, from discrimination on the basis of race or color, where people have decent housing, proper educational opportunities, good food, and the health care they need.

But in getting it, we don't want to throw out the window all the attributes that have made this country great. In short, we want the Federal Government to assist, not absorb. We want it to help but not to dominate. We want our States to continue to function within their capacities for the benefit of their people.

There are too many instances in recent years of bypassing the States and concentrating more power in Washington, of enacting far-reaching programs without concern for the views of responsible State and local officials, or for the effect of Federal action on existing State and local programs. The National Government cannot possibly appreciate the widely varying local situations and headaches. Woodrow Wilson once said: "The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it." As Governor Romney put it more recently: "The big issue 100 years ago was whether the excess sovereignty of the States was going to destroy the Union and the Constitution. The big issue today is whether the excess of concentration of Federal power and sovereignty is going to destroy State, local, and individual freedom and responsibility."

I have always believed that strong local government, sparked by the initiative and cooperative interaction of large numbers of interested and dedicated citizens is an important ingredient of our success as a nation.

Changing times and needs have thrust new and important responsibilities on the National Government, but government functions best when it is closest to the people, where it can direct its efforts to local needs and ways of doing things. Activities and programs which can be handled at the local level should be handled there. When local government abdicates its proper responsibilities, of course, the National Government is going to absorb them, often without truly advancing our individual cause. What we must do is see to it that our local governments are made to toe the mark and to respond effectively to community needs.

One difficulty they have in doing so is that they lack sufficient funds. Various suggestions have been proposed to remedy that situation. Should we have a system of Federal block grants to States? Should there be a tax credit? Should certain types of Federal taxes be turned over to States? This whole

subject merits our careful attention, for our localities must be in a position to meet their obligations to their citizens.

Furthering the goals of justice and insuring that every individual enjoys the rights guaranteed to him under our Constitution is the responsibility of each of us. Think how important the accomplishment of these fundamental rights is to the way in which other nations of the world look at our country and our way of life. Today our country is the leader of the free world. The world looks to us for guidance and for assistance, but it looks to us also to set an example. Certainly the goals for which we strive are the goals of most of the people of the world.

The late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said, and I quote: "Our purpose, ultimately and at all times, should be to use our great power, without abusing it or presuming upon it, to move steadily toward lasting peace, orderly freedom, and growing opportunity. Thus do we achieve our constitutional purpose to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.'" We stand for equal rights and the worth of the individual.

There is no place for partisan sniping at a President or a policy when the peace of the world, the security of our Nation, and our international prestige and standing are at stake. This does not mean we must accept uncritically every action that is taken. We move forward as a nation by improving our techniques and our policies, and we improve them by insisting constantly that they stand the test of challenge.

As you and I well know, the United States has no territorial ambitions. We don't seek to overthrow any legitimate government, and we oppose any such attempts by other countries. What we want is a world at peace where people are able to develop in their own way free from the threat of domination by others. Our policy has been to lend assistance, where our help is desired, to independent nations as they attempt to meet the tremendous economic and social problems they face, and in their efforts to maintain their own independence and security from external interference.

Sixty years ago President Theodore Roosevelt summarized our role in a nutshell. His words are as true today, and I quote:

"We have duties to others and duties to ourselves, and we can shirk neither. We wish peace, but we wish the peace of justice, the peace of righteousness. We wish it because we think it is right and not because we are afraid. No weak nation that acts manfully and justly should ever have cause to fear us, and no strong power, should ever be able to single us out as a subject for insolent aggression."

As Roosevelt pointed out, to achieve our goals of peace and justice, we must remain strong, for strength is one thing the Communists and their allies understand. As General Norstad, former head of NATO forces, said, our foreign policy is no greater than the force which exists to back it up. The Communist leader, Mao Tse-tung expressed the same view when he said, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

Of course today when we think of world trouble spots, we think first of Vietnam. The President has made it clear that our objective will remain the freedom of South Vietnam to determine its own future without external interference, and the right to work out its relations with the North by peaceful means. We seek no more than this and cannot accept less. We do not like the situation, but we cannot run from it. If we did, we would be derelict in meeting our responsibility to the people of South Vietnam. And the impact of our action on other southeast Asian nations could have serious consequences, not only for our own security but also for that of the free world. Think of the increased pressures of our adversaries if we pulled out. We intend to show the Communists that we mean business and that aggression and the slaughter in villages of innocent civilians is not the best course. We cannot safeguard our principles by abandoning them.

The road ahead in Vietnam is not easy. Nor is it likely to be short. It more probably will be long and winding, full of detours and dangers. But we must take it, ever on the alert for solutions and alternative approaches. We must take it together as a united people, mindful that sacrifices will be called for, and above all, mindful that we are right in our determination to succeed.

We hear criticism all the time of the actions President Johnson has taken or perhaps has failed to take in Vietnam. But what would you do if you were in his place? I wake up sometimes in the middle of the night and ask myself that momentous question. It is mighty hard to say what could be done that he is not already doing. We certainly cannot negotiate if our opponent won't even sit down at the conference table opposite us. We stopped the bombing for 37 days and made very clear our intentions, yet Hanoi and Peking were not interested in what we had to say or even in offering any constructive counter proposals.

Today our attention is directed toward Vietnam. For the President and his advisers, for our military commanders, and for the Congress, however, Vietnam is but one of many difficult situations around the world. One indication of this is the fact that we have members of our armed services in more than 100 countries today.

This is a restless world, a world in ferment, where developments wherever they occur must be watched closely. Dean Rusk said recently that there had been 52 coups d'etat since he became Secretary of State. Think of it. In Africa military coups have overthrown the governments of six of the new countries in the last 4 months, and many other African governments are not at all secure. Few, in fact, are firmly entrenched. Dont' forget that in just the last decade 28 European colonies were transformed into nations, and are feeling their way in their new independence.

Today we live in a world grown small by advance in communication and transportation and the exchange of information. People in one part of the world know better how people in other parts of the world are faring. The desires for increased material gains, especially in the developing countries, have led to many crises and a collective instability that may at any moment pose a threat to the security of the entire world. If we do not act to encourage political stability by giving hope to the many aspirations of people around the globe, we may well be faced with widespread wars of national liberation or a world where the future of freedom has dimmed perceptibly.

On every front there are problems as well as opportunities. We are all concerned with the situation in Rhodesia, in Indonesia, in the Dominican Republic, and in the Organization of American States, for example. The United Nations is still another headache. Apart from Vietnam, however, two main problems confront us. One is the growing threat of China; the other the crisis in NATO.

Just a few years ago, most Americans regarded Russia as the main threat to our security and that of the world. Today, it is Communist China. Suddenly we find that we do not know as much about China as we would like to. Recently statements by a number of professors that, while we must continue to contain China, we must avoid isolating her, make us think along new lines. You may be sure that our Government as well as universities is devoting more attention to the China problem. We see an apparent deep-rooted schism developing between China and Russia. This is encouraging from our point of view. We want to see to it that they remain apart.

We also see that China has been meeting with rebuffs of late. Her representatives have been thrown out of about five African countries. They were unsuccessful in aggravating the India-Pakistan dispute. Their influence in Indonesia and Malaysia has been sharply reduced. The meeting of the Organization of African Unity last month revealed that they are not going to have their way there. They see us committed in southeast Asia. They know that Japan and Russia have concluded trade agreements. Around the world, then, they are meeting with setbacks. The big question is, how will they respond?

A further question is whether China should be admitted to the United Nations. Would she join if she were invited? What would be the effect of her admission on the effectiveness of the U.N. and the Security Council? I do not think she would join if asked, but neither do I think we should ask her. The U.N. has problems enough now.

De Gaulle's actions precipitating the NATO crisis without doubt have raised immediate and serious questions for the United States and its allies in Western Europe. Can there be a defense of Western Europe without France? How far should the member nations go towards meeting President de Gaulle's demands? If the NATO bases are to be removed from France, who is to shoulder the costs? Is NATO as it was organized in 1949, and is now operating, responsive to today's needs? If not, how can it be revamped to meet them squarely? The issue is, of course, larger than NATO itself. It involves our whole relationship with Western Europe—economically, politically, and socially as well as militarily. How it is solved may be crucial to our security and standing in the world. What the eventual outcome will be is not clear at this moment, but we are hopeful that something can be worked out which will permit NATO to remain as an unified and effective arm of the free world in Europe.

Indeed there are those observers who, like Walter Lippmann, believe that the NATO crisis is really a blessing in disguise, since out of it may develop a new European alliance, a greater European community for which, in many ways, we would be a natural ally.

So our problems are complicated, they are worldwide, and they demand the attention of each of us. In a very real sense we all are political scientists, for we are all vitally concerned with government domestically and internationally. The public officials, the writers, the teachers, and the experts, the commentators, the community leaders in both public and private organizations—they and others can affect what we do as a Nation. And it is up to us to know where they are leading us, and in fact to participate in the decision-making process ourselves.

So we who are older than you have not solved all the problems. There are more than enough for you to conquer. Helping to solve them will provide you with great satisfaction, I can assure you. As you and I know, we do not need to go to the international or even the national scene to find problems which are crying out for solution. There is much to do right in your own hometown. Begin there, if you will, but maintain your interest in national and international matters, for if we are to succeed our country needs the talents and insights of people like you working at all levels. I'm confident that yours is not only a "can do" but a "will do" generation, and I wish I could be around to see you tackle the problems which we know must be solved and can only be solved when we all take part.

There is no more rewarding and satisfying experience than public service, and I know my friend Dwight Griswold would agree, were

he here with us today. I commend it to you. Certainly it has its frustrations and irritations. Certainly you will be misunderstood and you will be criticized by people who don't stop to ask why you voted as you did or said what you did. Certainly you will not be able to accomplish all you set out to accomplish. The hours are long, the tenure is uncertain, the pay may be considerably less than you could command elsewhere, and there are separations for your family. But public service has its rewards, its satisfactions, its compensations. It is stimulating, challenging, varied, and meaningful. You have an opportunity to help your fellowman and to play a part, however small, in influencing the course of events.

In closing I commend to you the words of Daniel Webster which appear above the Speaker's rostrum in the House of Representatives. I hope they challenge you to accept the responsibilities and opportunities which can be yours in public service. These words are: "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there has been much newspaper comment about the occasion. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the column entitled "More or Less Personal," published in the Lincoln, Nebr., Evening Journal of March 31, 1966.

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

MORE OR LESS PERSONAL

Friday will see the initiation of the Dwight Griswold memorial lectureship in political science at Nebraska Wesleyan University and it seems particularly fitting that U.S. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, will be the first speaker.

These men were friends. Both were wartime Governors of their States, both serving three terms—SALTONSTALL from 1938 to 1944, Griswold from 1941 to 1948. Both were moderate Republicans in the U.S. Senate.

The tragedy for Nebraska was that it lost this moderate voice on April 14, 1954, when Senator Griswold died of a heart attack. SALTONSTALL, who went from the governorship of Massachusetts to the U.S. Senate in 1944, is voluntarily retiring from office this year after 22 years of constructive service to the Nation.

These two men, who were native sons of their States and gave many years to public service, grew up in States separated by nearly 2,000 miles, and further in traditions and political heritage.

SALTONSTALL is a part of what is sometimes called the eastern establishment which has furnished so many learned and able men in the building of the Nation. These are the men who have had the backgrounds of eastern prep schools, the big name private colleges, many of whom, with independent wealth, had the desire for public service. Presidents of both parties have called upon them repeatedly to serve their country.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL is rich in famous forebears—two Presidents (the Adamses), eight Governors, two ambassadors to the Court of St. James's, fighting men of all wars and two speakers of the Massachusetts House of Representatives.

The Massachuetts Senator carved out his own political career. In his first campaign for Governor he took on James M. Curley in 1938. Even his close friends conceded him little chance against this Democratic pro. He won handily and continued to pile up large majorities in the Democratic stronghold of Boston.

Though SALTONSTALL came from the bluest blooded of the first families of Massachusetts he had a rapport with his constituents in all walks of life. He has described himself as "just a simple Yankee New Englander." He is much more, he is a great public servant. It was typical that he looked at the calendar and decided that 74 was an age to retire and that he did it without intrigue. He announced in plenty of time for all political hopefuls to plan their campaigns.

The friend he has come to honor grew up in a pioneer State. Mr. Griswold was born in a log cabin in Harrison, in the far northwest corner of the State. The family later moved to Gordon where his father founded the First National Bank.

Banking held little appeal for the late Governor and Senator. Politics was his love. He served in both houses of the bicameral legislature. He ran three times unsuccessfully for Governor before his election in 1941.

After leaving the governorship he served with the American Civil Administration in Germany and as head of the U.S. aid mission to Greece. In 1952 he was elected to the U.S. Senate and his death resulted in an incalculable loss to Nebraska. The Republican Party lost a voice of liberal moderation at a time when such a voice might have guided the party in its time of need.

These lectures—established by a gift to Wesleyan, where Mr. Griswold attended his first 2 years of college, by the former Mrs. Griswold, now Mrs. Henry I. Bomgardner, of Scottsbluff—are a fine tribute to a man who contributed much to his State and good government.

TVA AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE FOOD-FOR-FREEDOM PROGRAM

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, the food-for-freedom program—of which I am proud to be a cosponsor—now under consideration by the Senate Committee on Agriculture emphasizes the need for the full employment of all facets of American industry and agriculture, as well as the U.S. Government, in helping to assure an adequate food supply for all the peoples of the world. Nothing is more important toward achieving political stability in the underdeveloped countries. Freedom from hunger is an essential step toward achieving a stable political freedom.

In mobilizing our resources to make food a weapon for freedom, presently as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and formerly as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have long advocated that the fullest use should be made of the Tennessee Valley Authority's great experience and knowledge in the field of fertilizer. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has said that "fertilizer is as important as bullets" in the war in Vietnam. TVA's chemical division at Muscle Shoals is the world center for fertilizer research, and the fullest use should be made of its present program and its potential. Some people may believe that our success in the improvement of fertilizers is a damnation rather than a blessing in view of some agricultural surpluses. However, I believe when our commodity production is viewed in comparison to the world food needs that we will find the balance on the side of increased production.

TVA has already participated to a considerable extent in this field through work it has done for the Agency for International Development. Half a dozen teams of two to three TVA specialists in agriculture and fertilizer development have gone abroad under AID auspices to make studies in some foreign lands—Morocco, Korea, Iraq, Nigeria, Thailand, and Turkey. TVA also has recently made a survey of plans of the fertilizer industry for expanding fertilizer production to meet the needs of food-deficient areas, and this information is being used by AID and other Government agencies in determining future policies in this field. It has helped train technicians from foreign countries, an example being a 19-member fertilizer team from India which was given an 8 weeks' course at Muscle Shoals.

TVA has, however, both the technical resources and personnel to play a much wider and more significant role in meeting the crisis which population and food experts are describing with increasing alarm. For example, Dr. Raymond Ewell, of the State University of New York at Buffalo said:

> The world is on the threshold of the biggest famine in history * * * this is the greatest and most nearly unsoluble problem in the history of the world. And it is almost here.

TVA has 30 years of experience and leadership in fertilizer technology to draw upon, having been in the forefront in the fertilizer field since its establishment in 1933. From relatively simple beginnings, its activities have developed to the present National Fertilizer Development Center at Muscle Shoals which has contributed extensively to the interests of the fertilizer industry and of agriculture in this country. The facilities and staff at the Muscle Shoals Center embrace all phases of chemical fertilizer development from laboratory to plant-scale demonstrations of technology and production. They have the capability of developing fertilizers suited to different soils, climates, and crops.

Rice, of course, is the chief food for regions containing about three-fifths of the world's population. Yet, in the rice growing areas of the world the most serious threats of famine exist. TVA has done considerable work recently on a material, urea-ammonium phosphate, which holds particular promise for these areas—an improvement over the fertilizers now available for rice culture.

Urea-ammonium phosphate has several characteristics in its favor. It contains no sulfur, which is in short supply in the world. It is highly concentrated as compared with other high-nitrogen solid fertilizers. This latter is an important attribute, since the use of concentrated materials reduces freight and handling charges per unit of actual plant nutrient. This factor can be crucial in areas which of necessity must import most or all of their fertilizer materials, particularly during the initial stages of development.

Calculations have been made, for example, which indicate that the cost of

transporting plant nutrients to India in the form of urea-ammonium phosphate would be $31 a ton less than for other fertilizers, while transportation across India would be $23 a ton cheaper.

Of course there are other avenues to be explored in seeking fertilizers designed specifically for the needs of developing countries.

TVA has produced urea-ammonium phosphate in pilot plant operations, and there seems to be no question but that construction and operation of a demonstration-scale plant would be relatively inexpensive and at the same time a highly important project considering the high stakes involved in making effective our aid to the underdeveloped countries.

Another aspect of TVA experience should also be mentioned. That is the development of techniques by which the people of the underdeveloped lands can be induced to use the fertilizers and taught to apply them effectively. The development and refinement of new and improved fertilizers is only one-half the process, and in TVA it has been coupled with widespread and intensive educational programs carried on in cooperation with State agricultural colleges and extension services in close touch with the people.

While on the subject of university extension services, I wish to mention an aside. There are proposals before us to reduce not only the Federal Government's support of this service, but also the agriculture experimental units connected with land grant schools. These programs offer an example of one of the oldest and most successful programs of Federal-*State* cooperation existing in our country. The accomplishments and innovations of these services are renown, not only in this country but, throughout the world. I strongly believe that we should look with considerable askance on any plan to cut back programs which have been such excellent examples of constructive Federal spending.

But, to return to TVA and its work with these services, without going into a detailed description, it can be pointed out that the most effective method we have found to carry the message to the farmers on the land is based on the old adage that "seeing is believing." Farm test-demonstrations, distributor demonstrations, test plots, and similar activities have proved highly effective in introducing new fertilizers to farmers in this country and in teaching the principles of scientific fertilization. Such techniques should be doubly important in lands where the populations are far less literate than our own.

TVA is fully aware of the importance of the programs now under way to help the people of large portions of the world feed themselves and avoid famine and disorder. It is prepared to employ its fertilizer experience to further these humanitarian and peaceful aims.

Mr. *President*, a series of articles and editorials on the subject of TVA and its work in the field of fertilizers were recently published in the Chattanooga Times. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times Mar. 15, 1966]

TVA AND AN URGENT TASK

The urgency of the world food crisis—with some authorities feeling we are on the edge of the worst famine in history—raises the logical and indeed the pressing possibility of a newly significant role for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Specialists at top scientific and general levels in TVA are now convinced that the Authority has both the resources and the personnel to play a key role in meeting this crisis. The primary method is through the perfection of fertilizers that can best increase crop yields in southeast Asia and other poorly developed areas.

TVA's recent annual report on farm and chemical development mentions the promising potential of one fertilizer in particular, urea-ammonium phosphate, for regions containing some 60 percent of the world's population, where rice is the chief food.

Urea-ammonium phosphate appears to have one quality of revolutionary import: a very high concentration of actual food nutrient—which makes its transportation $31 per ton cheaper to India, for example, than other fertilizers, and $23 per ton cheaper across the Indian subcontinent. Most of the underdeveloped lands must import their fertilizers.

In addition, urea-ammonium phosphate contains no sulfur, a common fertilizer ingredient which is in worldwide shortage.

There would seem to be no question that a test demonstration plant, probably to be located at Muscle Shoals, would be a relatively inexpensive but highly important step deserving the consideration now of the executive and legislative branches of Government.

The United States, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, private corporations, and the great foundations are all engaged, as articles in Sunday's Times pointed out, in the problem of the world food shortage.

TVA, with its global respect, its technical competence and its trained demonstration personnel, seems ideally suited for this basic complementary task.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, Mar. 13, 1966]

TVA'S KNOW-HOW IN FERTILIZERS CAN AID OTHERS—AGENCY HAS EXPERIENCE, KNOWLEDGE TO HELP THE DEVELOPING NATIONS

The Tennessee Valley Authority—for more than three decades one of the modern world's great examples of putting technology and humanitarian motives to the service of human betterment—offers to the starving people of the world an unmatched resource for expanding the food output in underdeveloped areas.

As human suffering and famine conditions blight the lives of millions of people, the old TVA concept of seeing is believing—the simple demonstration method which bridged the gulf between scientist and destitute farmer in the famous New Deal domestic experiment—is emerging in sharper focus as a kind of magician's wand to help turn fear and hunger into hope and fulfillment.

In simple terms, TVA's great reservoir of experience and knowledge in the development of chemical fertilizer, a backlog of technical information unequaled by any other organization in the world, is available in unique manner to guide the developing nations toward swift and substantial food production for their exploding populations.

HUMANITARIAN IDEALS

Moreover, it is this awareness of the TVA's unmatched competence in meeting this great hunger crisis of the world that is stirring the regional agency's scientists and technicians in promoting discussions and assessing resources along this line. For it is the feeling throughout the agency that enlistment of TVA in the world attack on hunger would be a bold and dramatic underscoring of the humanitarian ideals that spawned its creation under President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

TVA experts point to the fact that President Johnson has called for an all-out effort to create a viable economy in war-torn Vietnam and provide a showcase for Asia. In this setting, the experts note that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman observed that in Vietnam the real need was fertilizer and not bullets.

The proponents of using the TVA skills in this area to tackle world hunger point out that TVA also possesses an advanced level of technology in the study and use of urea-ammonium phosphate, which appears to have qualities of an ideal rice fertilizer with distinct advantages over fertilizers now available for rice farming.

Against this backdrop, they argue, TVA has a well-equipped fertilizer development center at Muscle Shoals with an experienced scientific and engineering research organization that can develop and produce fertilizers for virtually any soil, crop, or climate in the world.

Moreover, it is noted, TVA could establish a urea-ammonium phosphate test plant tied in with all the farflung activities of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and at the same time utilize TVA's great esteem with the scientists and technicians of foreign lands who have visited TVA for many years to receive instruction in fertilizer techniques.

It is the view of some that no other leading nation in the world actually possesses the built-in grassroots good will for service abroad that this Nation has with the TVA history and experiment.

To outline the ways in which TVA could use its fertilizer facilities and technical personnel in contributing materially toward solving the world food problem, the following six items have been prepared on the basis of interagency discussions and assessments.

(The first three items underscore the cooperative areas currently involving TVA and overseas agencies, all of which can be continued and expanded. The second three items concern the new contributions the TVA fertilizer technology could make on the world hunger front.)

1. Technical assistance and planning:

TVA is in an excellent position to provide overall guidance to developing nations with regard to both shortrun and longrun planning for fertilizers. TVA has specialists in practically all fields of fertilizer technology and use from which it can assemble teams capable of making on-the-spot studies and evaluations of all phases of a nation's fertilizer situation-crop responses to fertilizers, raw materials situations, cost of alternative production processes, location of plants, development of marketing systems, etc.

TVA through AID is already participating extensively in this area. Since the summer of 1962, seven TVA teams of two to three specialists each have gone to six nations (Morocco, Korea, Iraq, Nigeria, Thailand, and Turkey) for periods ranging from 1 week to 3 months.

2. Special studies and surveys:

In order to guide the development of policies for use by AID, the United Nations, and the world fertilizer industry in planning broad programs for introducing fertilizers into developing countries, certain special studies and surveys frequently have to be made relating to world and regional fertilizer needs, production, and use. TVA personnel are especially suited for these kinds of

studies because of their experience and knowledge.

A prime example of this type of activity is the recent survey made for AID on the fertilizer industry's plans for expanding production to meet needs in food-deficient areas. This survey is now being used to develop the U.S. Government's policy relative to making funds available to developing countries for fertilizer imports and plants.

3. Provide formal training in fertilizer technology:

The lack of well-trained technicians is one of the most serious deterrents to advancing fertilizer production and use in poorly developed regions. TVA can help fill this gap by providing practical training for selected groups of foreign nationals. Competence in practically all specialized areas of fertilizer science makes it possible for TVA to provide classroom-type instruction supplemented with whatever degree of practical application the situation may demand. Such things as plant operating techniques and field demonstrations can be included.

This type of activity is illustrated by the 8-week short course TVA provided last spring for a 19-member Indian fertilizer team. A similar short course—but with 60 or more participants from several nations—is scheduled this spring. TVA has offered training to a lesser extent for many years by arranging special study periods for individuals and small specialized groups from various foreign countries.

4. Special emphasis in chemical research and engineering development:

Some portion of TVA's effort in research and development of fertilizer production technology could readily be redirected to products or projects which are especially promising in their potential for use in food-deficient nations. Vigorous pursuit of process development and demonstration designed more specifically for developing countries could help a great deal in improving their food production in a short time.

Urea-ammonium phosphate is an outstanding example of such an opportunity. TVA already had done enough research with this product to know that, from a worldwide point of view, it is one of the most promising materials that has been developed.

Rice is the principal food crop in most regions of the world that face the threat of famine. Urea-ammonium phosphate appears to have the qualities of an ideal rice fertilizer, offering distinct advantages over fertilizers now available. Also, it contains the maximum concentration of plant food obtainable in high-nitrogen solid fertilizers by present technology, where transportation is difficult or much of the fertilizer must be imported during the initial stages of development.

RICE RESEARCH PROGRAM

As an example of how TVA could work through other organizations, initial testing and introduction of urea-ammonium phosphate in Asia might be done through the International Rice Research Institute at Los Banos, The Philippines. The Tropical Research Institute in Nigeria and the Colombian Agricultural Program, both sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation, could be involved in introductions in Africa and South America.

Development and testing could be coordinated with the extension-type activities of FAO's Freedom From Hunger program. It now has fertilizer demonstrations in 18 countries and is planning expanded activity in southeast Asia. This approach would have the additional benefit of aiding in acquainting industry with new products since private fertilizer companies participate in the Freedom From Hunger campaign through contributions of money and fertilizers.

Thus, by working with and through existing organizations, results of developmental work at Muscle Shoals could be carried to all parts of the world with minimum effort on TVA's part.

6. Isotope labeling of fertilizers for agronomic research:

FAO and the International Atomic Energy Agency jointly support a research program in 20 developing countries in which isotope-tagged fertilizers are employed to determine the effect of placement, time of application, fertilizer source, and various environment factors on the efficiency of nutrient uptake by rice and corn.

Previously, labeled fertilizers for this program were obtained from the U.S. Department of Agriculture fertilizer laboratory at Beltsville. Upon closing of the USDA laboratory, the program was left without a source of tagged materials.

All equipment at the USDA laboratory for tagging fertilizers has been transferred to TVA and also the man who headed the program. FAO–IAEA has requested TVA to provide labeled fertilizers starting next fiscal year. TVA currently is considering this proposal and also investigating domestic requirements.

Providing tagged fertilizers for use in the international program would permit developing countries to obtain fundamental agronomic data upon which to base a sound fertilizer program. A similar program initiated in the United States immediately following World War II proved of real value.

Demonstration of the urea-ammonium phosphate process by TVA would provide the technology for early adoption of the process by U.S. companies who are presently planning to establish facilities in developing countries or by the countries themselves. It could also provide materials for agronomic tests and demonstration in appropriate parts of the world.

RECOGNIZED LEADER

TVA is recognized as a leader in granulation technology, but the technology developed for U.S. needs cannot always be adapted to developing countries. For example, in India the immediate problem is to make granular combinations of ordinary superphosphate, urea, and ammonia, which is not practiced in the United States. In Zambia, a high-analysis sulfur-containing fertilizer of an unusual ratio is needed. The solutions to special granulations problems such as these could be readily obtained by studies in TVA pilot plants.

The world shortage of sulfur and its high price are a serious problem in planning phosphate fertilizer production. Acceleration of the development of several promising processes that require no sulfur, or less than conventional processes, would be of particular help to developing countries.

Another important contribution TVA could make is to assist in the evaluation of indigenous deposits of phosphate. TVA is by far the best qualified agency to answer questions regarding the suitability of phosphate ores through laboratory tests, mineralogical examination, and pilot-plant studies.

5. Help develop programs for testing and introducing improved fertilizers:

TVA also could help develop and coordinate small-scale tests and demonstrations of promising fertilizers to introduce them to researchers and their fertilizer industry in developing nations. Small quantities of experimental products could be furnished to initiate introduction on a worldwide basis similar to the approach used by TVA through the years.

As a result of past program activities with the universities and the fertilizer industry, TVA has a wealth of knowledge and experience on the roles these and similar organizations can play in introducing new products and practices. This experience in dealer and farmer fertilizer education programs can be made available to such organizations as AID or the Food and Agriculture Organization.

If an individual situation warranted, TVA could supply short-term help to plan and implement such programs in developing countries.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, Mar. 13, 1966]

TVA PATTERN SEEN AS GOOD PLAN FOR HALTING WORLD HUNGER CRISES

Two experts recently used these words in attempting to describe the appalling consequences of the food shortages that are creeping relentlessly upon the developing countries of the world:

Dr. Raymond Ewell, vice president for research, State University of New York at Buffalo:

"The world is on the threshold of the biggest famine in history * * * this is the greatest and most nearly unsoluble problem in the history of the world. And it is almost here."

Nyle C. Brady, former director of science and education, U.S. Department of Agriculture:

"Between the years 1960 and 2000, another world full of people will be added to these less developed regions of our inelastic earth * * * and they are falling steadily behind in their capacity to feed themselves."

Opening up new lands has great limitations. If all the land in the developing countries on which agriculture is economically feasible were placed in production, it would increase food supplies only 25 percent, at present production rates.

Food from the sea is a hopeless prospect. It now provides only 1 percent of the world's food; doubling or trebling it would be of no consequence.

Improvement in seeds and breeds is helpful only in long range.

This leaves chemical fertilizer, which increases the production on existing acres, as the one great hope for expanding food output substantially and quickly in the developing areas.

It has been demonstrated by both FAO and AID that fertilizers can increase in yield within present primitive farming methods; that is, with present varieties and crude methods of cultivation. It is estimated that a ton of plant nutrients will increase the yield of food crops by 8 to 10 tons.

Improving yields through the use of fertilizers in these countries involves much more than providing sufficient chemical fertilizer. There is a built-in caution among farmers, stemming from ignorance, fear, superstition and other factors, which must be overcome. This was true in the Tennessee Valley and the South in the early years of TVA and specialists feel that the drag will be even more pronounced in Asia, Africa, etc.

In addition, there is a lack of adequate marketing, transportation and credit facilities. Increased food production means a great transition from subsistence agriculture, where most is consumed and little sold, to commercial agriculture, with all the "middleman" problems that result.

The following is indicative of the effect of such braking influences:

The FAO in 1946 estimated that India's requirements for nitrogen in 1960 would be 1,500,000 tons; it used 323,000. It placed requirements for phosphates at 750,000 tons; India used 58,000. Potash was placed at 150,000 tons; use was only 29,500.

Put another way, if India keeps falling behind at the present rate in supplying food to its people, it will need by 1970 the equivalent of half of the present U.S. wheat crop in addition to its own production. By 1976 it would take the entire crop.

TVA's experience over the years has provided two things, basically:

An advanced level of technology in the chemistry and production of fertilizers; and with the extension services of the land-grant colleges, a background of adult education among farmers by the test-demonstration method which has successfully overcome farmer reluctance to modernize his methods.

In fertilizer technology, perhaps the most important advance has been made in increasing the plant nutrient content, permitting shipment at lower cost. Superphosphoric acid, a breakthrough of recent years, is being considered for shipment to other countries. It opens the way to the production of high analysis phosphatic material such as ammonium polyphosphates which have high plant nutrient content (over 70 percent as against the U.S. average of 35 percent) and add the nitrogen element.

On the education side, the test-demonstration "seeing is believing" method was the arch which bridged the gulf between the scientist and the farmer in the Tennessee Valley. It is largely responsible for the revolution which saw pastures replace row crops. Fertilizers produce results which are visible and thus rewarding; consequently, it has been found that they are an effective opening in getting farmers to adopt modern methods.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, Mar. 13, 1966]

NEW PHOSPHATE MAY CURB CRISIS—FERTILIZER'S QUALITIES ARE SUPERIOR FOR USAGE ON RICE CROP IN ASIA

Urea-ammonium phosphate appears to be an ideal rice fertilizer. Rice is the major food crop in the area where the world's food problem is most acute. Asian countries, which have approximately 60 percent of the world's population, depend heavily on rice.

Rice is grown on flooded soils, which means that the nitrogen must be in urea or ammonium forms rather than the nitrate form which results in losses through leaching or denitrification; urea-ammonium sulfate, now used in large quantities on rice, is proving undesirable at higher application rates because it acidifies the soil and also because it forms hydrogen sulfide which damages rice roots; urea-ammonium phosphate contains no sulfur.

Phosphorus for rice is most available if supplied in water-soluble form; all phosphorus in urea-ammonium phosphate is water soluble.

Urea-ammonium phosphate has an added advantage of being a good fertilizer for other crops. Thus, it would not be necessary for a country to import such materials as ammonium phosphates or ammoniated superphosphates, or develop plants for their production, unless it was so inclined.

Urea-ammonium phosphate takes moisture at a slower rate than most high-analysis fertilizers and is nonexplosive and noninflammable—factors which make the material easier to store and handle under adverse conditions.

The high-nutrient content of urea-ammonium phosphate is of particular importance to developing nations. Antiquated and inadequate rail systems, shortages of freight cars and poor highway systems make shipping expensive and limit the total amount of products that can be transported. This, coupled with lack of good storage, makes it difficult to move fertilizers from the point of manufacture or import to the farm in the right amounts at the right time.

In India, the average cost for transporting fertilizer is $20 per ton (compared with about $5 in the United States). Substituting urea-ammonium phosphate (25–30–0 grade) for the commonly used ammonium phosphate sulfate (16–20–0) would amount to a saving of $23 per ton of actual plant nutrient. Each bag of ammonium phosphate would contain 1.6 times more plant nutrient, greatly reducing the pressure on transportation and storage facilities.

Urea-ammonium phosphate also would permit large savings on overseas shipments of fertilizers. This is important since most developing countries initially must import part or all of the fertilizer they use. Freight costs from Houston to India amount to $27.18 per ton of fertilizer. Substituting 25–35–0 urea-ammonium phosphate for 16–20–0 would save $31 per ton of plant nutrient shipped.

DEATH OF NEWBOLD MORRIS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I call the attention of the Senate to the passing of Newbold Morris, a very close friend of mine. I was his campaign chairman in 1949 when he ran for mayor of New York. He was one of the most distinguished and delightful personalities that ever graced our city.

As president of the city council in the LaGuardia administration, and as parks commissioner in the Wagner administration, Newbold Morris displayed in full measure the high qualities of character, integrity, and devotion. As the son of one of our city's first families, he directed his talents and his energies toward making New York City a better place to live for all its citizens.

Newbold Morris was one of those rare men of wealth and position who literally devoted their entire lives to public service. And it was a measure of Newbold Morris' devotion to his native city that he always concentrated his efforts on the city itself. At one time he said he would rather be "mayor of New York than President of the United States."

Newbold Morris was also one of the most prominent Republicans in New York, and was twice the candidate of my party for mayor. In short, he left a record that deserves the respect and remembrance of all New Yorkers, and he will be sorely missed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times, Herald-Tribune, and New York Post concerning Mr. Morris, and an article from the New York Times outlining his career.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1966]

NEWBOLD MORRIS

Newbold Morris always said he would rather be mayor of New York City than President of the United States. He did become the first president of the City Council, a position he held for 4 consecutive terms, and he frequently was Acting Mayor when Fiorello La Guardia was away. He twice ran for mayor in his own right, but his defeats did not kill his appetite of municipal service. As Parks Commissioner for the past 6 years he tried hard to indulge his first love, the city's betterment.

His death may well end the era of patron-politicians—men whose families have regarded public service as an obligation for centuries. New York and the Morrises have been as one. They gave their name to the Morrisania section of the Bronx, and Newbold Morris at his death lived on the same upper East Side street on which he was born.

In a city too often notable for the cynicism of its politics, his activities over the past 35 years were an unflagging force for integrity and dedication.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 1 1966]

WE LOSE A GOOD NEW YORKER

Newbold Morris was, in the first place, a New Yorker. He regarded this city with affection and concern, and devoted his energies and talents to it. With relatively few and brief exceptions, it bounded his ambitions.

From this it follows that Newbold Morris was a good New Yorker, one who worked for the city from no hope of personal gain but from a sense of civic duty and noblesse oblige. There are more men and women of this type serving New York and its various public and voluntary agencies than is generally recognized; Mr. Morris carried his devotion a step beyond board rooms and public-spirited organizations into the heat and dust of politics.

He was by no means always successful in this complex field—but often his failures stemmed from the defects of his qualities: from idealism that did not reckon with reality; from the suspicion of the professional politician for the "do-gooder." Yet he served ably and honestly in a number of important municipal offices, and he leaves a record that has won the respect and gratitude of his fellow-citizens. Newbold Morris was a man who deserves emulation; our city can never have too many of his kind.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 1, 1966]

NEWBOLD MORRIS

Newbold Morris was a spirited, dedicated man. Born to wealth and social prominence, he could have invested his life in respectable, conventional works. Instead, following in the Republican tradition of Theodore Roosevelt, he preferred the role of mugwump. He served notably in the fusion administration of Fiorello H. LaGuardia and himself sought the mayoralty in a coalition similar to the one that finally elected John Lindsay.

A man of sympathetic, decent instincts, he added dignity and sober style to the administrations he served. As parks commissioner under Mayor Wagner, he was often too inclined to imitate the leadership of his strong-minded predecessor, Robert Moses. But he protected the parks against commercial encroachments, and his decisions, if frequently traditionalist, were fair and thoughtful.

A scion of an old, established American family, he exemplified the qualities of disinterest and vision that have kept America from hardening into a caste society. He served New York well, and he will be remembered with affection.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1966]

NEWBOLD MORRIS, 64, IS DEAD OF CANCER

Newbold Morris, former president of the city council and commissioner of parks and twice a reform candidate for mayor, died of stomach cancer Wednesday night at St. Luke's Hospital. He was 64 years old.

Shortly before entering the hospital 3 weeks ago, Mr. Morris, a member of one of the city's oldest families, was the host at a gala dinner at the Tavern on the Green in Central Park.

It celebrated the opening of the opera season at the New York City Center, of which he had been board chairman since its founding. He underwent surgery 2 weeks ago.

Mayor Lindsay ordered all city flags to fly at half-staff until after Mr. Morris' funeral, which will be held at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow at St. Bartholomew's Church, Park Avenue at 50th Street. The burial will be private.

"Mrs. Lindsay and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Morris and her family," the mayor said. "I should also like to express the sorrow of all the people of the city of New York and to acknowledge the

many years of devoted and constructive service that Newbold Morris gave to the city."

Governor Rockefeller said, "This gentleman was filled with the vitality and enthusiasm of the city he loved so much and did so much for. All New Yorkers will miss him."

Former Mayor Robert F. Wagner, under whom Mr. Morris, a Republican, served during his nearly 6 years as parks commissioner, said, "I have lost a personal friend of long standing, and New York City has lost one of its truly first citizens. He was a gentleman and an aristocrat in the noblest sense of that word."

A TRYING COUNCIL PRESIDENCY

In 1940 one of the popular pastimes in town was to go down to city hall to listen to the ferocious abuse heaped on Newbold Morris, president of the city council, by members of the Democratic majority.

Mr. Morris, whose amiability, liberal social philosophy and dedication to the cause of good government were legendary, was regularly called a boy scout, a goon, a hamhead, a sneak, a Simon Legree and a Scrooge.

One day, a councilman, carried away by the tide of invective, shouted at the handsome 6-foot 3-inch presiding officer, "You're a big ape. I can tell by the length of your arms and the shape of your head."

This was nothing personal. In fact, the Democrats, many of them the sons of immigrants, were generally fond of Mr. Morris, whose ancestors arrived in 1660 and once owned the section of the Bronx that is still called Morrisania.

It was just their way of expressing their dissatisfaction with the policies of the man Mr. Morris admired above all others in public life, Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia.

Mr. Morris tried to suffer these taunts in gentlemanly silence. At last, however, he could bear no more. He tried to reply in kind, but his upbringing and education had left his arsenal of rough language almost bare.

"You're a peanut politician," he finally declared.

City Controller Joseph McGoldrick said at the time that, as a politician, Mr. Morris had been born under "the insurmountable handicap of having rich but honest parents who denied him the opportunity to sell newspapers as a boy.

"A lesser man would have abandoned hope in the face of such adverse fortune," said Mr. McGoldrick.

But Mr. Morris never stopped trying to put into practice the ideals of public service and noblesse oblige that he was taught in his parents' mansion and at Groton School and Yale.

His unbending rectitude and his inability to express his thoughts in the standard political idiom amused some persons and offended others.

Perhaps the most widely circulated quip at his expense is credited to Paul Crowell, a retired political reporter of the New York Times: "Newbold was born with a silver foot in his mouth."

Nevertheless, Mr. Morris could speak plainly and forcefully when his sense of honor and fairplay was offended. Under heavy pressure, he refused to go along with the Board of Estimate when shortly after the end of World War II, it gave permission to the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. to bar Negroes from its Stuyvesant Town project.

"Huge as this project it," he declared, "it dwindles into insignificance as compared to the principle involved."

On an earlier occasion, he spoke out at a Board of Estimate meeting against a measure for the purchase of fire equipment that Mayor La Guardia was trying to rush through.

While he was still in the chamber he received a note from the mayor asking if he were a stockholder in another company that wanted the business. Mr. Morris rushed to Mr. La Guardia's office and in his presence tore the message into small pieces and dropped it on his desk.

"I don't like to get notes like that," he said later.

His final months were clouded by disappointment. As a lifetime, if somewhat irregular, Republican, he cherished the hope that Mayor Lindsay would retain him as parks commissioner.

WAS ASKED TO RESIGN

But he was asked to resign, partly because of his close association with his predecessor, Robert Moses, who, some critics said, continued to run the department.

Then, when his successor, Thomas P. F. Hoving, canceled many of his favorite projects, including the proposed Central Park cafe, and criticized what he called the neglected state of the parks, Mr. Morris was outspokenly bitter in his comments.

Mr. Morris was born on February 2, 1902, in his family's town house at 52 East 72d Street. He was christened Augustus Newbold, but he never used his first name.

Through both his father, Col. Newbold Morris, and his mother, the former Helen Schmerhorn Kingsland, Mr. Morris was descended from the city's Knickerbocker aristocracy. His ancestor Capt. Richard Morris, a veteran of Cromwell's Roundhead cavalry, staked out the manor that was to become the basis of the family fortune.

Other members of the family were Lewis Morris, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and Ambrose C. Kingsland, who, as mayor of New York in the 1850's, acquired the land for Central Park.

Mr. Morris was educated privately here and then sent to Groton. He said later that the headmaster, the Reverend Edincott Peabody, and Mr. La Guardia had been the most powerful influence in his life.

He went on to Yale, which members of his family had been attending for 200 years. Mr. Morris had rowed on the Groton varsity and he soon won a place in the university freshman boat.

In the big race with Harvard, the young oarsman, to avoid the possibility of a disastrous slip, fastened his shorts to his seat.

When the shell sprung a leak, however, he was forced, under the eyes of thousands of spectators, to abandon ship in his athletic supporter.

Mr. Morris was graduated in 1925 and went on to the university's law school, from which he received his degree 3 years later.

A NO DEAL TICKET

Returning to New York, he kept in trim by running around the Central Park reservoir. He took up figure-skating and by 1935 was the Middle Atlantic amateur champion.

Down at City Hall, Mr. La Guardia enjoyed asking him, "Still skating, Mr. Henie?" The reference was to Sonja Henie, who at the time was starring in epics of the rink.

Mr. Morris joined his father's law firm and took his seat on the Republican County Committee. By 1933 he was president of one of the party's clubs in the 17th (Silk Stocking) Congressional District on the East Side.

Of his introduction that year to Mr. La Guardia, then a Congressman making his first run for mayor as the Republican-Fusion candidate, Mr. Morris said, "He just took me over completely that first night."

The blueblood campaigned hard for the roly-poly bandmaster's son. After the victory Mr. Morris was appointed an assistant corporation counsel. A year later he won a Silk Stocking seat on the old Board of Aldermen.

As an alderman, Mr. Morris showed from time to time a puckish wit. He once made a small bet that, although he was a member of a despised minority in the Tammany Hall-controlled body, he could nevertheless get a bill passed.

Mr. Morris then introduced a measure that made St. Patrick's Day a city holiday. It was passed by acclamation but vetoed by the mayor.

One reason that the council was so hard on Mr. Morris after he became its leader was frustration. Under the charter, it had few powers aside from the naming of streets.

But there was also the feeling that Mr. Morris had set a dangerous precedent when he voluntarily cut the budget of his office from $70,000 to $40,000 a year. Furthermore, he campaigned for the abolition of hundreds of patronage jobs.

In 1936, ignoring Mr. LaGuardia's advice, he ran for the board presidency and was beaten by a 2-to-1 margin.

The next year, under charter reform, the board was replaced by the city council. There was a new election. With Mr. La Guardia at the head of the ticket, Mr. Morris won the council presidency, and he held it for 8 years.

In 1945, when the mayor decided not to seek a fourth term, Mr. Morris unsuccessfully sought the Republican nomination. When it went to Judge Jonah J. Goldstein, whom Mr. Morris called a tool of Tammany Hall, he bolted the party to run on a "No Deal" ticket.

Mr. Morris' hopes of keeping alive the La Guardia spirit of fusion and reform ended when William O'Dwyer won the election, snowing under both rivals.

After 63 stormy days, he was summarily released by Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, who, a few hours later, was dismissed by the President.

He ran once more, in 1949, this time with the endorsement of the Republican, Liberal, and City Fusion parties, but again he was badly beaten by Mr. O'Dwyer, who less than a year later was to resign under fire and become Ambassador to Mexico.

Asked if he might make yet another try to win the office, Mr. Morris replied, "When you've asked a lady twice to marry you, you don't ask her a third time."

He served from 1946 to 1948 on the city planning commission and kept busy with his law practice, which was mainly concerned with trusts and wills.

WASHINGTON NIGHTMARE

In 1952 Mr. Morris was summoned to Washington by President Harry S. Truman. Troubled by instances of corruption in his Administration, the President appointed Mr. Morris as a special assistant to the Attorney General to lead an investigation.

Nothing came out of Mr. Morris's probe. He later referred to the experience as "my Washington nightmare."

"Everything was cozy, comfortable, and cordial until Howard McGrath discovered that I meant business," he said.

While in Washington, Mr. Morris found himself under investigation by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, who declared that Mr. Morris's law firm had represented a company that purchased ships from the Government and used them for trade with Communist China during the Korean war. Nothing came of that, either.

During one of the Wisconsin Senator's question periods, the angry Mr. Morris was handed a message from the audience.

"Just a minute," he said, glancing at it, "I have a note here from my wife."

He read it and reported, "It say, 'Keep your shirt on.' "

Back in the city, Mr. Morris devoted himself to the law, to charitable work and to his favorite avocation, the guidance of the City Center of Music and Drama. He had been instrumental in saving the former Shrine auditorium on West 55th Street for cultural pursuits in 1943, when the city took over the derelict building for taxes.

In 1960, though, Mr. Morris was appointed parks commissioner by Mayor Wagner. During the nearly 6 years he held the post, the department, under the watchful eye of Mr. Moses, supervised the erection of Shea Stadium, the creation of the Perkins Garden in Riverdale, the Bronx, and the transfer of Flushing Meadow Park to the uses of the World's Fair.

The commissioner was a doughty defender of the parks, opposing the construction of parking garages under the greensward and other encroachments. He also took a dim view of the erection of sculpture by Henry Moore and Alexander Calder at Lincoln Center but was overruled by the City Arts Commission.

Studying the work of the two renowned modernists, he said regretfully, "I don't get it. I'm in love with representational art." When he was informed of the commission's action, he said, "If I were 40 years younger I'd go sit on a park bench and cry."

WED IN GRACIE MANSION

Mr. Morris is survived by his widow, the former Mrs. Constance Hand Jordan, a daughter of Learned Hand, the eminent jurist. He married her in Gracie Mansion, the mayor's official residence, in 1942. They lived at 340 East 72d Street, the street on which Mr. Morris was born.

A previous marriage, to Margaret Copley Thaw, had ended in divorce 2 years earlier.

Mr. Morris had two sons by the first wife, Peter V. C. Morris, of 1170 Fifth Avenue, and Capt. Newbold Morris of the Marine Corps, who is stationed at Camp Lejeune, N.C., and a son and a daughter of the second marriage, Lewis Morris, a doctoral candidate in history at the University of Pennsylvania, and Frances Morris, a student at Barnard College.

Two brothers, George L. K. Morris of Paris, a painter, and Stephen V. C. Morris, a retired State Department official who lives in Washington, also survive.

RETIREMENT OF ALFRED H. KIRCHHOFER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the retirement of one of New York State's most distinguished and respected editors, Alfred H. Kirchhofer, of the Buffalo Evening News.

Mr. Kirchhofer, a veteran of 56 years in news work—51 of them with the Buffalo News—will continue as president of WBEN radio and television, but will give up the duties of editor which he has performed so with such dedication and integrity since 1956.

A former president of the National Press Club while he was Washington correspondent of the News, Mr. Kirchhofer has long been active in improving standards of journalism education. He was one of the founders of the American Press Institute at Columbia University and a former president of the American Council on Education for Journalism, which accredits college and university journalism courses and programs.

His contributions to the improvement of the education of newspaper men and women in schools throughout the country are a source of pride to everyone concerned with a vigorous, impartial, free press, and I know he will continue his effective crusade for higher standards.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in last Friday's Buffalo Evening News concerning Mr. Kirchhofer and his successor, Mr. Paul E. Neville.

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

A. H. KIRCHHOFER RETIRES AS EDITOR OF EVENING NEWS—MRS. E. H. BUTLER NAMES PAUL NEVILLE EXECUTIVE EDITOR, MILLARD BROWNE, EDITOR OF EDITORIAL PAGE

Alfred H. Kirchhofer retired today as editor of the Buffalo Evening News but will continue as president of WBEN Inc., which operates WBEN AM-FM and WBEN-TV, the News radio and television stations.

Mrs. Edward H. Butler, president of the News, in announcing Mr. Kirchhofer's retirement, also announced appointments to two new positions on the newspaper.

Paul E. Neville, managing editor, was named executive editor responsible for the entire news operation. Millard C. Browne, chief editorial writer, becomes editor of the editorial page.

The retiring editor, whose distinguished newspaper career has been nationally recognized by many high honors and awards, joined the News in 1915.

CONTRIBUTED IMMEASURABLY

He served as a reporter and political writer, assistant city editor, Albany correspondent, and Washington correspondent, and in 1927 was named managing editor. He became editor in 1956 upon the death of Edward H. Butler, Jr.

"Mr. Kirchhofer," Mrs. Butler said in a notice to the employees, "has contributed immeasurably to the progress and development of this newspaper which has been profoundly influenced by his competence and character.

"He will undertake some future special assignments for the News and, of course, will conduct the operation of our radio and television stations which have always been conducted in close cooperation with the News."

GREATEST DAYS LIE AHEAD

In a letter to members of the news and editorial staff Mr. Kirchhofer reminisced about his 56 years in newspaper work, 51 of them with the News.

"These have been wonderful years," he wrote, "in which to report, present, and interpret the news of a fast-changing world. But the past is prolog. The greatest days of the News surely lie ahead.

"The newspaper which intelligently serves its constituency will continue to be an indispensable source of intelligence and civic leadership. There is no substitute for news honestly and intelligently reported in the printed form."

Mr. Kirchhofer has long been active in improving standards of journalism education.

HEADED NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

A former president of the American Council on Education for Journalism, which serves as an accrediting committee for college and university journalism schools, he helped organize the the accrediting program.

He is also a past president of the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., and was president when the $10 million, 12-story National Press Club Building was constructed in the heart of the Capital.

He is a former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and is a member of the prestigious Gridiron Club composed of present and former Washington newsmen.

He is founder of the American Press Institute at Columbia University and served on its board of directors.

RECEIVED HONORARY DEGREES

Presently, Mr. Kirchhofer is chairman of the Journalism Advisory Council of St. Bonaventure University. He is a former member of the Council of the University of Buffalo and was for many years a member of the General Administration Committee.

St. Bonaventure University and D'Youville College have awarded him honorary degrees.

The schools of journalism at the University of Missouri and Syracuse University in 1956 and 1958, respectively, awarded Mr. Kirchhofer their medals for distinguished service in journalism.

He was elected to membership in the National Journalism Hall of Fame at the University of Missouri in 1959 and in 1960 was the recipient of the Canisius College Board of Regents Distinguished Citizen's Achievement Award.

Mr. and Mrs. Kirchhofer left Buffalo today on a vacation and expect to return in late April.

NEVILLE WITH NEWS 9 YEARS

Mr. Neville is a cum laude graduate of the University of Notre Dame. He began his newspaper career in Massachusetts with the Worcester Post and Boston Herald.

He served in 9th Air Force public relations in the European theater during World War II after assignment as editor of the Richmond, Va., airbase newspaper.

He subsequently returned to the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune where he had been a police reporter and was in turn general reporter, political writer, sports editor, and managing editor. He joined the News in early 1957 as assistant to the editor and was made managing editor in 1958.

Mr. Neville is vice president of the New York State Society of Newspaper Editors, a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and a member of the board of directors of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association.

BROWNE A NIEMAN FELLOW

Mr. Browne was born in the State of Washington but grew up in California and is an alumnus of Stanford University. His early newspaper experience was obtained as a reporter and staff writer on the Sacramento Bee.

In the early forties Mr. Browne was designated a Nieman fellow, one of journalism's most coveted awards, providing for a year of specialized graduate study at Harvard University. He joined the editorial staff of the News in 1944.

The immediate past president of the National Conference of Editorial Writers, Mr. Browne is an active member of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalism fraternity.

He is also a member of the editorial board of the Society of Nieman Fellows which publishes the monthly Nieman Reports, a high quality and influential magazine devoted to the field of journalism.

ADDRESS OF CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN AT MEETING OF INTERNATIONAL JUDGES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on March 12, Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court addressed a meeting of international judges which was held at the Peace Through Law Center in Geneva, Switzerland. The group was gathered for the purpose of organizing a world association of judges of which Chief Justice Warren will be the chairman.

Certainly the Chief Justice's reputation for leadership in the movement of world peace through law is truly illustrious. It is a singular honor both for him and for this country that he has been chosen to head the new organization, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks on this occasion be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW CENTER, GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, MARCH 12, 1966

We sincerely thank Your Excellencies and Chief Justice Haberlin for the hospitality of your wonderful country. Switzerland through the centuries has earned a unique place among nations as a land of peace. Its existence as a neutral amid the turmoil of the quarrels and wars of others has achieved this peace image in the minds of the peoples of the entire world. Switzerland's record of neutrality and its example of harmonious living among peoples of diverse language, race, religion, and custom, have set an example all peoples admire and respect. Here you have provided a place where they who would do the work of peace may meet in an atmosphere somewhat detached from the world's struggles.

I am sure also that the pulse of everyone here is quickened merely because we are in Geneva, the renowned "city of peace." It has become customary for mankind's greatest peace efforts to operate in and out of Geneva. Universally, they who would do the work of peace almost involuntarily say, "Let's meet in Geneva."

Geneva is thus a most natural place for us to meet and discuss our plans for cooperative efforts to advance the quest for peace through justice for men and nations. Here, as we seek to formulate a role for judges, we can draw inspiration from the work of the many international organizations headquartered here and the many meetings held here which have made Geneva such a symbol of man's striving for peace.

Here was born the Red Cross. Here lived the League of Nations. Here lives the International Labor Organization with its ringing motto "Poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere." Here, too, is located the European office of the United Nations. And here lives the baby of international organizations, one in whose birth so many in this room participated and for whose future we have such high hopes: the World Peace Through Law Center. And Geneva should be the headquarters of the new organization of the world's judges which we are here to create in order to further the cause of peace with justice under the rule of law for all men and all nations.

The peace conferences held in Geneva are so broad ranging and so numerous as to prevent even a partial description or listing. I must mention, however, that even as we gather, the anxious minds of the peoples of the world turn ever hopefully and prayerfully to the disarmament discussions which seek a way out of the ever-accelerating arms race. Mankind knows that every arms race in all history has, through accident or design, ended in war. And all men know that the holocaust of nuclear war could mean incineration of humanity. Never has mankind so urgently and so universally desired world peace. Never has peace been so imperative. Never has the world so urgently needed new peace machinery. It is my thesis that any such machinery that is possible, credible, and thus workable, will be composed of law.

Many of you in this audience are major contributors to man's constant efforts for survival in a peaceful world. To many of you, humankind owes a great debt for your contributions. We judges ask your help in defining a proper role for courts within the framework of man's ancient and unending search for peace. We further ask your assistance in carrying out that role in order that law may be kept synonymous with justice.

In the beginning disputes between man and man were settled by brute strength in a fistfight. Next man used stones in slings, bows and arrows, and finally guns, generally seeking decision by death. But today, in all civilized nations of the world, we have progressed to the point where decision by death is outlawed in disputes between man and man. These disputes are settled in the courts under the rule of law. Law is the indispensable base of civilization. But even today with all our claims for achieving such a high state of civilized existence, decision by death under the law of the jungle is the ultimate mechanism in disputes between nations.

With leadership and hard work, we can and we must progress to the point where law performs the same functions internationally as it does within nations. We must create such a credible system of justice under law that it will anticipate and prevent war. Our dramatic accomplishments in so many areas of human endeavor prove beyond question that we are capable of filling this the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization.

War is the most repugnant product of the human mind. To pull the world out of the present ultimate reliance upon war as a method for resolving disputes between nations we must create a credible alternative. This must encompass a plan to achieve and maintain peace which the peoples of the world will accept. Such a plan must capture and fire the imagination of peoples everywhere. To be successful, it must be a plan which all peoples can understand. It must be related, therefore, to their ordinary, everyday knowledge and experience. If this is done the peoples of the world will understand, admire, and support a law system which replaces decision by armed violence between nations with decision under law in courthouses.

As initial proof of this plan's credibility, let me remind you that in every international area where law rules are universally accepted they are effective. The law of the sea, law of diplomatic immunity, and Postal Convention are evidence of this fact. In instances where international courts have been used for peaceful decision of international disputes their decisions, with very few exceptions, have been accepted and carried out even though unpopular with those who lost. The Thailand-Cambodia and Nicaragua-Honduras border dispute decisions of the International Court of Justice are examples. The European Court of Justice has an outstanding record of decisions on many international disputes between men and nations within the Common Market.

While the pages of recorded history are in large part a chronicle of wars and warriors, and the weapons they used to kill, destroy and enslave, no one can dispute that the brightest chapters in world history are those which represent advances in law. The Code of Hammurabi, the Ten Commandments, the Law of Moses, the Code of Solon, the Twelve Tables of Rome, the Corpus Juris of Justinian, the law revisions and compilations of Charlemagne, the Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, Napoleon's Civil Code, and our own Constitution are illustrations of such chapters.

In every community, city, state, or nation, civilization has blossomed and advanced as law has replaced force as the controlling factor in relations among men. Every new high in civilization's progress has been accompanied by a new crest in use of and reliance upon the rule of law. History demonstrates that where law has prevailed, individual freedom of man has been strong and progress great. Where law is weak or nonexistent, chaos and fear lurk and thrive and human progress is destroyed or retarded.

An evaluation of the ideas, ideals, and concepts which mankind has developed since the dawn of civilization leads to the inescapable conclusion that the rule of law offers the best attainable route to peace. In a world sundered by differences of language, color, creed and belief, and by background in diverse forms of government, the rule of law is the one concept universally understood as an ideal nearly all men have in common on a worldwide basis. It, therefore, offers the best common ground which mankind possesses upon which to erect an edifice for peace.

I sincerely believe that in today's world no man can stand aside from the search for a peace formula which will command such universal support as to be both credible and workable. We must all contribute our efforts, our thinking and our leadership. We judges must seek out together a role that is appropriate to the position we occupy and the function we perform. That is why I am here. I am sure that is why each of you is here.

Ours has been called the space age, the science age, and the atomic age. But if man is to live until future ages, ours must become known as the age of peace. To pin that label on our time and make it a true label requires the most extraordinary creative effort in the history of mankind. For it requires no less than that mankind get beyond words and work together on such concrete steps that world peace will indeed be created—created out of words, but they must be words which mean something because embodied in law; law adopted by so many nations that it is universally applicable to men and nations and their international relations; law that is so extensive it will govern and guide so much of these international relations as to minimize conflict; law which will channel the inevitable conflict into a world court system where peaceful decisions can be made and violent conflict thus avoided.

I do not join the doubters who say this task is impossible because it has never been accomplished. I join that growing group of optimists who say we will do it because we must. I refuse to believe that our creative generation which has split the atom, conquered space, developed a cure for polio, set up an almost instantaneous worldwide communications system, and brought about more international cooperation on more subjects than any other generation since the world began cannot create a workable peace structure for the world community.

These great achievements were accomplished even though detractors, many of them scientists of great distinction, scoffed at the idea of splitting the atom or putting a man into space. Other great scientists were determined to succeed and did succeed. So it must be here. We men of the law must not allow detractors and scoffers to prevent the great effort without which success is impossible. The price of failure is too great. We dare not fail. Mankind's failure to realize that the answer to our problem of establishing world order is a strong world law structure and mankind's failure to concentrate cooperative international efforts on creating this law structure is the main reason such a peace structure has not yet come into existence. There has been a failure to communicate to the people, to educate the people, in the required elements of a world order which is strong enough to achieve and maintain peace.

Law development must be the heart of all international efforts to build world stability, order, and peace. And while law in many respects reflects crystallized public opinion, this task of building a law structure for the world and creating proper public realization of its worth, is primarily a job for the legal profession. Heads of state, diplomats, medical doctors, dentists, engineers, and ministers of the gospel can help but we of the law must provide the manpower and the leadership. Sure it is a long, uncharted, and tremendously difficult road. But travel it

we must. And the more of us that travel the road, the sooner we will reach the great goal we seek.

We must not overlook any experience or idea. No two of us have traveled the same law road in reaching this Conference. We come from many systems of law. We each bring to this meeting our own private and personal history of hopes for the law, discoveries about the law, disappointments about the law, and then new insights and new hopes and new defeats, and perhaps fresh hopes again for a constantly improving justice for all men and nations under the rule of law. I believe in the law and its creative capacity to meet the needs of man. That is why I believe so greatly in our creative capacity to develop justice under law which will meet the imperative need of our generation for a peace structure to prevent war.

A creative program of law building and new legal institutions adapted to our ever more interdependent world is the most positive and most possible initiative for peace which we of our day can undertake. We must use our inventive genius to create these new law instruments of control which are equal to the new instruments of destruction mankind now possesses. We can and must confront and master the problems that exist in such a program. Again, I say we will succeed because we must.

I trust that others here who are not members of my profession know that we of the law are already practicing what we preach when we urge law as the best road to world peace. We have already banded together worldwide and organized ourselves effectively to do some of the work that must be done. Through the World Peace Through Law Center we have compiled summaries of international law and summaries of the national law of over 100 nations. We have used and are using this worldwide law experience to develop and carry out a work program containing ideas, proposals, and projects designed to make law a credible plan for peace.

The idea for this historic Conference to create a world organization of judges first arose in Athens in 1963. There I participated in the inauguration of the first world Conference ever held to consider how we of the law could best further the goal of world peace. Some 50 judges and more than 1,000 lawyers from 105 nations attended that Conference. These judges informally discussed the fact that the executive departments have their channels for exchange of ideas and experience through their diplomats and members of parliaments have their interparliamentary unions, but that the world's judges have not yet created any organized channels for exchange of opinions and similar material or for face-to-face discussion of common problems. When the Washington Conference on World Peace Through Law was planned the Chief Justices and other high court judges were invited to attend so we could explore this matter further. We held two special meetings of the 65 chief judges and the some 200 other judges at the Conference. But the pressure of so many other programs and events along with the attendance of over 3,000 members of the legal profession from some 115 nations prevented our finalizing plans for a world organization of judges.

The Athens Conference did adopt a work program, which was updated and expanded at the Washington Conference and which includes many things we judges are interested in, such as plans for the first volume of a world law code and a system of low-level international courts as the beginning of a world judicial system. The formal declaration of faith in world order adopted unanimously at the final session of the Washington Conference is an inspiring document setting forth the beliefs that "only under law can there be order and justice" and "whatever transient disputes there may be, a just world order under law can be achieved." It was the Athens Conference which created the World Peace Through Law Center to carry out this global work program as a cooperative effort of the more than 1 million members of the world's legal profession. And in January 1966 the Center established its Secretariat here in Geneva.

By usual standards this Conference is convening rather quickly after the Washington Conference. But these are unusual days, and an acceptable plan for world order must provide justice for men and nations. Speedy efforts to advance world order is the great necessity of our day. At the Washington Conference and since then in many communications addressed to the Center, it has been urged that the very formation of a world organization of judges will have an impact on this necessity. It is in response to these urgings that this group of distinguished judges has been invited here to complete the task of organizing the world's judges and to define what the role of this new organization should be.

So I want you who are not of my profession to understand that in the broad spectrum of the worldwide picture of ever-increasing cooperation in religion, education, science and other disciplines, those of us concerned with the law are searching for new ideas, assuming new initiatives and utilizing the advanced thinking and technology of our times. We are, for example, exploring the feeding of law into computers to make it more available nationwide and worldwide. Our great law libraries around the world have offered to provide materials upon request to judges and lawyers in nations and cities not served by adequate law libraries. These are vital steps. By making law more available it will be used and relied upon more than ever before. Thus will it grow as a factor for world peace.

This then is the record of the legal profession and its growing efforts to further world peace. It is no longer a mere spectator of world events but is deeply implicated in the destiny of mankind. We are creating programs out of law which will substitute organized peace for organized force. Law is the only device yet developed by the mind of man whereby power can be constrained.

In urging law as the best formula or path down the road to peace, I do not mean to downgrade the great contributions of diplomacy, religion, science, communications or economics. I do point out that the contributions of each other discipline sometimes gain permanence and stability only when written into law or when so universally used, accepted and respected that they become law by custom. Customary law which that great English law leader Sir Wilfred Jenks, who is here with us, records in his book the "Common Law of Mankind."

Many take the growth of the law for granted like the air we breathe and the water we drink. But this is a misreading of law's history. Every great reform or expansion in the law has come from leadership and hard work. What we need today to make law grow strong enough, and quickly enough, to achieve and maintain world peace is the type of concentrated "crash" programs which split the atom, put manned satellites into space and which may soon put men on the Moon, Venus, or Mars. If any man of responsibility had spoken of a man on the Moon a few years ago, few would have agreed. Now no one can really doubt that this will happen.

And so in the field of law where all mankind has so very much at stake we must seek and secure the support of all who desire peace as backers for our effort to mount such a concentrated "crash" program to build a peace structure for the world community.

We of the law are working for peace with an intensity, knowledge, and effectiveness never before achieved. We still have a great educational program to carry out. The public at large does not yet realize that a world ruled by law can indeed be created. But the number and strength of the law's supporters are growing constantly. The fact that more than 100 messages from heads of state were sent to the Athens and Washington Conferences urging a strengthened and expanded rule of law for the world is in itself evidence of this ever-rising tide of support.

But we need to create more public awareness of the value of the world law as the most credible road to peace. As one illustration, the major educational foundations have not provided the support for law which they have for science, medicine, and other disciplines. Many nations have great academies devoted solely to the art of war, but no existing academy or university is devoted solely to the art of peace. It is estimated that worldwide some 150 billions of dollars are being spent yearly on arms by governments. But governments spend very little on building a peace structure—a law structure—for the world.

Man desires peace and individual liberty. Equal justice for men and nations under the rule of law is the only concept that can supply both. Any system that brings and maintains peace with justice will be a law system, not an arms system. The rule of law is the only concept with a proven record of capability to control the emotions and actions of men when made strong enough in all of its elements to be effective.

Those who lack faith in the law, and thus downgrade the value and effectiveness of the law, often do so because they fail to realize the respect for, and faith in, the law which exists among the vast majority of the peoples of all nations. The people do not look upon the rule of law as representing perfection or utopia. But they do look upon it with all its imperfections as representing the best system yet devised by man to avoid conflict, or to provide a peaceful decision for those conflicts that are always going to occur in a nation or world inhabited by human beings. This faith in and respect for the rule of law by most people is the reason why we of our generation can find in the application of that rule to relations between nations the answer to our number one necessity, world peace. In the law's principles, processes and procedures we have the best tested formula for living together rather than dying together in nuclear war.

We who work for peace through law are opening the door to a brighter tomorrow. And tomorrow's world is being built by today's people. If it is to be a peaceful world, a world wherein human rights are respected, a world wherein decision by death is ended, it must be a "law-ful" world.

As man has become more civilized, and as destructive power has grown, decision by war is no longer an acceptable method for settling disputes. True it is that reliance on the war method is easy and building a peace structure is perhaps the most difficult task ever undertaken by man. So difficult the fainthearted shy from trying. But no matter how difficult the creation of a peace structure may be, we dare not fail to build it, for it constitutes humanity's only hope for survival.

Since the dawn of history man has dreamed of a world without war. That the pages of recorded history are chronicles of failure does not mean we of our day will fail if we but make the greatest effort yet assembled by mankind on a worldwide basis for our assault on the problems of a world peace structure. We of our day can, and I believe we will, create this warless world. We will do it by building a new world order under the rule of law.

Not far from here near the Peace Palace at the Hague in a quiet resting place at the side of an ancient church in Delft, Netherlands, lies the remains of Hugo Grotius. He, with other greats of the law in centuries long past, earned eternal fame for articulating the idea of a peaceful world achieved and maintained through the rule of law. That their idea has not died but has risen up and shone forth to inspire succeeding generations to strive anew to make their dream come true attests to its strength and validity. There is an old proverb that nothing is as strong as an idea. And that nothing can stop an idea whose time has come. I urge you great leaders of men in this audience that we should seek together to enlist the support of all men, women, and children throughout the whole world in a crusade for peace, a crusade which will thereby gather the support to make the time of this great idea arrive in our day. We of our generation have made more ancient dreams come true than any generation in all history. The dream of world peace can also be translated by the peoples of our generation from dream into reality. The peoples of the world have the desire, the capacity, and the power to achieve this. Up to now they have lacked the inspiration, a program, and the essential leadership. Such inspiration, program, and leadership must be developed and it is our fervent hope that it will emanate from this center for world peace through world law.

The day when leaders could become renowned through use of arms is gone. The greatest leaders of our era will be those who lead in erecting a world peace structure. The rule of law will indeed replace force as the controlling factor in the fate of humanity as the peoples of the world become convinced that this is the only credible material out of which world order can be fashioned. Mankind's ancient quest for world peace will thus end in success—success through a world ruled by law. And when this rule of law prevails, then and only then will we live in a world where any man can live anywhere on the face of the earth, or travel to the vistas of endless space, in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

REACTION TO SPEECH OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, made a speech which has caused great concern in the agricultural areas of our Nation.

He inferred that the present inflationary pressures are caused largely by increased prices for farm products.

The facts are, farmers are not presently receiving parity in the marketplace and should not be required to take a reduction in the price of their commodities. They should not be expected to pay for the cost of our war in Vietnam.

There is a great deal of resentment against the Secretary's statement in the agricultural areas, and I sincerely hope he will, at the earliest opportunity, clarify his position on agricultural prices and agricultural income.

I read into the RECORD a wire I received from Glenn Pickett, executive vice president of the Kansas Livestock Association:

We deplore Secretary Freeman's expression of delight with a drop in farm commodity prices. He has again demonstrated his refusal to represent the interests of agriculture and the public. If producers are to meet world food for peace need, they deserve better. Better diets today require a new law in percentage of income. Food is relatively the cheapest in history. Farm income is relatively low. We urge you to call these facts to the attention of Federal officials. To suggest that consumers control inflation by eating inadequate diets is highly irresponsible.

TO REPEAL SECTION 6 OF THE SOUTHERN NEVADA PROJECT ACT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1064, S. 2999. I have discussed this matter with the majority and minority leaders, and this action is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2999) to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)).

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this bill was introduced by my colleague, Senator CANNON, and myself, as a result of the transmittal to Congress of a request by the Secretary of the Interior on March 1, 1966.

The reason for the request for amendment of the Southern Nevada Project Act was contained in a statement made by President Johnson when he signed S. 32, the bill to authorize the southern Nevada project.

The President's full statement is incorporated in the report.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have approved S. 32, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes.

The southern Nevada water supply project which would be authorized by this bill consists of a system of distribution pipelines and related facilities to furnish water to Las Vegas, several other Nevada towns, and Nellis Air Force Base. I have supported Federal authorization of this project as the appropriate means for assisting this area to meet its growing water supply problems.

However, during the course of this legislation through the Congress a rider in the form of section 6 was added to it without consultation with any executive agency.

Section 6 provides as follows: "In all water supply contracts for the use of water in Nevada under this Act or section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) the Secretary shall recognize the intrastate priorities of water rights to the use of water existing on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as validating any right diminished or lost because of abandonment, nonuse, or lack of due diligence, nor shall anything in this Act be construed as affecting the satisfaction of present perfected rights as defined by the decree of the United States Supreme Court in Arizona against California et al. (376 U.S. 340)."

Although these provisions are couched in general terms, the scant legislative history of the bill indicates that they are intended to be applicable to one company only. While there may be some equities which would justify special consideration for this company, I am advised by the Secretary of the Interior that these provisions might well have a much broader sweep. In fact, it appears that they might affect in unforeseeable ways the water rights of a number of individuals and firms amounting to 60,000 to 70,000 additional acre-feet.

In these circumstances I have asked the Secretary of the Interior to develop legislation which would amend section 6 to limit its effect to that intended by the Congress. I am confident that those Members concerned with this legislation will agree that the uncertainties surrounding the broader than intended effect of section 6 make its amendment desirable.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Department of the Interior in transmitting this legislation to the President of the Senate under date of March 1, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft of bill to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)).

We recommend that this draft bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted.

The Southern Nevada Project Act authorizes the Secretary to construct, operate, and maintain a project in southern Nevada for supplying water to municipalities and industrial centers within Clark County. Section 6 of that act provides:

"In all water supply contracts for the use of water in Nevada under this Act or section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) the Secretary shall recognize the intrastate priorities of water rights to the use of water existing on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as validating any right diminished or lost because of abandonment, nonuse, or lack of due diligence, nor shall anything in this Act be construed as affecting the satisfaction of present perfected rights as defined by the decree of the United States Supreme Court in *Arizona* v. *California et al.* (376 U.S. 340)."

That section was not in the original bill as submitted to the Congress and commented upon by the Department. It arose out of a statement submitted by the attorney for Basic Management, Inc., a Nevada corporation claiming certain rights to waters of the lower Colorado River. In that statement it was stressed that the rights of Basic Management, Inc., arose from a purchase contract executed with a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a U.S. corporation. On the strength of that statement, the House amended the southern Nevada bill (S. 32) and sent it back to the Senate with that amendment. The Senate accepted the amendment and the bill was passed with section 6, as drafted by the House committee.

The problem that has arisen in connection with this act stems from the fact that, although it was intended to cover the claim of one particular organization, the section was couched in general language and may possibly have application far beyond that

which was intended by its drafters. The President, in a signing statement stated that:

"Although these provisions are couched in general terms, the scant legislative history of the bill indicates that they are intended to be applicable to one company only. While there may be some equities which would justify special consideration for this company, I am advised by the Secretary of the Interior that these provisions might well have a much broader sweep. In fact, it appears that they might affect in unforeseeable ways the water rights of a number of individuals and firms amounting to 60,000 to 70,000 additional acre-feet.

In these circumstances I have asked the Secretary of the Interior to develop legislation which would amend section 6 to limit its effect to that intended by the Congress. I am confident that those Members concerned with this legislation will agree that the uncertainties surrounding the broader than intended effect of section 6 make its amendment desirable."

Basic Management, Inc., the company referred to by the President, acquired certain facilities on the lower Colorado River in 1952. These facilities were built and operated by the United States during World War II as part of the Basic Magnesium project of the Defense Plant Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which had applied for and obtained two State permits for the appropriation of Lake Mead water in 1942. Proof of application for beneficial use was made in 1948 and certificates of appropriation were issued in the same year with priority dates relating back to the permit dates in 1942. One of these certificates is for milling and metallurgical uses and covers 45 cubic feet per second of water. The second certificate covers 12 cubic feet per second for municipal purposes. These asserted water rights, it must be stressed, were acquired by compliance with State water law procedures. The Defense Plant Corporation never had a contract with the Secretary of the Interior for the use of these waters. After the end of World War II the Basic Magnesium project facilities were conveyed to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada and were ultimately acquired by Basic Management, Inc., and its subsidiary corporations. Assignments of certain of these asserted water rights have been made to each of the four operating subsidiaries.

The U.S. Supreme Court held in *Arizona* v. *California* (373 U.S. 526) that persons desiring water from the Boulder Canyon project must have contracts with the Secretary of the Interior as required by the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928. Following that decree, the Department has been negotiating with water users on the lower Colorado River to establish their rights to uses of Colorado River water. Basic Management, Inc., is one of the corporations with which the Department has been negotiating and these negotiations were taking place at the time of consideration of S. 32 the southern Nevada project bill. The Department had already established a general rule that uses of claimed water existing on December 31, 1963, would be given a priority to the extent of that use over subsequent uses. Basic Management, Inc., had claimed by virtue of its water rights, acquired from the U.S. corporation, that it was entitled to confirmation of the full extent of the rights which it had purchased; that is, 57 cubic feet per second of water of the lower Colorado River. The Department had asked for documents to be submitted to it supporting the position of Basic Management, Inc. This was the situation at the time of consideration of the southern Nevada project bill and enactment of the enabling legislation.

This Department is prepared to recognize whatever water rights Basic Management, Inc., has under Nevada law, and we have so assured the company. We are now engaged in drafting a water delivery contract with the company on that basis.

Were it not for a possible ambiguity in interpretation of section 6 of the act, it would be unnecessary to consider the draft bill attached to this letter. The concern of this Department is that the broad language of section 6 might be construed to carry beyond the specific case of Basic Management, Inc. That section relates to certain "intra-state priorities existing on the date of enactment of this Act." It is not clear just what those priorities are or may be. A person wishing to make use of Nevada waters must generally first apply for a State permit for the use of those waters. There are on file with the State engineer of Nevada a number of applications for the use of Colorado River waters. The State engineer's office then considers these applications and may grant permits to the applicants confirming their right to take the additional steps necessary to put that water to beneficial use. After the water has been put to beneficial use the applicant may then obtain a certificate confirming his right to the use of that water so long as he continues to make beneficial use of it.

The rights of Basic Management, Inc., in this case fall into the third category of certificated uses. There are a few other uses with certificates purporting to entitle them to the use of lower Colorado River water; in the main these certificates are now subject to cancellation for nonuse or are so minor as not to constitute a serious problem. Additional difficulties, however, have arisen in the identification of the possible claimants to the use of waters of the Colorado River, nor is it clear whether or not the classes of applicants and permittees fall within the category of persons described by section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act. If they should fall into that category, it is entirely possible that control over 80,000 acre-feet of Nevada's 300,000 acre-foot entitlement to the waters of the lower Colorado River would be taken from the Department.

There is nothing in the legislative history of section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act to indicate that this result was intended by the Congress. To the contrary, at a time when the control of this vital resource is a matter of extreme importance to the citizens of the Southwest, it seems its proper management is a matter of great importance and of considerable concern.

The contract which is presently being negotiated will in fact comply fully with the requirements of the statute. The only explanation offered on the floor of the House for the existence of this section related specifically to the claim of Basic Management, Inc., a claim based on its acquisition of water rights obtained by the United States under Nevada State law. Once the justification for existence for the section has been removed, there can be no further justification for this section to remain in the bill.

We have prepared and present for your consideration this bill to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act. We can and do assure you that the contract which is presently being negotiated will recognize the intrastate priority to the use of Colorado River water to which Basic Management, Inc., is entitled under Nevada law. This being so, section 6 serves no further useful purpose, and we urge its prompt repeal.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter directed to Mr. Northcutt Ely, of the firm of Ely, Duncan & Bennett, under date of March 1, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1966.

NORTHCUTT ELY, Esq.,
Ely, Duncan & Bennett,
Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ELY: This letter will confirm your conversations with members of my staff regarding recognition by this Department of intrastate priorities of the water rights of your client, Basic Management, Inc.

Under section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965, 75 Stat. 1068) this Department is required to "recognize the intrastate priorities of water rights to the use of water. * * *" As you know, the administration proposed to recommend to Congress that this section be repealed.

In order that you may have assurance that such repeal will not affect the rights given you by section 6 we assure you that, in the water supply contracts now being negotiated between the Department, the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, and Basic Management, Inc., and its assignees, we agree to the insertion of a provision which would recognize in Basic Management, Inc., and its assignees, all that they are entitled to under section 6 of the Project Act. More specifically, the Department will recognize the intrastate priorities of water rights of Basic Management, Inc., and its assignees, to the use of water, whatever it may be under State law in quantities and priorities, under certificates No. 3118, dated June 21, 1948, for 45 cubic feet per second or 32,578.5 acre-feet, and No. 3119, dated June 21, 1948, for 12 cubic feet per second or 8,687.6 acre-feet, being the certificates held by Basic Management, Inc., and its assignees.

We anticipate that actual signing of the water service contracts may be delayed an appreciable length of time, perhaps several months, because of the delays we can anticipate in negotiating a pollution-control provision. We give you this present assurance in regard to the water right provision, because the administration is proceeding immediately to make a recommendation to Congress for the repeal of section 6.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is important that this legislative history be made. The letter to Mr. Ely affirms that the Secretary of the Interior is prepared by contract to take care of the problems raised by section 6.

I am sure that the testimony before our committee made it very clear that the deletion of section 6, as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, and in accordance with a suggestion by the President of the United States that the section be amended, fully accords to Basic Management, Inc., all the rights they had under State water law in Nevada.

This is all set forth very fully in the report. I ask unanimous consent that the part of the report beginning on page 4 under the subheading "Committee Consideration," be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

In testimony received by the committee from Mr. Ivan P. Head, administrator of the

Colorado River Commission of Nevada, the contracting agency for the repayment of the costs of the construction of the project it was pointed out:

"Section 6 and the subject covered by it has nothing to do with the southern Nevada water project. The feasibility studies, the operation studies, and so forth, gave proper recognition to Basic Management, Inc.'s ability to divert up to 45,000 acre-feet through its system. Then in no way is the southern Nevada water project affected economically or financially by either deletion of section 6 or its inclusion. Las Vegas Valley Water District will have its intrastate rights fully protected in its contracts with the commission for water delivery from the southern Nevada water project."

It was further pointed out at the hearing that section 6 was not considered by the committee or when the bill was originally considered on the Senate floor. The section was added in the House and was approved by that body on October 7, 1965. The Senate concurred in the amendment without further hearings and the bill was transmitted to the President where it was signed on October 22, 1965.

It is the committee's opinion that the legislative intent as expressed in the House report on S. 32 and the discussion on the House floor prior to passage has been completely implemented by the agreement of the Department of the Interior to contract with Basic Management, Inc., for the full recognition of the water right purchased by the company, and that section 6 should be deleted from the law.

The committee therefore recommends the enactment of S. 2999 without amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this legislation received the unanimous approval of the subcommittee, and likewise the unanimous approval of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

After the bill was reported to the floor, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, propounded in writing to me two questions concerning this particular legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the question propounded by Senator FANNIN and the answers by me be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Senator FANNIN. S. 2999 would repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Water Project Act, and, in doing so, would eliminate from the act the following words: "nor shall anything in this act be construed as affecting the satisfaction of present perfected rights as defined by the decree of the U.S. Supreme Court in Arizona against California et al. (376 U.S. 340)."

Would the enactment of S. 2999 in any way affect the interstate allocation of mainstream waters of the Colorado River under that decree?

Senator BIBLE. No. The method of apportionment of the mainstream waters of the Colorado River among Arizona, California, and Nevada is set forth in paragraph II of the decree dated March 9, 1964, in the case of Arizona against California. The enactment of S. 2999 would in no way alter or affect that apportionment.

Senator FANNIN. Paragraph II(B)(3) provides that in the event of shortage, in apportioning the mainstream water of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide "for satisfaction of present perfected rights in the order of their priority dates without regard to State lines."

Would the enactment of S. 2999 affect the Secretary's obligation to satisfy present perfected rights in the order of their priority dates without regard to State lines?

Senator BIBLE. No. It is not the purpose of S. 2999 to alter or affect the Secretary's obligation to apportion water in accordance with paragraph II (B)(3) and no such result would be achieved by this legislation. S. 2999 in no way alters or affects the rights and obligations of the Secretary and the water users under that Supreme Court decree.

Section 6 directs the Secretary to recognize intrastate priorities (Nevada), provided that such recognition shall not affect perfected rights under the Arizona-California decree.

Under the decree, rights perfected before 1929 have first priority.

The reference to the decree was therefore necessary in order to qualify the direction to recognize intrastate (Nevada) priorities.

When the direction to recognize intrastate priorities is repealed, there is no longer a need to retain the reference to the decree.

The repeal of section 6 could not possibly affect rights under the decree.

Mr. BIBLE. I have personally discussed the matter with Senator FANNIN. I discussed it with him on the floor a short time ago. He had raised questions that were very pertinent and should be answered. He states he is satisfied with the answers, and he has no objection to the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I fully concur with my colleagues in urging favorable action on S. 2999, which would repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act.

The section in question was not considered during Senate hearings last year.

It was added by the House, and has generated questions about its effect on water rights.

It is necessary to repeal section 6 of the act to eliminate possible ambiguities in its interpretation.

The bill now before the Senate will accomplish this, and its passage will enable us to move ahead on work to meet the critical water needs of southern Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2999) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (Act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)) is hereby repealed.

Mr. BIBLE. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CITIES REVOLT AGAINST THE EXPRESSWAY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is mounting evidence of a revolt against urban expressways in Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Philadelphia, Boston, New Orleans, Cleveland, Baltimore, and other cities. Citizens' groups and government officials express the fear that their city could become a mass of interchanges, elevated causeways, trenches, and ribbons of concrete. They express the view that the interests of the highway user are being placed above all other interests. This revolt indicates that we must find new and more imaginative ways to design urban highways and the necessary dollars to finance them.

In addition to building safe and economical highways, we must protect certain urban values—historical sites, neighborhoods, and scenic beauty for the enjoyment of residents and pedestrians, as well as those who travel through the area at 60 miles per hour.

The city's problem is not unique. Highways should not run through farms and national parks without careful consideration of how the damage to these areas might be minimized. We should recognize the value of protecting the best agricultural land. We should recognize the value of protecting scenic wonders and wilderness areas in our highway construction programs. There are values to be protected in our urban areas, too. Highway engineers should not try to pick the shortest distance between two points. They should try to adjust locations to do the least amount of damage. Sometimes there is an unfortunate tendency to try to minimize land acquisition costs at the expense of neighborhoods, historical sites, and urban beauty. Unlike rural areas, protecting these features of the city does not just involve selecting the least damaging locations. In many cases, any route through the city does an unconscionable amount of damage. Protecting cities from being overrun requires more expensive kinds of highway design. It involves the greater use of tunnels and covered expressways.

The reaction to expressway intrusions has been quite intense in several cities in recent weeks.

In San Francisco, the board of supervisors rejected two highways where the Federal Government was to have invested $280 million. The board did this because it felt the highways would destroy the city's character. Last July, the board asked the State of California to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway at an estimated cost of $100 million because it was an eyesore.

In Washington, D.C., consultants to the Policy Advisory Council recently recommended a moratorium on the construction of the Inter Loop, the Three Sisters Bridge, and the North Central Freeway. Again, this recommendation was based on the fear that pressing ahead with present plans may do irreparable damage to the Nation's Capital. The world famous city planner Constantinos Doxiadis has put forth plans to tunnel the Whitehurst Freeway as it passes Georgetown because the present highway destroys the historic and scenic character of the area.

In Philadelphia, the city, the State, and a wide cross-section of citizens groups have been waging a continuing fight to prevent the desecration of the historic Independence Mall-Penn's Landing area by the Delaware Expressway. As a result

of the protests, the location for the highway was shifted and depressed so that it would run through a trench. The proponents of better design pressed for a covered expressway. At first, State and Federal highway engineers said it was not feasible. It could not be done. But a local citizens group hired an engineering firm that proved that a cover was feasible. This is not now in dispute. The engineers now say it is too expensive and not necessary.

This Philadelphia problem offers an excellent example of the kinds of urban values that ought to be preserved in highway development. More than half a billion dollars in public and private money is being spent in the renewal and rehabilitation of the Independence Mall-Penn's Landing area. The Delaware Expressway, which will bisect the area, is a vital part of Philadelphia's future highway network. But, the success of the renewal effort will depend in no small part on the proper design of this highway.

It will pass through one of the heaviest concentrations of historical properties in the United States. Here is the place where William Penn landed, the site of his first house, Independence Hall, and Carpenters Hall. Anything less than a covered expressway would constitute a desecration of this historic area.

This is also the site of a major public and private renewal effort to restore the downtown as a place where people want to live. An open trench will detract from that goal.

In the United States, most of our river and lake fronts in cities have been ugly. They have been lined with industrial complexes, railroads, and warehouses. They have not been places of scenic beauty. Restoration of these riverfront properties for people to enjoy should be a major goal of the beautification program. Again, such an effort is underway in Philadelphia in the Penn's Landing development. In a park-like setting, people will find walkways by the Delaware River, museums, restaurants, and a marina with historic ships. A covered expressway will augment this development. An open trench would isolate it from the rest of the city and greatly detract from the setting.

The President and the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior have expressly recognized the need to preserve scenic and historic areas in cities. The Federal Bureau of Public Roads has directed the State departments of highways to take them into account. The Bureau of Public Roads and the Department of Housing and Urban Development have entered into an agreement to work together on compatible arrangements where urban renewal areas are involved in highway locations.

Although there is evidence of a constructive attitude and a desire to develop more compatible highway locations and designs, the revolt in Washington, San Francisco, and Philadelphia, as well as the other cities, indicates that much more needs to be done to make these announced goals a reality.

Better urban highway design is a challenging governmental problem. All levels of government are involved, with the Federal Government financing a major highway development program. There are important goal conflicts within each level of government. Highway departments and the Federal Bureau of Public Roads are interested in building as many miles of road as they can with the funds available. The Department of the Interior is interested in open space and the preservation of historic sites. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is interested in good urban design. For the good of the city, all of these goals must be brought together and weighed.

Better urban highway design is also a challenging financing problem. Urban highways are always expensive. There is considerable competition for the limited funds in the Federal Highway Aid Trust Fund. There is not enough money to build all the highways we need. Nonetheless, the tendency to pinch pennies in building urban highways must be avoided. The cost is too high. The damage done may never be undone.

Governments that build highways must recognize a responsibility for good design and for maintaining values of neighborhoods, historic sites, and scenic beauty. This is part of the "cost" of the highway program, and it should not be shifted elsewhere.

At the present time, the Federal Aid Highway Trust Fund is the only realistic way to finance the greatly increased cost of building tunnels and covered expressways. The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of Interstate highways. This is a very high ratio of Federal to State funds. State and local governments would find it impossible to absorb the cost of covering and tunneling proposals without assistance of this magnitude.

There are other possible sources of Federal funds to support a tunneling or covering project, where the end result will be a park on top of the expressway. The open space programs under the Housing Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund might legitimately be used, but, again, the Federal contribution is too small. Funds are already far too limited to absorb this additional burden of reducing the barbarity of the highway program.

Open space grants under the Housing Act are up to 50 percent of the cost of the project. The authorization limit for special purchase of open space in built-up areas is only $64 million for the entire United States.

To cover the Delaware Expressway in Philadelphia and create a park would cost $25 million alone.

Only $69 million is available in the 1967 fiscal year for grants to State and local governments for open space purchases under the land and water conservation fund.

A new program or, at the very least, additional funds are needed to save our cities. Until such a program can be enacted and fully implemented, the Highway Aid Trust Fund must be used to design and build the kind of highways that do not destroy the urban fabric.

One possible new approach would be to authorize the Department of the Interior to share in the cost of an expressway cover where, such as is the case in Philadelphia, an unusual historical complex is involved. The Department could be authorized to purchase the air rights for the cover or the land on top of a tunnel.

A new administrative mechanism is needed within the Federal Government to bring in other points of view to balance those of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. The Bureau is, quite naturally, most interested in building as many miles of roads, highways, and expressways as possible. This goal must be balanced with the other goals of the Federal Government—to build better and more livable cities and to preserve national historic sites, open space, and places of great scenic beauty.

Perhaps an administrative committee should be established for this purpose. It could consist of the Secretary of Commerce—or the Secretary of Transportation if that Department is created—the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. This committee could review highway plans where federally aided highways would pass through especially significant scenic or historic areas.

Such a committee would need funds to back up its findings. At present the Federal Aid Highway Trust Fund must be used. It may be desirable to create a new fund, which could be called the Urban Conservation Fund, for that would be its purpose. It would finance the additional cost of tunneling or covering proposals where national historic sites, recreation areas, or urgent needs of the city dictate that special steps be taken in highway construction.

Such a mechanism for building and financing better and less disruptive urban highways must be developed quickly. I urge the Secretaries of Commerce, Interior, and Housing and Urban Development to work together and develop the necessary administrative arrangements and financing procedures.

I will explore the need for new legislation to promote a better urban highway program.

Decisions are being made every day that will have a lasting impact on American cities. It is late, but not too late, to heed the warning that Lewis Mumford issued in 1958:

> When the American people, through their Congress, voted a little while ago (1957) for a $26 billion highway program, the most charitable thing to assume about this action is that they hadn't the faintest notion of what they were doing. Within the next 15 years they will doubtless find out; but by that time it will be too late to correct all the damage to our cities and our countryside, not least to the efficient organization of industry and transportation, that this ill-conceived and preposterously unbalanced program will have wrought.

EMERGENCY FOOD RELIEF FOR INDIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 149, to support U.S. participation in relieving vic-

tims of hunger in India, and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported Senate Joint Resolution 149. This resolution was amended in order to conform with the House resolution pertaining to the same subject. I understand that a similar House joint resolution is at the desk. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 997.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The House joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. House Joint Resolution 997, to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 997).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on March 30, the President of the United States requested congressional support of the action he has proposed to take to provide additional aid to India in order to meet her increased needs caused by a drought over large parts of that country last year.

In 1965, we shipped about 6 million tons of food grains to India. Under normal circumstances during this fiscal year we would have shipped 6½ million tons. However, because the natural disaster has created extreme hardship for her people, India now finds that it will need an additional 6 to 7 million tons of food grains through next December in order to avert famine.

The President has proposed that the United States supply 3½ million tons of food grains to meet this additional need. He has also proposed to provide India with up to 200,000 tons of corn, 150 million pounds of vegetable oil, and 125 million pounds of milk powder to take care of direct food requirements and from 325,000 to 700,000 bales of cotton and 2 to 4 million pounds of tobacco in order to release Indian foreign exchange for the purchase of food and fertilizer.

The President is also asking other nations of the world to contribute to India's dire needs. He has invited these other nations to match the amount of food which we will supply. He hopes that they will scrutinize closely their available supplies, their needs and under the differing circumstances make a maximum effort in this field. He has also asked the industrial countries which cannot send food to supply instead a generous equivalent in fertilizer, or in shipping, or in funds for the purchase of these requisites.

Yesterday, during the hearings on this resolution Secretary of State Rusk indicated that 113 countries have been contacted in this regard. He reported that at this time 23 countries have already made contributions totaling about $150 million. This includes the substantial contribution from Canada. It also includes funds from private citizens in countries like the Netherlands, for example, where through a radio and television campaign, they have raised over $5 million. Another 13 countries have contributions under consideration and 33 countries have not as yet responded. Still another 44 countries have indicated they did not expect to make a substantial contribution because of circumstances concerning their own wealth and food problems. Mr. Rusk reported that the Indians are also making strong representations in a great many capitals of the world. They have sent visiting teams to such capitals to present their case, indicating that they have accepted their diplomatic responsibility in this endeavor.

The President also indicated that we expect India to make an all-out effort to produce more of its own food needs. In this regard, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman said yesterday that the Indian Government is moving to improve her own position. The program they have instituted involves increased fertilizer production, both in Government-owned fertilizer plants and also those in the private sector of the economy. They are adjusting their own internal rules and regulations to encourage more production and more investment. They have almost doubled the amount of money in their budget for the next 4-year period for agricultural purposes. They have increased the amount of foreign exchange made available for the purchase of machinery, equipment, and raw materials particularly in the fertilizer area. They are engaged in a number of pilot programs to make more credit available and are reviewing irrigation and water use.

Mr. Rusk emphasized that this program involves two important elements. One is self-help, the other that India's problem is not just a U.S. problem but a worldwide problem. It is my hope that much progress will be made in the near future.

The President now has adequate authority under Public Law 480 and other legislation to provide the additional assistance that he is now proposing. However, he has asked for congressional endorsement of his action and for the support of this program by the American people. The resolution we have before us today would provide this endorsement. In the joint resolution, Congress endorses and supports the President's proposed action to help meet India's food shortages, help combat malnutrition, and encourage India to expand its own production. This congressional resolution also urges the President to seek the aid of other nations in providing assistance to India.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that in the past few years our great Nation has been very generous toward India. It has been my privilege to visit India on at least 9 or 10 occasions, and I have seen all parts of that great country. As one travels through India, he is very much impressed with the large population of that country. It is my belief that unless India takes positive action to reverse its present rate of population growth, she will soon run out of the productive land necessary in order to provide for its people.

It is my hope that the Indians will take some action in order to curb somewhat its population explosion, because unless they do so, I can see no hope for them.

Since 1946 through 1965, we have made available to India, through loans and economic assistance, $5,882,400,000. That is quite a sum of money. It would seem to me that had the administrators of our programs forced the Indians to do more to help themselves, conditions in that country would be much better today than they are.

As to the resolution the Senate is considering, it is hoped that our administrators in India will insist that she do something for herself if she is to expect further assistance from us.

Mr. President, I pointed this out on many occasions. I realize the difficulties that confront us, or any nation, in getting a country like India to change overnight.

On my visits I remarked that there was much food consumed by work buffaloes, cattle and other sacred animals in India. It meant the difference between a reasonable diet and starvation in that country. These sacred animals, of course, are revered by the Indians, and I realize it will take a long time for India to veer away from that concept.

I remember in my traveling in India, when I was not very far from New Delhi, I saw in excess of 100 peacocks in a field. The people there will not eat peacocks, or other birds. Sacred animals account for the consumption of millions of tons of food grains.

Unless India is willing to take heed now, and unless something is done about the explosive population growth, I do not believe this country could possibly manage to supply the food necessary to maintain India's increasing population.

The population of India today is increasing at the rate of over 1 million persons a month. It takes a great deal of food to accommodate that many additional mouths.

I express the hope that India will take cognizance of what we are saying to her now—that is, if she expects continued assistance not only from this country but from other peoples of the world, she will have to do something on the home front to help herself.

As I have just indicated, the aid program through fiscal year 1965 has amounted to $5,882,400,000. That figure does not include military assistance that we have furnished India in the last 4 or 5 years. I wish I could give that figure to the Senate, but it happens to be confidential, and I cannot state it.

If we add the 1966 figures to the previous amount, it adds quite a few more millions of dollars to the figure of $5,882,400,000 that we have furnished India up to now.

I also express the hope that the present Government of India will attempt to get other nations to assist her, and not depend entirely on the United States.

I was informed some time ago that the present Indian Government did not

want to go out and ask other countries of the world to assist, because India did not like to be indebted to anybody. But India is looking to Uncle Sam for a full measure of assistance.

It is my belief that the food we are now providing, which amounts to about 50 percent of her present need, should be the limit of our contribution for this year. I express the hope that India will make every effort to obtain assistance from other countries that are well able to take care of such assistance.

I wish to point out that the estimated carryover of wheat for July of next year will be 610 million bushels. We have quite a large crop coming up now. I understand the estimated amount of production will be in excess of 1,300 million bushels.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Senator stated that the figure he used was the estimated carryover for next year. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I meant 1965.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. July 1?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I want to correct the RECORD. The year should be 1965.

The estimated amount of wheat for this growing crop year is in excess of 1,300 million bushels.

It is my belief that we shall have a good deal more wheat than we need for our own use.

My good friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] had suggested that an amendment be added to the resolution. I stated I saw no reason why it should not be put in, but it would simply delay passage of the joint resolution. The discussion on the Senate floor as to the intention of Congress will be in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in fact, I had prepared an amendment to provide that under no circumstances should our domestic reserve of wheat be permitted to fall below 600 million bushels. It occurs to me that under our commitment under the pending resolution we are committing all but 400 million bushels of the divisible reserve.

We are on the threshold, however, of a crop year, and I doubt that we will endanger the domestic supply of the country, but we cannot foresee at what point there may be a drought or a failure from some difficulty. For that reason, I thought there should be a cutoff on the amount of wheat that shall remain on hand. But now by legislative history we can show the intent.

We should ever be mindful of our requirements, at the same time we are being mindful of the necessity for charity and compassion when we are dealing with a country like India, and that we cannot defend ourselves if we do not look after our own needs.

I think if the chairman of the committee will emphasize that fact, it will be helpful for the future.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have no doubt that the crop which is now growing and which will be harvested this summer will result in a carryover that will be as much as or perhaps a little more than it was in 1965. I do not believe the carryover will be under 600 million bushels.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am very happy that the distinguished minority leader will not press for the adoption of his amendment. I think we should have a minimum reserve, but I think this is something that should be considered by committee action with the opportunity for various Senators and others to be heard.

It is possible the commitment could leave us with a 400 million bushel carryover by July 1, but, according to the grain trade, we will have extreme difficulty in delivering the 100 million bushels because of the shortage of boxcars.

The new crop is coming in in about 6 weeks. We will have no problem for some time to come with a shortage of wheat.

I agree with the Senator that a minimum carryover should be established. But when we do this, we are emphasizing the need for adequate price support.

Wheat is a war crop and also one with widespread demand for famine relief. It is still the staff of life. In times of emergency or when there is a shortage and the price goes up, we place limits on our exports.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am quite familiar with that fact. On the other hand, if the reserves are dropped to a point where it would stimulate tremendous increase in the prices of wheat, you are only going to feed the inflationary level.

I think everybody would like to see the farmers get a fair price for wheat. But if it goes through the ceiling, that becomes another matter. If there is anything at all to the law of supply and demand, and reduction in the supply market to the point of disappearance, it will do something to the demand, and at the same time to the prices. That I would like to keep in mind.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In spite of all this discussion about a possible shortage of wheat, the price of wheat dropped 12 to 15 cents a bushel in the last 2 weeks. There will be plenty of wheat left. The cash price of wheat on the market today is about a dollar a bushel less than it was 20 years ago.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think there is virtue in limitation when we yield to resolutions of this kind. We had commitments of one kind or another in the form of cash when a distinguished member of the executive department went out through the world. One never knows how far they go.

After all, Congress is charged with exclusive authority over the public purse and it should exercise that responsibility by setting certain limits. If there is a danger in trying to set a limit, unless there is a fabric of testimony on which to base it, so that we are not exactly sure we should exercise caution. I would add this mainly to call to the attention of Congress that on an open-ended resolution we should exercise caution.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no question that India is in dire need of food at this time. I do not know if even under normal conditions tens of millions will die from starvation there as someone has said, but it is a fact that in any country where there is a reported food shortage there are always certain people who begin to hold back food supplies. That starts prices going up, right along with such hoarding. As prices go up and get out of reach of the poor people, there is actually famine and starvation.

When this resolution passes the Senate notifying the world, and particularly India, that a large quantity of food is on the way, any tendency toward hoarding, inflation, and famine will automatically be discouraged, because I understand this food we are selling them on very reasonable terms will be handled in such a way that the poor people of the country will be able to get it through their authorized stores.

I have participated in many conferences relative to this subject, and each time I have insisted that we should retain here in the United States enough wheat to guarantee us a year's supply. I have felt 600 million bushels was about the minimum amount which we should carry over from year to year.

However, it is a fact, as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and others have pointed out, that we probably cannot deliver too much between now and the beginning of the new harvest year. Harvesting this year's crop will start along the Rio Grande in about 2 months and by the middle of July the harvest should be in full swing in the United States.

But if it were at the other end of the season, I would say we should insist on guaranteeing a 600 million bushel carryover for the United States.

I do not know whether they will sell down to 400 million bushels or not. I do not know if there can be delivered enough to bring it down to 400 million bushels at this time, but certainly when people are in danger of starving, the United States is always on hand to see that they do not, even our enemies. We have been known to feed them and probably will do it again.

I think this resolution will have a very healthy effect.

I hope the world notices that we are sharing; that we are perhaps willing, if need be, to bring our own reserves down somewhat below our actual annual requirements.

Actually, I do not believe that will be necessary, but if it should be, it would not be too harmful at this time of the year as the new crop will soon be available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to agree with the suggestions just made on the floor to the effect that we should have a reasonable surplus to take care of our domestic needs. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont that the protective figure should be 1 year.

I think we should also emphasize that while this country has invested—and I prefer the term invested—billions of dollars in the future of India, India itself has done a remarkably fine job, all things considered, in raising its food production capabilities, and also, if I may say so after recently talking to Prime Minister Ghandi, in undertaking programs seeking to bring about some degree of population control.

These problems of food production and population control are well understood in that great nation and attempts are being made by her to cope with these problems which are, of course, the primary responsibility of the Indian people themselves.

But I look upon this resolution as one of partnership; partnership between India and the United States; partnership between the Executive and Congress; partnership between the two parties in Congress. I look upon it as a good omen. It is certainly a truly bipartisan effort because the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, moved this resolution to and through his committee as rapidly as was possible. The chairman was ably assisted in this endeavor to report out the resolution by his counterpart, the ranking minority member, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

I had discussed with the chairman of the committee, the ranking minority member, the distinguished minority leader, and others, the possibility of a rollcall vote on this measure this afternoon. But we find no one in opposition to it. So I would anticipate on the basis of this unanimous report of the committee, and the unanimous support of the Senate and the House of Representatives that it would not be too long before we could come to a final conclusion on this worthy and necessary measure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would call to the attention of my good friend from Illinois that 3 or 4 weeks ago the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings on two bills: Food for freedom, S. 2933, and another bill designed to do the things now suggested; that is, fix food reserves for our protection. That is included in Senate bill 2932. It is possible before Congress recesses that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will come forward with a bill which would fix reserves.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion that the Senator from Illinois made with regard to food reserves.

I think the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, also made a pertinent comment on the fact that if there are to be ceilings they should be considered by the committee in a separate bill. This bill deals with a temporary problem. It is not a permanent problem.

Coming as I do from a wheat section of the Nation, I cannot conceive of any possibility of moving more wheat than is being moved now. The transportation channels of the Nation are filled, in the effort to get wheat to the coasts, so that it can be shipped. There are millions of bushels of wheat today that we in the Midwest are concerned about having moved before the new harvest. In fact, a grain man called me last evening and said he has had quantities of wheat ready to be delivered since January 18. He said that he was subject to fines amounting to $150,000 because he had been given 90 days in which to move the wheat.

What we in the Midwest need is something more than a temporary movement of grain. I do not believe we need to be concerned about the great additional supply of grain to be shipped to India. Our reserves are 600 million bushels, as the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER] has mentioned. I am confident that 50 million bushels more is the most that could possibly be moved. Based on present transportation facilities, that would bring the reserves down to about 550 million bushels.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois has made a suggestion which I think the distinguished chairman of the committee may wish to consider when he gets into the long-range program of food for peace.

Coming as I do from the wheat area, I think I can assure the American people that there will be plenty of wheat for this year and into 1967.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have in mind that if the wheat measure is amended, it will have to go back to the House of Representatives, and that will entail some delay. But I believe a question should be raised, and it should be raised in connection with any resolution or bill by which we expect to sell, dispose of for free distribution, or export resources or produce from our own soil to any other country.

I do not want our sense of compassion and charity to obscure the fact that there is a little fault on the side of India, and we should not let it go by without letting it be noted for the RECORD.

It must be apparent to those who study the problems of India that much of her economic segment has been preempted by government itself as against private enterprise. When India is looking for outside private capital, a number of restrictions are imposed.

First, it is necessary to call in the Indian Government and let it have 51 percent of the interest in any outside corporate entity that enters that country. We must not forget that the corporate tax in India runs as high as 70 percent. Right now in the Indian Parliament is a bill that would restrict the granting of patent rights to any other country. That has been called to my attention any number of times by persons who are vitally interested in the subject; so a case can be made.

But over and above that, there is the transcendent fact that the people of India are hungry, and that we are dealing with one of the most vital forces, with one of the most dangerous impulses, of which man is capable. It was centuries ago that Isaiah wrote:

> And it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God, and look upward.

That is the danger in a country of 550 million population, where so many are hungry. When hunger knows no bounds, then, of course, all restraints upon judgment fall by the wayside. Who shall say, then, what will happen?

So I cannot but lend my efforts to this enterprise and to make sure that we leave nothing undone, within reason and within the reasonable capacity of this country, to help those starving people. I do not speak with my tongue in my cheek. I visited India some years ago. I went out into the countryside. I was there at the same time that there were not only a cholera attack and the bubonic plague, but famine, as well. That year it was reported that several million people died. You could drive in the countryside and see families sitting along the roadway, waiting for death to overtake them.

There was still another unhappy situation, in that we sent some types of food that India could not use. The castes would not permit it. India has 2,400 or more castes, subcastes, and sub-subcastes. I am sure that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], our distinguished former Ambassador to India, who is in the Chamber this afternoon, could tell us an interesting story about that.

Those are the problems. We must take them into account, because we cannot superimpose something from the outside upon another country. But I do like to call such a country to account, a little, when I discover that it is operating in a fashion that, in fact, restricts and repels private capital and private enterprise. Only about 30 percent of the private capital that India needs today is going into that country. Yet capital ought to go into India for the construction of fertilizer plants and whatever else is necessary in order to increase India's production of foodstuffs and make her reasonably self-sufficient. When that is done, we shall be in India with something over $7 billion. That is a large amount of taxpayers' money. Our hope, of course, is that this will not be a continuing condition. We believe that, perhaps, at long last we can assume that she will become self-sufficient.

So I am more than ready to help this cause. I remind India, however, that this is to put her straight; and that while we are compassionate and are charitable and are open-hearted, and always have been, we expect to have another country show a reasonable sense of gratitude by dealing equitably with our own country, instead of putting restrictions upon us and upon our enterprising businessmen, who want to go to India to help, only to discover that they become victims

of burdensome taxes and governmental restrictions with which they cannot contend.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the President has taken the initiative to help provide for the Republic of India food sufficient to help India meet its minimum needs during this calendar year. When the resolution is approved and the President proceeds with the action he has announced he will take, about 3.5 million tons of feed grains will be provided, which will make a total of 10 million tons provided this year.

That is a large amount of assistance; yet it will provide only for the minimum needs to prevent suffering and, perhaps, starvation. When I speak of minimum needs, I invite attention to the fact that the food intake in India is about 800 to 900 calories a day. So the resolution, if agreed to, will be in the humanitarian tradition of this country. It is worthy of the efforts and initiative of the President and of Congress.

I should like also to comment briefly upon the subject which the distinguished minority leader raised—and it is important. Several lessons can be drawn from this proposal, and from the action that our country will take.

First. Our attention has been drawn to the fact that our own food resources are not inexhaustible. Perhaps now the administration and Congress will take steps to establish the reserve supplies of food which are necessary for the needs of our own people, for the security of our Nation, and to continue to provide some humanitarian aid to other countries. I may say that legislative proposals are before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve, directed to this point of establishing adequate reserve supply levels of food, and I know they will receive attention.

This situation should bring also to the attention of the American people the importance of our own agriculture. It is a wonderful thing that our farmers and our country can produce the food and fiber essential not only for our own needs but also for the health of other peoples in the world.

Second, I believe this situation and those toward which the President's food-for-freedom proposal is directed should bring more forcefully to the attention of the administration and Congress that our influence should be directed toward insisting, or at least persuading and encouraging, these countries to take stronger measures to increase their own food production. It is a lamentable fact that many countries we assist have not taken the necessary steps to do this.

When I was in India 10 years ago, I urged that its food production be increased. I recommended stronger steps to our State Department, and to our foreign aid agency, at that time.

I am happy to say—and I know that I say it from solid information—that the Government of India in the last 2 or 3 years and particularly this year has placed increased emphasis upon increasing its own food production. It will be several years, in my judgment, before that country will be able to come close to satisfying its needs. But at least this change in policy and emphasis has now been made.

The Congress of the United States, in passing its aid programs and appropriations for aid, should continue to request the President of the United States to use the influence of our country to recommend, to encourage, and even to insist that food production be increased in those countries to which we extend our aid. If a country, particularly a developing country, cannot feed and clothe its own people, the chances of stability and of the success of our aid programs and the country's own development plan are minimized and perhaps lost for all time.

This situation should bring to the attention of the American people the importance of our own agriculture. It is a wonderful thing that our country and our farmers can produce food and fiber essential not only for our needs but also for the health of other peoples in the world.

I wish to speak also about what I believe is the attitude of India, and upon its value. We have provided a tremendous amount of aid to India. Through the use of these funds, and their own funds, they have made reasonably good progress. India has increased its agricultural production by 75 percent in about 10 years. It has made economic progress. It has attempted to provide for the needs of its own people, and for the raising of their living standards. It has attempted, with a large measure of success, to reach the needs of its people. That is not true of some of the other countries to which we have extended our aid.

India has nearly half a billion people. We have expended billions of dollars of aid to India. I think it can be said that it is good for India, good for that part of Asia, good for the world, and good for the United States that such a large country appreciates democratic values and maintains democratic institutions. That this is true has been a great influence for stability, and for democratic values, in that part of the world.

I hope that this program will be carried out. I hope also, as I have indicated, that our country and the Congress learns some lessons from this proposal—that we should establish reserve supplies of farm products, that we should insist in our foreign aid program that these countries establish and improve their plans so as to emphasize food production, and that we must secure better planning and coordination in the preparation of our own foreign aid program so that these plans for increased food production will be carried out.

The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is always fair and objective. He gave this proposal full consideration and brought it to the floor of the Senate quickly. He presented his views during the committee hearing, and let everyone present his views, and brought the measure to the floor of the Senate in a very short time. That is an accomplishment such as we seldom witness in the Senate.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I know that no one is better qualified to speak on this particular problem confronting India than is our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kentucky, who served for years as our Ambassador to that great nation and is personally familiar with the problem.

The Senator has stressed some of the important problems. One was the importance of our own agriculture and the fact that it not inexhaustible. We are one Nation that can furnish and is furnishing food to countries of the world despite the fact that we have 60 million acres out of production, on which acreage we pay $2 billion of taxpayers' money. The fact that we can do this and still be a great agricultural nation demonstrates the type of agriculture that we have in this country and its great possibilities.

I discussed with the distinguished chairman of the committee a few moments ago the amount of rupees that might result from the sale of this food and the use of those rupees.

The pending bill provides that the commodities we ship there will be sold for rupees. A great amount of money will be available in rupees. The Indian economy can be improved by the use of this money.

I make one suggestion with regard to housing. For several years in our committee I have stressed the importance of housing in underdeveloped countries. A number of American companies are engaged in private housing in India. They do a splendid job. As we build up additional rupees in India, we might find some way to engage in home construction. When a man has a home, he has an interest not only in his country and community, but also in being a better citizen.

There was some discussion that this should constitute a gift. Let us get these rupees. Let us use them for the benefit of people. I think that we should stress this program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, we have in excess of $500 million in rupees in India at the present time reserved for our own uses. This money will soon be used to form a binational foundation for educational purposes. In addition to that, from the money we have loaned India, we now have in excess of $1,920 million that will be collected over the years. From our Public Law 480 transactions of the past, we also had for collection $1,445 million in rupees, so that we will have more rupees than we need at the present time. When this transaction is completed, it will again generate many more millions of rupees.

I am very hopeful that these rupees can be put to good use so that India will not be so dependent on us for food.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place a table in the RECORD at this point showing the total of our aid to India since 1946.

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

India

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

Program	Total, 1946–65	Repayments and interest, 1946–65	Total, less repayments and interest
AID and predecessor agencies, total	2,485.6	180.4	2,305.2
Loans [1]	2,101.0	180.4	1,920.6
Grants	384.7		384.7
Social Progress Trust Fund			
Food for Peace, total	2,753.4	70.1	2,683.3
Title I (total sales agreements)	(2,854.3)		(2,854.3)
Less (planned for U.S. uses)	(357.9)		(357.9)
Title I: Planned for loans and grants	2,496.4	70.1	2,426.3
104(c): Grants for common defense			
104(e): Grants for economic development	788.2		788.2
104(e): Loans to private industry	202.6	10.4	192.2
104(g): Loans to government	1,505.6	59.7	1,445.9
Title I: Assistance from other country sales agreements	6.1		6.1
Title II: Emergency relief and economic development	21.9		21.9
Title III: Voluntary relief agencies	229.0		229.0
Title IV: Dollar credit sales			
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	406.4	71.0	335.4
Other U.S. economic programs	237.0	66.5	170.5
Total economic	5,882.4	388.0	5,494.4
Loans	4,445.7	388.0	4,057.7
Grants	1,436.8		1,436.8

[1] Excludes $20,000,000 loan in fiscal year 1958 financed by Asian Economic Development Fund. This loan is included in NESA regional data.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, much can be accomplished if India participates in the kind of self-help program the Senator from Kentucky has been talking about. This is something that I have been preaching for 15 years in the Senate. Perhaps now, it will be adopted.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the President in his message on aid to India did have a suggestion that we set aside $300 million of rupees for a foundation that was to be controlled and managed by distinguished people from the Governments of India and the United States. This provision is not contained in the pending legislation. It will be dealt with by another committee. It is a provision that I think we should give consideration to.

It is probably as good an advantage as we can get from the use of these rupees as anything we can think of.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to speak only of the foreign policy implication of this bill.

I have a certain background, I think, for speaking on this matter. I was a cosponsor in the other body in 1951 of the bill to give 2 million tons of grain to India at a time when we were faced with a similar situation.

I remember distinctly going to the port of Baltimore, as the House sponsor of the bill, to see the first grain ship loaded to begin this program.

Mr. President, I could not agree more with the observations which have been made on the floor today. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, has for years insisted on the concept of building up India's agricultural plant, her fertilizer capability, and her adoption of the agricultural practices which have distinguished our extension services and have been so helpful to us. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has spoken properly of the necessary foundations for education and research—a very noble consummation of our efforts, an effort which will generate more productivity and money for India. Food is also money; it is a form of aid enabling people in transition to do industrial jobs instead of devoting so much of their energy to food production.

Of course, India has both that problem and the problem of being hit by a drought. My friend, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who was a most distinguished ambassador to India, much liked and highly respected there, and with whom my wife and I traveled to India at the end of 1956, just before he returned to the Senate and I took my post here, is particularly qualified to speak on the problems in India. He also excels in his analyses of United States-Indian relations.

He has spoken very movingly about the terrible food situation there, how lack of food debilitates the people. He told us that the great measures of self-help require not only outside financing, but Indian volition and initiative as well.

Mr. President, I wish to speak about the significance of India.

India is not always a comfortable friend. Sometimes she has voted against us in the United Nations. Sometimes she has taken positions we thought too favorable to the Communist bloc. Indian attempts at neutrality, however, were not sufficient to avert an attack by Communist China. India has now experienced Peking aggression.

As far as we are concerned, Mr. President, India is an essential counterweight to Communist China. India must at all costs be preserved as a free nation.

A Senator said to me a moment ago, "There probably will not be too much debate on this measure, and there probably will not be a rollcall vote; there is too much money involved. We will not talk about it very much. We only talk about things that involve relatively little money."

But, Mr. President, the money is but half the point. There is a new awareness arising among the people of India. India is an enormous subcontinent. It has become keen to the values of freedom. It has learned them the hard way. I think that Indian cooperation in signing the Tashkent agreement was an extraordinary and gifted act of statesmanship. I feel very positively about the choice of Mrs. Gandhi—whom I have had the pleasure of knowing in years past—as Prime Minister of India.

India is showing a resourcefulness and toughness of spirit which is most admirable, and of the utmost importance to the freedom of mankind. For, Mr. President, without India all Asia goes under. India, as I say, has the population, the territory, and the resources to be a counterweight to Communist China. The Indian people are among our most important natural allies.

Because of our demonstrated friendship for India, because of our aid and moral support for Indian ideals and values, the people of the United States have come to view the people of India as partners in peace. This friendship results not only from common interests and ideals, but through the active participation of a friendly relationship by outstanding U.S. Ambassadors such as Mr. Bunker, Mr. Galbraith, and Mr. COOPER.

Mr. President, I rise to speak because I hope that the people of India will interpret this new grain aid not merely as famine relief, but as an investment in our partnership, an investment which does not always have to be in money, but can be in the spirit, the love for freedom, and the respect for the creativity of their own nation. There are many things that they can learn, just as there are many things that we can learn. I agree with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that a great deal of benefit and a great deal of help can come to India through the private enterprise system. There are enormous opportunities and a great private enterprise tradition in India, and there are many American and worldwide companies anxious to go to India.

Senators may remember that I am known—and very proud to be known—as the father of the so-called ADELA Investment Company which is now operating very successfully, with an endowment of about $35 million of capital, in South America—a great worldwide involvement of the banks and industrial companies of North America, Western Europe, and Japan in the industrial development of Latin America. I would like to see an Asian version of ADELA to assist India, provided there would be a congenial climate in India for private enterprise development. There is nothing inconsistent between private enterprise development and the struggle for

freedom, and no inconsistency between both of these and state involvement. Witness, for example, the experience of President Frei of Chile, a country from which I have just returned, who is now seeking to operate a mixed private business and Government enterprise which will enormously increase the productivity of the copper mines, and give Chile a 50-percent participation in the result. Contracts are being made with the most outstanding private enterprise companies in the United States, which own large amounts of Chilean property. Cooperation between private enterprise and Government can be fruitful. Such cooperation, I believe, is the way for countries like India to advance economically and yet maintain the foundations of democracy.

Mr. President, this resolution is in the great humanitarian spirit of our Nation. Even if it meant privation to us, we would never let a great people starve. I remember in this Chamber, Mr. President, serious discussion about relieving famine in Communist China, if some way could be found to move the food to the people. That is the way we feel about such things.

But beyond that, and in the great spirit in which Senator COOPER spoke, I hope very much that the people of India will consider this action on its face—as an earnest desire for partnership and friendship. India and the United States are in the same great tradition of seeking world peace through democratic means. The people of the United States wish to do every thing possible to assist the Indian people in their fight against famine and for freedom.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I strongly support the President's proposals to meet the food and financial crises facing India.

I congratulate the President on his skillful and obviously successful conduct of the conversations he held with Mrs. Gandhi last week. The memorable visit to our country by this amazing woman hopefully marks the beginning of a brilliant new era of the Indo-United States relations. On every score, I felt the discussions and the joint communique struck a positive note that should guide Indo-American relations for years to come.

No other free country has the importance for us of India.

India is the world's largest democracy and second most populous country. Her fate will profoundly affect the future of all the rest of the world.

Out of the revolution of rising expectations among the two-thirds of the world's people who live in the underdeveloped world, two nations have emerged as rival models of economic and social development.

Communist China proclaims that political independence and economic development can only be achieved on the Communist model, exemplified by the industrialization of the Soviet Union. In sharp contrast, India insists that a decent standard of living and national economic self-sufficiency can be achieved in a relatively short time, without paying the price in slavery and loss of human dignity and individual freedom that economic development in Communist terms demands.

The choices the underdeveloped nations will make between the Indian and Chinese development models cannot be predicted with certainty. The average Asian, who lives at or slightly above the level of subsistence, consumed by the elemental struggle to put food in his children's mouths, is understandably less concerned with democracy than we. Nehru is reported to have observed that a nation cannot have democracy on an empty stomach.

If the Chinese should succeed in effecting the historic transition from primitive economy to industrial society within a relatively short time, even at the enormous human cost they are exacting from their enslaved people, the Chinese experience will have an incalculable impact on the more than a billion people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. All the Western preachments about elections and individual freedom and free enterprise will mean nothing if more than half of all the world's people see no practical alternative to the Chinese method of economic development.

In contrast to China stands India. India has pursued a course of development since independence which has preserved individual freedom and respected human dignity, while making substantial industrial and agricultural progress.

India demonstrates by her very existence that a backward and once oppressed nation can lift herself into the modern world without radical, totalitarian methods, without rejecting its cultural heritage, and without destroying individual freedom.

Despite the barriers of two antagonistic religious groups, 13 separate and distinct languages, mass illiteracy, and inexperience in self-government, India has forged a viable parliamentary democracy, with a written constitution and a bill of rights much like our own.

While building and strengthening its system of personal and political freedom, however, India has made tremendous progress toward modernization of its economy. Overall, industrial production in India has grown about 9 percent a year since 1950 and food grain production about 3½ percent a year.

Of the greatest significance, however, is the fact that the Indians are paying their own way toward development. Although our assistance to them has been substantial, almost 80 percent of India's total investment has been financed by internal savings.

But these formidable statistics of Indian growth tell only half the story—the happy half.

These favorable rates of growth and expansion are dwarfed by the fact of India's enormous population and the primitive point from which India began its growth in 1951.

India's 55-percent increase in total food production since 1951 has been drastically undercut by a 33-percent increase in population. With food production rising at the rate of 3 percent and population rising at a rate of more than 2 percent each year, India has to run hard just to stay even.

The economic dislocations caused by conflicts with Pakistan and China and deadly drought-induced famine now threaten all the progress which India so far has made. India's third 5-year plan, which began with the reasonable goal of expanding national income by 30 percent by 1966, is ending this month with a crisis in agriculture and serious underemployment of industrial resources.

Whether the present crisis will amount to a major and perhaps fatal setback for India, or whether it will be only a brief interruption to her otherwise rapid march to development could be decided in the coming months.

Underlying the entire Indian crisis is the weakness in Indian agriculture which struggles along under the growing specter of a birth rate which constantly threatens to outstrip the growth in agricultural production.

If India is to survive as a nation, it must feed its people. If India is to feed its people, it must make a radical improvement in the productivity of its land already under cultivation—and that improvement will require drastic changes in India's agricultural technology. The supply of new land that can be readily brought under cultivation has been virtually exhausted. India simply must improve its use of irrigation, seeds, tools, pesticides, and most important of all, fertilizers.

I welcome President Johnson's direction to the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Agency for International Development, to consult with the Indian Government in order to find ways and means to strengthen India's programs for increased fertilizer production, improved water and soil management, expanded rural credit, and enlarged and improved agricultural training and education programs.

But raising food is only one side of India's agricultural crisis. The other side is that India simply has too many mouths to feed. And every year there are almost 15 million more. The population growth every year in India exceeds the combined populations of Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, and Tennessee.

If the Indian economy seems to be running up an escalator marked "down," one answer clearly lies in the realm of population control. And so I applaud the President's support of the Indian Government's plans to tackle the population problem as a national crisis and triple its investment in family planning measures.

To help slow the population growth now outstripping agricultural and industrial growth throughout the underdeveloped world, Senators GRUENING, CLARK, HARTKE, MCGEE, MOSS, NEUBERGER, SIMPSON, YARBOROUGH, and myself have introduced a bill, S. 2992, to authorize the use of foreign currency generated by our foreign aid program to finance family planning programs in nations like India. I hope the merit of this important bill in meeting the problems created by the population explosion in India and elsewhere among the

emerging nations will inspire the President's support.

Agricultural underproduction and human overproduction are the twin crises facing India today.

Many reputable observers believe that India can achieve agricultural self-sufficiency by 1971, if it can get the increased agricultural assistance it needs from the United States and if it can control its birth rate. India has the will and determination to meet its twin crises. But India needs help.

I think the President's proposals will provide a substantial part of that help.

A particularly important feature of the President's message to Congress on the food crisis in India is his emphasis on international action to meet India's development needs.

We should not, and do not, have to carry the whole burden of helping to bring India to meet its food crisis and to come to economic maturity. Every free nation has a stake in India's fate. To make sure our aid is used most effectively, and to encourage other free nations to do their fair share for India, we must work to strengthen the existing international framework for planning and financing India's economic and agricultural development.

Aid to India from the advanced free world countries is presently coordinated through a consortium of non-Communist governments working with the World Bank and the International Development Association.

The consortium arrangement brings pressure on developed countries of the free world to give their proper share of aid. It provides a framework within which to coordinate all the Western aid programs to India, in order to avoid duplication of effort.

As the principal aid-giver and as free world leader, the United States dominates the consortium. We should continue to encourage vigorously every aspect of the India consortium operations.

Close observers of the India scene also welcome the President's proposal to establish a joint Indo-United States Foundation, financed by Indian currencies paid by the Indian Government to us for part of our aid program. Under the President's proposal, this Foundation would be designed to give fresh encouragement to education and scientific research in India, especially in the field of agriculture and agricultural development.

The amount of Indian currency we own, however, has been mounting rapidly and relentlessly as our aid program has continued. We now own $2.5 billion worth of Indian rupees. This is over 20 percent of all of India's money, and could very well become almost 30 percent of it within the foreseeable future. The additional accumulation of Indian currency generated by the Indian money already in U.S. accounts in India is not only useless, it is unnecessary, foolish, and dangerous.

We must ask whether we really need to own up to a third of India's money supply in order to guide its development. Can we expect the India people to resent and fear our ownership of a third of their currency less than we would resent French or British ownership of our own currency?

President Johnson has wisely moved, first through his new food for freedom program and now through the Indo-United States Foundation, to stem further accumulation of foreign currencies in our hands as a result of our aid program.

The President's wisdom about the courses open to us to meet India's crisis is especially apparent in his restraint about our goals in aiding India. President Johnson affirms in his message on India that "the United States interferes neither in the internal politics nor the internal economic structure of other countries. We ask only for results."

India is a democracy. As such, the Indian Government must adjust its plans and programs to the political forces within India, just as we do here.

The democratic process may be a limitation on India's development. Certainly the Communists think so. But that is what the epic of India's development is all about.

If we are to help India prove that democracy is not incompatible with rapid development, we have to accept the limitations of democracy along with its strengths. We must recognize that frictions and differences of opinion are bound to arise during the continuing intimate relationship that the United States and India will share as long as our aid is necessary.

But just as India must be, and is, prepared to accept what amounts to U.S. intervention in its national economic planning, we must understand India's right to determine her own course. The reforms we see as vital may seem less significant or politically impractical to an Indian politician or administrator.

We must always remember that we are talking about reforms in their nation, not ours. We must be patient with action that may seem at times to be too slow or too grudging. And we must be prepared, at times, to accept no change at all.

Nor can we expect miracles once plan changes are agreed upon. We are dealing in India with Nehrus, Shastris, and Gandhis, not with Hitlers, Mussolinis, or Stalins. India's democracy is no more automatic in its political processes than is ours.

Naturally, we should use the influence that our substantial aid gives us in helping India to guide its development, but we must exercise that influence deftly, or we will prevent our friends in India from carrying out the very policies which we endorse.

It better serves our long-range interest to have India as a strong, independent and nonalined nation than to create a "Charlie McCarthy," mouthing U.S. foreign policy, in Asia. We will, in the long run, attract more adherents to the cause of democratic self-development with the honey of respect than the vinegar of coercion. After the Chinese border incidents, the Indians have little doubt who are their real friends.

The President's message to Congress on the food crisis in India signifies an enlightened and effective approach to the development problems now facing India. Enactment of House Joint Resolution 997, the bill we have before us today, is an essential part of that program to put India on its feet as the prime example in the underdeveloped world of the compatibility of freedom with economic development.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 997 to support expanded U.S. efforts to avert famine in India. I was proud to be able to join as a cosponsor of this important resolution, and to sit on the Senate Agriculture Committee yesterday afternoon when we gave it unanimous approval. It is my hope that the Senate will join with the other body in passing this important resolution without dissent.

I visited India 3 months ago to study the effects of our food-for-peace program in that country, and the severe problem of human hunger there. What I saw was grim—the efforts of the worst drought of this century were already making themselves felt. We cannot hide from the fact that if we do not substantially increase our food shipments to India, millions of human beings will starve in the months ahead.

But what I saw in India also gives us grounds for hope. For India is moving, with impressive determination, to correct past weaknesses in agricultural policy, to give priority to the need to improve her food production. I saw, in the intensive agriculture district program, clear evidence of success already achieved in raising yields as much as 30 to 60 percent over 5 years. What is needed is to extend the successful techniques used to raise yields in these districts to much larger areas of cropland, and this is what we must help India to do.

There is impressive agreement in the administration and the Congress on the importance of greater emphasis on self-help in our food assistance program. There is also an accord on the need for other wealthy countries to bear their share of the burden of alleviating world hunger. President Johnson has been a leader in both of these directions, as his message to the Congress of food aid to India makes clear. He deserves our admiration and our support.

As many of my colleagues have undoubtedly noted, the Washington Post has editorialized that "President Johnson's congressional message on aid to India is a great and gratifying document." The Post praised the President for presenting the problem as a "challenge to this country's humanity." The editorial goes on to add:

> He has rightly assumed that the Congress of the United States and the people of this country will support action on this magnificent scale on a purely humanitarian basis.

I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that this editorial, "Aid for India," be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to make one final, very important point. Just as we call on other nations to take a greater share in food aid to India, so also we must encourage private charitable groups to continue and expand their programs to provide sustenance and nourishment to the hungry. I was particularly pleased to note, as one fine example of such private efforts, the action by Lutheran World Relief in shipping 3 million multivitamin tablets—valued at $304,000—to victims of India's famine in mid-March. This is to be the first of three such shipments.

This is a fine example of Christianity in practice, the type of good work that Lutheran World Relief and other religious and charitable agencies have been carrying on quietly and effectively for many years. I would, therefore, like to call this work to the attention of the Senate, and ask that an article from yesterday's New York Times entitled "Lutherans Send Vitamins To Combat Indian Famine" be printed also at the close of my statement.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 1966]

AID FOR INDIA

President Johnson's congressional message on aid to India is a great and gratifying document. It is a great document because it asks Congress forcefully and directly to underwrite the rescue of the Indian people from the threat of starvation—at any cost. It projects the direct appropriation of 3½ million tons of wheat—in addition to 6.5 million tons already scheduled for 1966 shipment. And it calls for shipment of 200,000 tons of corn and up to 150 million pounds of vegetable oils and up to 125 million pounds of milk powder. It proposes besides the shipment of quantities of cotton and tobacco that may permit the diversion of more Indian crop land to food products. But more than this, it bluntly states that if others do not meet the remaining requirements the United States will.

The President has dared to present the problem to Congress, it is gratifying to note, as a challenge to this country's humanity. He did not claim that the United States will derive any promised or unpromised quid pro quo. He did not assert that feeding the Indians will help contain or isolate Communist China. He did not allege that it will help balance or frustrate the Soviet Union. He has not asked the Congress to support the program for any of these reasons or for any other national or selfish reason. He has rightly assumed that the Congress of the United States and the people of this country will support action on this magnificent scale on a purely humanitarian basis.

He has had the courage to recommend this vast program of aid, not because the Indian people some day may be our allies, not because they may help us in Asia, not because they will subsequently reward us with friendship or assistance but simply because the people of India are hungry. And that is the only attribute, the only necessity, the only condition we ought to require as a qualification for aid from the granaries and storehouses of America.

This program is being undertaken in the spirit of the great efforts of this country to feed the hungry of many nations after World War I and World War II. It is in a great American tradition. The President will not urge in vain "the strong and warmhearted and generous support of this program by the American people." He will not be disappointed in the response to an appeal to the hearts of the citizens of this country.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1966]

LUTHERANS SEND VITAMINS TO COMBAT INDIAN FAMINE

Three million multivitamin tablets valued at $304,000 and weighing nearly seven tons were shipped to India famine victims in mid-March by Lutheran World Relief, according to Religious News Service.

The shipment, by commercial airliner, was the first of three scheduled to go to Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta. The three shipments total about 10 million tablets.

The vitamins were received by the Lutheran material aid agency from Interchurch Medical Assistance, an interdenominational agency which solicits donations of hospital equipment, medicines, and other medical supplies for free distribution overseas.

A spokesman for Lutheran World Relief noted that space for the vitamins on the airliners was being provided without charge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY in the chair). The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 997) is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resoultion.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 997) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the preamble.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 149 be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to praise the Senate for its action on the India assistance measure. Its swift approval distinguishes all of the Members immensely. But, as I mentioned before, there are a number of Senators, on both sides of the aisle, who should be singled out for assuring expeditious action on this vital resolution.

First of all, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] responded capably and decisively to the President's request. Under his able and skillful chairmanship prompt action was taken by the Agriculture and Forestry Committee to bring this measure before the Senate today. Moreover, his articulate presentation on the floor assured decisive support.

And, of course, the astute ranking minority member of that committee, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is to be highly commended for his efforts in assuring successful Senate action today. His cooperation—so typical—contributed greatly to obtaining efficient committee action and to winning the Senate's overwhelming approval of this most important resolution.

Indeed, our thanks go to all of the Agriculture Committee members. Their combined efforts made action today possible. Their combined support made unanimous Senate approval a certainty.

Additionally, we are grateful to those Senators who rose to discuss and to support the measure. I am referring to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] whose compelling support of the President's request assured unanimous Senate endorsement. The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and New York [Mr. JAVITS] are likewise to be singled out for their enlightening remarks which helped immeasurably to obtain this great success.

Again, to the Senate as a whole I personally am deeply grateful for this great cooperative achievement. For we all hope that in the end it will be a victory in the continuing battle against hunger.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, with the action just taken today with regard to the Indian resolution, we have completed a full cycle in the past 23 years. I well remember the terrible Calcutta famine of 1943. If I may be spared a few moments to speak of a personal reminiscence, I was in India during the year 1944. I talked to many people who had seen the terrible problem which existed in 1943. It was a pretty rough experience for the entire country.

Despite the massive assistance which has been given by this Nation and others in the intervening years, this year India is again facing a major famine affecting an estimated 10 million of its citizens. We are moved with great compassion to do what we can to help our friends in India to lessen the catastrophe facing them in the months ahead. But, Mr. President, the situation in India should awaken us to the fact that we need to take another searching look at our programs which we have been pursuing in the hope of helping the hungry nations of the world. It is obvious that they have not been as successful as we had hoped and we must look for new and additional ways to meet a crisis which is drawing ever closer.

With India as a prime example, we should be painfully aware that the world food gap is growing instead of lessening. In the past 30 short years the number of grain-exporting regions has shrunk from six down to two. Because of the exploding world population, many nations which formerly met their needs for food now are falling behind, and the North American Continent has had to increasingly become the breadbasket for the entire world—for friend and enemy alike.

We must face cold, hard facts. Our bounty is not endless. No matter how great our compassion for less fortunate countries, we cannot indefinitely undertake the burden of feeding the world. Other nations which lack the know-how must be taught to help themselves. And while we are undertaking to impart our technological know-how to less developed nations, other fully developed nations of the world must share our burden

of helping the food-hungry nations of the world.

We cannot go it alone. West Germany, France, and England and our other allies in Western Europe must join in sharing their bounty and their knowledge with these less fortunate nations in meeting the approaching world crisis.

In the immediate future, the whole question of world peace may depend upon how well we of the developed nations can impart our technical know-how in food production to the food-short, underdeveloped nations of the world. We cannot—we must not—fail, or we shall sooner or later be faced with the Solomonic decision to determine who shall be allowed to live. It is that serious.

Mr. President, I support the action we are taking today to help the starving people of India, and I urge that we move ahead with deliberate speed to provide the means to answer the world food crisis.

While the world food crisis grows, we are faced with a paradox in American agriculture today. Our farmers are saddled with oppressive restrictions limiting their ability to produce. I believe we must act immediately to unharness our farmers if we are to succeed in coping with the coming food crisis.

I wish to state parenthetically at this point that under the present administration program there has been a reduction in agricultural labor, which has lead to a shortage in certain agricultural products. Our efforts to increase production by having persons available to work in agriculture have been either ignored or played down by the present administration.

Time is needed for our farmers to increase their production—our food supply cannot be instantly turned on or off like a water faucet. And we need more leadtime for a program to teach food production know-how to the less developed nations of the world.

I cannot estimate how much time this might take, but it took this country literally decades to develop technical innovations to bring about our present agricultural production. We cannot possibly be able to get the other underdeveloped nations to stimulate their agriculture through technological advances unless there is a long leadtime. It would take at least 10 or 15 years before they could go forward.

In addition, we need to gear our assistance to these nations more on their own demonstrated willingness to help themselves. Our knowledge is of little value to them if they are not willing to put it to immediate use. We cannot afford to waste the lessons we have learned in India.

I had an opportunity to be a delegate in a recent senatorial group that went to Japan, India, Pakistan, and on into Afghanistan and Israel. I had the opportunity of talking firsthand with many officers and very important and leading congressional people in India, including the present Prime Minister.

One of the things we had hoped was that we would find a better atmosphere in the country of India toward its ability to produce its own food.

But it is an interesting thing, Mr. President, that although we have been trying for some 3, 4, or 5 years to increase fertilizer production in India, which is so desperately needed, the Minister of Finance in India had refused to permit any foreign development in the private sector to come into India to produce fertilizer.

I hope that in the implementation of this resolution and in the discussions with the Indian Government, we can make as a condition of our particular loan the opportunity for the creation of a fertilizer industry in India so that we can find the means and the technology to help them to help themselves in their food production.

Unless we do this, their rate of productive capacity is going to continue to go down, and we are going to be called on more and more to meet the food needs of the Indian nation. This is only one nation. Before we are through we are going to be asked to help in Africa and Asia.

From the point of view of timing, the hour is late and I believe we must move ahead immediately to forge and put into effect a program of food, fertilizer, and family planning throughout the world.

Unless we do this, population will increase and food production will decrease, in both quality and quantity.

Consequently, although I support this humanitarian resolution, it seems to me that we must take this opportunity to stimulate discussion of our overall programs and objectives in assisting underdeveloped nations with food and food production.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Colorado for commenting on the aid to India program.

In addition, I wish to stress the fact that while we have a great agricultural operation in this great Nation, it is not inexhaustible. It is time that we begin to look at the future, based on a long-time program for the strengthening of our agriculture, to be certain that our people will not only have sufficient quantities of food, but that we will be able to help other countries, as we have in the past.

I wish to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator that we have 60 million acres out of production for which we pay $2 billion in taxpayers' money to take it out of production.

We should give serious consideration, and I hope the Secretary of Agriculture will give serious consideration, to putting at least 10 to 20 percent of our present allotment of acreage back into production so that we may be able to assure future supplies for our people and for others.

Mr. DOMINICK. I know how experienced and able the Senator from Kansas is in this field. He has been one of the leaders in this field, and I very much appreciate the comments that he has made.

I might say at this point that I am often reminded of what I call the "upside down world," of our agricultural production and our agricultural programs.

As the Senator has said, we take all of this acreage out of production and we pay farmers for taking it out of production. At the same time, we pass bills, which I have voted for time and again, partially to increase the water supply of the West so that more crops can be grown on the land in these areas. At the same time we go through a research program, as the distinguished Senator is well aware, showing farmers how to drain their wet lands so they can get more land into production.

Each program conflicts with another, and we do not have an overall policy in this area. We are presenting to the farmer all the time the absolutely impossible task of his trying to be a chemist, surveyor, Government analyst and in a sense, Government regulator. He is in a hopeless position because of all the technical know-how he must have to produce and keep his family alive on a private enterprise system.

I have tremendous admiration for any farmer who can make any money on the system we have now.

I am happy to have the comments of the Senator from Kansas. I appreciate his support on these comments.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6319) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by government of foreign countries, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the Senate convenes tomorrow, I may be recognized for an address on a nongermane subject for 30 minutes.

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

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY LAUDS "AGE OF OPPORTUNITY" IN SPEECH BEFORE AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as one who has long been actively interested in, and associated with, the efforts of the

Congress to enhance the educational opportunities for our Nation's youth, I was encouraged and delighted to read the speech presented to the American Personnel and Guidance Association on April 4, 1966, by our Vice President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

The keynote of the Vice President's remarks was both challenging and stimulating, as he said:

We are entering an exciting new age: the age of opportunity.

Those of us who have been intimately involved with the passage of the vast body of educational legislation, which is now a part of this Nation's law, are determined that the opportunities offered by the programs we have created shall be made available as fully as practicable to our children. We do not intend to renege on the promises inherent in these programs; we intend to bring the age of opportunity to the stage of realization for the youth, and for the needy, of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech on this subject, delivered by the Vice President, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 4, 1966

My message today is this: We are entering an exciting new age: The age of opportunity.

And those who do not understand this fact do not understand the most important fact today of American life.

The age of opportunity is already upon us—in the corridors of our schools, on the campuses of our universities and colleges, in the personnel offices of our corporations.

Old barriers are being torn down. Old struggles are being won.

The day is near when the future will lie open ahead—open to every American child who will make the most of it.

A 30-year fight for a program of health insurance has been concluded.

A hundred-year struggle to obtain Federal assistance for elementary and secondary schools has been won.

A century-long struggle to implement the words of the Emancipation Proclamation is being won.

Root causes of poverty are being attacked.

A new immigration policy has been established to make the words on the Statue of Liberty honest words.

Tremendous breakthroughs in medical science mean that most of us will live longer, in better health, than any people at any other time.

A host of programs to improve the quality of our physical and cultural environment have been enacted.

Our quest into outer space has brought us new knowledge, new technology, and a great adventure into the future.

And the whole sum of our progress—the whole fact of our stronger and better America—gives hope to the two-thirds of mankind living in hunger and darkness that there may be a share of something better ahead for them, too.

I, for one, am determined that the hopes of mankind shall not be in vain—that their faith in the strength and goodness of America shall not be misplaced.

The good old days were never that good, believe me. The good days are today. And better days are coming tomorrow.

As I travel around America, I see a people on the move full of enthusiasm and idealism, and wanting to participate fully in this new age of opportunity.

Sometimes I wonder whether we fully grasp the changes which have taken place in America in the past few years—changes for the better.

I am privileged to serve as a member of the Advisory Council of Plans for Progress—the voluntary organization of major business corporations pledged to promote equal opportunity in employment.

In my meetings with these leaders of American business, I am told that competition among companies is fierce to hire competent Negroes and other minority group members. Where just a few years ago most Negro college graduates could only look forward realistically to careers as teachers or preachers, the picture now has changed dramatically and the doors of opportunity in the business world are swinging open.

Many of America's finest colleges are now searching for qualified minority group members to enroll as freshmen each year.

These institutions learned it was not sufficient merely to sit back and wait for Negroes and other minorities to apply. Years of discrimination and exclusion dictated that initiative had to be exercised by the colleges and universities.

Each summer program Upward Bound, sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity, seeks to expose talented young people from deprived areas to the challenge and excitement of educational excellence so that they will be motivated to enter college after high school.

Under the recent reorganization of civil rights responsibilities of the Federal Government, the Civil Service Commission has developed a comprehensive new program to attract minority talent into the Federal service and to make sure that every effort is made to promote and advance persons who are now Federal employees. President Johnson recently met with the principal personnel officers of every Federal agency to emphasize the Federal Government's commitment in this regard.

In occupation after occupation, on American street and farm, the story is the same: We are entering the age of opportunity.

How will we meet this age?

First, we must make sure our young people understand that new opportunities are, in fact, opening up every day. We must crack through generations of cynicism and despair so that our boys and girls will seek the right education and training to fill the jobs of the future.

Second, we must be prepared to offer our young people the education and training they need—as the President has said, "all the education they can take."

The challenge of providing quality education—education of and for excellence—is a massive and difficult job.

Quality education is not being provided in many school systems.

But it must be provided lest we cheat both our young people and our Nation of the chance for full productivity.

We know the need to continue eliminating obsolete and outmoded teaching methods and curriculums—methods and curriculums which stunt the development of creative thinking and understanding.

We have begun to emphasize the importance of understanding the basic structures of mathematics, languages, and the physical and biological sciences.

And we know our young people have astounding capacity for learning when they are truly challenged and excited by the process of education.

We must, of course, recognize one overwhelming task among the great challenges facing education: What about education for the poor and deprived?

Despite the recent efforts to improve the lives of those persons consigned to live in the slums and ghettoes of our cities, we must recognize that little has changed in their daily lives.

We still find the poorest schools there—not the best. In those areas where young people are usually denied broad exposure to culture, the arts and society generally, we find schools that often do little to compensate for it.

And in those areas where children come from a home environment which provides this exposure, we usually find schools which also offer a wide variety of special courses, exciting cultural programs, and the latest teaching techniques and equipment.

It is time to see that educational excellence exists everywhere—but especially in those areas where it is needed most urgently.

We must espouse what Franklin Roosevelt called "that broader definition of liberty" under which the fortunate make an extra effort on behalf of those lacking good fortune so that, in the longer run, all may benefit.

A few months' experience with Project Headstart is enough to excite our imagination to the possibilities for lifting young minds in families and communities left far behind the rest of us. And this opportunity must extend throughout the elementary and secondary years—not come to an abrupt halt as youngsters enter first grade.

As we concern ourselves with the problem of school dropouts, let us remember that many of these youngsters are, in fact, pushouts—persons whose unique talents are never developed or recognized by the schools—persons to whom education has been a deadening and defeating experience.

We surely have a job to do here. It is estimated that if the rate of school dropouts continues at its preesnt pace, we will have some 32 million adults in the labor force without a high school diploma by 1975.

During this past year we faced the prospect of 750,000 dropouts. Although this estimate has been reduced by the intensive efforts of many persons in this room—including my own—we still have not succeeded in halting this tragic waste of human resources.

But today we have the tools to accomplish this objective—especially if local school systems and the States make full and imaginative use of new resources at their disposal.

Last year the Congress enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the Teaching Professions Act, and amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, the Vocational Education Act, and the Manpower Development and Training Act. Just last week, the House of Representatives voted funds to launch the National Teachers Corps.

We have the resources. What we must concentrate upon now is using these resources in creative and innovative ways. This is primarily a job for the States and localities.

This summer the national youth opportunity campaign—under the chairmanship of the Vice President—will again seek to provide our young people with meaningful and exciting job experiences. As many of you know, last year the private and public sectors provided more than 1 million additional summer jobs for youngsters between 16 and 21. Besides providing money, these jobs were vitally important in introducing many boys and girls to the world of work—and helped them see the need to complete their education and training before seeking a permanent job.

We hope the youth opportunity campaign for 1966 will be even more successful. We have again established the goal of 1 million jobs—with emphasis placed upon hiring young people whose lack of skill or experience insulates them from the normal forces

of the job market. We are especially counting upon your cooperation and support in helping deprived youngsters experience a rewarding and challenging summer. But this will not happen naturally—each of us will have to make a special effort to see that it does.

Perhaps more than any other profession, the members of the American Personnel and Guidance Association hold the keys which can unlock the door of opportunity for our young people this summer—and for the rest of their lives. You stand at the threshold of this new age of opportunity. And so your response to these challenges is critically important.

You can touch the lives of our young people at that critical moment when they decide whether or not to leave school.

You can help them pursue courses of study to develop their individual potential to the fullest—thereby making the process of education an exciting and joyous experience.

You can direct them toward jobs to challenge and develop further their particular aptitude and skills—thereby continuing the development of their unique capacities.

At so many crucial periods in our young people's lives you provide the crucial link between the individual and society—between his preparation as a citizen and his entrance and participation in the processes of democracy.

Let us, then, heed the words of John Stuart Mill: "The unwise are those who bring nothing constructive to the process, and who greatly imperil the future of mankind, by leaving great questions to be fought out between ignorant change on one hand, and ignorant opposition to change, on the other."

Today all of us have the chance to be constructive. We have the chance to make change a force for good and enlightenment—to include everyone in this new age of opportunity.

Let us recognize that the true source of national power is our power of intellect, of our wealth, our wealth of ideas, of our resources, our resources of human skill and energy.

Let us accept the challenge of our time.

Let us fulfill the promise of a people blessed as none have ever been blessed before.

Let us fulfill what the author Thomas Wolfe—in the despair of the 1930's—called the promise of America:

"To every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this * * * is the promise of America."

I ask you to join in making that promise come true.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is always good to see tribute paid to someone who deserves it. An article in yesterday's New York Times pays tribute to such a woman: Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer.

I have worked with Elly Guggenheimer in many good causes—notably in trying to provide more and better day-care facilities in this country. Dedicated, hard working, and well informed, she is a fine example of the sort of talented woman to whom our Nation owes so much progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article just referred to, from the New York Times of April 5, 1966.

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

FIGHTER FOR CHILDREN: MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER

Since the early 1930's when, as a young mother herself, she became interested in the care of children of working mothers, Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer has been speaking out in defense of children.

"Conditions then were terrible," she reflected yesterday in her office at 114 East 32d Street "Children were being abused and neglected. There was no licensing, nothing." Since then she has visited day care centers all over the world, including England, France, Italy, Sweden, Japan, Switzerland, and Germany. And she is still far from satisfied.

"Our affluent society is behind almost every country in the world in providing care for the children of mothers who, for one reason or another, can't provide care for them during the day," she said.

"We like to pretend that Mom's still in the kitchen, but the fact of the matter is, she hasn't been in the kitchen for years."

As part of her continuing fight for a better life for young children, Mrs. Guggenheimer resigned as cochairman of the city antipoverty program's Headstart Committee yesterday. She did so in protest over conflicts in the running of the preschool enrichment program.

A SIZE 10 GRANDMOTHER

At 53 (she will be 54 next Monday), Elinor Guggenheimer is trim (size 10) and forthright, with a fine sense of the ridiculous.

She and her husband, Randolph, a partner in the law firm of Guggenheimer & Untermyer, live in a cooperative apartment at 1095 Park Avenue. They are the parents of two sons, Charles, 32, and Randolph, 30, and the grandparents of two boys and a girl, all under 6.

"Actually, you'd better say young Randolph is 6 because he can read now and he always says he's almost 6," Mrs. Guggenheimer explained. "I wouldn't want to hurt his feelings."

In addition to her children and grandchildren, Mrs. Guggenheimer is proud of her indomitable mother-in-law, Mrs. Charles S. Guggenheimer, known to thousands of music lovers as Minnie. Mrs. Charles S. Guggenheimer is credited with almost single-handedly having founded the summer concerts at Lewisohn Stadium.

The younger Mrs. Guggenheimer's duties as a member of the New York City Planning Commission take up so much of her time that she does not have enough left over to pursue her hobbies as much as she pretends that she might like to.

"As the result of my famous mother-in-law, I am conversant with music," she said, "and in my spare time, I do needlepoint." To illustrate, she produced a piece of petitpoint from her handbag and ran off a few stitches.

"I also play atrocious golf and cook divinely," she said. "Honesty compels me to tell you that when I get finished, however, the kitchen is a mess."

She gives a course on park and recreation planning at the New School for Social Research each fall, paints, collects Chinese porcelain, and writes skits.

BARNARD GRADUATE

Mrs. Guggenheimer is a native New Yorker, the only child of the late Nathan Coleman, a commercial banker, and Mrs. Lillian Coleman.

She was educated at Horace Mann, a private school which at that time accepted girls; Vassar and Barnard College, from which she graduated. Later, she took courses at Columbia University's Teacher's College and Pratt Institute in early childhood education and city planning, respectively.

A woman who takes her work seriously, she has been rumored to be informally soliciting support for the Manhattan Borough presidency to replace Mrs. Constance Baker Motley.

Although Mrs. Guggenheimer becomes incensed at the lag in day-care facilities in this country, she nevertheless sees some hope ahead.

"If Operation Headstart can be developed to relate to day-care centers, this would be a step forward," she said. "There is hope in the small amount of Federal funds that have served to stimulate licensing laws for the protection of children in group programs."

Governor Rockefeller's program to appropriate funds for day care is also a positive move, she feels.

"I don't want to stir things up to make trouble," she said seriously. "I want to be able to speak freely to end trouble and bring peace. There's a difference."

SENATOR FULBRIGHT SPEAKS OUT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the views of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] deserves special attention. Senator FULBRIGHT has not hesitated to make his opinions about our involvement in Vietnam known, and many of his statements are already in the RECORD. A recent and very timely article has been brought to my attention, however, and I feel it merits the special scrutiny of my colleagues. In the April 9 issue of the Saturday Evening Post he has written a column entitled "We Must Negotiate Peace in Vietnam." Besides calling for American acceptance and understanding of the realities of the situation in Vietnam, he feels that the United States, as the most powerful Nation in the world, can afford to be magnanimous.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

WE MUST NEGOTIATE PEACE IN VIETNAM

(By Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT)

America is a Great Society and it is becoming greater. Our people enjoy greater material abundance, with greater personal opportunity and human dignity, than any people have ever known in the history of the human race. There is, to be sure, much unfinished business in our society, but the fact remains that we are a great and fundamentally decent Nation; we know it—or ought to—and the world knows it.

At times, however, we act as though we did not believe in our own greatness, as though our prestige were constantly in jeopardy, requiring unending exertions to prove to the world that we are indeed a great and powerful Nation. We are told, for example, that we must beat the Russians to the moon, that we must build the world's fastest airplane, that we must maintain our pressures against Castro, that we must faithfully discharge dubious commitments, not primarily because these actions are considered essential in themselves but more because it is believed that if we did not do these things, our prestige, which is to say, our reputation for greatness, would be hopelessly compromised.

In the case of Vietnam, our honor and prestige are indeed involved, but they are involved principally because we laid them

on the line and did so in a legally uncertain and politically casual way. Legally, under a reasonable interpretation of the SEATO treaty, we have agreed to act against external Communist attack in accordance with our constitutional processes but are obligated only to consult with our allies in the event of subversion from outside. We have neither the obligation nor the right to intervene in a civil war. If, prior to American intervention, the war in South Vietnam was essentially a civil war, as I believe to be the case, then the legal basis of American involvement is dubious. Practically and politically, whatever the legalities, the all-out commitment to South Vietnam was made almost casually, by a series of minor escalations of the American involvement, many of which were accompanied by statements that the war was not our war and would have to be won or lost by the South Vietnamese themselves. Only when they were about to lose the war did the United States take it over.

The Executive and the Congress must share responsibility for the casual way in which the United States committed its honor and prestige to an unstable and intransigent regime which refuses to negotiate with its enemies and may yet drag the United States into an all-out war with China. The Executive tended to explain each increase in the American involvement in Vietnam as a tactical step rather than a change of policy, while the Congress failed to meet its general responsibility of holding the Executive to account and the Senate failed to assert its constitutional powers of "advice and consent" in the field of foreign policy.

It is my hope that the hearings on Vietnam recently held before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and future proceedings now under consideration will help to correct past omissions on the part of the Congress. There is some evidence, for example, that we are now expanding our commitment to Thailand in the same disorderly way that we became so deeply involved in Vietnam. There is still time, however, for the Senate to insist that any new commitment to Thailand be contracted in full accord with our constitutional procedures, including full and frank debate.

We have committed our prestige to an unwise degree in Vietnam, and we have suffered accordingly some loss of prestige, but I do not think that America's greatness is questioned in the world, and I certainly do not think that strident behavior is the best way for a nation to prove its greatness or salve its damaged pride. Indeed, in nations as in individuals, bellicosity is a mark of weakness and self-doubt rather than strength and self-assurance. There is something appropriate and admirable about a small or weak country standing up defiantly to a big and powerful country; such behavior confers upon the small country an assurance which it needs to nourish its dignity and self-respect. The same behavior on the part of a big nation is grotesque, marking it as a bully. The true mark of greatness is not assertiveness but magnanimity. "Magnanimity in politics," said Edmund Burke, "is not seldom the truest wisdom; and a great empire and little minds go ill together."

It is precisely because of America's great strength and prestige that we can afford to be—that indeed it is in our interest to be—magnanimous in Vietnam. If the Vietcong or North Vietnam were to take the initiative in offering substantive concessions, they could plausibly be regarded as having been intimiated by American power. If we were to take the lead in suggesting peace terms involving a compromise with the Vietcong, many people would suppose that the American people had grown doubtful about the war—which is probably true—but no one could seriously believe that the United States had been frightened or intimidated into submission by a small and poor country in southeast Asia.

What then should we do, what can we offer, to try to end the war in Vietnam? The first step which I recommend is that we state explicitly and forthrightly that we recognize the Vietcong as a belligerent, with whom we are prepared to negotiate peace, and further, that we will use our considerable powers of persuasion in Saigon to induce the South Vietnamese Government, which has said that it will not negotiate with the Vietcong, to change its mind and indicate its willingness to do so.

It has been said that the Vietcong is entitled to no special negotiating position because it is, after all, only one of many factions in South Vietnam. It is, however, a rather special faction inasmuch as it is the one with which we are at war. The British did not regard George Washington and his fellow revolutionaries as the only faction in the Thirteen Colonies, much less a "legitimate" or legal one; they made peace with them because, assisted by the French, they were the ones who were fighting them in the field.

Moreover, and more important, however much we may regret it, the Vietcong is something more than an organized group of terrorists. It is, I think, a genuinely nationalist as well as a Communist movement, as evidenced by its impressive military performance over a long period against heavy odds.

Nationalism is the strongest single political force in the world today. In most of the emerging countries the nationalist movements have been non-Communist, with the result that Communist efforts at subversion have for the most part been unsuccessful. It is a tragic fact, but nonetheless a fact, that in Vietnam the effective nationalist movement is controlled by Communists. For this reason above all others I recommend that we state plainly and directly what President Johnson and Ambassador Harriman have hinted: that we acknowledge the Vietcong as a belligerent and invite it to participate, along with the governments of South Vietnam and North Vietnam, in formal peace negotiations.

My second recommendation is that we state forthrightly and explicitly, in advance of negotiations, that we are prepared to conclude a peace agreement providing for an internationally supervised election to determine the future of South Vietnam and, further, that we are prepared to accept the outcome of such an election, whatever that outcome might be. The latter assurance is important because, among the many violations of the Geneva agreements of 1954 committed by both sides, the most significant was the refusal of President Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam to allow the election provided for at Geneva to take place, and America's complicity in that refusal.

I suggest further, in this connection, that we use all available channels to persuade the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong that, whatever the future political complexion of Vietnam, Communist or non-Communist, united or divided, it can enjoy a secure and independent existence and normal relations with the United States as long as it respects the independence of its neighbors and as long as it upholds its own independence of China.

Such a settlement would not constitute a victory in the traditional sense; but neither would it represent a decision, as has been suggested, to "scuttle and run." It would, quite simply, represent a compromise, including, as any compromise must, concessions by the United States. A concession, however, is not a humiliation and may indeed be turned to one's own advantage, as General de Gaulle demonstrated by giving freedom to Algeria and as Khrushchev demonstrated by proclaiming himself a peacemaker while yielding to the American ultimatum in the Cuban missile crisis. The concessions we must make are necessary as an act of commonsense in a tragic situation; as Walter Lippmann has written, "a display of commonsense by a proud and imperious nation would be a good moral investment for the future." And as George Kennan said in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in February: "I would submit there is more respect to be won in the opinion of the world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than in the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or unpromising objectives."

It may be difficult indeed to persuade the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to enter a negotiation along the lines indicated. They have little reason to trust the Western nations, having been betrayed by the French in 1946, who recognized Vietnam as a "free state" and promised a referendum on its unity but then tried to reassert their colonial authority, and by Diem and his American sponsors in 1955 when we encouraged him in his refusal to hold the elections provided for by the Geneva agreements. It will be necessary to show our good faith as well as to insist on the good faith of the other side. It may be that at first we will be rebuffed and, if so, we can do no better than to restate our assurances, patiently and repeatedly, conducting ourselves in a manner befitting a great and mature nation.

There is an unacknowledged presence in all that we think and say and do in connection with Vietnam; it is the presence of China. We wage war against the Vietcong and North Vietnam, but we regard them as instruments of China, and it is China that we consider to be the real threat to the security of southeast Asia. If it were not for our concern with China and what she might do, it would probably be an easier matter to come to terms with our enemies in Vietnam. Our prospects in Vietnam cannot therefore be separated from our attitude toward China and China's attitude toward us.

United Nations Secretary General U Thant recently described China as a country "obsessed with fear and suspicion," a country undergoing a kind of "nervous breakdown." U Thant's words suggest the need for Americans to make a critical choice in their attitude toward China. On the one hand, we can treat her as persons with "nervous breakdowns" were treated in centuries past; we can throw her into the figurative snake-pit of world politics, treating her as an insane and predatory creature, an outlaw with whom there can be no accommodation. On the other hand, we can treat China by the more civilized standards deriving from our modern understanding of human behavior; while resisting any aggressive act she commits, we can at the same time treat China as a respected member of the world community now going through a period of dangerous chauvinism and warranting our best efforts to rehabilitate her to the world community.

I hope that America will make the second choice. I hope that in its attitude toward China, America will act with the magnanimity that befits a great nation by following the advice of Pope Paul who said in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly: "Your vocation is to make brothers not only of some, but of all peoples, a difficult undertaking, indeed; but this it is, your most noble undertaking. * * * We will go further, and say: strive to bring back among you any who have separated themselves and study the right method of uniting to your pact of brotherhood, in honor and loyalty, those who do not yet share in it."

The hatred of the Chinese Communists for America is something more than the normal political hostility of one nation toward another whose policies thwart the realization of its ambitions. America is hated as the leading Nation of the West, as the center

and purveyor of a civilization which has had a devastating effect on China and subjected it to such humiliations as few great nations in history have undergone. I am inclined to the view that China's irrational and hostile behavior has a great deal to do with ancient grievances and that the Chinese regard their quarrel with America not only as an ideological struggle but also as an ultimate historical reckoning for China's humiliations during the past century at the hands of Western nations.

It is impossible in a few words to describe the deep and bitter humiliation inflicted upon the Chinese, a great and civilized people, by imperialist nations, including Russia and, to a degree, America. Something of its flavor, however, can be gotten from a young Chinese engineer's account of his return from Europe to China in 1913 with his Belgian wife and son. Referring to his arrival in Shanghai, where Western interests owned the hotels, restaurants, and other public facilities, he wrote:

"In Shanghai it was agony, for there it was only too plain that in my own country I was nothing but an inferior, despised being. There were parks and restaurants and hotels I could not enter, although she could. I had no rights on the soil of a Chinese city which did not belong to the Chinese; she had rights by reason of something called skin.

"We boarded the English steamer from Shanghai to Hankow; the first class was for Europeans only, and there was no other steamer. Marguerite leaned her arms on the railings and stared at the river. She was in first class, with our son. I went second class. I had insisted it should be so. 'It is too hot for you here below.'"

Today China stands isolated, mistrustful and hostile toward the outside world. Her illustrious history of 4,000 years has contributed to the view of herself as a superior civilization set upon by hostile barbarians. In the wake of so tragic and unique a national experience, one can hardly be sanguine about immediate prospects for drawing China into the community of nations as a trustworthy and responsible partner. A great deal is at stake, however, and it would be tragic folly if we did not do what little we can to rehabilitate China to the world community. The West, to be sure, must defend itself against irrational and aggressive Chinese behavior, but in the long run we can only hope to be safe in the world with a powerful and dynamic China by drawing her out of isolation. Treated with friendliness and respect, China may be brought in time to see that the "barbarians" of the West are in fact less barbaric than they seem.

As Secretary General U Thant pointed out, China is going through a difficult period; it befits us as a great nation to act upon this fact with understanding and magnanimity. If we can bring ourselves to do so, we will be on the way to a solution of the great problems that beset us in eastern Asia. The prospects for an honorable and lasting peace in Vietnam have everything to do with China and its relations with the outside world, because China is the greatest nation of Asia. It is not within our power to make it otherwise, but it is within our power to repair some of the damage done by the arrogance and condescension of the past.

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, this country has been plagued with a serious boxcar shortage for several years. This problem is now reaching crisis proportions.

The crisis is most severe in the great grain producing areas of the Midwest and the lumber producing regions of the Northwest. However, the shortage has become so pressing that all sections of the country are beginning to suffer.

There is now a current daily shortage of around 14,000 plain boxcars. And, Mr. President, we have not yet entered the heavy demand period which begins with the commencement of the wheat harvest in June and extends through the corn harvest this fall.

I have had letters and telegrams from flour millers and grain elevator operators in Kansas telling of the hardships these shortages are causing. Several flour mills in Kansas are already being forced to periodically close down operations because of the unavailability of boxcars.

In the past 2 or 3 months there have been numerous reports of lumber mills in the Northwest being forced to close down for the same reason, causing great economic loss and total unemployment to their personnel.

The boxcar shortage has been a long-term problem but it is now being dramatically accentuated by the fact that this country is expected to ship more and more grain to such countries as India where food deficits are reaching famine proportions, and by the stepped up Government purchases and shipping related to the Vietnam conflict.

Mr. President, another thing which has been placing additional strain on this already overburdened transport system has been the ill-considered and unjustified action by the Commodity Credit Corporation in dumping millions of bushels of Government-owned corn on the open market.

The administration has been dumping corn in an effort to force farmers into the feed grain control program and to roll back the price of corn so that meat prices will be lowered through the increase in the production of hogs. This massive dumping has been unjustified and unwarranted. Moreover, in regards to its impact on the boxcar situation, it has simply served to make a bad situation worse.

Mr. President, another alarming aspect of the boxcar shortage is the fact that it is creating new and significant inflationary pressures. The impact on the key product of lumber is a case in point. The Wall Street Journal of April 1 reports that the boxcar shortage has been a primary factor in recent sharp rises in lumber prices. The price of green Douglas 2 by 4's has risen $12 since the end of February. At $80 a thousand board feet the price of this key product is near the record high of $85 reached during the Korean war. Prices on other products such as plywood have also increased sharply. These sharp price increases will have ramifications throughout the economy. For example, a major producer of prefabricated houses states that he will have to increase the price of his homes by 5 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article I have referred to be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, this emergency situation demands emergency action. During the past month or two several Midwestern and Northwestern Senators and myself have been urging that the Interstate Commerce Commission take appropriate measures within existing laws in an effort to alleviate this situation.

I note that several such measures have recently been taken by the ICC. However, to assure that all possible steps are taken to alleviate this emergency I have written to Mr. John Bush, ICC Chairman, asking him to determine if there is any future action that can be taken by the ICC within existing authorization. I have also asked that he outline possible new emergency legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

APRIL 6, 1966.

Mr. JOHN W. BUSH,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, 12th Street and Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I note that during the past few weeks the Interstate Commerce Commission has issued a series of new directives designed to alleviate the boxcar shortage situation. Because of the increasing demands for shipments of U.S. grain to foreign countries and because of stepped up Government purchasing related to the Vietnam conflict and in view of the fact that the harvest season will soon be upon us, the boxcar situation has reached crisis proportions which may well have disastrous results.

In view of this fact, I would like to have you determine whether or not there are any further steps that can be taken by the ICC within existing authority to deal with this most urgent problem.

I would also like to have your assessment as to what new emergency legislation beyond S. 3091, which is now before the Committee on Commerce, might be useful in dealing with this problem in the immediate months ahead.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. PEARSON,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the boxcar shortage cannot, of course, be cured by administrative fiat. Although the problem is now at a crisis stage, its causes are long term in nature and the ultimate solution of the problem requires enactment of basic remedial legislation.

There are two bills before the Congress which strike at the causes of this long term problem. I refer to S. 1098 which was passed by the Senate last year and S. 3091 which was introduced last month and which has been referred to the Committee on Commerce. I am privileged to be a cosponsor of both of these bills.

Mr. President, the present crisis and possible impending disaster make it imperative that these bills be passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President at the earliest possible date.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 1, 1966]

LOGJAM: LUMBER PRODUCERS REEL FROM BOXCAR SHORTAGE, DEFENSE, HEDGE BUYING—THEY HAVE PLENTY OF CAPACITY, BUT CANNOT DELIVER GOODS—PRICES NEAR RECORD HIGHS—BAD NEWS FOR HOMEBUILDERS

(By W. Stewart Pinkerton, Jr.)

PORTLAND, OREG.—If only Paul Bunyan would show up.

He and Babe the Blue Ox probably could help out their successors in the lumbering business. But it wouldn't be easy even for them. Here's the situation: Uncut lumber is scarce, heavy war-buying by the Government is causing a shortage of cut wood, industrial buyers are trying to get extra supplies as a hedge against a possible strike by lumberjacks this summer and severe rail-car shortage is limiting shipments of what lumber is available and is causing temporary closedowns of mills.

As a result of all this, users aren't getting as much lumber as they had planned on, and what they are getting is costing a lot more than they had expected, adding to the woes of homebuilders who already are beset by a decline in housing starts and a tightening of credit. And further price rises are likely.

"I expect to have to add 5 percent ($650) to the price of my homes," says an Indiana producer of prefabricated units that sell for around $13,000. In New York, a Long Island homebuilder says, "Business is only fair, and I certainly don't want to raise my prices—but I have no choice." In San Francisco, a builder of apartment houses says he has delayed work on one project to renegotiate his financing; he needs more money to buy lumber.

IF NOT ONE THING, IT'S ANOTHER

The industry probably could handle with ease any of the several problems individually. But the combination is proving too much. For instance, lumber mills—especially plywood producers—have plenty of capacity to handle some increased demands. By adding a third work turn, lumbermen figure, plywood output could be boosted 20 to 30 percent on top of the 10-percent climb to 13.7 billion square feet already expected in 1966. But the boxcar shortage and the lack of logs rule out the addition of a third shift.

Similarly, the strike-hedge orders normally wouldn't be too tough to cope with—but the Government's buying of wood for use in Vietnam is causing a scarcity. The Government purchases are no minor factor. Defense buying from mills is expected to hit $50 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, double the level of fiscal 1965, and much of the increase is being squeezed into the final 4 months of the fiscal year. Just last week mills were asked to bid on 680,000 sheets of plywood for Vietnam, an amount equal to a third of an average plant's yearly production. The buying is expected to continue heavy for 2 more years.

The strike-hedge buying accounts for as much as 30 percent of current orders, some mills say. The industry is readying for negotiations with an array of unions, the biggest round since 1963 when a contract was reached only after an 8-week strike. Current contracts expire in June. Until last week, industry sources said there was a 75 percent chance of a strike, but a March 21 settlement with one union has lessened considerably the possibility of a strike, these sources now say.

LOG AND BOXCAR SHORTAGES

The shortage of uncut logs is being caused by rising exports, which would be a blessing to the industry in normal times. Exports of logs from the Northwest totaled 901 million board feet last year, up from 835 million in 1964 and only 311 million in 1962. The 1966 pace is up still further, industry officials says.

Probably the biggest problem at the moment, however, is the shortage of boxcars. Big west coast mills say car supplies are about 25 percent below requirements, and they don't see much relief from a recent Interstate Commerce Commission order requiring roads to return empty cars to the West more promptly.

Last month, the car shortage forced 12 sawmills in Montana to close for a week. "Our shipping rate is 10 to 15 percent below what it should be for this time of year, due to the boxcar shortage," says Gus R. Hubbard, traffic director for Simpson Timber Co. in Seattle. Many companies are seeking other means of transport, but find that they often are uneconomic.

Forest products executives complain that in general railroads haven't been replacing the boxcars fast enough. For instance, Southern Pacific Co. has cut its entire boxcar fleet by about 5.5 percent since 1962—and this is taking into account an order last week for $21 million of new cars.

THE LONG WAIT

If the mills are unhappy about the boxcar shortage, so, too, are the lumber buyers. "We've had to wait up to 40 days for some shipments" of items usually available in 10 days, say a big west coast wholesaler who has been besieged by unhappy customers. Adds a Cleveland lumber dealer: "Ordinarily, we'd be buying up for the summer, but we're ordering what we need right now, because we can't expect delivery for any more than that."

While most users may not be strapped for immediate needs, many are feeling the impact of the tight supply in another way. And they are feeling it hard. Big eastern buyers now are paying about $80 a thousand board feet for green Douglas 2 by 4's, a key product. That's up $2 in just the past 2 weeks. All told, the price has risen about $12 since the end of February; it currently is near the record $85 hit during the Korean war, and is up from less than $65 a year ago.

The price of one-quarter-inch sanded interior-grade plywood has shot up to $84 a thousand square feet, up $2 in the past week and $12 since the end of February. This price, too, was less than $65 a year ago.

Forest products executives generally contend the prices will go a little higher before leveling off. "This market hasn't peaked yet; the pipeline is still being filled," asserts one plywood official. Says an Oregon lumberman: "Prices will go higher, then back off some, but probably will stabilize at a relatively high level."

WISCONSIN AND PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS OBJECT TO PROPOSED SCHOOL MILK CUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the letters protesting the administration's plans to cut the school milk program by 80 percent keep pouring in. This morning I would like to refer to letters I have received from the administrator of the Lancaster, Wis., community schools, Mr. Philip E. Myott and the director of cafeterias for the Abington Township, Pa., schools system, Mrs. Margaretta S. Plewes.

Mr. Myott writes that his district "goes in the red over $1,000 each month for food services." We are all aware of the tremendous financial burden school districts across the United States have to face. By further cutting funds for the school milk program, the administration is simply increasing the debt of schools like Mr. Myott's, who will have to take up the slack. Some schools simply will be unable to pay the increased costs. In these schools the school milk program will be virtually eliminated.

Mr. Myott goes on to say:

The school lunch and milk programs are so much a part of our school operation that they cannot be reduced or eliminated. Besides providing needed nutrition for many pupils, these programs are a continuing experience in proper diet, good manners, and social living.

It seems to me that Mr. Myott has raised a very significant point. The social living experience he refers to is most important insofar as the culturally deprived children from our Nation's slums are concerned. If the proposed milk slash goes into effect, these very children will be singled out as charity cases.

This point is effectively made by Mrs. Plewes when she states:

Although many details of the President's proposed Child Nutrition Act of 1966 have not been clarified, it appears that this act, if passed, may change the school lunch program into some form of child welfare program, which would be extremely difficult to administer on the local school level. It would remove much of our present support for the school lunch program.

Of course these remarks can and should also be applied to the school milk program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two letters I have referred to be printed in the RECORD.

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

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Joint Economic Committee,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: We sincerely appreciate your stand on the Children's Special Milk Act and hope that Senate 2921 will pass.

We would like to call your attention to the fact that there is also a danger that the President's program will severely mutilate the present school lunch program, which involves, as you know, support for a school lunch which includes milk.

It is our conviction that this lunch program has been an extremely effective program for the improvement of the nutrition of children. Although many details of the President's proposed Child Nutrition Act of 1966 have not been clarified, it appears that this act, if passed, may change the school lunch program into some form of child welfare program, which would be extremely difficult to administer on the local school level. It would remove much of our present support for the school lunch program and would have a serious effect on the lives of the children of this district, driving the cost of the school lunch higher than many could afford.

We urge your strong support of measures to continue the school lunch appropriations, at, or near, the level presently established. If they must be reduced we hope you will support a gradual reduction to be spread over the years rather than an abrupt deduction, such as is proposed by the President's message.

The school lunch program of this district alone involves over 500,000 dollars of childrens' money per year and we have operated without profit or loss. Any major change in the Federal aid would upset our entire lunch program.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARETTA S. PLEWES,
Director of Cafeterias.

LANCASTER COMMUNITY SCHOOLS,
Lancaster, Wis., March 25, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator from Wisconsin, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PROXMIRE: We have been informed that the administration's budget calls for a drastic reduction in appropriations for the school lunch and milk programs for the next school year.

We would urge that you support a budget that would increase such Federal aids instead of reducing them. Our district goes "in the red" over $1,000 each month for food services and we all realize that prices continue to rise.

The school lunch and milk programs are so much a part of our school operation that they cannot be reduced or eliminated. Besides providing needed nutrition for many pupils, these programs are a continuing experience in proper diet, good manners and social living.

We think it ridiculous that the administration try to save such a relatively small amount of money in this manner while it extends other aid programs in many directions.

Please do all you are able to see that food service aids are continued at existing levels. Better yet, an increase in these aids appears to be in order.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP E. MYOTT, *Administrator.*

JET SERVICE AT NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the Federal Aviation Agency and Gen. William F. McKee, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, should be commended for granting permission on April 24 to operate short- and medium-range jet aircrafts to and from Washington, D.C., and my home State of North Dakota.

The reduction in time between Minneapolis-St. Paul, Seattle-Tacoma brought about by this new service will be substantial. For example, a Northwest Orient Airlines fan jet will leave Washington National Airport at 6:55 p.m. and arrive in the Twin Cities at 8:24 p.m., a nonstop flight flying time of 2 hours and 29 minutes. This compares to the present fastest flying time on Northwest Airlines of 3 hours and 13 minutes, a saving of 44 minutes. This same flight departing Washington National Airport at 6:55 p.m. will continue on to Seattle, arriving at 10:15 p.m., and Portland, arriving at 11:32 p.m. The elapsed time to Seattle from National Airport will be 6 hours and 20 minutes, a saving of 2 hours from the previous fastest schedule from Washington National Airport, and 10 minutes faster than previous jet service from Baltimore Friendship Airport.

The Federal Aviation Agency in making this move assures the public the benefit of jet service from Washington's close-in airport a distance from downtown of only 4½ miles.

Last year, 7 million people used Washington National Airport, and it is expected that as more jet service becomes available, the airport will serve 8.7 million passengers in 1970.

I salute the progress made possible by the Federal Aviation Agency.

INDIA AND THE CONTAINMENT OF CHINA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of our most pressing problems today is the formulation of potentially effective foreign policy alternatives in Asia. Whatever course we eventually decide upon, it must be coordinated with the policies of our allies. Joseph Kraft is an able and thoughtful correspondent, and in this morning's Washington Post he has a very stimulating column on Indian views toward the containment of China. Since India is one of the most stable democracies in Asia, and since it is the only major Asian nation directly embroiled with China, I feel our interests are similar and their views may have considerable relevance to our own. I strongly recommend Mr. Kraft's column.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONTAINING CHINA

(By Joseph Kraft)

NEW DELHI.—For better or worse, the effort to contain China through a network of midget dictatorships backed by the 7th Fleet is crumbling. What new security system for Asia can take its place?

India affords a good measure of the possibilities. She is, after China, the second largest and most populous state in the world. She is the only major Asian nation directly embroiled with Peking. A security system that does not enlist the cooperation of India is a security system unlikely to work.

The first element of a system that can elicit Indian cooperation is that the military component be rather small. This is not because India is still mesmerized by the Gandhi-Nehru doctrines of nonviolence. On the contrary, the army is extremely popular here; there is a growing defense industry and, considering the past, a surprisingly active discussion of security problems. Right now, India would like more weapons for defense against China.

But India would prefer not to have the additional weapons if the price were more arms for Pakistan. For the basic Indian strategy—the strategy used successfully in the past against Pakistan and planned for the future against an enemy—is to get him hopelessly bogged down in the trackless Indian countryside.

India's most successful commander, Gen. J. N. Chaudhuri, chief of the army general staff, is a soldier in the mold of Fabius Cunctator, the famous Roman practitioner of gradual attrition tactics who gave Fabian socialism its name. General Chaudhuri believes that, even if the Chinese penetrated hundreds of miles through the northeast frontier and Assam, "we would eventually break their heads."

For him, in other words, space is more important than military weapons. Indeed, because of the space problem he does not really believe that the Chinese have ever attempted or are likely to attempt the conquest of India. "Nobody can capture India," he says. "It is too darned big."

Along with deemphasis on the purely military, there goes an emphasis on entente with foreign powers. As main security against China, India looks quite openly to parallel action by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Indians expect that Washington and Moscow would apply strong pressures against Peking if the Chinese put new military pressure on India. They expect that American and Soviet nuclear power would be cast in the balance against Chinese nuclear power—which is one reason there is little pressure here for India to build or acquire her own nuclear weapons. As General Chaudhuri has repeatedly put it: "Nonalignment is a good policy provided that in a pinch you have strong allies."

A third element in the Indian strategic outlook is a play-it-by-ear approach to the problems of China's tiny neighbors. Given the internal weaknesses of Burma and Nepal, for example, India goes along with their efforts to fend off China by making concessions. Given the internal cohesion of Thailand, Delhi also approves Bangkok's moves to take arms against subversion supported by the Chinese.

With respect to Vietnam, I have yet to meet an Indian who believes that anything decisive is going to happen there. Both in political and military circles, the prevailing view is that Asian security would best be served by a local political agreement guaranteed by the great powers.

A period of extreme tension is a period of transition. Indians think that changes in Chinese leadership will probably bring a toning down of the Chinese militancy. While even then they see problems with China, the belief is that, with a more conciliatory stance in Peking, an Asian balance could eventually be struck. To that end the Indians are slowly beginning to knit up relations with other large Asian countries—notably Japan and Australia.

The views that I have been describing are, of course, Indian views. They are not necessarily right. They are necessarily colored by India's interests. Even allowing for the bias, however, they have for me a wider significance. They represent the seeds of a general strategy, the pieces from which, with help in Washington, there can be constructed a new model Asian security system.

CONTAINMENT NOT ISOLATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, those persons privileged to hear Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY's lucid and constructive discussion of our Vietnam involvement on the "Meet the Press" television program on March 13 found his exposition of U.S. policy toward Red China greatly impressive.

Believing that his remarks on the American presence in southeast Asia are deserving of the widest possible circulation, I have secured a copy of that televised press conference.

I ask unanimous consent that this document be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MEET THE PRESS

Mr. SPIVAK. Our guest today on this 1-hour special edition of "Meet the Press" is the Vice President of the United States, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Interviewing the Vice President are eight of the leading publishers and editors from across the country.

John S. Knight, publisher and editor of the Knight Newspapers.

Otis Chandler, publisher of the Los Angeles Times.

Turner Catledge, executive editor of the New York Times.

John Cowles, Jr., editor of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune.

Robert Lasch, editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Post Dispatch.

J. R. Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post.

Barry Bingham, publisher and editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times.

James A. Linen, president of Time, Inc.

We will begin the questioning now with John Knight of the Knight Newspapers.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Vice President, despite all of the millions of words about Vietnam, the editorial opinion, background, interpretation and even the Fulbright hearings, the

American public is still divided and confused as to our ultimate aims and objectives.

Could you tell us what our national purpose is?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Knight, I am not at all convinced that the American public is confused, but if there is some confusion, then it is, I think, the privilege and the duty of all of us to try to clarify it and to clean away the confusion.

Our purpose is to prevent the success of aggression against South Vietnam from the North. Our political objective is to help secure, with the Vietnamese, their freedom and their independence, so that they may exercise the right of self-determination.

Along with that objective is the helping of the people of South Vietnam to build a new social order, a viable economy with stable governmental institutions.

Of course, in order to achieve these goals and objectives, it is essential that there be peace, so the highest purpose of our national effort in Vietnam is to obtain peace, at least the conditions of peace that make possible the achievement of self-determination, social progress and a better society for those people.

Mr. KNIGHT. By peace and since you rule out dealing with the Vietcong, are you saying in effect that what the purpose is is total victory?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Knight, the word victory is often used—and if by victory you mean to thwart or prevent the success of aggression against the South—yes, we mean that kind of victory, but we do not mean to conquer or to dominate any other state or to destroy any other regime. We do not seek to invade North Vietnam nor do we seek to have confrontation or war with any other powers.

What we are seeking, sir, is a conference, negotiation that can lead to the conditions that can produce peace. This necessitates—one of the conditions, I would hope, would be a cease-fire.

I am sure that if we can get any response at all from Hanoi that indicates a desire for peace that this Government is prepared as of this hour to sit down and to negotiate the conditions that make possible peace.

May I add one final word about the Vietcong. It has never been ruled out that the views of, or the words of, or the representation of the Vietcong would not be at that conference table. It has been said by the President of the United States that this was not an insurmountable obstacle. It is not a difficulty that cannot be handled, if we ever get the opportunity for negotiation.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Vice President, you said Friday, and I believe the administration has stated this on several occasions, that we will abide by the results of a free election in South Vietnam. If the Communists were to win such an election, would this not mean that we have lost many American lives for nothing?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Chandler, we are all students of history, and I must rely upon the lessons of history and the facts of history. The Communists have never won a free election, and I have no reason to believe, nor do I think you have any reason to believe, that the Communists would win a genuinely free election in South Vietnam. This is a risk, but let me tell you, if you never have to take a bigger risk in your life than this, Mr. Chandler, you are going to have a life of happiness, tranquillity, and security.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Vice President, assuming you are correct in this supposition, how effective now is Premier Ky's government in winning a political war in South Vietnam in terms of influencing the peasants and the farmers toward Prime Minister Ky's point of view and against the Communist point of view?

Vice President HUMPHREY. I am very pleased, Mr. Chandler, that you emphasized the political struggle, because this is a two-front struggle and war in Vietnam. One is the struggle on the military front to provide security and to prevent the success of aggression. And an equally important and maybe even more important ultimately, struggle or war is the one against social misery, the struggle to build a better society. This is what Prime Minister Ky referred to when he talked about the social revolution that was needed for his country.

He said to me—and I think you would be interested in his words, because I put pretty much the same question to him that you put to me. I had a long visit with him from Honolulu to Saigon, and that takes a few hours even by jet, and he said to me, "Mr. Vice President, I know we are 12 years late in getting underway with these reforms, but we are not too late." And I believe that the Government of South Vietnam is really exerting itself now to gain the allegiance and the support of the peasantry, to create conditions that will improve the life of the peasant and the farmer in the rural areas.

This is essentially a rural economy, as you have well noted. And there are training programs underway for the political cadre that must go back into these countryside areas. I will add one final word on it: Since 1958, Mr. Chandler, it is estimated that the Vietcong has assassinated or kidnaped some 61,000 village leaders and governmental representatives. It is against this kind of background, may I say, that the struggle goes on in Vietnam today, to build a viable economy, to find a new way of life, and if this program permits us the time, I think I can show you that many things are underway that are very, very encouraging. And I only hope that this Government will continue in its stability so that we can continue with these efforts of reform.

Mr. CATLEDGE. Mr. Vice President, to what extent do you think China is involved in the present struggle in Vietnam?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Catledge, I think it is quite well recognized that China today is the main source of supply for the munitions, the small arms, the tube artillery, the shells, and so forth that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese use. China surely is an ideological source of irritation. She prods on Hanoi. I was informed in several capitals of Asia that as of this time it appears that Peking, China, the Communist regime, has the major influence in Hanoi. I am not at all sure that the Vietnamese, north or south, are always too happy about the presence of China in any area of Vietnam. They were ruled by the Chinese for about a thousand years, and the Chinese are not the most popular type of ruler. But there isn't any doubt that Communist China has a significant influence, at least behind the scenes and in the ideological struggle that is maintained.

Mr. CATLEDGE. Accepting your assessment of the situation insofar as it refers to China, do you think the struggle can be settled in Vietnam, north or south, just between us and Vietnam?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. CATLEDGE. Or must we confer also eventually with Peiping?

Vice President HUMPHREY. As to conference, sir, we have said that we are prepared, as you know, to enter into a Geneva Conference again, a Geneva-type conference which as I recollect, did include Peking, China, and the Soviet Union. Major powers are obviously involved in this struggle in Vietnam. Some indirectly, some directly.

We have said that we would go through the United Nations and that has been rejected. We have said that we would accept the offer of the 17 nonalined nations. Hanoi rejected that. We have said that we would accept the good offices of the Holy Father, the Pope. Hanoi has rejected that. We have said that we would accept the good offices of the President of India, President Radhakrishnan. Hanoi has rejected that. We have said we will go to a Geneva-type conference. The Soviets have rejected that and so has China. But we are prepared to sit down with anybody that wants to sit down and try to find a peaceful solution to the struggle that is under way in Vietnam.

Mr. COWLES. Mr. Vice President, at our current level of operations in South Vietnam, we are losing about 100 to 200 American lives per month, plus several hundred more wounded each week.

Are you concerned about the American people's willingness to continue tolerating this kind of casualty rate or possibly an even higher casualty rate for the next 6 months or 12 months or 18 months?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Cowles when anybody hears about fatalities or casualties, it makes you very sad. But the American people recognize that this Nation has a great responsibility in this world and that with responsibilities come sacrifices. I have never believed that a position of leadership gave you any privilege or any luxuries. Actually it imposes heavy demands and duties.

Our rate of casualties is, of course, always of concern, but I am happy to be able to tell you, sir, that, out of every 100 wounded, 99 live. This is the highest rate of survival of the wounded ever in the history of warfare. This is eight times better than in World War I, four times better than in World War II, twice as good as in the Korean war. What is more important, more men do get into the hospitals, and they get there within 35 to 40 minutes to an hour which is a remarkable feat, may I say, of rescue, and the military service to our soldiers, to our defense forces is excellent.

We do feel that the rate of casualties upon the enemy is something that they ought to be concerned about, because that rate is running five to one, approximately five to one over that of the allies, fatalities and casualties. And may I say with casualties to the enemy, from what information we get, most of their wounded, severely wounded, die.

Mr. COWLES. To what extent do you think a continuation of our present policies in southeast Asia will influence next fall's congressional elections, and conversely, to what extent do you think the prospect of congressional elections next fall may influence the administration's own policies in southeast Asia?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Let me say first that this administration and any administration that is entrusted with the security of this Nation cannot let the political eye govern the decisions that must be made in reference to our national interest and our national security.

One of the prices that you pay in public office as an elected official is the risk of making decisions at times that are rather unpopular.

I happen to believe, that the American people understand what this struggle is about. They understand that we are not fighting just for a piece of geography. They understand that we are fighting for a principle: namely, that aggression cannot go unchecked.

We have learned some lessons in the last 25 and 30 years about aggressors, and we do not believe that the principle of aggression should be embodied into international conduct as a way and a means of gaining political power or national political objectives.

I have a lot of faith in the American people. They are a mature people, and they are an understanding people, and the forces that we have in Vietnam today manifest that. They reveal that. These are the finest fighting men that we have ever put into the field. They do their job. They are brave, they are courageous, they are able, they are efficient, and they understand what they are there for.

I think that is a reflection of the American body politic.

Mr. LASCH. Mr. Vice President, I would like to get back to the subject of negotiations. You have had a good deal to say about what Hanoi has rejected. This week the Secretary General of the United Nations said that if we are going to have any movement toward negotiations, three things must happen:

1. The cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam;

2. A substantial reduction by all parties of all military activities in South Vietnam; and

3. The participation of the National Liberation Front in any peaceful settlement.

I don't know how Hanoi feels about any of these propositions, but I would like very much to know in detail how our Government feels about it.

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Lasch, our Government has said that the four points of Hanoi, the 14 points of the United States in terms of peaceful negotiations, the 5 of South Vietnam, and 25 or 30 of anybody else, all of these can be placed on the table. Everything is negotiable, but before you can talk negotiations, Mr. Lasch, you have to have somebody to negotiate with.

Everybody seems to be telling us the kind of concessions that we ought to make to Hanoi in order to get to the conference table. Has anybody said anything to Hanoi about the kind of concessions they ought to make, since they are the aggressor?

What we have said is, we are prepared to come to the conference table with no preconditions: unconditional negotiations, sir.

We are prepared at this moment to accept a cease fire. We are prepared at this moment, if the North Vietnamese will quit bombing the South, we are prepared to quit bombing the North, but you cannot, my good friend, place upon the South Vietnamese and the Americans the onus of something that is not of their making. We didn't start this struggle. We did not aggress against North Vietnam. We did not send our bombers against North Vietnam until full regiments of the North Vietnamese forces were in the South, until it was recognized in every chancellery and every embassy around the world that the North Vietnamese had committed an act of aggression.

Any time that the North Vietnamese wish to come to a conference table, Mr. Lasch—and if anybody knows how they can get them there; we have tried every way we know—we are prepared to talk about every single subject that can be conceived by the mind of man.

Mr. LASCH. What I had in mind, Mr. Vice President, was this: In our resolution which Ambassador Goldberg presented, which is now, of course, I presume a dead letter, but in any case the resolution he asked the Security Council to adopt called upon U Thant, the Secretary General, to offer his assistance as far as possible in bringing about negotiations. He has now made an offer of assistance, as it seems to him, of how to bring them about, and I don't believe our—do we simply flatly reject these proposals of his?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Lasch, we had 37 days of no bombing, total pause, deescalation of the war during that 37 days. During those 37 days the North Vietnamese proceeded to move more troops into Laos—which is a fact—proceeded to move more troops into South Vietnam, proceeded to repair the roads and the rails so that they could continue to move additional supplies into South Vietnam.

We already have accommodated point No. 1, and we didn't even get a feeler from Hanoi. I thought possibly that Hanoi, during those 37 days, might, as we put it, try to confuse the situation by indicating through some third party or directly that maybe they would like to negotiate—which obviously would have kept the bombing pause going. Instead of that, we got an arrogant defiance, and Mr. Lasch, in all kindness and goodness, may I just say that I think it is about time that leaders in the world tried to bring a little pressure to bear upon Hanoi as to what Hanoi is willing to do.

I remember my visit with Mr. Kosygin in New Delhi, and I have had the privilege of talking now with the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union.

We have gone to the Soviet Union and asked them to help us. We have been to India. We have been in contact with the Vietcong. We are in contact with Hanoi—if not directly, through third parties—and directly, may I add. And what did Mr. Kosygin tell me about the possibilities of peace in South Vietnam?

He never mentioned the National Liberation Front. He never mentioned the Vietcong.

I don't believe that he really ever thought they amounted to anything. He said, "You will have to negotiate this with Hanoi."

Hanoi—all of the talk about the NLF, and the Vietcong seems to have a particular American tinge to it. When you get into the councils of other nations, they talk about Hanoi. I think they are a little bit more realistic than we are.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Vice President, if we ever do have any negotiations or truce, what sort of interim arrangements do you think would be acceptable to us, pending preparations for a free election?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Wiggins, I think the one great disservice that the Vice President of the United States could do would be to try to describe what might come as an interim government or an interim solution.

I will say this, that we are prepared to sit down and discuss that formulation of such an interim government, but we are going to do it with South Vietnam being represented there. It is their country. The war is being fought in their country, and I would admonish my fellow Americans not to make this an American war. We are an ally. We are not in charge of South Vietnam. The South Vietnamese have a government. They have been there a long time. This is a very fine people, and I do believe that we ought constantly to keep in mind their wishes, as well as our own.

Needless to say, if we go to the conference table, we will speak up—and we want peace. We want it with all of our heart, but we do not want peace, Mr. Wiggins, at the price of appeasement and at the price of a loss of principle. We have learned that lesson, and I hope that no generation of Americans will ever again have to learn it once again.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Vice President, you have spoken personally and for the Government very strongly about reconstruction and social change and political improvement, but can we carry out a very large program of development and social improvement and economic reorganization with the sort of military tactics we are now pursuing? Aren't we going to be required, instead of striking and withdrawing from villages and rural areas, to take and hold areas so that we can provide the people with safety and security behind our own lines?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Wiggins, when I returned from my trip to the Far East, I said I had reasons to feel encouraged about the situation—the military situation—in South Vietnam, and one of the reasons was because we have a plan of action.

We are, in a sense, moving on a premeditated, preconceived plan, week by week and month by month. We are on the offensive, and that plan includes not merely military successes, it includes, if you please, the holding of the areas that have been cleaned of the Vietcong. At the same time, it includes working with the South Vietnamese, and through the South Vietnamese, the rebuilding of the countryside.

This is going to be a slow process, at least for the immediate future, but we are not just going in and having a battle over a village and then retreating. We had to do some of that last year in order to contact the Vietcong, but the Vietcong is on the defensive today, and the villagers are beginning to cooperate much more with the forces of South Vietnam. They are not so frightened. The impact of terror and fear from the Vietcong is less meaningful today.

I think the most encouraging sign in South Vietnam right now is the fact that we are getting information from the villagers, that the villagers are cooperating with the allied forces and that the representatives of the government of Saigon are also receiving cooperation.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Vice President, when you were in Asia recently, did you hear any discussion or did you find any enthusiasm for the development of the Mekong River valley along the lines of the TVA development?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Bingham, this is the hope and the dream of the people of that entire area. I am very pleased you have asked about it, because most of the time when we talk about southeast Asia, we are talking about killing and fighting and war. When I was there the one thing I tried to stress was that I didn't come there as a military expert, but I did come there to try to effectuate, at least in the beginning stages, some of the dreams and the plans of the Mekong River development, the valley, the Mekong valley regional development and the Honolulu declaration.

I said, "I come here to speak to you about the President's commitment under the Baltimore speech," where we pledged not only aid to the South but to the North in the development of the Mekong. I said, "I come to you to talk about the new social development, the social revolution that Prime Minister Ky and President Johnson pledged themselves to at Honolulu."

I went into the Mekong Valley, by the way. I made it my business to do so. I went to see some of the projects under way, and I can only say this, that if the Pathet Lao in Laos can occupy the banks of the Mekong backed up by the North Vietnamese forces—Pathet Lao being the Communist forces there—and if the Thais lose out in Northeast Thailand, there will be no Mekong River development.

One of the real important objectives in this struggle in South Vietnam is to permit the social-economic development along TVA lines of the Mekong River. It will do wonders for the people, but it can't come unless there is peace.

Mr. BINGHAM. Sir, you were the originator of the Peace Corps idea. I wonder if you foresee in the future some usefulness for that type of American operation in Vietnam?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Yes, at another date. I think it would be not advisable right now to put the Peace Corps into South Vietnam because of the terrible political disturbances and military disturbances there, but the International Voluntary Service is there; the IVS is doing a remarkable job. I visited with the International Voluntary Service. Mr. Gardner, our former AID Director, is the head man there, an American doing a fine job. Some graduates of the Peace Corps are there working with them. And another thing, Mr. Bingham, over 5,000 young students of the universities in Vietnam last summer went to the villages in the Vietnamese's own Peace Corps program. We don't hear much about this. They went on what they call their summer work project, and it worked out so well, sir, that it is now a national program, and I witnessed it at work. I saw it in district 8 in the slums and suburbs of Saigon, and they are doing fine work.

Mr. LINEN. Mr. Vice President, you visited several other capitals on this recent trip of yours, and it is often said in Asia that the arguments going on in the United States tend to confuse Asians about our intent. Did you find that to be true?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Yes, in some instances I did, Mr. Linen. Asians do not always fully understand our mores, our culture, our governmental procedures, our constitutional procedures, just as we, I might say, fail to undertsand many things that they believe in as a part of their pattern of life.

But I do believe that in the main the leaders of government now know that we have the will, that we have the determination, that we have the resources to stick it out, as we say. There is a great deal of emphasis given, of course, by Communist propaganda to the dissent that takes place in our country.

But let me make it quite clear, I told the leaders in two or three nations that one of the reasons we were in South Vietnam was to afford the people of South Vietnam the right of dissent, the right of freedom of choice. Dissent is a part of our way of life. I am not advocating that everybody should dissent, but if you have a different point of view, you ought to be able to state it.

Mr. LINEN. Mr. Vice President, seemingly the Chinese Communist's foreign policy has been suffering several setbacks. Did you hear anything in the neighboring capitals about the situation in Indonesia?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Of course I heard, Mr. Linen, about matters in Indonesia. Everyone in Asia was interested. Everyone was wondering what the developments would be. I was very circumspect in my remarks. In Indonesia there is a genuine local struggle for power going on. There isn't an outside force of aggression as such, even though the Chinese Communists' political apparatus had been at work in Indonesia for some time. But this is a struggle within the country, as compared, may I say, or as contrasted to what you see in Vietnam, where you have open aggression from another country moving into South Vietnam trying to overthrow a regime and to change a way of life.

I would only say that we are watching very carefully what happens in Indonesia.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Vice President, am I to understand from what you said a little while ago that the United States and South Vietnam would be ready to stop shooting in Vietnam, with or without negotiations, with or without agreements, if the enemy also stopped?

Vice President HUMPHREY. I think it is fair to say if the North Vietnamese and their agents, the National Liberation Front, the Vietcong, would cease its military operations—in other words cease-fire and come to the conference table—that this would be a proposition that would meet with genuine acceptance in the United States.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Vice President, in discussing aims and objectives of Vietnam you did not discuss one point. The United Press reported the other day that you told Senator CLIFFORD CASE that our real objective was the containment of Red China. If this report is accurate, could you say whether this is really our objective, and how could this be brought about?

Vice President HUMPHREY. It is my view that Communist China today is the militant aggressive force in large areas of Asia and that she is using some of this militancy through her agent in North Vietnam into South Vietnam.

I do believe that containment of aggressive militancy of China is a worthy objective, but containment without necessarily isolation. Containment of its militancy, of its military power, just as we had to do in the postwar years in Europe, relating to the Soviet Union. But at the same time not trying to isolate from the family of mankind.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Vice President, my question was, was it accurate for the United Press to say that you felt the containment of Red China was our real objective and, secondly, since the Defense Secretary says they already have nuclear capacity within a range of 500 to 700 miles and it will be much longer as years go on, how do you contain a power like that without getting into direct conflict?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Knight, first of all, our immediate objective, as I indicated to you, is to prevent the success of aggression on South Vietnam.

It is our view that North Vietnam is acting with the support and the assistance of China, that China has shown—that is, Communist China—aggressive militancy against India, against Tibet, and surely against—in South Vietnam.

Therefore, it is in the interests of international paece that China be brought to understand that aggression is not a policy that can be pursued, that it is a dangerous policy in this nuclear age.

We have, of course, exercised a policy of containment and restraint on the Soviet Union in the past, and she had nuclear capacity far beyond anything that China has today. The Soviet Union is a powerful nation, and I am happy to say that that program of responsible containment, the building of collective security in the West, but at the same time a probing and trying to find ways of communication has been relatively successful, and I think it is in our interest and in the interest of humanity that the same kind of approach be exercised in Asia where Communist China today shows not only militancy against the West and against her neighbors, but also against the Soviet Union, sir.

Mr. KNIGHT. Then you are saying, in effect, sir, that the United States is prepared for this kind of a confrontation with Red China if required?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Every decision that this Nation has had to make in recent years has been one that carried with it terrible risks. When we faced up to the Russians in Berlin, there was always the risk that it might explode into a terrible war, When we faced up to the Russians in Iran immediately after World War II and asked them to get their forces out, there was a risk. When we aided the Greeks in the Greek civil war, there was a risk of a confrontation, once again, with the Soviet Union.

And surely in the Cuban missile crisis we were right, mighty close to terribly, terribly destructive war.

Unless the Communist leaders believe that we mean what we say—I think the worst thing this Nation could do for humanity would be to leave any uncertainty as to our will, our purpose, and our capacity to carry out our purpose.

This is why I believe that you resist little aggressions before they break out into massive confrontations. We seek no confrontation with China or with Russia.

Mr. KNIGHT. But you would accept it?

Vice President HUMPHREY. These are not choices that we make. They are sometimes forced upon us. Pray God that the choice never has to be made.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Vice President, last Saturday, one of our top military leaders, U.S. Combat Brig. Gen. Ellis Williamson, reported to President Johnson at the L.B.J. ranch that we can win the war.

Now, this, to me, would apparently mean that he feels that we can push the forces from the north back across their border and that we can occupy almost the whole of South Vietnam and hold it until the end of hostilities take place.

Are we prepared to make that commitment now, which would seem to be a very long-term commitment, and if we are prepared to make it, how long in your opinion will this take?

Vice President HUMPHREY. I had the privilege of visiting with General Williamson. He was with the President yesterday when the President and members of the Cabinet—Secretary Rusk, Secretary McNamara, myself and others—General Taylor—met with the Governors, and General Williamson gave a full report. I was so pleased to hear what he had to say, because I had never talked to General Williamson on my visit to Vietnam, but I came back with the same conclusions. His conclusions or his observations were namely these, that things were better militarily; that we did have a plan of operation which we were following, as I said a moment ago; that the villagers were now cooperating with the Government forces, that is, with Saigon and with the allied forces; that the rate of defection among the Vietcong was running at over 2,000 a month; that we were being able to break into the strongholds, the military strongholds of the Vietcong; we were defeating their main units, and what he is simply saying is, if we stick with it, sir, we will have to do less of what some people think we might have to do because we have it coming with us now. But we are prepared to do what is necessary, Mr. Chandler, to prevent the success of aggression. I think the American people must know that, and I think they do.

Mr. CHANDLER. Turning to another question again, Mr. Vice President, regarding the criticism in this country of the administration's conduct of the war and the impact of that in Asia, specifically, is this criticism of the administration's conduct of the war hurting our efforts to hold the Ky regime intact?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Not as long as the Government of the United States continues to express its faith and confidence, I would say. Let me add one other thing, Mr. Chandler. I traveled in nine Asian countries on my recent journey. Several of them had some differences of view as to whether we were pursuing the tactical, the right tactical course. But I didn't find one single country that felt that we ought to be out of South Vietnam or that really contested our purpose in Vietnam. And I found every one of them knew that the blame for failure to achieve peace was on Hanoi and Peking.

Mr. CATLEDGE. Mr. Vice President, one of the spillovers out of the discussion of the situation that we are involved in in southeast Asia involves considerable speculation as to the political future of some people whom the American people might want to call to higher duty sometime, including yourself.

A basis for this speculation, some of it, is in an unhappiness felt by some of your present or former—especially former—spiritual kinfolk, that you had left the family circle and had gone off after some sort of political security.

I wonder how you feel about that, if there is any basis, or how do you feel that this speculation originates, and is there any basis for it?

Vice President HUMPHREY. My good friend—I am not at all sure, Mr. Catledge, who has left any family circle. I feel very "family" and very much a family man, but let me make it quite clear that on matters of national security there is no room for basic partisanship. That is No. 1. We need to think as Americans. We may have different points of view, but we ought not to think as partisans, and I don't believe we do. I think it is very encouraging to see the tremendous support that comes from the Republican Party for the President, and may I say from the Democratic Party, too.

I am of the opinion that much of the noise of criticism is limited to a few articulate voices.

The quantity is not always fully described by the velocity or by the vehemence of the outcry.

As far as my political future is concerned, I have never really been able to plan it very well, Mr. Catledge, and I am not going to spend much time doing it. Not at the expense, may I say, of national security; not at the expense of the life of our people or the honor or integrity of our country and its commitments. I haven't the slightest idea whether what I am doing is helpful to me or not, but I think that what I am doing is the right thing to do, and I have been brought up to believe that when you are in a position of responsibility, you had better do what is right. I have sat in on the councils of this government; I have studied long and hard the situation in southeast Asia, and I believe we are following the right course.

I was one who thought we ought to have international responsibility in Europe. I believe in collective security. I believe that we need to learn how to have the free nations of the world stand together to prevent totalitarian power from consuming other nations, large and small, and if the principle of collective security is good for Europe, Mr. Catledge, it is good for Asia, for the brown and the yellow people of Asia and not just the white people of Europe, and I think it is just about time we said so.

Mr. CATLEDGE. Back to the matter of the job you are doing, which some people say is more than being a good soldier, I have seen it expressed that you are a recruiting sergeant. In your recruitment of support over the world let me ask you this question very frankly: Did you find in any government anywhere a great enthusiasm for the American policy in southeast Asia?

Vice President HUMPHREY. I found in every government everywhere a deep concern lest we withdraw.

Mr. CATLEDGE. My question was "enthusiasm."

Vice President HUMPHREY. May I say that other governments have their own problems. but I can assure you that those allies that are with us there understand that we are there for the right purposes, and I didn't find a single government that was critical of our presence there, and when you talk privately to government officers, Mr. Catledge, they will tell you very candidly, very frankly, that there is a danger of aggression in Asia and that that aggression needs to be checked.

Some of them feel that the aggression comes from other sources. When I am in Pakistan, for example, our friends in Pakistan were concerned about the matter of the power of India.

And, when you are in India, they are concerned about the power of two or three countries, including Communist China. But I didn't find anybody in Asia that thought we ought not to be doing what we are doing in southeast Asia.

Mr. COWLES. Mr. Vice President, I'd like to ask about China and the United Nations. There seems to me to be a perhaps new or revitalized line of thought growing, which is that our firm position in southeast Asia may for the first time make it possible for the administration and any U.S. administration, both in terms of domestic politics and in terms of its effect on the overseas Chinese and other countries in Asia—for the United States to begin to reduce, if not eliminate, its opposition to the admission of China to the United Nations.

A few moments ago you referred to the isolation of China as being very undesirable, from the world. Would you care to comment on this matter of admitting China to the UN?

Vice President HUMPHREY. One of the most fruitful procedures underway in this government are the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Asia and China. I think that the American people know far too little about Asia and the countries of Asia. They are all very different, and we need to know much more about them. We are a European-oriented society, and so is our educational structure. We need much more going on in our universities and institutes on China and on Asia.

Our problem with China is not of our own making. We have had over 120 meetings with representatives of Communist China. One is taking place next week again in Warsaw, and those meetings start out just this way, whenever we seek to have any broader contacts or discuss any matter of mutual concern, the first thing that the Chinese representatives says is, "You must yield"—what he says is Formosa, and what we call the Republic of China—"You must give us that, and if you are not willing to give over the 10 or 11 million people who are in the Republic of China to the Communists,"—if we are not willing to do that, they won't talk.

I think Dr. Fairbank made it quite clear before the Foreign Relations Committee that China has a position of isolating itself. We have only recently—the President has said scholars should travel there, journalists can travel there, doctors can travel there. We have tried upon several occasions to break into China for the purpose of the visitation with people—people-to-people. This is the beginning. It could be the beginning of a much better relationship. I am afraid that we are going to have to wait until the men of the Long March, of the Mao generation, are out of positions of leadership. But in the meantime we ought to maintain as best we can a spirit of friendship toward the Chinese people, but recognizing what the regime is and making that regime understand they can not achieve their purposes by military power.

Mr. COWLES. I am not trying to lead you into unwise speculation, sir, but can you imagine circumstances wherein Red China may be admitted to the—might be admitted to the United Nations within the next 3, 4, 5 years?

Vice President HUMPHREY. That is very difficult for me to conjecture about. China today still stands branded as the aggressor by the United Nations in Korea. China has never asked to be admitted to the United Nations. She has suggested several revisions of the U.N. Charter. So maybe we ought to get the picture of China in proper perspective. We are always worrying about that she is not in; she doesn't worry about it at all. I have a feeling that she has some things she'd like to do before she comes into the family of responsible nations, and she is busily engaged in doing some of those things. She as yet has not made formal application, and even when some others have applied for her, she has rebuked them.

Mr. LASCH. Mr. Vice President, I'd like to ask about something you have had a good deal to say about lately, some rather hard words about the possibility of a coalition government as one element in an ultimate settlement.

Isn't this substantially what we have done and are doing in the Dominican Republic? We had a civil struggle, we have an interim government which is supposed to represent and be tolerable to both sides, while preparations are made for an internationally supervised election. What is the objection in principle to doing in southeast Asia what it seems to me we are doing in our own backyard?

Vice President HUMPHREY. There is a great deal of difference, Mr. Lasch. I doubt that anyone in this country would have any objection to a government in South Vietnam that included the Buddhists and the Catholics and the trade union leaders and the peasants and so forth. Just as in the Dominican Republic you have many elements in that government, but not the Communists.

When you are talking about a coalition government, we have a coalition government in Italy between the Christian Democrats and the Social Democrats. But not between the Christian Democrats and the Communists. And we are talking about whether or not—the discussion was whether or not the Vietcong, sir, the Communists, should be a part of a coalition government, at our insistence, I just—in all due respect, sir, I can't imagine that we would insist that we fasten upon the people of South Vietnam the enemy which has been the terror of the countryside.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Vice President, I wonder if you could say anything about our outlook in Thailand?

Vice President HUMPHREY. The Thais are deeply concerned. They feel themselves also, now, the victims of subversion, infiltration, and there have been regular units, by the way, of the North Vietnamese forces who have gone into northeast Thailand. I think, however, the Thais are aware of it, and they are taking preventive action. They are doing a job, may I say, on their accelerated agricultural development. I believe the situation can be managed in Thailand.

Mr. BINGHAM. Sir, in view of our heavy financial commitments in Asia, do you see any hope of real progress in some of the wars we are carrying on here in our own country, such as the war on urban blight?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Bingham, I noted yesterday in a discussion that we had, that the percentage of our gross national product that is now dedicated to defense, including the war in South Vietnam, is 7.6. That is the same as it was a year ago, and it is just one-tenth of 1 percent more than it was 2 years ago.

Our gross national product continues to go up, and we have put in more money, may I say, into the programs of the Great Society.

We are hopeful that there can be some deescalation of this struggle. We are hopeful that we can get peace in Vietnam and if we can, we are prepared to make the budgetary adjustments that will advance what I think both you and I are very much concerned in, the war on poverty, our programs in education, health, and our urban blight—programs to eliminate urban blight.

Mr. LINEN. Mr. Vice President, you are one of the few statesmen of the world who has seen General de Gaulle lately. Would you care to comment on his current attitude toward NATO?

Vice President HUMPHREY. This attitude expressed by General de Gaulle, I think, is one surely within his general expression of attitude over the many years. He believes in an independent France; he believes in an independent course of action for France.

He wants total protection without total involvement. Actually I regret this, because I think we have learned that collective security is absolutely essential if we are going to bargain with the nations of the Soviet bloc and if we are going to make a better world out of this, and to prevent aggression.

General de Gaulle seeks to go back to what I call the period of 1914, the kind of bilateral arrangements that led us through this unbelievable period of turmoil and tension and, ultimately, destruction from 1914 up through World War II.

I don't think we ought to return to that, sir, and I don't think we will.

The argument that is going on today is not between De Gaulle and the United States, it is between General de Gaulle and the other 14 members of NATO. We are all partners in this, and I think we ought to keep that in mind. Let's not make this a personal argument.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Vice President, I'd like to come back to Vietnam and ask you a question about the Saigon government. As you know, there have been many reports that

the government in Saigon is dead set against peacetalks and any negotiations. Can you tell us what their position is on negotiations today? You have just come back from there.

Vice President HUMPHREY. Their position on negotiations is the same as the one expressed by the President of the United States. Prime Minister Ky, Chairman Thieu of the National Unity Council have agreed with our President that they are prepared to sit down at the conference table without any preconditions for unconditional negotiations.

Mr. LASCH. You mentioned the Cuban missile crisis and how important it was that we stood up there, and I agree with you that it was very important that we should and I am glad—I think we had to, and we did.

That brings up the question of the double standard of international conduct. That was a case where the Russians, after being contained by us for many years, decided to try a little containment on us, and we wouldn't stand for it, very rightly.

Aren't we applying a different standard of conduct to the Russians and the Chinese in their part of the world, to the one that we claim for ourselves in our part of the world?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Mr. Lasch, I didn't think that we needed any containment. We are not an aggressor. This Nation has given away hundreds of billions of dollars since World War II. We have had 167,000 casualties in the defense of other people's freedom. We have aggressed against no one.

There is a great deal of difference, I might add. What Mr. Khrushchev sought to do was to penetrate with the powerful new nuclear weapons system the Western Hemisphere, and we said no.

The only reason we are in Europe, Mr. Lasch, is because Europe was a target for Soviet ideological and military penetration some years back. I am happy to say that our relationships with the Soviet Union are much more stable and steady now, but I don't think we ought to kid ourselves for a single moment that the Soviet Union is anything but a Communist power.

Mr. SPIVAK. Gentlemen, we have less than 3 minutes.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Vice President, do you think a reasonable application of the Keynesian economic theories under which we have been operating now requires us to raise taxes?

Vice President HUMPHREY. If the costs of defense go up as the President has said, if the demands on our public revenues are larger, then we will have to raise those revenues. We have no immediate plans of doing so. We keep a very close eye on the economy, not only in terms of revenues, but fiscal policies as a way and means of being able to curb inflationary pressures as well.

Mr. BINGHAM. Do you think, sir, that a frank discussion of foreign policy differences among the American people is of potential usefulness to the enemy?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Limited, if any. I think, Mr. Bingham, that we ought to just face up to the fact that we are a strong, mature nation. We have differences of view. As long as those differences are expressed responsibly and in the national interest.

I think there are times that certain more abrasive comments could be subdued, but all of us that have been in public life have been a little guilty upon occasion of being anything but sweet and charitable, and I suppose I stand guilty, myself.

Mr. LINEN. Mr. Vice President, is the Democratic Party in the fall congressional elections in trouble because of the war in South Vietnam?

Vice President HUMPHREY. I think not, not if the Democratic Party understands that the people of the United States are a strong people, that they are a patriotic people, they understand their international responsibilities. If some Democrats get themselves in trouble, it will be individual. I don't think it will be partywise——

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Vice President, as a longtime liberal with 100 percent ADA voting record, you have in recent years said some very kind things about business. Does this represent a change in your attitude?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Not at all. My father was a businessman. I grew up in a business family. I had business support when I was in Minneapolis as the mayor of the city. I believe in the free enterprise system. It works better than any other. As a matter of fact, I have never found anything quite equal to it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Vice President, when you were in Vietnam recently, were you satisfied with the lines of communication that have developed between our Government here in Washington and our military and civilian personnel?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Yes, sir. Much improved. Much, much better. I think that we are doing much better.

Mr. SPIVAK. I think, Mr. Vice President, that we have come pretty close to the end of our time. We wouldn't have time for another question and certainly not for another answer. I am sorry to interrupt, but our time is up.

Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for being with us today on "Meet the Press."

Our thanks also to our special panel of publishers and editors.

PERSECUTION OF SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Jews throughout the world are celebrating the festival of Passover. It is traditionally a joyous holiday—a holiday that marks the deliverance of the Jewish people from oppression.

At this season, however, our joy is marred. For we know that our happiness is not shared by the 3 million Jews of Russia who continue to live in a state of religious and cultural deprivation.

We have long realized that Soviet Jews are not allowed to live out their lives freely as Jews. They are forbidden schools and other institutions of Jewish learning and research.

They are forbidden the right to have a nationwide federation of congregation or of clergy, despite the fact that religious Jews earnestly long for contact with Jews elsewhere in the world.

They are forbidden the right to join their families in the United States, Israel and other countries.

And they are forbidden many other rights accorded to other minority groups in the Soviet Union.

As I have said on many occasions, the policy of the Soviet Government reduces Jews to second-class citizenship in the Soviet Union. It attempts to shatter and gradually eliminate Jewish historical consciousness and Jewish identity.

We are happy to learn of even the smallest improvements in the lives of Soviet Jews. A few more Yiddish books and a few public statements against anti-Semitism are welcome signs, indeed.

We must be hopeful. But we know that hope is no substitute for substantial concrete progress. Therefore, we will continue to protest Soviet policy, so long as injustices against Soviet Jews persist.

THE ROLE OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE IN WORLD TRADE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CARLSON, OF KANSAS

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the most able and respected Members of the Senate—Senator FRANK CARLSON—on March 24 made a speech before the Grain & Feed Dealers National Association in Chicago which I think will be of special interest to the Members of the Senate.

Through his long years of service as Governor, Congressman, and a Member of the Senate serving on such key committees as Foreign Relations and Finance, Senator CARLSON is an outstanding authority on such issues of the day as the war in Vietnam and international trade. With his background in agriculture, he is also a great authority on Public Law 480 and the effect that our present modern agriculture is having on both domestic and world problems.

This speech is thought provoking and full of good commonsense. It is an outstanding presentation of the role of American agriculture in world trade and the work being done to expand our trade in farm products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this speech by my friend from Kansas, Senator FRANK CARLSON, inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON BEFORE THE GRAIN & FEED DEALERS NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 24, 1966

Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct honor and privilege to meet with the officers and members of the National Association of Grain and Feed Dealers at its 70th annual convention.

Your organization has for 70 years been devoted to expanding and improving the marketing of farm products, with a goal of building a better and stronger agricultural industry.

American farmers and ranchers—together with those who deal with them—are the most efficient producers in the world. They have developed a facility to put research findings and technological improvements into practice on a sound basis. Their chief problem is markets and an opportunity to adjust their productive enterprise to the ever-changing market opportunities.

Agriculture's performance since World War II is most impressive. In the past 10 years the average annual increase in output per man-hour on the farm was three times the ratio of increase in nonfarm activities.

Today—and for the foreseeable future—our American family farm will be able to feed our people at home and make available increasing amounts of food and fiber for trade and aid and economic development around the world.

The most challenging crisis for the rest of this century will be the accelerating race between food and people. We are faced with the specter of widespread hunger and starvation on a scale the world has never before known unless we begin today to plan for tomorrow's food needs.

The nations of the earth must do more than they are now doing to meet future food demands or major starvation will be the

most painful fact of life on this planet within 10 years.

The production of food and fiber, their distribution and their marketing are immediate problems confronting our Nation in this period of confusion and uncertainty.

We are faced with what seems to be almost insurmountable problems—both domestic and international.

In Congress, we are wrestling with such domestic problems as taxes, deficit financing, balance of payments, inflation, international trade, civil rights, the Great Society, minimum wage, and reapportionment.

We also face international pressures and problems on every continent on the globe—Vietnam, Red China, India, Pakistan, the Congo, Rhodesia, Korea, NATO, the Alliance for Progress, Cuba, and Santo Domingo.

When you add to these the coming election, I can assure you the American people will not want for concern and action during 1966.

The issues in the campaign will be discussed with great fervor by both Republicans and Democrats. I think a statement made by the great American statesman, Chauncey Depew, illustrated what we may expect. During a political campaign, he told a Democrat colleague that if the Democrats would agree not to tell lies about the Republicans, the Republicans would agree not to tell the truth about the Democrats.

FOREIGN POLICY

Our foreign policy seems to be on dead center as to policy and, meanwhile events in most parts of the world have gone from bad to worse.

I contend we must stand first of all for a foreign policy that will serve the national interest. It might seems almost incredible that this should have to be repeated over and over again—and even defended against attack. For obviously, if any foreign policy does not serve our national interests, it must serve the interests of our enemies.

Secondly, and just as important, a successful foreign policy can only be a firm foreign policy. Never in the history of the world has any nation profited from weakness in its dealings with other nations. Never have wavering and uncertainty been of any benefit. Never have delay and refusing to face up to hard choices put off forever the day of reckoning.

Standing firm is the only foreign policy that works. It is the only foreign policy that can protect our interests, keep the peace, and give us any hope for ultimate triumph over the Communist empire. It is the only policy that the Communists understand.

While our immediate concern is our war in Vietnam, we cannot overlook or underestimate the conflict between India and Pakistan, the revolution in Indonesia, the Congo and Rhodesia in Africa, the general deterioration of NATO in Europe, unrest in Latin America, and, closer home, the festering sores in Cuba and Santo Domingo.

It cannot be said too often that the business of being a great world power is not easy. Great power involves greater responsibility and sometimes greater risks. This is especially true in an atomic age.

It is quite true that Americans want an end to the war. It is quite true that most of their friends around the world want it ended too—but it is not true that Americans and their friends could accept peace terms which would humiliate the United States and destroy South Vietnamese hopes for freedom.

In no modern war have Americans so heartily wished themselves out—but surrender is too high a price.

AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION

Our Nation is witnessing a revolution, the agricultural revolution, and it is having a great impact on our people. It is sweeping—with a quickening pace—throughout rural America.

This revolution has been going on during the past 50 or 75 years. It has paralleled the industrial revolution in its effectiveness. Nowhere else in the world is food production such an efficient process.

Were it not for this agricultural revolution, our phenomenal industrial progress of the 20th century would have been impossible.

We often regard the steel industry, the automobile industry, transportation, and public utilities as the largest employers of labor in our Nation's economy.

Farming employs 6 million workers—more than the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, the steel industry, and the automobile industry.

Agriculture's assets total $230 billion—equal to about two-thirds of the value of current assets of all corporations in the United States—or about half the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

The value of agriculture's production assets represents over $27,000 for each farm employee.

Modern agriculture is a creator of employment. Three out of every ten jobs in private employment are related to agriculture. Six million people have jobs providing the supplies farmers use for production and family living. Eight to ten million people have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products of agriculture.

I would like to discuss one crisis which I feel is kindred to the heart of every member of the National Association of Grain and Feed Dealers. It is the impending world crisis of mass starvation—a crisis which is coming about at such an amazing pace that our national attitude and agricultural policies which for 30 years have centered upon ways to deal with crop surpluses, must be abruptly and unmistakably changed.

Abundant evidence, supported by cold facts, undeniably points to a world calamity, the true impact and effects of which are terrifying to consider.

Much has been said and written criticizing crop surpluses, stored foods, and of the expenses involved, but today these stored farm foods are diminishing at a significant rate.

What is very realistic is that the wheat stocks of 1.4 billion bushels that we had at the beginning of this decade, have been curtailed to 800 million bushels today, and by June 30 could be as low as 550 million bushels.

Corn—as well as other feed grains—is barely adequate for 6 months' consumption in the United States alone.

Currently, we are paying farmers directly around $2 billion a year to produce less. Through various programs, we have idled some 50 million acres of land. Most of it could rapidly become croplands again if we stopped planning to produce less and gear toward producing more.

The United States must give immediate consideration to the release of several million acres for the production of food and fiber that are now held out of production through allotment acreage programs.

The diminished surpluses over the past 10 years—through the combined effects of land retirements, Government subsidies, and increasing agricultural exports—make more concentrated use of our farmland most imperative. Those big surpluses we have been hearing about for many years simply do not exist today.

I am fully aware of the possibility of increasing our surpluses to unmanageable proportions—but on the other hand we cannot take chances with our food reserve during present world conditions.

There are two international trade programs that are of vital importance to agriculture and to the members of the National Association of Grain and Feed Dealers—the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, universally known as Public Law 480, and the Kennedy round in our dealings with the European Economic Community.

It will be necessary for Congress to consider the renewal of Public Law 480 this year, as it will expire at the end of 1966.

Public Law 480 was enacted by Congress in 1954 and since that time has been used as a weapon to strengthen the free world and to advance the underdeveloped nations of the world along the path of economic and social betterment.

The benefits of Public Law 480 go far beyond the initial aims of surplus disposal and humanitarian feeding of the world's underprivileged. From a practical standpoint, it has played an important role in U.S. balance of payments by using the funds generated from the agricultural sales to offset the need for dollar expenditures in many fields of endeavor.

Public Law 480 can continue to play an increasingly vital role in U.S. foreign policy and further offset dollar expenditures.

It is estimated that this year we will export between 750 and 850 million bushels of wheat.

This program has also played an important role in developing many of our new commercial markets for grain.

If we should take away the export market that goes under special programs of Public Law 480, we would still be concerned about surpluses and decreasing acreage allotments.

The immensity of the Public Law 480 program can be realized when we observe that under this program, we have generated foreign currency equivalent to $9,403,200,000 as of June 30, 1964.

Of this amount $7,290,700,000 has been transferred to various governmental agencies for their use.

These funds are used in foreign countries for programs dealing with economic, market, educational and scientific development—payment of U.S. obligations, common defense, U.S. Government buildings, international fairs and exhibits, binational centers, and vocational rehabilitation.

Eleven different agencies of the U.S. Government have used Public Law 480 funds to carry out various programs which benefit both the United States and the free world.

Public Law 480 is now 11 years old and has demonstrated how American agricultural abundance can be used to feed the hungry while mobilizing resources within developing countries, in an effort to move these countries along the paths of freedom.

KENNEDY ROUND

In 1962 Congress passed what was known as the Trade Expansion Act, and the ministers of the countries belonging to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), met in May 1963 to launch the Kennedy round and decided that grains negotiations should be carried out by a special group aimed at negotiating a world grains arrangement.

This group comprises the principal countries—both importers and exporters—concerned with international trade in cereals. It has had a number of meetings. In May 1965 members exchanged their offers and ideas as to the shape the world grains arrangement should take.

Under the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962, two Members of the U.S. Senate and two Members of the House of Representatives participate in these negotiations. Senator RIBICOFF of Connecticut and I have been

appointed by the U.S. Senate to participate in these meetings.

Congressman CECIL KING of California and Congressman TOM CURTIS of Missouri represent the House. We attended earlier meetings at Geneva and expect to return this spring.

The Trade Expansion Act expires on June 30, 1967, and therefore, it is essential that every effort be made to complete these agreements between the European Economic Community and our Nation before that date.

This is a very tight schedule, however a workable one. It has particularly set a test of will for the European Economic Community itself. The six Common Market countries have a very short period in which to resolve their internal problems if they are to return to the negotiations at a meeting of the Kennedy round this spring.

Speaking at the National Convention of Wheat Growers at Lincoln, Nebr., on December 15, 1965, Irwin R. Hedges, agricultural trade specialist, stated:

"To summarize, a world grains arrangement must hinge on three principles realistically related to the world situation:

"(a) The need for meaningful assurance of access to the major commercial markets of the world and equal opportunity for all to compete.

"(b) the need for all participants in a WGA to accept part of the burden and to share the responsibility for adjusting production and managing the supplies moving into commercial markets.

"(c) the need for all participants in a WGA to share the responsibility for feeding the hungry of the world.

"These principles form the three pillars of our proposal. Other provisions, such as the level of international prices and the minimum price, would reflect the supply/demand balance created by the provisions of the arrangement relating to the above principles."

When the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962 was passed, Congress stipulated that no final agreements would be arrived at and no trade agreements consummated unless and until agricultural products were given their full protection and assurance of benefits in the Kennedy round.

The momentum of trends now in existence insures that the gap between food production and food needs in the less-developed world will widen further. Some countries will likely face acute food shortages between now and the time when these trends are reversed. We must be prepared to respond.

The National Association of Grain and Feed Dealers will play an important part in the expansion of food and fiber distribution to undernourished and underdeveloped countries. Our ability to produce and distribute food to people of undernourished countries could well mean the difference between peace and war.

SENATE SHOULD FOLLOW HOUSE IN APPROVING RECOMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES FOR SURVIVORSHIP BENEFITS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on January 12, 1965, I introduced legislation to extend to Federal employees who retired before October 1962, and who elected a reduction in their annuities to provide survivorship benefits, the same liberalized benefits currently enjoyed by annuitants who retired after that date.

The House this week incorporated in the Federal salary and benefit proposal a provision similar to my bill, S. 548. The move eliminates a complicated and inequitable pattern of annuity reductions which occurred in the law between April 1, 1948, and October 10, 1962.

During these years since 1948, both salaries and annuities have increased many times but the increases in salaries have been much greater than the increases in annuities. As a result, the average annuities of persons retiring today are much higher than the average of present annuities of persons retired some years ago.

Though changes were made to liberalize the survivor provisions of the law in 1949, 1956, and 1962, they were not made retroactive to persons previously retired. Thus, the 1948 retiree pays four times as much as the 1963 retiree and receives less survivor annuity. The persons receiving the least annuities have to pay the most for survivor protection, and their survivors must suffer a lower percentage formula. The pre-1962 retiree is penalized simply because he had the misfortune of retiring at an earlier date.

Adoption of this important measure would provide a uniform basis for figuring survivorship benefits for all retirees who have elected such benefits. Under my bill, the benefits would be identical to Public Law 87-973, for those who retired on October 11, 1962, or after. This provides a simplified and uniform procedure in figuring all costs of survivorship benefits.

I urge the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to give serious consideration to the merits of this proposal when deliberating the Federal salary and benefit bill.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE INVESTIGATION—CHARGES OF ARCHIE P. SHERAR

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain correspondence between the Commissioner of Internal Revenue Service and myself with respect to a hearing of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure last week.

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

HON. EDWARD V. LONG,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have just received the results of my inspection staff's complete and thorough investigation of the charges made by one of our former employees, Mr. Archie P. Sherar, before your subcommittee on March 30, 1966. Under the circumstances, I feel it is appropriate that I share these findings with you.

Before getting into the substance of the investigation, I want to emphasize that inspection reports directly to me and is completely independent of Internal Revenue's field management. I call attention to this fact to stress that the investigation was carried out in an openminded and objective manner.

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION

The investigation turned up no evidence that would support Mr. Sherar's charge of a "fix" in a tax case. Here is a summary of our findings:

1. It is not true that Mr. Sherar was fired because he refused to remain silent about a "fix." He was removed from the Service because he refused to cooperate and furnish records for the audit of his own tax returns.

2. There was no "fix." The tax cases in question have been carefully reviewed and we found no evidence that any were handled improperly. The only impropriety we discovered was the poor judgment Mr. Sherar used in conducting the audit and in dealing with taxpayers and their representatives.

3. There is no foundation to the allegation of a personal relationship between former Commissioner Mortimer M. Caplin and Mr. Nathan Friedman, the accountant who represented the taxpayers on these cases.

What our investigation does not reveal is why Mr. Sherar made these charges. I can only surmise that this young man, disgruntled by the loss of his job, chose this way to get even with IRS for discharging him.

Now I would like to set forth some of the factual detail underlying the results of our investigation.

DETAILED FINDINGS

This, as I understand it, is the substance of Sherar's charges: that in 1962 he was forced to "fix" some tax cases by limiting the scope of an audit and by falsifying reports; that he was ordered to do so by his group supervisor because "word has come down to limit it;" that word from above to limit the audit was attributable to an alleged personal relationship between Commissioner Caplin and the taxpayers' representative, Mr. Friedman; and that Sherar was removed from the Service in 1966 for refusing to keep quiet about the "fix." A brief review of the facts should lay these unfounded charges to rest.

To place this matter in context, Sherar was first assigned the key 1957 and 1958 returns in question in 1959. When conducting an audit a revenue agent may under certain circumstances requisition related returns, if in the judgment of the agent substantial tax adjustments would likely result. An agent's judgment in such matters is, of course, subject to the review and concurrence of his group supervisor.

In this case, the few returns originally assigned to Sherar soon grew into a wide-ranging audit involving 5 partnership and 34 individual returns. It was at this point, in 1960, that Sherar first came into contact (and conflict) with Friedman, accountant for the five partnerships. (It is interesting to note that in 1960 Mr. Caplin was a law professor at the University of Virginia and not Commissioner of Internal Revenue.)

In the fall of 1960, after the scope of the audit grew, Friedman complained to Sherar's group supervisor, at that time Mr. David Rossi, about Sherar's conduct of the audit. (It is not uncommon for a tax practitioner to complain to a group supervisor about the way a revenue agent is handling an audit.) By this time, the audit had grown to about 60 tax returns. In view of Friedman's complaint and since the principal issue was an engineering problem, Rossi decided to bring an IRS evaluation engineer into the case.

Sherar was instructed that the engineer was to handle this issue and that he was not to have anything else to do with it nor to contact Friedman or any of his clients on this aspect of the case. Rossi told Sherar, however, that he was free to continue his audit on any other significant issues involved. During the time Sherar was under Rossi's supervision, Rossi does not recall Sherar ever raising any other significant issues in the group of cases. The engineering issue appeared to be Sherar's main concern, and he was disappointed to have an engineer brought into the case.

Through a routine administrative realinement Sherar was transferred to Group Supervisor Thomas Haywood's group in August 1961, and took his inventory of cases with him. Meanwhile, Sherar's audit had grown

to over 100 returns involving several partnerships and about 30 different individuals.

Shortly before March 1962, the engineer finished his examination of the principal issue. Although he recommended significant tax adjustments, the net tax result was more favorable to the taxpayer than that originally proposed by Sherar. Sherar did not agree with the engineer's treatment of the issue but made no formal dissent or written protest.

In March 1962, Friedman again complained about Sherar's handling of the audit, this time to District Director Joseph Cullen who referred Friedman to Group Supervisor Haywood. Friedman felt that the tax assessed to date in the group of cases was substantially correct and that after 2 years on the audit Sherar was just looking for "nickel-and-dime" adjustments.

Again, I believe it is important to place this matter in its proper context. One of the major management problems facing the Service is to carefully manage our workload to achieve the most effective use of our limited manpower. To help attain this objective, it is Service policy to keep our workload as current as possible, i.e., to emphasize disposing of old returns in inventory so more recently filed returns can be audited. If we are to keep our work current it is obvious that we cannot allow our agents to conduct open-end examinations and audit every case ad infinitum. We instruct them to audit a return until they are reasonably sure they have arrived at the substantially correct tax, then dispose of the case, and move on to other work. It is important to note that in 1962 some of the returns involved in Sherar's audit were 5 years old.

After Friedman complained, Haywood discovered that another taxpayer's representative, a law firm, had also recently complained about Sherar's conduct as a revenue agent. At this point, Haywood contacted Rossi, Sherar's former group supervisor, and both supervisors held a meeting with Sherar to view his handling of the cases. Haywood then personally reviewed all aspects of the audit, found no additional significant tax, and directed Sherar to complete his audit and prepare final reports which were to include any significant issues Sherar had developed up to that time.

Haywood states that he definitely did not tell Sherar to confine his audit reports to the adjustments based on the engineer's findings. Haywood also emphatically denies that he was under any pressure from any of his superiors to limit the examination. He states that he directed Sherar to wind up the audit because in his judgment it was the right thing to do based solely on the facts. He said Sherar was hopelessly bogged down, the cases were old, and many other cases had been closed in the same way.

The investigation supports the statements made by Mr. Haywood. All other San Francisco officials directly involved in this matter state that at no time was there any kind of pressure from anyone in IRS brought to bear on them to limit the examination. Further, Sherar was not, in fact, limited to the principal returns in the case. The record shows that he made adjustments on at least four other returns and assessed several thousands of dollars in additional tax against the taxpayers. These adjutments were made subsequent to the time Haywood told Sherar to wind up the audit.

The investigation also shows there is no substance to Sherar's allegation that one of the cases involved fraud. None of the supervisors involved can recall Sherar ever mentioning the possibility of fraud in any of the cases. Our review of the case files reveals no indication of fraud.

Sherar testified before your subcommittee that he wrote a memorandum on March 15, 1962, requesting that an investigation be made of this whole matter. If he believed there were irregularities in the handling of these cases, the proper thing to have done, and every revenue agent knows this, would have been to bring this to the attention of Inspection. This he failed to do until 4 years later when he was being removed from the Service. Sherar did write a memorandum on March 15, 1962, to the Chief of the Audit Division, but it did not contain a request for an Inspection investigation nor was there any indication in the memorandum that he felt he was being forced to "fix" a tax case.

Concerning the alleged falsification of reports, it seems to me that this boils down to Sherar not being allowed to conduct the audit in the way he wanted. The judgment of the agent conflicted with that of his supervisor, and the result was that the agent was directed to do something he did not want to do—wind up the project, write his reports, and get on with more important work.

This, of course, is precisely why we have supervisors and delegate authority to them. We depend on the mature judgment of our supervisors to provide guidance to our younger, less-experienced personnel. One of the most important functions of an Audit group supervisor is to protect taxpayers from overzealous agents. This, in my opinion, is one of the real strengths of our tax system.

I would like to turn now to the alleged personal relationship between Messrs. Caplin and Friedman. I do not presume to speak for these gentlemen, but I can tell you that we have interviewed them and both deny knowing each other. I have never met Mr. Friedman, but I am well acquainted with Mr. Caplin and know him to be a man of integrity.

Sherar's statements in testifying before your subcommittee perhaps most effectively discredit this charge.

When asked if he knew for a fact that there was a personal friendship between Messrs. Caplin and Friedman, Sherar said: "No. This was just a rumor." Again, in his own words, when asked by you if he had any specific evidence that the alleged friendship was the reason he was not allowed to conduct the audit as he wished, Sherar replied: "Well, Senator, nobody told me that this was the case. Anything that I would say would be an assumption on my part." And finally, in his testimony before your subcommittee he indicated that he is not really sure in his own mind why he thought he was being pressured to limit the audit. The record shows that he cited four other possible reasons why he felt this way, in addition to the alleged friendship between Messrs. Caplin and Friedman. Again, in Sherar's own words: "Now, the District Director may have, because of his own friendship or he may have wanted to avoid any embarrassment with the Commissioner, or avoid any complaint going to the Commissioner or for what reasons, or perhaps this was just administratively expedient."

Then, directly after this statement, the record of Sherar's testimony shows he admitted that he did not even know for sure if his District Director knew of the alleged friendship between Messrs. Caplin and Friedman. The more this charge is exposed to the light of reason, the more absurd it becomes.

Finally, Mr. Sherar was discharged from Internal Revenue solely because he refused to cooperate and furnish his records to substantiate deductions claimed on his own tax returns. Every employee of Internal Revenue knows full well that his own tax affairs must be completely above board. He also knows he must cooperate fully with other IRS personnel when his returns are being audited. The confidence of the American people in the equity and integrity of our tax system demands that every IRS employee be scrupulously correct in his own tax affairs.

Mr. Sherar was directed numerous times, both orally and in writing, over a period of approximately 6 months to make his records available and to cooperate with the agent examining his returns. He repeatedly refused to do so. The district director was faced with no alternative but to take disciplinary action. When informed of possible adverse action, Mr. Sherar chose not to answer the charge. Consequently, he was removed from the Service.

CONCLUSION

In sum, I believe this whole matter can be attributed to the poor judgment of a rather immature individual. I am sure you are well aware of Mr. Sherar's erratic behavior. In his testimony before your subcommittee, he admitted his unauthorized use of electronic equipment in routine audit cases to make surreptitious recordings of his conversations with taxpayers. Of the incidents of misuse of such equipment uncovered in IRS to date, this is the only instance where a revenue agent working a regular audit case has been involved.

In the light of Inspection's investigation and the conclusive results reported to you in this letter, I feel it would serve no useful purpose for Mr. Haywood and other San Francisco officials to appear before your subcommittee on this matter. However, if you still feel it is necessary, I will, of course, be glad to make them available.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

[Pursuant to S. Res. 190, 89th Cong.]

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE,

April 5, 1966.

Commissioner SHELDON S. COHEN,
Internal Revenue Service,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: Thank you for your letter of April 5, 1966, with respect to the charges made by Mr. Archie P. Sherar.

It would be inappropriate for me to pass on the merits of this issue as none of the documents in the case have been made available.

Needless to say, we would not have permitted Mr. Sherar to make such charges without a prior investigation if we had had any inkling that such charges would be made.

Mr. Sherar was questioned twice by staff lawyers. The first time the questioning was by Bernard Fensterwald, chief counsel of the subcommittee, in San Francisco on October 29, 1965. Mr. Robert Shaeffer of the IRS regional counsel's office was present. Mr. Sherar revealed that he used clandestine electronic listening devices on ordinary taxpayers, but gave no hint of the situation with Mr. Friedman. Mr. Sherar was reinterviewed by Mr. Gordon Homme, assistant counsel of the subcommittee, on March 30, 1966, in Washington before he took the stand as a witness. On both occasions, he was asked whether he had anything to say in addition to his revelation about electronic eavesdropping. Both times he answered in the negative. Thus, despite these two interviews, we never had any hint of the existence of the situation to which he testified. However, we were interested in his information on the use of electronic listening devices on ordinary taxpayers.

Kind regards,

Sincerely,

EDWARD V. LONG,
Chairman.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1966.

Hon. EDWARD V. LONG,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter relating to Mr. Sherar's testimony on March 30, 1966.

Our records confirm that, when Mr. Sherar was interviewed by staff on October 29, 1965, he said nothing which would have necessarily alerted you to the possibility that he would testify as he did with respect to the 1962 audit. His discharge from employment by the Internal Revenue Service on March 25, 1966 would appear to have affected his attitude toward what had occurred some 4 years earlier.

We share your regrets regarding the publicity which attached to his unexpected testimony and trust that you will continue your efforts to set the record straight.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on April 4, the people of the Republic of Senegal celebrated their sixth anniversary of independence from French colonial rule. Under the able leadership of President Leopold Senghor, one of the most astute politicians and intellectuals in Africa, the Senegalese have demonstrated a consistent trend in overcoming the difficulties which characterize most new states.

While still largely an agricultural country, Senegal has rapidly expanded its industrial capacity. For example, its industries process such commodities as peanuts, phosphates, oil, and tobacco, for domestic and foreign consumption. Even more diversification of the economy is expected from expansion of the tuna fishing market. A modest petroleum refinery, and a fish cannery are now being constructed. Most of Senegal's economic assistance is derived from France, though American private capital and economic assistance have received generous welcome. Peace Corps volunteers have played and continue to play a significant role in Senegal's efforts to become a truly strong and modern republic. Senegal is also cooperating with United Nations and multination efforts to develop the Senegal River Basin. A successful undertaking there will be of monumental benefit to the nations taking part therein.

Even prior to achieving independence, President Senghor and other African leaders called for a union of the various components of former French West Africa on a Federal basis. Senegal's participation in the African and Malagasy Union—UAM—and the Organization of African Unity—OAU—clearly demonstrate her commitment to active intra-African cooperation.

Before closing, I should like to pay tribute to an event for which Dakar, Senegal's beautiful capital, is host. That is the First World Festival of Negro Art which is scheduled for April 1–24.

I am sure that Congress and the American people join me in wishing the people of Senegal best wishes as they celebrate their sixth anniversary and as they host this festival which will play a significant role in increasing international understanding.

May Senegal's prosperity and progress ever continue.

TRIBUTE TO MR. JAMES DOLAN OF BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article honoring Mr. Jim Dolan, president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, printed in the RECORD. This article, published in the Civil Service Leader of February 22, 1966, pays tribute to Mr. Jim Dolan's work in fighting to save the Brooklyn Navy Yard and his subsequent work in helping to relocate employees of the yard losing their jobs.

As president of Carpenters Local Union 2031, and unpaid president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, Mr. Dolan has demonstrated his able leadership in helping employees at the Navy yard to adjust to this major social change.

I join the workers of the Brooklyn Navy Yard in paying tribute to the able job done by Mr. Jim Dolan and commend him to my colleagues in the Senate.

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

JAMES DOLAN; DEDICATED TO FAIR AND DECENT TREATMENT OF BROOKLYN NAVY YARD AIDS

"It has a great past, but it has no future." With these words, it was reported, did Robert McNamara dismiss the subject of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, shortly after he announced its scheduled closing. The order to close the shipyard was made public on November 19, 1964, and is slated to be effective on June 30, 1966, a few short months from now.

Many events have taken place between the announcement date and the present time. The *Sandoval, Intreprid, Ogden,* and *Duluth,* all fighting ships of a fighting Navy, have been completed and sent to their places on the seas in the defense of this country. With unseemly haste much of the fine facilities of the Brooklyn Navy Yard have been ordered moved or destroyed. The Hammerhead Crane, the largest weight-handling structure in the port of New York, with a replacement value of over $2 million was sold for $6,000 and demolished for the junk value. The navy yard with a record of 165 years of achievement was left to the control of individuals who seemed to step out of the pages of "The Caine Mutiny" or "Mr. Roberts."

But what has happened to the almost 10,000 men and women workers during this time? We can answer this question best by looking to James J. Dolan, president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council, president of Carpenters Local Union 2031, and now general representative of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. Jim Dolan, as president of the council represents all the workers at the shipyard. For the past 2½ years he led the fight to save the navy yard and later to obtain the maximum in fair and decent treatment for the workers. This was a task that required, in many instances, 16 hours a day, innumerable meetings, frequent trips to Washington, and a dedication to his fellow workers that borders on the unbelievable. It might well be thought that the salary of president of the Brooklyn Metal Trades Council must be quite high. The reverse is true; the position does not carry a salary. As Jim said when asked, "My satisfaction is being able to help the devoted, hard-working people of the Brooklyn Navy Yard in any way possible, especially at this time when most of their fair-weather political friends are not to be found."

What has this 38-year-old father of six been able to accomplish during his time as representative of the yard workers? Prior to November 1964, he spearheaded a drive to keep the yard open that will long be remembered. The assistance of chambers of commerce, labor unions, fraternal, and business groups was obtained. Petitions numbering almost half a million were collected and forwarded to the President of the United States; street rallies attended by prominent political figures were held; a letter campaign was started; proposed legislation was submitted to our lawmakers; Madison Square Garden was packed with New Yorkers protesting the threat to the navy yard; and a comprehensive program of public education was undertaken.

The President of the United States publicly acknowledged, at Albee Square in Brooklyn, having had the Brooklyn Navy Yard future repeatedly brought to his attention. Despite these efforts of Jim Dolan, and the many who joined him in the fight, the Secretary of Defense, Robert Strange McNamara, announced the intention of closing the yard that had served the Nation so well and so long.

On November 19, 1964, the civilian work force at the navy yard totaled 9,625. The average worker's age was 46 with 18 years of service at the yard. To this group, whose only mistake was that of choosing a career with the Federal civil service, the closure announcement was a thunderclap of doom. With their shipbuilding skills not required in the New York area and with family ties that in many cases prevented moving, they felt they were destined for the industrial scrap heap. However, at no point in the ensuing months did their dedication to duty falter. They continued to perform their work on ships in the same high-quality manner that had long ago earned the "can do" name for the shipyard. Commendation after commendation was received by the yard for top-notch work, performed on time.

TOP WORKMANSHIP

While the shipyard commander freely predicted an inability to produce work, the faithful men and women continued to turn out top quality workmanship. All this, while they were "working on their own coffin." When this work was finished, their jobs were through. Many believe that this sterling performance was in no small part due to the leadership of Jim Dolan and the fact that the workers knew that he was there to help them. During this time an out-placement program was established and Dolan was successful in tempering certain aspects of it that would have worked extreme hardship on the workers. He was also able to have layoffs delayed until they were required by lack of work. He continued meeting with legislators and assisted directly and indirectly in obtaining the passage of laws that provided for improvement of both retirement benefits and severance pay.

On September 16, 1965, at a testimonial dinner, Borough President Abe Stark, of Brooklyn presented a citation to Jim Dolan in recognition of his efforts "not only in behalf of the 10,000 men and women at the shipyard, but also in behalf of the people of the Borough of Brooklyn." The testimonial dinner was attended by numerous prominent labor representatives, chamber of commerce officials and most important to Jim, many of the workers whose interests he has so well represented.

Since that date many of the workers have moved on to other jobs, some in other sections of the country, others have retired, and one of his worker friends gave his life while working on the U.S.S. *Intrepid* at the navy yard. With the last ship, the U.S.S.

Duluth, gone from the once-proud Brooklyn Navy Yard the remaining workers are engaged in dismantling or packing machinery and equipment for shipping to other locations or scrapping. The former admiral in charge of the yard has been removed, a new admiral assigned and it is hoped a final phase of decent treatment for the remaining workers has commenced.

Thus the curtain slowly falls on the Brooklyn Navy Yard; the yard that has built and repaired the finest fighting ships of the U.S. Navy. The shipbuilding tradition that extended back to the time of Washington, Jefferson, and Adams is now to be broken. Dolan has said hopefully, "May the time never come when American lives are lost because of the navy yard that no longer exists but whose ships are vitally needed."

As for Jim Dolan, he will continue to represent and fight for fairness for his workers until the last man leaves and the gates are slowly swung shut.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the House today is acting upon the appropriation bill for fiscal 1967 for the Department of Interior and related agencies, with a $7 million provision for the newly created National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

As chairman of the special Senate subcommittee which handled the authorizing legislation for this new program, I have a very special interest in this program and I therefore want to take special note of the House action at this time.

The $7 million allowed by the House represents a cut of $6,930,000—or almost 50 percent—from the administration's request of $13,930,000 for fiscal 1967.

Most of the $6.9 million cut is accounted for by the failure of the House Appropriations Committee to take any action at all on a $5 million request for the National Endowment for the Humanities because the program for that endowment had not been clearly formulated at the time the House committee considered the bill. The reason was simply that the National Council on the Humanities, which is establishing the policies and guidelines for the foundation, was not sworn into office until 2 days after Dr. Henry Allen Moe, the interim chairman of the Council, was called to testify before the House committee.

I was, therefore, most pleased to note that the House committee in no way closed the door to Senate action on the request for the Humanities Foundation but simply indicated that the decision had to be deferred until the program of the Humanities Council became more clear. The pertinent passage of the House report states:

> The committee has passed over this item of the request without prejudice with the understanding that it may be taken up at a later date by the Senate.

The purpose of my statement today is to state that I shall lend my efforts to Senate consideration and approval of the amount needed for the National Endowment on the Humanities, and also for the restoration of the funds requested for the National Endowment for the Arts and for administrative funds.

Mr. President, I shall at the appropriate time make a detailed defense of these programs and state what I believe are the compelling reasons why these amounts should be restored, and I hope that other Senators with an interest in this area will see fit to join me at that time. For the present, I want only to have the RECORD show the effect of the cuts as they have come from the House, and in this connection I ask unanimous consent that various articles and editorials from the Washington Post, the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, and the Washington Star be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 6, 1966]

HOUSE WINDS UP DEBATE ON APPROPRIATIONS BILL

(Robert L. Asher)

A couple of GOP jabs at the arts and at spending in general fizzled under bipartisan rebuttal yesterday as the House wound up debate on a $1.2 billion appropriation bill with only minor changes from committee recommendations made last week.

With a final vote postponed until today because of the Passover holiday, the House backed Appropriations Committee cuts and spending proposals for the arts and humanities program, Washington's subway and the Interior Department's fiscal 1967 projects.

Representative WINFIELD K. DENTON, Democrat, of Indiana, chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior, shepherded the measure through the minor skirmishes, which included one move to scuttle the entire arts and humanities request.

DETAILED PROPOSALS

That amendment was offered by Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, who branded the program to underwrite cultural projects a "hearts-and-flowers deal."

But more Republicans than not backed the proposal, which would provide $7 million out of a $13.9 million request.

Of the $6.9 million cut, $5 million had been sought for the humanities endowment. The request was knocked out by the committee last week pending more detailed spending proposals from the new Council on Humanities which was sworn into office after the subcommittee's hearings last month.

Among GOP members urging support of the program were Representatives SILVIO O. CONTE, of Massachusetts; JOSEPH M. MCDADE, of Pennsylvania; FRANK J. HORTON, of New York; THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, of New York; and OGDEN R. REID, of New York.

DENTON said the $7 million appropriation had been justified to his complete satisfaction, adding, "I don't know a thing about art, but I admire and I respect the people who do."

NEITHER SIDE SATISFIED

Referring to concern about his group's cut in the program, Denton said "Neither side is satisfied * * * so we might have made a pretty good figure."

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, floor manager of last year's bill creating the program, pointed out that the $5 million cut can be remedied in the Senate and said he merely was asking that the recommendations "not be cut any deeper."

Urging approval of the Committee recommendation, THOMPSON said, "We are not talking about luxuries, or window dressing or hearts and flowers. We are talking about the essential quality of American life."

He noted that the per capita expense in the bill amounts to less than 4 cents annually for the arts. "It is utter nonsense to call that an extravagance," he declared.

MUST NOT INTERFERE

Several Congressmen, including REID, and Representatives CHARLES S. JOELSON, Democrat, of New Jersey; ROBERT N. GIAIMO, Democrat, of Connecticut and CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, warned that Congress must not try to interfere with the cultural programs to be administered by the councils.

Spending proposals for Washington's subway—minus $8 million deleted by the Committee with a provision that it could be sought in a supplemental bill if needed—drew no discussion.

Also unchallenged was a $6.1 million committee cut in the National Capital Planning Commission's request that had been sought to preserve parkland along the shores of the Potomac.

Representative FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio, led two unsuccessful Republican attempts to make across-the-board cuts in the bill, and will try again when the measure comes up for final passage.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 4, 1966]

TROUBLE FOR THE ARTS FOUNDATION

Already the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, created by Congress only last September, is running into congressional trouble. A House appropriations subcommittee has cut the $5 million authorized by the bill for the Arts Endowment to $4 million and denied the money authorized for the Humanities Endowment altogether. Chief among the subcommittee's complaints seems to have been that the endowments' plans for spending the money were not yet sufficiently detailed.

This complaint, however, cuts to the heart of the philosophy behind the Foundation: that Federal support for the arts and humanities should be provided, but that it should be insulated from Federal control. Critics of the bill originally protested that nothing would more stifle creativity in the arts and humanities than the "dead hand" of Government, and nothing would be better calculated to realize their fears than to have the endowments answerable to a Congressional committee for their choices of projects.

Each endowment has been provided with a highly distinguished council of private experts, who may know little about legislating but know a great deal about the arts and humanities. The amount of money involved is relatively small. The principle at stake—support without interference—is large. The matter is expected to come before the House this week. By all means let the experiment be funded so that it can proceed in the only way that success is possible, which is to leave the decisions in the hands of the Foundation itself and its councils.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1966]

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE ARTS

The House Appropriations Committee has recommended a cut of $1 million in the already miniscule $5 million sought for direct grants in the coming fiscal year by the National Arts Endowment. Compared to annual public grants to the arts in other major countries, the American appropriation—even if the full $5 million should be provided—would be disproportionately small.

But far more serious than the proposed cut is the way in which the House committee has undertaken to interpose its ideas on artistic issues for which it has no basis of judgment. For Congress to attempt to pass on details of the program would be a grave error, bound to lead to charges of political interference in delicate areas where Congress lacks expertise.

The law adopted last year set up a National Arts Council, and the President has appointed to it a civic minded, experienced, sensitive group of men and women. Their advice should be followed. In Great Britain, where the Arts Council decides how to spend the money appropriated by the Parliament for the arts, the program has worked impressively for more than two decades. Washington would be wise to learn from the British experience.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 5, 1966]

FUNDING CULTURE

Although Congress overwhelmingly approved the creation of a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities last year, the Federal Government's cultural program already is endangered. The issue is money and the arena is the House of Representatives.

Using the guns versus butter argument, Republicans are expected to attempt on the House floor to emasculate the $7 million appropriation that came out of committee. The amount is small, far less than one-one-hundreth of 1 percent of the 1967 budget, but the principle is of great importance. The foundation was established with the support and encouragement of the artistic and academic communities, partly to help right the unfavorable balance created by lavish Government spending in the sciences and partly to provide seed money to nourish growth in the arts and humanities throughout the United States.

To grant the Foundation only token funds in its second year would be to dash the hopes of persons who feel that there can be a creative partnership with Government in these fields and to insult the distinguished Americans who have accepted positions on the National Arts and National Humanities councils.

A further problem for the infant program was revealed in subcommittee hearings when it was suggested that Congress might want a voice in directing the grants given out by the Foundation. While rendering judgments as to the amount of money that should be budgeted for the arts and the humanities each year, Congress ought to show the same disinterest toward individual grants and programs as it does in the sciences. To do otherwise would be to disrupt the program by alienating the advisory councils or to make it another pork barrel.

Friends of the Foundation in the Congress should muster their forces, for if their creation is to grow, prosper and retain a necessary independence, its case must be made now.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 4, 1966]

PENNY FOOLISH

The House Appropriations Committee has cut almost in half the request for funds for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. The request was for just under $14 million for 1967. The committee has recommended $7 million.

This is a great mistake on the face of it. Last year was the first time the Government feebly ventured into the field of assistance to the arts, although it has long been underwriting large areas of scientific endeavor. The first year's program, announced last November by Chairman Roger L. Stevens, showed courage, imagination, and much expert thought. There is no reason to believe those qualities will diminish. There is no reason to believe the need for financial help will diminish.

The existence of the National Foundation and its Endowments and Councils in the Arts and the Humanities has been one of the most encouraging signs of these times. It has meant national concern for the higher reaches and the higher rewards of the human spirit, a concern very long overdue. The penny-pinching spirit evinced by the committee is a discouraging reminder of the days when Congress could laugh at the very idea of the arts and humanities.

The sums involved are trifling compared to the overall budget and compared to the very real needs in those fields of culture and learning. But they are enormous in relation to the past and as omens for the future.

When the matter comes to the floor of the House this week, that body should restore the cuts.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 5, 1966]

"KNOW NOTHINGS" COME ALIVE AGAIN

(By Doris Fleeson)

The "Know Nothings" are coming to life again in Congress under cover of President Johnson's call for domestic economies. Their immediate target is the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities, whose request for $14 million for 1967 has been cut to $7 million by the House Appropriations Committee.

Washington has only just been getting accustomed to some slight deference by Congress to the fact that man does not live by bread alone. It has ventured to hope that the days when the late Senator Robert S. Kerr set the cultural tone of the legislative branch with ridicule of esthetics were gone forever.

Public debate this week will reveal House sentiment toward crippling the program put together with idealism and intelligence by Foundation Chairman Roger L. Stevens. If the cuts are restored and maintained by the Senate, the discouraging glimpses of what went on behind the scenes may be forgotten.

Yet they should not be. They show that the trend set in motion by President and Mrs. Kennedy and carried forward by President and Mrs. Johnson could be reversed if its adherents and defenders do not work hard to sustain it.

The attackers are not at all confined to the old conservative coalition or Goldwater Republicans. House Republican leaders say they will not oppose the program as a party matter, that in fact there has been no minority discussion of it.

This is an intelligent political decision. Republicans have too long been alienated from the intellectual community, and it is a major problem in their effort to restore ideas and tone to their political dialog. For Kennedy the intellectuals had a natural affinity but they have been alienated from Johnson on the Vietnam issue and in matters of form.

The arts and humanities program is so minor in contrast to vast Federal appropriations no one Congressman will be much affected by his vote for it. But opposition will be construed by the intellectuals as hostility.

The fact is that the opposition in private sessions was set off my Members identified with the Johnson party. Other Democrats professed themselves nonplussed by this circumstance. The same old sequence occurred that is sadly familiar here. Is the President really for the bill? When others were being urged to fight for it why were not his friends called? The questions are multiplying and the rollcall will be watched with unusual care.

Some of the private debate was useful and friendly even though it revealed doubts. The House group is clearly unsure what its role ought to be in a Federal cultural program and how much control it should attempt to exercise. Stevens remained cool and tactful under questions that showed the gap between his point of view and the questioner's.

Those who believe in the new effort argue that it is only fair to give the dedicated Stevens a chance, and enough money to give the program at least an even chance of survival.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 5, 1966]

CAPITAL OPERA HOUSE

For years every city in Europe has had its own opera house while the Capital of the United States has had none. Not only have such famous cities as Paris, Vienna, and Milan long enjoyed beautiful government-owned opera houses, but even an obscure city like Socchi in southern Russia has its own attractive opera house.

Almost every European country also has its government-sponsored art and cultural centers. Recently the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have secured small appropriations from Congress to promote arts and culture in the United States of America, though this year, because of the Vietnam war, the amount has been whittled down to $6 million.

Today, however, Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee, led by FRANK BOW, of Ohio, and GLEN LIPSCOMB, of California, are lying in wait for the arts and culture money ready to meat ax it altogether.

Chief Republican champions of culture are BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota, only American Indian in Congress, and SILVIO CONTE, from Massachusetts.

STREAMLINING OF APPOINTMENTS OF CONSULAR OFFICERS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, some time ago—in fact, almost 2 years ago—the Committee on Foreign Relations began exploring with the Department of State the feasibility of streamlining the so-called routine Foreign Service lists with a view toward eliminating unnecessary confirmations.

I am very pleased that the Department of State has now announced a simplified procedure for the appointment and assignment of Foreign Service personnel who perform consular functions.

The handling of these nominations in the past has, to be sure, not been an excessive burden on the Senate or on the committee. The principal beneficiary of this change is the Department itself by the elimination of unnecessary paperwork, and I commend the Department for taking this step.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Department of State Newsletter of March 1966, entitled "The New Procedures for Appointment and Assignment of Consular Officers" be printed in the RECORD at this point together with the correspondence leading up to the announced change.

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

[Department of State Newsletter, March 1966]

THE NEW PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT AND ASSIGNMENT OF CONSULAR OFFICERS

A new procedure for the appointment and assignment of Foreign Service personnel who perform consular functions was announced this month.

The new procedure will eliminate considerable paperwork, and also enable the Department to tailor consular titles to assignments.

As outlined in Foreign Affairs Manual Circular No. 389 of March 11, officers in the Foreign Service who are to perform consular functions will be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as consular officers of the United States of America—instead of as vice consuls, consuls, or consuls general.

Thus, once appointed as a consular officer, an individual will receive—as the needs of the Service require—an assignment commission as vice counsul, consul, or consul general for a specific consular district.

(Assignment commissions are issued by the President upon the recommendation of the Secretary and do not require Senate action.)

Effective immediately, Foreign Service commissioned appointments will be handled as follows:

An individual entering the Foreign Service Officer Corps will be nominated by the President to be (1) a Foreign Service officer of the United States of America of a specified class and (2) a consular officer and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America. Following Senate confirmation and attestation by the President, two Presidential appointment commissions will normally be issued: one as a Foreign Service officer of the United States of America, of a specified class, and one as a consular officer and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

A Foreign Service officer already holding a Presidential appointment as vice consul or consul will be appointed a consular officer incident to his promotion to a higher class or when the needs of the Service require the use of a different consular title. No further appointment action will be taken in the case of a Foreign Service officer of class 1, 2, or 3 who has already been appointed consul general.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer will be nominated by the President to be a consular officer and a secretary in the diplomatic service in cases where he is required to serve in a diplomatic or consular capacity. Following Senate confirmation and attestation by the President, one Presidential appointment commission will be issued, as a consular officer and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer already holding an appointment as vice consul will be appointed a consular officer when the needs of the Service require—and his Foreign Service Reserve class permits—the use of a different consular title.

A Foreign Service Staff officer or employee will be nominated to be a consular officer when he is required to serve in a consular capacity. Following Senate confirmation and attestation by the President, one Presidential appointment commission will be issued, as a consular officer of the United States of America.

The Secretary of State will no longer appoint Foreign Service Staff officers or employees to be vice consuls. Such personnel now serving under secretarial appointments will, however, complete their present assignments. If they are again required to serve in a consular capacity, they will be appointed consular officers, as described above.

The circular pointed out that none of the new procedures affect the present procedures followed in the appointment of consular agents by the Secretary.

The consular title specified in an officer's assignment commission will normally equate with his grade, as in the past. Under the new procedure, however, consular titles no longer depend upon Senate action, and consequently may be tailored to the requirements of the assignment.

There may be occasions when an officer will receive a title higher or lower than that to which he would otherwise be entitled by virtue of his grade.

The conferral of a higher consular title will not signify reward nor will that of a lower title reflect discredit upon an officer.

As a matter of policy, the Department will not lower an officer's consular title during the course of an assignment.

Consistent with the needs of the Service, consular titles will equate with grade as follows:

CONSUL GENERAL

Foreign Service officers of class 1.

Foreign Service officers of classes 2 and 3 when assigned as principal officers of a consulate general, when assigned as chief of the consular section at a large diplomatic mission, or when such title is required by the nature of the assignment.

CONSUL

Foreign Service officers of classes 2 through 5.

Foreign Service Reserve officers classes 1 through 5.

Foreign Service Staff officers of classes 1 through 4.

Foreign Service officers or Foreign Service Reserve officers of class 6 when assigned as principal officer at a consular post.

VICE CONSUL

Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service Reserve officers of classes 6 through 8.

Foreign Service Staff officers and employees of classes 5 through 8.

The circular explained that a Foreign Service officer who resigns his Presidential appointment as such, in order to join the Foreign Service Reserve Corps or the Foreign Service Staff Corps, should make clear in his written resignation that he is not also resigning his appointment as secretary in the diplomatic service and consular officer. This will make reappointment unnecessary if the officer is subsequently again required to serve in a diplomatic or consular capacity.

JANUARY 11, 1966.

Hon. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACARTHUR: This is in reply to your letter of December 10, 1965, with reference to the appointment of consular officers.

The procedure you outlined would seem to be a considerable improvement over the present system and I am pleased that the Department is taking this action to streamline the appointment process. The gradual course for implementing the new system appears to be the most desirable one and it is agreeable with me for the Department to proceed as soon as feasible.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., December 10, 1965.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I refer to your letter of September 18, 1964, my reply of April 19, 1965, and, also, your letter of October 8, 1965 regarding nominations of Foreign Service personnel.

The President and the Secretary of State have now approved a proposal, which if agreeable to your committee, will substantially simplify the procedure for processing consular appointments of Foreign Service personnel. Therefore, if you concur and starting at a time convenient to you, all nominations for consular appointments, including Reserve and Staff officers, will be for confirmation as a "consular officer" rather than as a vice consul, consul, or consul general, as is the practice now. Once confirmed as a consular officer, the officer will be designated—administratively by the Secretary as a vice consul, a consul, or a consul general as subsequent assignments are made.

Under this procedure, the appointment of consular officers will be similar to the present practice of appointing an officer as a secretary in the diplomatic service. Once an officer is commissioned as a consular officer, his name will not be resubmitted for further confirmation in this general category.

There are basically two ways we could initiate this new system. One would be to resubmit all of the names of Foreign Service personnel now holding consular commissions so that they could be reappointed as consular officers in one massive operation. The second course of action would be to appoint each officer as a consular officer as he is promoted or newly transferred to a consular assignment. The second course would mean a gradual decrease, over a period of years, in the number of consular nominations submitted to the Senate. We believe the first course would be burdensome and expensive in view of the fact that a nomination list and new commissions would have to be prepared for approximately 5,000 officers. Therefore, if agreeable to you, we propose to follow the second, gradual course.

We believe that this new system will help reduce—both for your committee and for the Department—the workload of the nominations that must be confirmed by the Senate. Further to your letter of October 8, we will soon be forwarding to you our comments on H.R. 6277.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

OCTOBER 8, 1965.

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

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: H.R. 6277, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for consideration.

As you know, this bill has far-reaching implications for the Foreign Service and the conduct of the Nation's foreign policy generally. The committee will want to study the proposal very carefully and would appreciate a detailed report from you on it. As a part of the report, the committee would like to have your comments on the objections which were raised to the measure in the House of Representatives.

It is not expected that the committee will have an opportunity to begin consideration of the measure until early in the next session and, in view of this, a report is not required in the immediate future. This will give the Department ample time to prepare detailed comments on the bill.

I might add that the Committee in working on this bill will probably wish to consider the commissioning system for the Foreign Service along the lines of my letter to the Department of September 18, 1964, and the Department's reply of April 19, 1965.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

APRIL 19, 1965.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Reference is made to your letter of September 18, 1964, addressed to Mr. J. Edward Lyerly, deputy legal adviser for administration, and to ensuing conversations between members of your staff and representatives of the Department

relative to the possible elimination of Senate consideration of Foreign Service personnel who, already being confirmed in their class, are sent up for further confirmation as vice consuls, consuls, or consuls general.

Proposals for simplification of existing procedures are currently under active consideration by appropriate officials of the executive branch.

As soon as this matter is resolved, I will communicate with you again.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1964.

Mr. J. EDWARD LYERLY,
Deputy Legal Adviser, for Administration, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. LYERLY: This is with reference to the request of the committee staff for the Department of State's suggestions on means of eliminating the necessity for Senate confirmation of Foreign Service officers or Reserve officers who are already confirmed in their class but are being designated "to be also" consul generals, consuls, vice consuls, or secretaries in the diplomatic service.

Although, since May 1964 when this request was made by telephone, the committee has approved three lists containing such designations, this is to inform you of the continued committee interest in finding ways to simplify these procedures.

I hope very much that before a list containing such designations is submitted to the 89th Congress, the committee could have the benefit of your ideas.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

SHERMAN D. PARSONS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE—OLDEST LIVING MASON IN THE WORLD

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, those of us who were fortunate enough, as I was, to be born and raised in New Hampshire are conscious of the fact that, all things being equal, we may anticipate a long and fruitful life. Even this expectancy was exceeded, however, on March 17, when Mr. Sherman D. Parsons, of Wolfeboro, became at the grand old age of 104 the oldest living Mason in the world. Active in citizenship and fraternal service for many decades and actually not in retirement yet, Mr. Parsons enjoys the esteem and respect of all New Hampshire, and I am proud to extend my personal tribute.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a short news item referring to Mr. Parsons, which was published in the March 31 issue of the Littleton, N.H., Courier.

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

Many north country people know of Sherman D. Parsons, one of the most remarkable men you will ever meet. On January 13 of this year he observed his 104th birthday. On March 17 he became the oldest living Mason in the world. A resident of Wolfeboro, Mr. Parsons has been living at the Masonic Home in Manchester for the past 2 years. Writes Herbert E. Kimball, grand master of Masons in New Hampshire: "New Hampshire is proud to salute this distinguished Mason for his more than 80 years of Masonic membership and service. His is a record that will probably never be equaled again in our lifetime. Every one of New Hampshire's 17,000 Masons extends most sincere congratulations and the wish that Brother Parsons may long enjoy his proud honor (he is still active in Masonry and is serving the Grand Lodge as a grand steward—an office he has held continuously since 1944)."

We add our non-Masonic best wishes to an outstanding citizen who belies his age by at least 35 years.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE TO UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, ALUMNI LAW DAY, APRIL 2, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on the evening of April 2, I had the opportunity to hear the address of our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] at the dinner arranged by the students of the College of Law of the University of Kentucky, as part of the university's annual alumni Law Day ceremonies.

Senator MORSE's speech on international law paid particular attention to its application to the situation in Vietnam. The audience of 800, made up of students of the college of law, members of the faculty of the university, alumni, and lawyers of my State listened to Senator MORSE's speech with the greatest of interest and attention and, at its close, rose and applauded him.

I ask unanimous consent to have his speech printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE AT THE ALUMNI LAW DAY, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, LEXINGTON, KY., APRIL 2, 1966

There is an American folk tale, often related by Carl Sandburg, which tells of a group of Americans who met in Paris in 1898 to celebrate the Fourth of July. The first speaker arose and raised his glass in the traditional American toast: "Here's to the United States; bounded on the north by Canada; on the south by Mexico; on the east by the Atlantic Ocean; and on the west, by the Pacific Ocean."

But the next speaker arose, and said that while this was a time-honored toast, it did not take into account the new ventures into overseas expansion, into imperialism that was carrying the United States into Cuba, and across the Pacific into the Philippines. So he proposed a new toast: "Here's to the United States; bounded on the north by the North Pole; on the south by the South Pole; on the east by the rising sun; and on the west by the setting sun."

The third speaker said it pleased him that the second toast had improved on the first. But in light of the changed streams of history, in view of the immensity of the responsibilities the United States had taken onto itself, he felt he did not go far enough in expressing the new dimensions of the country. So he raised his glass: "Here's to the United States; bounded on the north by the aurora borealis; on the south by the precession of the equinoxes; on the east by primeval chaos; and on the west, by the Day of Judgment."

I do not suppose there has been a time when it could more appropriately be said that today American foreign policy is bounded on the east by primeval chaos, and on the west by the day of judgment. In Asia, we are fighting virtually alone in a war that our State Department says must be fought if confidence in us among our 42 treaty partners is to be maintained, while in Europe our strongest alliance is being dissolved on the ground—or at least one of the grounds—that the American involvement in Asia robs NATO of American interest and protection and the others must now go their own way.

It is commonplace for commentators to say today that the postwar era of cold war blocs has ended, and the changing conditions of the world are causing the military alliance system of the 1940's and 1950's to break down into irrelevancy.

Yet there is every indication that our foreign policy, like so many military policies of history, is designed to cope with past problems more than with current or future ones. This, for example, has been the response of the American Government to the withdrawal from NATO of French forces and the order by France that NATO forces withdraw from France. The American President appeals to NATO nations to remember the lesson of World War II, and maintain the unified military force that was developed first to fight Germany, and subsequently to forestall any Russian military move across Europe.

In the opinion of President de Gaulle of France, the necessity for the treaty force has been totally undermined by events. Of course, the text of the treaty itself provided that it was a 20-year treaty, to be renewed or revised in 1969 upon the wishes of the members. It was not perpetual, in other words. We knew in 1949 that the conditions that made NATO desirable could change or disappear in 20 years.

France has concluded that some of them have, and that the essential task for Europe is no longer one of amalgamating American military forces into a defense against the Soviet Union, but amalgamating the Soviet bloc into a peaceful coexistence and cooperation with Western Europe. It is the French view that the massive American presence in NATO makes this European task more difficult.

The extent to which this Gaullist view may or may not be accurate, and the extent to which it poses excruciating problems for Germany, have not been met by the United States. Instead, we have tried to pretend that it is only De Gaulle who is out of step and who fails to recognize the lessons of the past. We have assailed the breaking up of the unified NATO military force. But we have done it on the basis of its past success, rather than on the basis of whether it is wise or needed for the future, and indeed, whether its existence obstructs more desirable events than it prevents undesirable events.

The American Department of Defense, and the American State Department have for nearly 20 years grounded their defense policies upon the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We have counted on NATO countries, NATO territory, and NATO forces almost as part of our own. We have become quite accustomed to stationing some 300,000 to 400,000 men in Europe as part of the NATO defensive force, and the vast and farflung military bases across Western Europe are counted upon almost as much as those on American soil.

Now, the whole fabric is threatened; the most basic assumptions and practices of the American military stance are on the verge of dissolution. There is every evidence that it is this threat to traditional military planning that is uppermost in the American objections to the Gaullist plan.

I say this because the American arguments against De Gaulle partake of military ossification more than of political realities in Europe. In 1952, Stalin offered Adenauer the reunification of Germany provided it was entirely neutralized. But John Foster Dulles became Secretary of State in time to prevail upon Adenauer to reject the offer with the seductive counter-offer that if West Germany joined NATO, it could soon demand reunification on its own terms, including full German alliance with the West.

But the military strength of NATO, including that of a rearmed West Germany, never

was strong enough to reunify Germany short of war, and the hope and expectation of the Germans that it could has long since gone glimmering.

This one-time political objective has not been achieved, and there is a growing realization in Germany and throughout Europe that if Germany is ever to be united, and a major cause of East-West friction removed, it will have to come about through deescalation of military confrontations and not through their escalation. This is one attraction of the Gaullist theory to many Europeans. It is an attraction that the American insistence upon continuation of the military organization of NATO has no means of countering.

The opportunities of improved trade and cultural relations with eastern Europe are another attraction of Gaullism. As the monolith of communism breaks up in Eastern Europe, the fear of military aggression from it recedes in Western Europe. The issue that the United States does not face is whether this European view is right in feeling that the path to eased tensions and better relations is through "building bridges" rather than building armies.

The failure of the Secretary of Defense's appeal to NATO ministers to join us in the war in Vietnam reflects a decided European attitude that to become involved in the war in Asia can only get in the way of improved relations within Europe itself. To Americans preoccupation with Vietnam forces us to dredge up old battle cries about "Munich" and to warn Europe that if the so-called yellow peril is not stopped in Vietnam it will overrun not only the whole of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and North America, but Europe, too.

This "yellow peril" argument of the Secretary of Defense was coolly received in Europe by our NATO friends. Whether or not they think it useful for the Americans to fight communism in Asia, they seem convinced that it is not their war and that they have more urgent and useful endeavors on their own continent.

The American appeal for continuing NATO without France as though nothing had happened, and waiting for De Gaulle to pass from the scene, implies that nothing has really changed since 1949. At least it implies that we are seeking to perpetrate the solution of 1949 without asking whether the problem is the same.

We all know that NATO was created in 1949 to defend against what was feared to be a Soviet army poised to sweep across a defenseless Western Europe. The unified military force that was organized to act as one in case of attack was the keystone of NATO.

Twenty years later, the iron grip of Russia upon its satellites has greatly eased. All are in varying degrees of finding their own methods of organizing their economies, often with assistance from the west. Trade with Western Europe has increased, and even trade with the United States has increased. The Soviet Union itself shows no signs of planning or expecting any kind of armed attack upon anyone, much less a sweep across Europe.

To American eyes, this only means that Russia does not attack so long as NATO is in full battle array. To many others in the alliance, it means that Russia is not interested in armed conquest, if in fact, she ever was.

As one who participated in the Senate debate and ratification of the treaty, I am increasingly of the opinion that this is an issue that our European partners must decide, and not an issue on which an American decision can or should be forced on them. If Germany, Britain, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, and the other treaty partners want to continue the treaty organization, and pick up their share of the military and financial load being put down by France, then I think the United States should pick up its share, too.

But this can happen only if Europeans are themselves convinced that the military organization serves a more useful purpose than it frustrates. So far, we have not offered any convincing argument that it does. We have only depicted De Gaulle as going back to the pre-World War I system of alliances without unified forces, while we urge the system of only 20 years ago when a multinational military force helped to conquer Germany.

Both sides accuse the other of being tied to the past, and both claim to be applying the lessons of history. But are any of these analogies valid, or do they serve only to relieve both of the burden of making a case?

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has written a new chapter in postwar history by opening to public discussion the previously closed subject of our China policy, and the war in Vietnam. Without necessarily dropping that subject entirely, I am hopeful that the committee can also open the subject of the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the closely related issue of acquisition of nuclear weapons by nonnuclear powers, especially Germany, for it is said that Germany will seek her own nuclear force if she does not share in a NATO nuclear force. I hope we will hold open, public hearings on the future of NATO; if we do not, we are likely to continue to hear an American case based primarily upon the convenience of the Defense Department, and not one that considers the political objectives of the West and how they can best be pursued.

U.S. POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

The war in Asia does not, for reasons I have mentioned, seem to have the impact upon our NATO partners that our Secretary of State advertises to the American people. Another reason it has not strengthened European confidence in us is the way we have used the collective defense treaty in southeast Asia without regard for the wishes or actions of our treaty partners.

Despite the name of the treaty—Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty—it is not being used for that purpose. For several years, the American "commitment" in South Vietnam was described as stemming from a letter written by President Eisenhower to President Diem in 1954. But on August 17 of last year, President Eisenhower repudiated that interpretation of his letter, saying that it never referred to anything more than economic assistance. Since then, the administration has shifted to the SEATO treaty as the basis for our action in South Vietnam. It relies upon paragraph 2 of article 4, which permits us to consult with other members in case of some subversion or revolution within the treaty area.

But the weakness of this intervention is emphasized by the fact that we are under no obligation whatever to act under this provision. In fact, Secretary Dulles also nailed down that situation in the hearings of November 1954 on ratification of the treaty. In a colloquy with Senator Green of Rhode Island, he said:

"Senator GREEN. Is there not some provision in the treaty—I thought I saw it as I glanced through it—that we join in putting down insurrections in these countries?

"Secretary DULLES. No, sir. There is provision that if there is a subversion, threatened subversion, of the political independence of any country, then we will consult together what to do about it.

"Senator GREEN. That is subversion then.

"Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir.

"Senator GREEN. Well, isn't that another word for insurrection?

"Secretary DULLES. I would think insurrection is a form of subversion, yes.

"Senator GREEN. Then we are obliged to help put down a revolutionary movement.

"Secretary DULLES. No. If there is a revolutionary movement in Vietnam or in Thailand, we would consult together as to what to do about it because if that were a subversive movement that was in fact propagated by communism, it would be a very grave threat to us. But we have no undertaking to put it down; all we have is an undertaking to consult together as to what to do about it."

PARTIES' OBLIGATIONS ARE EQUAL IN A COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TREATY

The administration, as of last month or so, is now relying instead upon paragraph 1 of that article. That paragraph states:

"Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations."

Yet there is no establishment that an aggression by means of armed attack has occurred insofar as the treaty members are concerned. Where is the finding of the SEATO foreign ministers council that an armed attack upon South Vietnam from North Vietnam has occurred? The only such finding has been made by the United States. As Senator FULBRIGHT has pointed out so often in the recent hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee, the reason we have no substantial help from other countries in Vietnam is that no one has considered the war there to be an armed aggression of the kind that would threaten the peace and security of themselves. When Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, Cambodia, Japan, and India, all non-SEATO members, made no such finding, that is bad enough, but neither have our other major SEATO partners—Pakistan, France, and Britain.

Surely the evidence of even our own Defense Department is skimpy in this respect. Its latest figures, dated February 14, 1966, indicate that 11,100 North Vietnamese troops are in the south. When 11,000 troops enter to buttress a local force of an estimated 73,000 regulars and another 100,000 militia, while 200,000 American troops enter to buttress 700,000 South Vietnamese forces, it is no wonder that the world is skeptical of our allegation that an armed aggression from the north has occurred.

But the administration sees it, even if the other powers with much more at stake than we do not see it. It is, again unilaterally so far as other treaty powers are concerned, invoking paragraph 1 of article IV of SEATO to combat it.

Reciprocity is one of the most basic principles of international law.

If one partner refuses or is unable to perform his treaty obligations, the other parties are relieved of any obligation to perform. The general principle was stated in a thorough article as follows:

"However widely the various meanings of the word 'reciprocity' may differ, one idea underlies them all—that of the interrelation of action and counteraction, or, to put it more exactly, that of one side's action, whether consummated or expected, providing the motivation for that of the other *side*." (Lenhoff, "Reciprocity: The Legal Aspect of a Perennial Idea," 49 Northwestern University Law Review 627).

Applying this principle to Vietnam we find that the obligation under SEATO becomes a self-imposed one, apparently, without any reciprocal obligation by our treaty partners. We have 300,000 men involved in this conflict, counting those serving in the 7th Fleet. According to the Department of Defense, our 7 SEATO treaty partners had a total of some

1,600 men in Vietnam as of January 15, 1966. Australia had 1,400; New Zealand had 150; Thailand had 17; the United Kingdom had 12; the Philippines had 70; France and Pakistan had none and will never have any because they do not support our policy. Arthur and Don Larson have stated the question of reciprocity under the SEATO treaty this way:

"It must be remembered that our obligation under this treaty does not run to South Vietnam. South Vietnam is not a party, and indeed has on its part agreed to nothing. The commitment of the treaty runs to the other signers. As long as the other signers acknowledge no obligation to us to send troops in the present circumstances we have no such obligation to them."

We are using SEATO not as a collective commitment among interested and affected parties, but as an American hunting license to do what we choose to do in Vietnam. We are using it as a license to bomb whom we choose, to fight whom we choose, to send American military forces where we choose, without any regard whatever for the fact that the other treaty partners have not made any finding of an armed aggression from the North that for them, would bring paragraph 1 of article IV into operation.

Even Secretary Rusk will not go so far as to say that we have a legally binding obligation under SEATO. Prior to his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations on January 28, he had never stated that we were in Vietnam because of a SEATO obligation. On two specific instances in the last few years the Secretary has told the committee in executive session that we were not acting in Vietnam under SEATO. One was during his testimony on the southeast Asia resolution.

Therefore, I am unable to reconcile his statements to us in executive session and his statement to the committee on February 18 that "It is this fundamental SEATO obligation that has from the outset guided our actions in South Vietnam." The Secretary tells us one thing privately and another publicly.

In sum, we have not asked for SEATO action in Vietnam.

We have not called the SEATO Foreign Ministers together and asked that they invoke paragraph 1 of article IV.

We have not sought a collective finding of an armed aggression within the treaty area.

We have heard the American Secretary of State Rusk declare it. When did the hostilities in Vietnam cease being a subversion and become an armed attack? Even Mr. Rusk has not said. Presumably it was a few days before his testimony of January 29, 1966; otherwise, the United States would have been guilty of violating the requirement of paragraph 1 that all actions taken under it be reported to the Security Council.

In April of 1964, the previous rule whereby SEATO members had agreed to act only by unanimous vote was altered to permit a majority to take collective action if there were no negative vote. Abstentions would not count as negatives.

Why has not the United States sought a majority decision that armed aggression has occurred? Do we fear that even a majority of the other seven treaty partners would not share our finding? Or do we fear that France or Pakistan or others would cast a negative vote?

Since SEATO is clearly not acting as a collective defense body, have the members which do have troops in Vietnam reported their action to the Security Council as the treaty requires? Or were we acting as a self-appointed agent for the handful of soldiers that Austrialia and New Zealand have sent when we made our long delayed report to the Security Council some weeks ago?

There are too many loose ends lying around for a case to be made for justifying our action in Vietnam as a formal response under this treaty. To dragoon the American people into a war on so casual an invocation of a treaty is to call into question all our mutual and collective defense agreements, for the administration is laying down the principle now that only the United States has duties under these treaties and that we seek and expect no reciprocal duties and contributions from any of these so-called partners. Apparently we do not seek even a common understanding with them of the existence of a "common danger" in the treaty area.

WAR AUTHORITY RESIDES IN CONGRESS

With respect to our American constitutional practices, this audience will be interested in some discussion of the war power under these two treaties. In NATO, the terms of the treaty itself make clear that no further constitutional processes are necessary in case of an attack upon one of the treaty partners. Such an attack brings upon a state of war, insofar as the United States is concerned.

But this is not the case under SEATO. It specifically provides in article IV that an armed aggression shall be met in accord with the constitutional processes of each country.

Under our Constitution, this means the power of Congress to declare war.

During the Constitutional Convention, the business of declaring war was always treated as a legislative function. In none of the drafts was there any question of where this power should reside. Earlier drafts gave the Congress the power of "making war." The change in this phrasing to "declare" brought the only debate on the war power during the Convention. This debate demonstrates quite clearly the constitutional drafters' intentions. The noted constitutional authority, James Grafton Rogers, relates the incident in this way:

"Pinckney objected to the assignment of 'making war' to the legislative. Congress would be too slow, he said. The Senate would be a better designation. Butler suggests the President should be given the authority. Mr. Madison and Mr. Gerry moved to insert 'declare' striking out 'make war,' leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks. Sherman, Gerry, Ellsworth, and Mason all protested against leaving war altogether to the Executive. On a vote of eight States to one 'declare' was chosen with some explanation that this word left the 'conduct' of the war to the Executive while the Congress only could declare it."

In the Federalist, Hamilton wrote: "The President is to be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. In this respect his authority will be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It will amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first general and admiral of the Confederacy, while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the Legislature." That is Hamilton.

Some people say declarations of war are outdated, that events move too quickly and world affairs are too complex for adhering to the letter of the Constitution. This misses the point the Founding Fathers tried to drive home—the people must be brought into this decisionmaking process. James Grafton Rogers stated the underlying rationale of the Founding Fathers this way:

"War must be 'declared,' because it reaches many people. A declaration is in part a summons to citizens. It also gives notice that many legal rights are changed. Treaties are canceled. Trading and even correspondence with enemies is no longer proper. Enemy persons and property are restrained. Contracts and debts suspended. Our ships at sea and our own property and citizens abroad have only the protection force can provide. Vast and autocratic control of people by the Government is released by a declaration of war—the right to control prices, ration food and clothing, even to seize factories and to arrest our own people without the right to demand the charges against them or secure public trial.

"The Constitution says, therefore, in effect, 'Our country shall not be committed formally to a trial of force with another nation, our people generally summoned to the effort and all the legal consequences to people, rights and property incurred until the House, Senate and the President agree.' "

Our economic problems resulting from the war are being dealt with through evangelistic pleas from the President that housewives pass up the higher-priced items on the grocery shelves, and that businessmen forego making use of the investment tax credit to expand their enterprises. But the domestic ramifications of a war cannot long be dealt with by personal appeals for voluntary efforts any more than the military ramifications can be dealt with by appeals for voluntary action by the armed services.

This is the reason why the authority to declare war was vested in the Congress in the first place.

Nor was this war power delegated to the President by the resolution of August 1964. When the Tonkin Bay resolution was passed by the Senate in August of 1964, there were 16,000 American servicemen in South Vietnam. They were there in an advisory capacity. The object in asking Congress to pass that resolution was said to be that of warning North Vietnam of our intentions and thus avoiding war.

But the past history of these congressional resolutions has been that they have resulted in wars as well as avoided them. The Mexican war and the Spanish-American war were preceded by congressional resolutions endorsing an executive action that was designed to warn off a hostile power. They did not succeed then, and the Tonkin Bay resolution did not succeed in its purpose, either.

Just 2 days after signing the resolution, the President said: "Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict. They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job that Asian boys must do."

Today we have not 16,000 men in South Vietnam, but 230,000. One hundred thousand more are in Thailand and in the 7th Fleet offshore. Our men are no longer advisers but are carrying the brunt of the fighting. This fiscal year alone we will spend on the Vietnam war almost as much as we spent for the entire cost of the Korean war. Neither the resolution nor the rising level of American forces has caused the Vietcong to cease its efforts to take over the Government of South Vietnam. Nor has it had the desired effect upon North Vietnam, which was to warn it to stop supporting the Vietcong.

The real challenge to us in South Vietnam is to find a way to stop the fighting, to bring factions together who can stabilize the country. We could try to do that by inviting the noncombatant countries at the United Nations to lay down terms and conditions of a cease-fire. We could try to do it by pledging that the United States would accept and abide by any cease-fire the United Nations might order.

The noncombatant members of the U.N. themselves have an obligation to the terms of the charter to undertake to arrange a cease-fire, and to enforce it. Beyond that, we should be seeking to reconcile the conflicting political forces in South Vietnam if we hope ever to see a stable, indigenous government there.

Events in Europe are disproving, rather than proving the administration thesis that

American dependability in every alliance will come into question if we do not make good in South Vietnam. What is coming into question in NATO is the desirability of a mutual defense alliance with a United States that so totally disregards the mutuality of a treaty and seeks to transform it into a legal shield for pursuit of its national interests.

What is coming into question in this country is the desirability of these mutual defense alliances where no one but the United States seems to act.

In 1966, the United States is trying to create around China the same unified military force that we built around the Soviet Union in the 1950's. But we are getting little help from the large countries of Asia; and the further we pursue that objective, the more our on-going defense force in Europe seems to fall apart. These facts suggest to me that a policy that succeeded once, under certain conditions, can outgrow its usefulness; and it may not work elsewhere at all where conditions are as different as they are in southeast Asia.

We, too, can become prisoners of past slogans. We, no less than De Gaulle, can become mesmerized by a historic past when American power was complete and unchallenged. We, too, can make the mistake of thinking those conditions will again prevail if only we will do the same things now we did then.

To the east and to the west we see the world in flux. To sort out the useful elements in American policy that are still relevant and to devise new policies for those no longer relevant is the challenge to Americans today.

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVOLUTION—PART III

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the article entitled "The Birth Control Revolution" which was recently published in the Saturday Evening Post provides a clear and poignant discussion of current thinking on the moral aspects of birth control and birth control pills, particularly among teenagers or unmarried persons.

The moral problems associated with birth control are indeed serious and deserve the consideration of all who are concerned with the increase of illegitimacy and other social dangers in our society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, part III of this article entitled "The Moral Issue."

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

THE BIRTH CONTROL REVOLUTION—PART III

THE MORAL ISSUE

As the scientific revolution in birth control continues, solving human problems of many sorts, it also creates problems in morality. The new techniques eliminate fears that formerly deterred men and women from sex outside of marriage. With the deterrents reduced or gone, many people believe that the foundations of contemporary sexual morality may be threatened, especially the morals of the young. Newspaper headlines and book titles have cited "the new promiscuity" facilitated by the pill. "Sex on the campus" has been a popular topic on television discussion programs, and college health officers have shocked parents across the country by publicly reporting that coeds come to them for prescriptions for pills. One said that when a girl at a midwestern college recently made such a request, she was asked, "How old are you?"

"Twenty-one," the girl replied.

"You have a particular man in mind?"

"Well, yes, I do."

"Have you ever stopped to think that you might someday want to marry a man who holds virginity in high regard?" The doctor then asked.

"Yes," she said, candidly. "But I'm not at all sure I want to marry a man like that."

Indisputably, the revolution is making an impact on the lives and sex standards of the young, from teen-agers on up. Some authorities hope that the pill, prescribed for "the girl in trouble," the youngster whose sex impulses cannot be controlled, will at least prevent the tragedy of the illegitimate, unwanted child. Dr. Edward Tyler, president of the American Association of Planned Parenthood Physicians, says his clinic in Los Angeles follows the principle of giving birth-control help to girls who have had a baby or who are brought in by mothers saying they are afraid the daughters will become pregnant. In New York the Planned Parenthood clinics follow a similar rule, and if parents or guardians are not available, the girls are accepted for help on referral by a social or health agency, a clergyman or a physician.

As for the controversial issue of sex on the college campus, some college officials doubt the pill is really encouraging freer sex activity there. Though ministers and moralists are highly vocal about "the rapid breakdown of sexual moral standards" among the young, many administrators insist that the situation today is no different from what it has always been.

"We have about 5 percent whom I would call sexually active," observes Dr. Richard Moy, young head of the student health service at the University of Chicago. "But that's the same 5 percent we've always had. As for the pills, many girls have them when they come to school. Their family doctors at home have prescribed them. Or they borrow from each other or use the prescription of a married sister. Or they put on an engagement ring and get them as part of preparation for marriage. It's not a very formidable task to obtain the pills." A doctor on the west coast says, "I'm sure many are sold in the drugstores without prescriptions, and there is certainly a lot of pill swapping, like sugar or eggs."

Some investigators and many students insist that promiscuity is no more acceptable today than it was 40 years ago. Nevitt Sanford, professor of education and psychology at Stanford University, reports in the National Education Association Journal that on the basis of 12 years of studies at three schools—an eastern women's college, a western State university and a private college in the west, "there has been no revolutionary change in the status of premarital intercourse since the 1920's." He finds that between 20 and 30 percent of the women in his samples were not virgins at the time of graduation, and he thinks this is about the same percentage that existed in the 1920's.

A number of college girls interviewed on these questions believe there has been an increase in premarital intercourse, but not in the direction of promiscuity. "There is a more sensible assessment of the problem than our parents used to make," one girl explained. "I don't think that promiscuity is condoned any more today than it ever was. But sex between people in love, people who hope or expect their relationship to grow into marriage, is much more common." Nor do the girls think the rise in premarital sex is due to the pill.

Mrs. Mary-Jane Snyder, of the Chicago Planned Parenthood staff, had a discussion on several topics with girls from a half-dozen colleges. On the subject of the pills, one of them said, "A lot of girls who were using other precautions have changed to the pills, I think—in fact, I know. But that's just like changing from the horse and buggy to the automobile—it's progress." Another agreed. "No, I don't think the pill has changed campus morals. The change was there. The pills just make it easier." A third girl remarked, "Just think what the automobile did to increase sex activity. Don't forget, though, there are still a lot of girls left with strong old moral fiber."

"I wish it didn't seem so old-fashioned to have high moral values," one coed commented. "So many girls would just love to be able to say out loud that they think too much is being made of the importance of sex. The silly thing is that it's sort of embarrassing to admit that you disapprove. It's 'the thing' to sound modern and blasé even if you aren't. For this reason, one can get a false impression of the percentage of girls who indulge."

A faculty member at a big eastern university also doubts the pill has been a factor in changing campus morals, although he notes that "a great many girls are taking the pills, girls whose mothers send them to school all informed and ready."

"It seems to me that the changed circumstances between the sexes is the crucial factor," observes John Munro, dean of Harvard University. "The independence of women, for example. Going steady—the steady companionship of individual couples—is another aspect. Boys and girls are so much more companionable than ever before. Girls can do so much more, too. Families will send a couple of girls to Europe unchaperoned, for example. Or boys and girls start off together on some idealistic mission. But the young people, depending much on each other, become sexually entangled. Then one of them gets tired of the situation and the other suffers emotionally, and what you have is divorce before marriage, which can be pretty hard on these people." But one girl asks: "So long as we have no child—thanks to the pill—our relationship affects only ourselves. Why is this so wrong, when no one else gets hurt?"

A controversy over birth-control pills recently flared on the campus of Pembroke College, the women's division of Brown University, in Providence, R.I. A 19-year-old reporter for the Pembroke Record, a campus paper, called on Dr. Roswell D. Johnson, the Pembroke College health director, without identifying herself as a reporter, and asked for a prescription for the pills. In her article she wrote that she had "obtained a tentative prescription," though she went on to say she was "refused a prescription for the time being on the grounds that she was under age." Her story claimed Dr. Johnson did not mention any need for parental permission.

Dr. Johnson flatly contradicted the reporter on this point, saying he couldn't even begin to talk to her about prescribing pills for her because she was under 21. "I also told her the only way she could get them was for her parents to write and request me to prescribe them," he said, "and when I added, 'I assume you're not in the mood to write to them?' she replied, 'Oh-h-h, no-o-o.'

"Anyone over 21, however, is a free agent," Dr. Johnson remarked, although he said he had actually prescribed the pills for only two unmarried students, and both of them were planning to be married. He added that if a girl asked him for a pill prescription he wanted to know why she wanted it. "I want to feel I'm contributing to a good solid relationship and not to promiscuity," he said.

Mrs. Annabelle Cooper, executive director of the Washtenaw County League for Planned Parenthood, in Ann Arbor, Mich., finds no perceptible increase in the number of unmarried college girls under 21 applying to

the clinic for contraceptives. "Those who want contraceptives can get them so easily at the corner drugstore," she says, "that they usually don't come to us. The pills aren't available there without prescription, of course, nor the intrauterine devices nor the diaphragms. But foams and condoms are."

The Washtenaw clinic's policy statement on services to unmarried women is clear and decisive:

Contraceptive services are given to all women 21 years or older, all married women under 21, and all unmarried mothers 21 or under "upon consideration." "All women under 21 who are definitely engaged are given contraceptive service prior to marriage," the statement continues. "All others are counseled, but given contraceptive service only with their parents' permission."

The premarital counseling and examination will be given as long as 3 months before marriage. "We have trained social workers who try to determine if a young girl is really going to be married," Mrs. Cooper explained. "Occasionally we see a girl who is 'premarital' for a long as 2 years."

Among young couples who have premarital intercourse, many actually refuse to use contraceptives. In addition to those who observe a religious prohibition, there are couples who believe that the use of any contraceptive is "too premeditated," or is "not sincere." "Some felt 'planned intercourse' was not romantic, and was too great a transgression of standards," says Dr. Joseph Katz, of Stanford. "I believe this is one of the biggest factors in unwanted pregnancies."

Occasionally one finds a lonely, unloved girl who wants to become pregnant, even though she has no hope of marrying the baby's father. And there is always the girl who tries to snare a boy by this means. In contrast with these girls is the one whose story a university official said he had every reason to believe. Even though she was not having intercourse, she still was taking the pills, she told him, because when she turned down a man she wanted it to be a matter of her own free choice and not because she was scared.

With her bewildering reasoning, the girl had touched upon what may be the only inarguable conclusion that can be drawn about the impact of the birth-control revolution on sex behavior: In cases where fear of pregnancy was the sole deterrent, the reliability of the new contraceptives has removed that fear.

MORMON CHURCH NOT INVOLVED IN POLITICAL ALINEMENTS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial published in the Church News of March 26, 1966, entitled "Politics and Religion," printed in the RECORD.

The Church News is a section that appears weekly in the Deseret News, a daily newspaper that has been published in Salt Lake City since 1850. This newspaper is wholly owned, and is published by, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The Church News section is devoted to matters that are of interest to the members of the Mormon Church.

Recent activities of some of the members of the Mormon Church have brought charges that the church is favorably disposed toward the John Birch Society. The church has now officially spoken directly on this subject, and the editorial carries the message.

I should point out that this is not the first time that the presidency of the church has spoken and made it abundantly clear that the church was not involved in political alinements. Those who have charged the church of affiliation with, or sympathy for, or even any interest in, the John Birch Society, would do well to read this editorial.

It is devoutly to be hoped that this ringing editorial, disassociating the church from Communists, racists, and Birchers, will lay at rest for all time charges that have been made concerning the Mormon Church and the John Birch Society.

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

POLITICS AND RELIGION

The United States has a divinely appointed mission in the world. It was set up as a free Nation in the last days by act of God. This was predicted by the Savior when He ministered among the Nephites and was shown also to Nephi in his vision of the future.

The mission of the United States was plainly portrayed by the Savior when He said: "It is wisdom in the Father that they (the Gentiles) should be established in this land and be set up as a free people by the power of the Father that these things (true Gospel teachings) might come forth from them unto a remnant of your seed that the covenant of the Father may be fulfilled which He hath covenanted with His people, O house of Israel." (3 Nephi 21:4).

In a miraculous manner "these things" were restored in the latter days in the only land on earth which was free enough to permit it.

Under the sheltering power of this great government, the Lord's work has spread from border to border, and from here has been taken to all other free nations.

American passports are a protection to the missionaries as they traverse the world. Embassies have assured fair treatment to these ambassadors of Christ as citizens, and under the American flag our servicemen have introduced the Gospel where no missionaries had ventured. This, of course, was during wartime.

The Savior's prediction thus far has seen a great fulfillment. But, it is not yet complete. The destiny of America will continue on into the future, as will also the work of the church.

At times, America's position has been challenged, both from within and without. Our Constitution, divinely given, has been called into question; our flag has been desecrated, our citizens outraged. Mistakes in administration have disturbed the course of the ship of state, but Providence has continued with us.

Groups have formed both to protect and to undermine our way of life. Riots have been fomented by misguided and, at times, vicious leaders. Anarchy has been invited.

Pressure groups have taken sides against each other, often also against the best interests of the Nation. Unwise and sometimes evil persons have been elected to public office and their sacred trust occasionally has been abused for unrighteous purposes.

Good citizens wonder what may be done to steady the ship of state. Should they join any of the special groups pulling one way or another? And if so, which one? How can they tell which is good or bad? The names of some organizations are frighteningly misleading, in fact deliberately deceptive. Some which have a patriotic appearance in reality are the opposite.

What can Latter-day Saints do? In which direction should they turn?

There is one safe path for members of the church. That is found in righteously living the Gospel and following the precedent of the church in obeying both the laws of the land and the laws of God.

We have been taught to avoid extremes and extremists, whether in the word of wisdom, in politics or in any other area of thought. The Lord's work is not accomplished by immoderate measures and radical groups.

At the beginning of this dispensation in one of the revelations to the Prophet Joseph Smith the Lord said: "No one can assist in this work except he shall be humble and full of love, having faith, hope, and charity, being temperate in all things." (D. & C. 12: 8)

At another time He said: "Be patient, be sober, be temperate; have patience, faith, hope and charity." (D. & C. 6: 19)

The Lord justifies us in defending our Constitution and this land for which it was written. But He does not justify radicalism in doing so. Anyone who reads His pronouncement on war may see how really temperate and patient He is. (D. & C. 98: 23–48)

The great men of our Nation have never been extremists. Washington certainly was not. Lincoln was patience and kindness personified. He felt that the strength of the Nation rested in the masses of the common people, not in pressure groups. "* * * of the people, by the people and for the people."

Some have accused the church of being communistic because it once taught the United Order. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Communism is anti-Christ. The church is the church of Jesus Christ, established by Him and for His purposes.

Some others have wondered if the church is involved in such groups as the John Birch Society, but it is no more a part of that group than of any other political aggregation.

The church has nothing to do with Communists, nothing to do with racists, nothing to do with Birchers, nothing to do with any slanted group. But it does have everything to do with the eternal salvation of human souls.

Furthermore, let it be remembered that it is a church, not a political organization. It takes no sides politically. It does stand for moral issues. Its members have free agency as citizens. Knowing that a one-party system means a dictatorship, it favors a two- or multiple-party system. It stands for free elections and law-abiding practices.

It teaches that the best way to safeguard America is through righteous Gospel living so that we may earn the divine protection which is promised if the citizenry will but serve the God of the land.

WASHINGTON AIRPORT MESS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, yesterday, the Wall Street Journal published a front page story discussing the Washington airport mess.

The article written by Burt Schorr is an objective presentation of the many problems facing Dulles International Airport. It points out how these problems will be compounded if jet passenger service is inaugurated at Washington National Airport.

As Mr. Schorr points out, Dulles is costing the taxpayers $7.3 million annually. An economic feasibility study prepared by Operations Research, Inc. for the Federal Aviation Agency shows that opening National to two- and three-engine jets will cost the Federal Government an additional $85 million in lost revenue between now and 1980.

If one adds to those amounts the possible expenditure of $150 million for new terminal facilities at National Airport, he is suddenly faced with the realization that the public will end up being taken

for a ride by the FAA at a total cost of approximately $300 million by 1980.

By my standards, Mr. President, that is a lot of money. Furthermore, it is a wasteful expenditure at a time when we must economize and eliminate unnecessary expenditures.

Last weekend, WTOP radio broadcast an interview with former FAA Administrator Najeeb E. Halaby, now a senior vice president of Pan American World Airways.

Mr. Halaby pointed out that Washington National Airport was built for the DC-3 and is most ill-equipped to handle modern jet traffic. He further stated that National Airport is already the most congested airport in the Nation. The accuracy of Mr. Halaby's remarks can be attested to by anyone who uses National Airport.

Congress has established that the FAA should not operate Dulles and National Airports at a profit—but by the same token, however, Congress did not intend for those airports to be a continuing drain on the U.S. Treasury. No airport authority in the entire country loses money on its airports like the FAA—they could not afford it.

I submit, Mr. President, that it is time for Congress to make crystal clear it will not continue to underwrite the losses now incurred at these two airports. We should call upon the FAA's Administrator, William McKee, to prepare a sound management plan within the next 6 months which will place the airports' finances on an even keel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Schorr's article printed in the RECORD.

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

"AIRPORT OF TOMORROW," WASHINGTON'S DULLES, HAS PROBLEMS APLENTY—DISTANT FIELD OPERATES AT SOME 20 PERCENT OF CAPACITY; JETS' DEBUT AT NATIONAL IS NEW THREAT

(By Burt Schorr)

CHANTILLY, VA.—The Federal Aviation Agency's "fact book" about Government-owned Dulles International Airport promises visitors a 250-room hotel and two office buildings near the soaring glass-walled terminal. But the sites are still vacant.

Inside the echoing terminal itself, the men's apparel shop and the duty-free liquor store have folded. Other concessionaires are being allowed to pay less than the minimum rent. Four local-service airlines whose dates for starting Dulles operations were "to be announced," according to the June 1963 fact book, still haven't shown up.

Clearly, the Washington area's "airport of tomorrow" is finding that tomorrow is a long time in arriving; certainly longer than the Government expected. When Dulles opened in November 1962, the FAA predicted it would be handling 2,600,000 passengers annually by 1965. Instead, fewer than 1,000,000 used Dulles last year, and the FAA estimates the airport is operating at only about 20 percent of present capacity.

The agency insists that aviation growth and technological advances such as the supersonic transport will justify the Government's $109 million investment in Dulles by the mid-1970's. "Dulles benefited from the lesson of aviation history that airports usually require rebuilding 5 years after completion," asserts one FAA official.

HALABY AND HINDSIGHT

But, reluctantly, the man who was FAA administrator when the airport was opened expresses a contrary view. "Hindsight may indicate that Dulles was opened too soon and too far from the city center," concedes Najeeb E. Halaby, now a senior vice president of Pan American World Airways.

The troubles besetting the 10,000-acre airport 27 miles west of the capital's center likely will be compounded when, starting April 24, small and medium-size jet planes will be allowed to operate regularly at the only other Government-owned civil field, Washington National Airport, along the Potomac only 4 miles south of the city.

The FAA long resisted pressure from carriers and communities to open 67-acre National Airport to jets. "Every pound (of cargo) and every passenger that lands at Washington National in a jet is a passenger and a pound that does not land at Dulles International," Mr. Halaby, then FAA Administrator, told a House committee last year. Republican Representative JOEL BROYHILL, whose Virginia congressional district includes part of Dulles as well as National, wishes jets would remain banned from National for 2 more years; he says one reason for building Dulles was the "dangerous congestion" at National, which handled nearly 7 million passengers last year. He has support in the Maryland congressional delegation, whose members see any curbs at National as a benefit to Baltimore's city-owned Friendship International Airport, 32 miles north of Washington.

While most Congressmen, frequent airline users, would be loath to see National's convenience restricted, some on Capitol Hill believe Dulles' financial plight might at least bring on a formal inquiry into the big airport's future. Dulles' net book loss, counting interest and depreciation, is running at a rate of $7.3 million a year. The FAA, which initially assured Congress that the airport would repay its assigned capital costs over 30 years, now figures the payback at 35 years, and a former FAA official who played a leading role in the Dulles planning says that, under present conditions, it might take 45 years.

The biggest handicap for Dulles is its remote location. The 40-minute ride to Washington, much of it through beautiful rolling countryside, compares favorably with the time required to reach the city from such urban airports as Chicago's O'Hare International and New York's Kennedy International. What those airports don't face, however, is a major competitor like National only 15 minutes from downtown. Also, the limousine ride from Dulles costs $2.50, versus $1.35 from National, and the cab fare is a stiff $13.

"Naturally the businessman with an appointment at a Government office prefers being routed to National," says the vice president in charge of airport planning for a major trunkline.

"We're in the business of selling time savings," says Edwin L. Colodny, Allegheny Airlines senior vice president for legal affairs and economic research. Allegheny, which serves National but not Dulles, carries its average passenger only 198 miles, Mr. Colodny says, "and if we take him to an airport that's 30 minutes farther away from Washington we've lost him 50 percent of his time savings."

The trunklines have agreed informally with the FAA to maintain 89 of the present 103 daily arrivals and departures at Dulles after National opens to jets (Braniff International Airways intends to transfer from Dulles its 14 daily arrivals and departures of twin-jet BAC-111's). What's uncertain, however, is how many Dulles passengers might be lured to National by the shorter flying times there.

A jet flight from National Airport to Chicago, say, could connect with a nonstop flight on to Los Angeles, competing directly with present Los Angeles flights from Dulles. Also, jets at National will mean more seats and improved schedules. Delta Air Lines, for one, now serves National with three daily DC-7 flights totaling 231 seats. After April 24 it will replace two of these propeller flights with three DC-9 jets, making four flights and 272 seats. The anticipated addition of one or more stretched DC-9's carrying up to 90 passengers could improve Delta's service at National still more.

Dulles boasts two costly innovations that have yet to prove their value—its own 14½-mile limited-access highway to help link it with the city, and 21 mobile lounges to carry passengers between terminal and aircraft parked as much as a mile away.

The approach ramps to the $19.3 million four-lane highway deliberately prevent westbound motorists from getting off except at the airport and prevent Washington-bound drivers from getting on anyplace but there. The intention is to avoid congestion—but so far there's been little danger of that.

The mobile lounges, 90-passenger buses built by Chrysler Corp., cost a total of $6.5 million including development expenses. They represent a radical departure from conventional airport traffic-flow techniques; significantly, no other American airport uses them or intends to.

"An unproved experiment," is how Joseph A. Foster, Houston's director of aviation, describes them. Houston investigated the Dulles design in great depth before settling on its own $150 million design for Houston International Airport, due to open in June 1967. "We simply couldn't afford to take the same risk as the Federal Government."

The purpose of the mobile lounge is to reduce walking distance for passengers. But the 21 lounges at Dulles require a driver-supervisor force of 44 men. And the terminal was built big enough to house gates for 24 lounges; less than half that many are needed to accommodate current traffic. A less costly alternative would have been to construct a terminal to which loading fingers could be added as needed. Houston's technique for shortening walking distances will be to set its terminal buildings and parking lots in a row between two loading aprons, with access provided by a vehicular tunnel.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PAT McNAMARA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, no one can regret the announced retirement of Senator PAT McNAMARA of Michigan more than I. Since 1958, I have served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with this distinguished gentleman, and we have formed a relationship of more than respect; that of good personal friends. PAT McNAMARA is one of my best friends in this body. It is with sadness that I see him retire. His sense of honor called him to retirement, because of his ill health.

When PAT McNAMARA says that he believes he might not be able to give full justice to his Senate responsibilities, that means far more than it would for any normal man, for Senator McNAMARA has set high standards for himself. In general, he has achieved his goals.

Senator McNAMARA has been a supporter of the cold war GI bill every year since it was first introduced in 1959. He has given his total support to seeing that five million cold war veterans received

educational opportunities and a fair chance in life.

Senator MCNAMARA has without a doubt been one of the most valuable and influential members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in history, supporting all progressive, remedial, beneficial legislation to strengthen the health, education, and welfare opportunities of the people of this country.

As chairman of the Public Works Committee, PAT MCNAMARA demonstrated that his interest ran to every area in this great country, and that his vision was broad and enough to encompass every facet of our economy.

The absence of this great man, who has done so much for this Nation and for his home State of Michigan, will be dearly felt in the Senate, just as the beneficial results of the many programs he has fostered will be felt for years to come throughout the United States. We will miss him most of all in the committees where he was such a faithful worker for progress. We will miss him everywhere in Washington.

THE INDIVIDUAL CASUALTY IN VIETNAM—A RADIO BROADCAST FROM SAIGON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think we all have a tendency to become hardened by press reports of dozens of battles involving thousands of men. Arthur Koestler observed once that "Statistics do not bleed." Amidst the tumult and the shouting we frequently lose sight of the individual casualty—and of the tragic cost of war.

A recent radio broadcast from Saigon movingly elaborated on the meaning of this cost. The radio correspondent is a constituent of mine, Clyde Edwin Pettit, who traveled around the world on assignment of Station KBBA in Benton, Ark., and did some most incisive reporting on the war in Vietnam.

The station to which I refer is owned by David McDonald, Winston Riddle, and Mel Spann of my State. It is a small station, without the budget or the staff or the facilities of the large networks or the weekly news magazines. But like many other small stations and periodicals throughout our country, they try to do a good job of honest and accurate reporting. I believe that stations like this are to be commended on their high level of public service programing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of one of Mr. Pettit's series of broadcasts be inserted in the RECORD.

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

BROADCAST FROM SAIGON

For KBBA news, this is Ed Pettit reporting from Saigon.

This is the last of our letters from Vietnam.

In these broadcasts we could have been talking about battalions and regiments, about casualties and statistics, about tactics and strategy. But instead we've been talking about people, about GI's and Vietnamese. For it takes people to fight a war. And when wars end, as all wars must someday end, men may look back on days gone by, may reminisce of the pleasures of conquest, or of comradeship, or of common fears once fleetingly known.

But those who have seen the face of war are never nostalgic about war itself. For no man can honestly glorify nor glamorize war. That is, no one who has really been there.

For war is the men in the camps, and the women who follow the camps, and it is also disease as well as death or destruction. And it is drudgery—plain hard work and the monotony of being "support troops"—the totally important men without which there could be no war. Many would like to be in combat, but they are support troops, knowing that for the rest of their lives they will be asked, "Were you ever in combat?" They will hesitate and answer, but they now know they will never be able to explain that simply being here in Vietnam can be dangerous, and that any man is in combat the instant somebody tries to kill him.

War is the infinite beauty of a verdant jungle anguished by a piercing animal shriek of one man bayoneting another. And his last breath is the final, pitiable groan of one you didn't even know, could hardly hate, and of whom you might have been a friend under other circumstances.

For war is taking, and war is giving, and war is the sharing of common hopes and dreams.

War is walking warily in the steps of the man in front of you, and the funny feeling of knowing that if your friend steps on a land mine he will be the one to get it. Only the first man knows how it feels to walk in front.

War is the tension of being a target, and, for some, of being hit by your own men because somebody made a mistake.

If you're a civilian here, war is the chance to make a quick killing in the black market. Or, perhaps, to quick killing, period, if you are paid well enough. Or, for some civilians, the chance to see your house burned to the ground by a bomb. Or to see your father's head cut off before your eyes.

War is the warm, rich blood of a man washing away and mixing with the black mud of the Mekong River, each cell of his blood stamped by his heredity with the uniqueness that made him, once, an individual.

So war is the wicked waste and destruction of the wonder of life itself.

Perhaps the worst thing about war is that it changes the laughter of those who love life into the weeping of new wives and young widows. War is hardest on the living, on those who must carry on, tortured by poignant memories of the past, racked with the bitter reality of the irrevocable, destined always to wonder, pointlessly, what might have been.

War is death, and death is an indiscriminate harlot who chooses capriciously with whom she will lie in fatal embrace—the coward today, the brave man tomorrow.

And war is something that puts the really important things in their proper perspective: things like survival and health.

War is the triumphantly happy smile on the face of a kid who has just been told by a doctor that only a few more operations and he may be able to see again.

In war there is the joy of simple things: of tasting a chocolate milk shake, or a cold beer, or of getting to see a Hollywood movie out in the field at night even if the mosquitoes are biting you. And perhaps the greatest pleasure of all: the joy of a shower once a week, if you're lucky.

War is a bunch of guys having a last game of touch football before going out on a patrol from which some may never return.

War is the wandering mind of a young man on guard duty, thinking wistfully of a fireplace in Vermont, or a girl in Tennessee, or a hotrod in California.

War is a bangalore mine blowing the guts out of a guy from Grand Rapids.

War is the form of what once was a man, covered by flies, in a half-forgotten foreign field.

This might have been a doctor or a druggist from Des Moines or a farmer in Florida or a crop-dusting pilot from Pine Bluff, or he might have been a happy failure.

But now he is a statistic: only one of the casualties termed "moderate" in the press reports and by the politicians.

Of course, a nation must never fear to fight aggression and tyranny. But it would be a disservice to the dead not to pause and, out of respect, consider the cost.

For the cost of war is in the millions: the millions of homes that will never be built, the millions who will die from diseases that would have been conquered by medical research were it not for the cost of war.

The cost of war is in the billions: the billions of days that will never be lived.

CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO.'S HUGE EXPORTS HELP OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, recently I read an editorial published in the Peoria, Ill., Journal Star on the subject of the Caterpillar Tractor Co.'s huge volume of exports.

This matter assumes national significance when we consider its beneficial effect on our balance-of-payments position. In 1965, Caterpillar sold to customers outside the United States $461 million worth of products built in the United States by American workmen. If only a few more U.S. firms could show a record like this, we might possibly have no balance-of-payments problem at all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Caterpillar Shows the Way on Exports," published in the Tuesday, February 8, edition of the Peoria Journal Star, printed in the RECORD.

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

CATERPILLAR SHOWS THE WAY ON EXPORTS

A couple of years ago it was fashionable among those whose prejudices automatically expect perfidy and doubletalk from "management" to suspect and expect the worst from Caterpillar overseas expansion.

Today, the actual performance and experience demonstrates that, in fact, Caterpillar management's explanations, projections, and pronouncements on their future operations were accurate and wise.

The latest annual report to the stockholders reveals that exports have so increased as to jump already high figures by 20 percent in the income from overseas sales. This increase they have reported in the context of the balance of payments and of how (responding to the crying need the President has sounded) they have contributed $461 million to a more favorable balance. The previous year it had climbed to $373 million.

This is of key benefit to the entire financial position of the United States with its delicate situation on gold in foreign trade, but the direct nature of the benefit lies in the fact that it is of goods manufactured in our plants and sold overseas.

The 25 percent of overseas sales that is actually manufactured overseas has "opened doors" whereby the 75 percent overseas sales being made of products made here exceeds all previous sales put together.

Net gain is spectacular, and is precisely what Caterpillar predicted, and the gainers are not just Government with its eye on foreign trade balance but the tens of thou-

sands of workers engaged in making the equipment here that is thus being sold abroad.

The increase once again emphasizes the plain fact that Caterpillar's success, its employment level, and its ability to meet cost levels depend on the ability of the company to make sales in other countries.

As a leader in this complex field, Caterpillar has also passed on some of its knowledge and techniques to others, and assisted Governor Kerner in his efforts to stimulate overseas sales for Illinois firms.

It is no accident that the Manufacturers News, in announcing the 1966 directory of Illinois manufacturer's, calls attention proudly to the fact that "Illinois industry is developing new international muscle."

More than 5,000 Illinois firms now sell goods and services throughout the world. Almost 20 percent of the manufacturing and processing firms in this Midwestern State now do business overseas.

Meanwhile some 1,500 firms moved into Illinois locations during 1965 and only 3 moved out to locations elsewhere.

There is a connection.

The Governor deserves due credit for recognizing that the grassroots base for resolving economic problems, for having a base to support governmental efforts in solving social problems, and for maintaining key services lies in increased industry.

He deserves credit for working effectively in that direction, and for recognizing the key importance of export sales to it.

Caterpillar deserves credit for pioneering in this field and for giving every expert assistance to the Governor's program and to other firms interested in doing business in foreign lands.

Everyone is better off for it, just as we would all find ourselves worse off if this State had stood still in this field of activity.

Caterpillar has thus also demonstrated, with dramatic results, the honesty, integrity, and accuracy of its announcements on future plans of this kind, and its effective concern for the United States, this State, this community, and the security of its own work force.

Talk is talk, and facts are facts.

We have again been shown that the two go together at Caterpillar, and this, too, is a matter of great importance to this community.

HANKSVILLE TELEPHONE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is very hard to believe that in the year 1966, when we see daily feats of electronic gadgetry, that some areas of this great Nation are just barely catching up with some of our most commonplace achievements.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, following my remarks, a feature article written by William F. Smiley, the education editor for the Salt Lake Tribune.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Mr. Smiley's article tells how a small school at Hanksville, Wayne County, Utah, has just had its first private telephone installed. Through a Ford Foundation grant, the school was able to have a telephone installed along with a complex amplifying system so that each of the 37 students in the 2 classrooms can participate in telephone discussions with a caller.

It is also particularly interesting to note that the telephone is the only private line in the community of Hanksville. There are three other phones in the town, all of them pay stations at commercial establishments.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Arthur H. Lee, the Wayne County school superintendent and Mrs. Elayne Schwartz, a teacher at the school, for taking the initiative and securing Ford assistance for this project. As Mrs. Schwartz says in the article:

Education should teach children to live as well as how to work in the world about them.

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

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune, Mar. 31, 1966]

WHEN TELEPHONE RINGS, HANKSVILLE HAILS WORLD

(By William F. Smiley)

When the telephone rings in the Hanksville schoolroom sometime next month—

Wait a minute. Telephone? In the Hanksville schoolroom?

Why there are only three telephones in Hanksville, all pay stations and operated on a magneto (hand crank) system. There's no telephone in the school.

Or in the homes of the schoolchildren.

That's why Mrs. Elayne C. Schwartz, one of two teachers at the school, got the support of the Wayne County Board of Education, Supt. Arthur H. Lee and the Ford Foundation to put a telephone in the school, complete with amplifier so that the 20 children in her class and the 17 in George L. Morrell's room can roll back the dividing wall and talk from their desks and hear the person on the other end of the telephone without leaving their desks.

LOCATION: CENTRAL NOWHERE

Hanksville, located in the central nowhere of Wayne County, is 55 miles from any other town, its television reception is poor, it has those three toll stations, and it has had electricity for only 6 years.

So, when the telephone rings in the Hanksville schoolroom sometime next month, everything will come to a halt while Mrs. Schwartz flips a switch and brings "The world to us."

That is the name of the Ford Foundation project.

OUT OF ISOLATION

"Education should teach children to live as well as how to work in the world about them," Mrs. Schwartz said. "These children know about such a small part of the world because of their geographic isolation. It is difficult for them to imagine that there is anything beyond the shale mounds to the west, the undulating washes to the north and south, and the mighty crevice of the Dirty Devil River to the east."

OPERATING THE AMPLIFIER

The Hanksville telephones are operated from the Price exchange of the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., and Philip B. Horsley, manager, said the school installation will be made "as soon as our engineers solve a method of operating the amplifier on a magneto basis."

It will require designing of a special circuit to make the amplifier work, he said.

THE MANY FACES OF CRIME

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have here an address on crime by my distinguished college from Massachusetts, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY.

The address, delivered to the Boston University Symposium on Crime, April 1, 1966, is a carefully thought out comment on this Nation's crime problem, and it reflects a rare insight of the basic issues confronting not only law enforcement, but the courts and the public if the current threat to law and order is to be justly resolved.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

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

THE MANY FACES OF CRIME

(Address by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY before the Boston University Symposium on Crime, Boston, Mass., April 1, 1966)

I am delighted to be here tonight to participate with you in this weekend symposium. I congratulate Boston University's Student Congress for planning this program—which seems an extremely constructive approach to an urgent social problem concerning us all.

The fact of crime is as old as civilization itself—only the definition has changed. In 1639 our Pilgrim Fathers considered unusual dress a crime and churches were urged to prosecute those who "followed new fashion and fell to excessive costliness in attire."

Twenty years later in Massachusetts, the alleged crime of witchcraft sent people to the stake and a few years later the crime of selling liquor to the Indians sent liquor dealers to the whipping block.

These so-called crimes are no longer on our statute books. But the fact of crime continues to affect us all, and far more significantly than it affected the lives of our Pilgrim Fathers.

No human need is more elemental than personal security. No freedom is more basic than freedom from fear. Yet if we cannot feel safe and secure in our homes and on our streets, we are not fully free. The first duty of government, as Thomas Hobbes observed centuries ago, is to provide that protection and that security.

But our personal security is now being threatened by the high rate of crime—and the threat is growing.

The crime rate in this country has doubled since 1940; the dollar costs of crime run to tens of billions of dollars annually; and the human costs of crime, both physical and psychological, are so staggering they cannot really be computed.

Some say this growth in crime is due to a weakening of our country's moral fiber, a growing disrespect for the law encouraged by the civil rights demonstrations of recent years. Others seek to place the blame on recent court decisions expanding the constitutional safeguards we afford individuals accused of crimes.

I think judgments such as these are both misguided and dangerous. They are misguided because they precede rather than follow a careful and rational analysis of the problem involved.

And they are dangerous because, by seeking solace for fears rather than knowledge for solutions, these judgments tend to divert attention from the real causes of crime and to pose a threat to our courts and our Constitution—historically the strongest bulwarks of our democratic society.

We must not blame the crime rate on criminal coddling or bleeding-heart judges. Nor must we choose between the rights our Constitution affords every citizen—including the right to peacefully demonstrate—and the right of each citizen to public safety and protection.

The protection of our constitutional rights requires vigilance. There is a natural tendency, as the crime rate rises, to relax the

safeguards we afford all people in order to obtain more convictions of the guilty. We must guard against this tendency. We must work toward a system of criminal justice which both provides safety and protection for all members of society and at the same time guarantees to every American those essential safeguards contained in our Bill of Rights.

The firm observance of these constitutional rights may allow some of the guilty to avoid conviction. This is the conscious choice we make, for example, when we insist upon the right of the indigent to be represented by counsel. But it is also the price a free society must pay for the values it places on individual rights and personal dignity. I think we are strong enough to afford that price.

Our expanding effort to protect the right of the individual is not a satisfactory explanation for the crime problem. What, then, is the explanation, and what is the solution?

There is no single or simple answer to our crime problem. Indeed, there is a great deal about the phenomena of criminal behavior about which we know very little. But some basic things we do know.

We know that crime is a national problem. We know that it must be attacked at all levels of government, that we all have a responsibility to combat it. And—because crime has so many faces—we know that we must seek not pat answers which reinforce our prejudices, but mature and sophisticated explanations which enable us to match our national concern over crime with a blueprint for action—a strategy for tomorrow upon which we can agree as a nation.

Let me offer you a few examples of the many faces of crime.

A drug addict breaks into a New York apartment in search of something of value to finance his next purchase of narcotics. This is crime.

A police officer is murdered by a man attempting to rob a bank—a man who has spent most of his adult years in prison, but who prison failed to rehabilitate. This is crime.

Then there are those for whom crime is a business—those who feed off the weaknesses and ills of others, who support and profit from the traffic in narcotics, prostitution, and illegal gambling. They are the true leeches of our society. This most assuredly is crime.

And finally, a petty quarrel in Watts explodes into violent riot, arson, looting, and murder. This, too, is crime.

Each of these examples represents a different kind of social problem. Each requires special study, special attention, and the application of special skills. Each represents one of the many faces of crime. I could enumerate many others. I have chosen these few examples, because in each instance I have named, it seems to me that our Nation, through ignorance and public indifference, shares the blame for the criminal activity.

Consider first the problem of drug addiction, a spawning ground for all types of crime.

For far too long, this country has treated drug addicts as if they were ordinary criminals, rather than the victims of a serious disease. Because of our ignorance and indifference, we have failed both the addicts and ourselves.

As a result, drug addiction has increased at such a rate that there are today some 60,000 to 100,000 addicts in the United States. They consume some $350 million worth of heroin a year, and their habits—financed by petty crime—are exploited by organized crime feeding on the spread of this disease.

If we are to arrest this malignancy—if we are to fight the different faces of crime which flow from drug addiction—we need a new direction. Some of us in Congress are working now on legislation which would offer to addicts, under Federal jurisdiction, some hope of rehabilitation, by providing for civil commitment rather than imprisonment, for those addicts charged with or convicted of a Federal offense, who can benefit from medical treatment.

Under the proposed law, selected addicts would be placed in medical facilities under the supervision of the Attorney General and the Surgeon General. After it was determined that the addict had responded to treatment, he would be returned to his community under a carefully supervised community after-care program.

There is good reason to believe that this approach will return many more addicts to a normal life. California, which pioneered this kind of program in 1961, has had remarkable success with it. About half of those committed under the California program have returned to their communities and have not gone back to narcotics.

This kind of plan is not what the layman thinks of when he considers crime and punishment. But it is the kind of plan which I believe can make a significant contribution to our national fight against crime. I hope my own State of Massachusetts, following the lead of States such as California and New York will seriously consider adopting a similar approach.

Narcotics addiction is a personal aspect of the crime problem. Another aspect is an institutional one, flowing from the very nature of our federal system.

Crime detection and law enforcement have been traditionally a matter for State and local authorities. Yet in some areas the interstate nature of criminal activity makes effective regulation by local officials impossible without Federal support. This is the case with organized crime. And this is why Congress has taken concrete steps in recent years to enlarge the power of the Federal Government in the investigation and prosecution of professional racketeers, and why it is presently considering further action in this area, including measures to increase the protection our Government can provide its witnesses, both from physical violence and from further prosecution.

But new legislation is needed not only to control interstate criminal activity—but also to control the weapons which are used in the commission of crime.

There is no question that the rise in violent crimes in this country can be attributed to a significant degree to the ease with which any person—a criminal, a juvenile, a lunatic—can obtain dangerous and lethal firearms. In 1963 alone, some 1 million weapons were sold by mail order. Over a 3-year period in Chicago, for example, about 4,000 persons bought weapons from just two mail-order dealers. One fourth of these persons had criminal records. Every 2 minutes somebody in the United States is killed, maimed, beaten or robbed with a gun, and the indiscriminate sale of firearms without control or regulation makes this grim statistic possible.

Only last week members of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, of which I am a member, reported out a firearms control bill providing some basic minimum controls over mail-order interstate traffic in firearms and the importation of firearms into this country. This bill is only a first step. Our State governments will also have to take legislative action if there is to be effective control over this senseless traffic in dangerous weapons, because the Federal bill does not attempt to regulate the traffic in firearms within a State.

But Federal action is clearly a necessary step. For unless the Federal Government regulates gun traffic between States even the strongest State gun control laws will continue to be easily circumvented. Massachusetts, for example, has stringent gun regulations. But, as Commissioner Caples of the Massachusetts Department of Public Safety pointed out before our Senate committee, the Massachusetts law has not been fully effective because of the ease with which guns can be obtained elsewhere. In fact, 87 percent of the concealable firearms used in Massachusetts crimes came from out-of-State purchases. Massachusetts is helpless to deal with this problem, but the Federal Government is not. I believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to act on this, and without further delay.

There is strong opposition to such legislation from the National Rifle Association and other influential groups. And this opposition is both well organized and well financed.

The legislative budget of the National Rifle Association has gone up more than 30 percent a year since Federal gun legislation was first introduced. One mailing alone to the membership of the NRA urging opposition to the bill cost some $70,000—over half the annual budget of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. And that letter, by the very admission of NRA officials, contained errors and exaggerations about the provisions of the bill. The effect of this letter was to mislead the membership and to cause a veritable torrent of mail to Senators and Congressmen in opposition to the bill.

This opposition has taken a variety of forms. For example, car stickers which read "Register Communists, Not Firearms" have appeared on thousands of cars all across the country. And monthly gun magazines have carried numerous articles on how to influence legislation in Congress.

I have no quarrel with campaigns designed to affect the outcome of legislative voting—when they are honestly and fairly conducted, they are in the best tradition of our political process. But if the ordinary citizen is some day to be able to walk without fear in the streets of our society, I feel the opposition to this legislation must be overcome.

I will try my best to see that it is. I intend to work hard for the passage of effective firearms control legislation. And if the American people can become sufficiently concerned and informed about the need for effective gun control, and if they will join in the fight for enactment, this bill will become law.

Passage of gun control legislation would meet head on the problem of crime in the streets. Another aspect of the fight against crime—and one too often overlooked—takes place behind prison walls.

We need to pay more attention and to assign a higher priority to our State systems of correctional rehabilitation. Too often our correctional systems are looked upon solely as places where criminals are sent to be isolated from society. But criminal correction should instead be a process—beginning as soon as the lawbreaker is apprehended—whereby the individual criminal is treated as an individual, is taught the skills of a trade and the duties of good citizenship, and is assisted materially in finding a job and returning to his community. We have not done these things to any significant degree, and as a result our penal systems have not been successful in rehabilitating lawbreakers.

There are, of course, some notable exceptions where efforts are being made to apply the new techniques of rehabilitation to State penal systems. In New England, both Vermont and the Federal prison at Danbury, Conn., have instituted outstanding new programs of work release. Here in Boston General Decker, who will address you later, has initiated court clinics which provide legal, medical, and psychological assistance to offenders. Wisconsin and North Carolina have pioneered new types of rehabilitation and release techniques, and California has underway a unique demonstration project on parole which gives special, extended attention to youthful offenders. But overall, the fact is that unless some dramatic changes are made, more than 50 percent of our country's present prisoner population will go on

to commit further crimes. This is an appalling statistic.

Fortunately, the spirit of change is in the air. I believe a revolution is beginning in the field of correctional rehabilitation—a revolution which seems to me quite similar to the revolution in mental health care which we experienced in the 1950's.

I have tried to make a start on this revolution right here in New England. I am seeking a Federal grant for a study of all of New England's correctional systems, in a cooperative venture involving all the New England States. The study will rely on the most advanced computer techniques available—the same techniques which have proved so successful in evaluating our Defense Department programs. Hopefully the results of the study would indicate what needs to be done, and what money must be allotted if New England correctional systems are to perform their rehabilitation functions in the most effective and economical manner possible.

I think this detailed study will show that the correctional systems of many of our States are anachronisms—obsolete and ill-equipped to accomplish the objectives of rehabilitation we now set for them. If this is true, I will press for Federal assistance for States which have developed plans for revamping their penal systems but lack the funds to translate these plans into action. The money involved would seem a small price to pay for a system which would rescue those individuals who, once they are embarked on the road of crime, can find no exit to a normal life.

I hope such a study will serve another purpose. It should show dramatically the vital role that modern science and technology can play in attacking problems of law enforcement and crime prevention. We have not yet capitalized on the contributions our great scientific advances can make to the field of criminal justice. For example:

A computer can help to determine police deployment, or identify fingerprints, or manage the calendar and dockets of our courts.

Advanced communication systems can bring quick and effective police protection to the individual citizen.

Electronic aids can improve alarm and surveillance systems.

These are but a few of many scientific benefits available to us, and we cannot afford to ignore them.

I have worked as an assistant district attorney in Boston, and I know the difficulties our local law enforcement officials encounter every day of the year in working against crime. These are dedicated and able men deeply deserving our appreciation and our support. They should not be denied any resource which can aid them in their public service.

I have been discussing some of the specific faces of crime and the measures we must take to deal with them. But we must not be content to deal only with fragments of the problem—we must plan a broad and coordinated program for the future.

With this idea in mind, President Johnson recently appointed a national crime commission, composed of distinguished citizens, judges, and other experts, to study all aspects of the process of criminal justice. This is the first official body ever to make a systematic nationwide study of the entire spectrum of crime—from its causes to its cures.

Over the next 12 months this distinguished group will be preparing a blueprint for the future—a strategy for our national attack on crime and delinquency. This blueprint should also contain specific recommendations on how we can give to those who work in the criminal justice field the recognition, respect, and financial rewards they deserve. For a criminal justice system, no matter how wisely programed, can be no better than the people who man it.

To help insure the development of well-trained professionals in all areas of criminal justice, I have introduced a bill to establish a National Criminal Justice Academy. The idea of this academy was the brainchild of the very eminent criminologist, Prof. Sheldon Glueck, and it is, in my judgment, an excellent idea.

Such an Academy could help fill the desperate need which exists for well-trained middle management personnel. It could generate new prestige and supply new talent for all the important occupations related to criminal justice. And it could take its place with, and hopefully produce the same caliber of public servants as, West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy.

But beyond this Academy, and beyond all the specifics of criminal justice which I have discussed, lies the larger challenge—the social and economic programs which attack the roots of crime by improving the quality of our lives.

I believe there is a lesson to be learned in this regard from the riots of Watts and Harlem. What is most significant to me about those riots is not the fact of racial antagonism. It is the fact that the slum areas which bred these riots are Negro ghettoes—where the Negro lives in isolation, unable to communicate or participate with his fellow white Americans; where unemployment is two or three times higher than that of the white community; and where the school dropout rate of Negroes is twice as high.

Most of those who joined in the crime and violence in Watts and Harlem were young people, like ourselves. But unlike us, they had little education, no jobs, no hopes for the future. Their behavior is surely to be condemned—but no more so than our failure as a nation to provide that equality of opportunity and sense of participation which is the birthright of every American.

Watts and Harlem are perfect examples of crime which has its roots in social injustice. It may be true that not all criminal behavior is a consequence of social injustice. But it certainly is true that we cannot hope to mount a telling attack on crime without fighting at the same time for social justice and equal rights and opportunities for all Americans.

The problems of crime and punishment cut through the entire fabric of our society. Indeed, they provide the supreme test of our society. For America cannot be great if her people are not safe—both from the ravages of crime and from the encroachments of arbitrary government action. Our challenge is to maintain a free society which is at the same time a safe society.

To meet this challenge we must come to grips with the broad philosophical questions surrounding the individual and his relationship to the state. And we must also find the answers to concrete questions of social engineering and acquire the expert knowledge which will enable us to detect and correct antisocial conduct.

Each of us here tonight has a role to play in meeting that challenge—in helping to build a society that realizes the American dream. For those of you still in school, the true test of your concern and determination lies ahead. But the preparation for that test has already begun. The activities here this weekend are a part of that preparation. They should give you a better insight into the many facets of crime.

I congratulate each of you for the sense of civic responsibility and concern that brought you here. Your presence is a sign that you are committed to participation in the larger concerns of community and Nation.

This is as it should be. For, as Doestoevski knew so well, the problems of "crime and punishment" raise all the basic questions about the human predicament and about life itself.

DAVID DUBINSKY RETIRES AS PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the retirement of David Dubinsky as president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union marks the end of an era headed by one of the great champions of American labor.

Throughout 45 years of his life, Dave Dubinsky devoted his entire talents and energy to the betterment of his fellow man—34 of those years as president of the ILGWU.

Although mere words cannot possibly give an accounting of the good deeds of this great man, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles from the March 18, 1966, issue of Justice—the newspaper of the ILGWU—be printed in the RECORD: "End of an Era: Dubinsky Retires," on page 2; "Many More Years of Great Service," on page 2; the text of a letter from President Lyndon B. Johnson on page 7 and the text of a release from the AFL–CIO which includes a statement from AFL–CIO president George Meany on page 7; and the text of President Dubinsky's retirement letter printed on page 16.

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

END OF AN ERA: DUBINSKY RETIRES

Suddenly, early in the afternoon of March 16, an era ended.

The Wednesday afternoon session of the regular meeting of the ILGWU General Executive Board started as usual, with the board members assembling in the Biarritz Room of the Americana Hotel in New York City shortly before 2 p.m.

The long, U-shaped table was covered with the reports and note paper the ILGWU vice presidents had used during a long, discussion filled morning session. As they took their seats around the table and were called to order by President Dubinsky serving as chairman, not one of them could know the fateful turn the meeting was about to take.

In the general office only a handful—those closest to the president and involved in the preparation of reports and statements for the board meeting—knew. Besides them, only the President of the United States and the president of the AFL–CIO knew.

The session began with the continuation of the report on education and political action that had been started before the adjournment of the morning session.

Then it began as the first guest arrived. The GEB sessions are closed meetings. Members had noticed, however, that in the rear of the meeting room sat Emil and Abe Schlesinger and Elias Lieberman, longstanding legal aids to the ILGWU and President Dubinsky.

Soon after the start of the session, three of the city's outstanding newspapermen arrived and were admitted to the meeting. By the time A. H. Raskin of the New York Times, James Wechsler of the New York Post, and nationally syndicated Victor Riesel of the New York Journal-American were seated, President Dubinsky told the board members, "I have invited them because I intend to take up a matter that is very important to myself and to the union. These guests are here not as newspapermen but as friends." Among those present were Irving Vogel, of the Jewish Daily Forward, and Herman Morgenstern, of the Day-Jewish Journal.

Then, as President Dubinsky began a review of his 45 years as an ILGWU officer, a

few more were admitted. Some of the board members began to shake their heads with forebodings. The ILGWU chief told of the times he had thought of leaving office; then, after referring to the time when ILGWU Pres. Benjamin Schlesinger brought in his own written resignation, President Dubinsky, with Mrs. Emma Dubinsky sitting at his right, said: "I have come prepared with writing."

He asked that his letter to the general executive board be read. (The full text of the letter is on the back page of this issue of Justice.)

The words came with stunning effect. Around the table, disbelief registered on the faces. Each board member listened intently. Each marked the fateful words, the historic moment with some crucial memory of what the man now saying he wished to retire had meant in his or her own life.

"I have decided to retire and I hereby submit to the general executive board my resignation as president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union."

Suddenly, the reading was finished. For one dramatic moment there was silence, Some had been fighting back tears. Others were reaching back for the remembrance of when they had first met this man, now asking to be released from the burden of a presidency he had filled with honor and accomplishment for 34 years.

Then General Secretary-Treasurer Louis Stulberg moved to the microphone. He asked First Vice President Luigi Antonini to act as chairman.

"We are not going to discuss the question of this man's retirement," Stulberg said, "I move that a committee of this board be named to make every effort—in consultation with the president—to get him to postpone his decision."

The special committee was named.

Then, others spoke.

Following them, President Dubinsky replied. He said: "In an organization, in human life, nothing is permanent, nothing is forever. Giving 45 years of my life—34 as president—you will have to concede has meant I didn't have a life—only a union life. And I don't want to die in my boots.

"I have the interests of the union at heart. If I knew that what I am doing would be hurtful to the union—I wouldn't do it. But I feel it is better for me to do this thing now than to do it a year or two later. It must come to it. Dubinsky can't live forever. The union may have to live forever.

"I believe that what I am doing will be good for me; it will be good for the union; and it will be good for the man who will take over. It will give him the opportunity to strengthen his position—to become another Dubinsky or better.

"Now, we still have a lot of business to complete at this board meeting. But if you feel you want to discuss this matter with me, let us not lose time. I am ready to meet with the committee but I repeat what I said in my letter: I urge you to comply with my wish."

Then the session was adjourned. The murmur of voices rose louder. But some remained silent, in their seats, remembering.

HUMPHREY: "MANY MORE YEARS OF GREAT SERVICE"

Upon learning of ILGWU President David Dubinsky's decision to retire, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY paid special tribute to the head of the Garment Workers' Union in both a personal letter and a general statement.

In his letter, which opened with the greeting "Dear Dave," HUMPHREY said:

"Well, David, I simply had to call you on the phone and wish you well. I read about your retirement, and I could see how deeply moved you were by the expressions of affection and admiration that came from your membership and officers.

"To me, David Dubinsky will never be retired. It's just that you're changing your way of living a little bit. There's only one David Dubinsky, and I am the luckiest man in the world to have him as my friend.

"God bless you."

The Vice President's statement praised David Dubinsky as "one of the great champions of American labor. A champ may retire, but his heart will always be with the people for whom he has fought so long and so well. David is still young in spirit. He has many more years of great service still ahead for innumerable good causes.

"He is a dear personal friend, whose warmth, whose kindness, whose wisdom I cherish. His name is synonymous with trade-union integrity, trade-union pioneering, trade-unionism statesmanship.

"American labor, government and industry can, I know, continue to count on Dave for continued leadership. I wish him all the best. He deserves the best. He is the best."

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 17, 1966.

Mr. DAVID DUBINSKY,
President, ILGWU, AFL–CIO,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DAVE: The papers carried sad news today. The exit of David Dubinsky from the leadership of the Ladies Garment Workers Union is akin to detaching this country from its traditions.

Yet, there must be in your heart a warm and enduring satisfaction that comes only to a man who has built hugely and enduringly and who, almost singlehandedly, made life happier and more hopeful for hundreds of thousands of people.

I wish you long life, my old friend, for no one has worked longer or harder in the service of his fellow man than you.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

NEWS FROM THE AFL–CIO

AFL–CIO President George Meany today issued the following statement:

"David Dubinsky has been my warm and good friend throughout nearly all my life in the trade union movement. Those are the words—warm, good, friend—that I think best describe this unusual man.

"All his life has been devoted to helping people and he has approached every opportunity with an eagerness to do good that has been contagious.

"No one, I suppose, will ever completely tabulate all the good that David Dubinsky achieved in his lifetime and he would be the first to say no one should try. For it was the deed that always counted with him, not the plaudits.

"I am positive that David Dubinsky will never retire from the field he chose in his youth—the trade union movement, the brotherhood of workers dedicated to helping themselves by helping each other. David Dubinsky does not need the title of president of the ILGWU to make his impression on the trade union movement and on America. Even without it, there will be a 'D.D.' stamp on the future of American labor."

"I HAVE DECIDED TO RETIRE"

(NOTE.—Text of President David Dubinsky's March 16 letter to general executive board declaring intention to resign his ILGWU office while continuing activities in the labor movement, Liberal Party, and AFL–CIO.)

MY DEAR COLLEAGUES: As you probably know, since the age of 15 my life has been spent in the labor movement. From this movement I got my moral and spiritual nourishment. It has provided the guide for my life, giving it direction and purpose in helping workers to achieve a better life.

The principal arena of my life has been our union which I joined in June 1911 at the age of 19. Although I had participated in other sections of the movement here and abroad, it was in 1916 that I became active in the union. I served in many capacities in our union before I was entrusted with the presidency in 1932. Up until this very moment, my life has been wrapped up in the problems and the growth of our union.

To me, as to many other leaders of our union, serving the ILGWU has not been a career; it has been our life's work. Beyond all of my struggles through the years—the many complex problems, fighting off the enemies, suffering setbacks and pushing forward on new frontiers—I have always had the vision of a great union—great not only in numbers and resources, in contributions to the community and labor movement but great also—and especially—in the enrichment of the spiritual as well as the material life of the individual worker.

Having devoted my life to our union and the labor movement since my early youth, I came to feel, prior to the 1959 convention, that it was time to give up the cares and burdens and the heavy responsibilities of my office—and I gave serious thought to retiring. Frankly, I wanted more time for my family and for myself in the remaining years of my life.

However, as you will recall, we came to that convention confronted by a number of new, developing problems.

Local 25 had been made the target of an antitrust indictment. The strong antilabor bias of the charges was further emphasized by their being linked with unfounded allegations of racketeering. Basic protective provisions of our agreements were alleged to be monopolistic unfair trade practices.

Actually, these provisions were first formulated in the midtwenties by a special commission appointed by New York's Gov. Al Smith. The commission included such distinguished public-spirited citizens as Herbert H. Lehman, Prof. Lindsay Rodgers, George Gordon Battle, Bernard L. Sheintag, and Arthur D. Wolf. Their recommendations have withstood many challenges, even a case before the Federal Trade Commission shortly before the local 25 indictment.

This was a politically motivated attempt by the then national Republican administration to besmirch the reputation of our union. It would have seriously undermined the basic structure of our collective arrangements upon which the livelihood and the security of workers depended not only in our industry but also in the other needle trades. I considered it my duty, irrespective of my personal needs and wishes, to see to it that our union was vindicated, that the unwarranted attack was exposed and our vital interests were protected.

We had also begun to make real progress toward the merging of our 41 retirement funds. This was a big task, seriously affecting our members. I was determined to complete this task but at the time I didn't think it would take 6 years.

Another problem of deep concern was created by the union-within-the-union. I considered this a direct challenge to a vital trade union principle. It also created a potentially serious threat to the internal unity of our union, similar to the bitter experience we had with the Communists in the twenties.

It was followed by the politically motivated congressional (Powell-Zelenko) investigation. This was an attempt to smear our union's outstanding record in civil rights and racial equality. Unjustified and wholly unfounded charges were made that our union had discriminated against Negro and Puerto Rican workers.

As you know, these extraordinary and crucial problems have been resolved.

First, the indictment against local 25 was thrown out of court. Our union was completely vindicated. The structure of our collective relationships was preserved. We defeated this trumped-up charge just as we defeated similar frameup attempts earlier in our union's history.

Second, the false charge of racial discrimination leveled against us by the so-called congressional investigation collapsed under the crushing weight of our union's long record of dedication to the cause of civil and human rights. In fact, the Powell-Zelenko committee never even filed a report with the Congress.

Third, we finally succeeded in bringing about the creation of the ILGWU national retirement fund—a major landmark in the welfare program of our union.

Finally, only last September, a decision by the circuit court of appeals had the effect of liquidating the problem of the union-within-the union (four) thus ending this effort to divide and disrupt our organization.

While we were dealing with these problems, new challenges arose in our industry. Giant firms with diversified production began to spread. We became concerned with their effect on old firms and established standards. We studied these new developments and at our 1965 convention we took long-range action to deal with them.

We established a master agreements department to deal with these giant firms that cut across traditional industrial and organizational lines.

We adopted guidelines for future collective bargaining. While these are not a cure-all for all of our complex industrial problems, they have already shown their beneficial effect in recent negotiations.

We strengthened job security for our members by developing the idea of levels of employment. This insures that growing and expanding firms share their increased production equitably between their old workers and their new ones.

These achievements—like all the other achievements in the 34 years I have been president of our ILGWU—are the result of the good fortune I have had in enjoying the confidence, the respect, and cooperation of my colleagues on the general executive board as well as of all other officers and members. This has been the major factor in our success in overcoming threats to our union whether by Communists seeking to infiltrate our ranks or by other political enemies.

In the recent mayoralty election in New York, elements hostile to our union and envious of its achievements—inside and outside the labor movement—tried to exploit differences of opinion among our top leadership. But we disappointed them by proving that we were right in our policy and by emerging from the experience solidly united.

Now, with no major problems of an emergency nature confronting our union, I feel justified in turning again to personal consideration. I have decided to retire and I hereby submit to the general executive board my resignation as president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

In handing back to you the reins of my office, I wish to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to the members of the general executive board, to the managers of the locals, to our officers and members for their never-failing faith in me and in our union and for their understanding help through the years.

It is mainly because of this cooperation, this unity, that together we have been able to achieve higher standards and a better life for our members and the prestige and high standing of our union in the labor movement, in local communities, in the Nation, and even abroad.

For their loyalty and cooperation, I express my appreciation to the many members of the staff who have been imbued with the spirit of our union and have made their contributions to its progress.

On other occasions I have said—and I repeat it here—I am what I am because of the union. I shall always be grateful for the opportunity given me to be of service to others.

I leave the presidency of our union with the conviction that it is strong, stable, influential, and widely respected, that it is firmly rooted in the ideals and principles of the pioneers who preceded me, who founded it and fought and struggled to build and preserve it. It is a union that is demonstrating its ability to adjust to changing conditions.

I am confident that you will extend to my successor the same measure of cooperation that you have always extended to me. With a united organization, he will continue the work of my predecessors and myself in upholding the traditions of our union and in leading it to new successes for the benefit of our members and the greater prestige of our union.

I want to assure him of my wholehearted support and my readiness at all times to assist in any possible way.

Since I am aware that for you this decision comes unexpectedly, I know how you feel. Nevertheless, I urge you to respect my wishes. I am planning to go on vacation and I will leave for Europe within a month. Therefore, I request that you accept my resignation and that my retirement take effect April 12, 1966 [modified by committee to June 15].

I suggest that you proceed immediately to elect my successor. After you have elected him, and before the adjournment of this meeting, it would be a great privilege if you would permit me to install the next president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union.

Fraternally yours,

DAVID DUBINSKY,
President.

PROPHETIC LETTER FROM VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently, my administrative assistant, Lee Williams, and I received a rather remarkable letter from a constituent of mine who was in Vietnam. The letter is dated last January 13 and was mailed from Bangkok. Since late developments in Vietnam indicate further deterioration of the situation I think this letter takes on a prophetic light.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter to which I have referred be inserted in the RECORD.

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

BANGKOK, THAILAND,
January 13, 1966.

DEAR LEE AND SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This is a strange sort of salutation, I know, but although it is a bit cliche to mention it, I have never ever written a letter expressing my views to a newspaper, an editor, or a public official, and I have no intention of starting now; it always struck me as a bit presumptuous. So please let it take the form of what it is, a personal letter to you, Lee, and if you care to show it to the Senator or feel that it deserves his attention, do so.

Please permit me to be egomanical enough to comment on my observations in Vietnam. The old Wilsonian gambit of 14 points seems to be fashionable again, so here are an arbitrary 14 impressions received in Saigon where I talked intensively to over 200 people from colonels to privates, journalists and businessmen, Vietnamese, and English and French colonials. Here is what I found:

1. The war is not only not going well, the situation is worse than is reported in the press and worse, I believe, that is indicated in intelligence reports; I have had intelligence officers admit as much to me privately.

2. The kill ratio is, to be sure, in our favor, but the nature of the war is such that it would be most difficult to ascertain objectively what it is. And the formula used to arrive at casualty figures on either side are so esoteric as to resemble Italian bridge bidding conventions or Mr. Gallup's strange techniques of adjusting his polling results to be congruent with earlier assumed hypotheses. So "moderate" and "heavy" casualties are not only meaningless; so are the weekly totals of k.i.a. I would rather explain privately why this is so.

3. The kill ratio is irrelevant anyway. Were it 20 to 1, which it is not, the American military posture would not be, necessarily, substantially enhanced.

4. In one aspect, the number of U.S. military personnel is irrelevant. Since most are literally confined in closely guarded compounds, protected by moat-like defenses of concertina-wire and incessant barrages of U.S. artillery and 85- and 105-millimeter mortar fire, there is no necessary relationship; per se, between the bigness of these bastions in personnel and their security.

5. Although there is, to be sure, much to be said for the tactical advantages of a U.S. buildup if necessary, one obvious disadvantage is that we have beyond doubt greatly increased the number of possible targets for the enemy to strike at. Not only by airstrike, should events lead to that tragic eventuality, but by ground attack as well. So it is quite conceivable that we have created a certain potential vulnerability to sudden heavy losses via the sudden raid, the hidden plastic bomb, etc.

6. There is a general, although not universal, "gung ho" spirit among enlisted personnel, NCO's, and lower and middle-ranking officers, particularly in combat areas, morale is unbelievably high and sincere. There is something about combat that produces this—a messianic attitude of anger. This is not an unmixed blessing. It can lead to dangerous complacency and overconfidence. In addition to which it impairs the effectiveness of the avowed policy of the "pacification" of the South Vietnamese people, which is now most difficult at best. It is strange to talk to these men in the field who are against any cease-fire, any even temporary cessation of hostilities, and who talk blithely of remaining for 10 years and wanting to die there if necessary (sic)—and then to talk to colonels in Saigon who know the fields as well and who are infinitely more pessimistic, more cynical, and more realistic. One colonel who is most erudite (there is such a breed of officer, believe it or not) told me, "If there is a God, and he is very kind to us, and given a million men and given years and a miracle in making the South Vietnamese people like us, we stand an outside chance of a stalemate." These are harsh and bitter words, and I prefer to regard his remark as hyperbole, but there is considerable evidence that he may be stating the situation realistically.

7. There has never been an adequate picture painted of the tragic fruits of generations of French misrule. Vietnam is dotted with magnificent old French colonial mansions which serve as reminders of a dispensation which did nothing but suppress, which provided no education beyond the primary grades, which insulted a national dignity in countless ways. These mansions are inhabited by American officers now; I have been in several, and it's a nice life, indeed. But make no mistake about it: deservedly or not, we are now the inheritors of the

French mantle. We are Westerners, the outsider, the alien. To the leftists, we are villains; to the rightists we are fools (even if, out of temporary self-interest, we are allies). Left or right, there are very few South Vietnamese indeed who do not hate the shadows that remain of the Navarres and the Salans and who do not inwardly cheer at the memory of Dienbienphu.

8. So, as a consequence, any fancied similarities between Vietnam today and the problems of pacification of the Japanese people during the occupation are absurd. Too, any analogy between Vietnam and Korea is equally absurd. There we have a relatively conventional war; here we have none. There we had a battle line most of the time; here we have none. There we had a relatively defensible terrain; here we have none, there we had a people who had some faith, however misplaced, in the prospects for an eventual American victory; here we lack even that.

9. There is little understanding in the United States of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Vietcong tax collection methods throughout South Vietnam. They need money badly and they get it. They get it from individuals and they get it from businesses. They get it from the Vietnamese, from the French, and they get it on occasion from the Americans. Take a prominent hotel. It is French-owned, and common knowledge that they pay "rent" or what in the Capone era we called "protection money" to the VC. They are not fools. They want to avoid the fate of the Metropole Hotel. Officers and journalists of all nations like to drink on its comfortable terrace. As a U.S. intelligence colonel put it to me over a martini there, "You know, it's damned nice to be able to drink with impunity." It is no secret, and you have seen it in the press, that on more than one occasion Standard Oil has had to pay tolls to the VC to get U.S. gasoline through to our own forces. The VC has felt that money would do them more good than our gasoline would do them harm, and they are probably right.

10. This whole problem of blackmail to buy off terrorists leads us to the point of terrorism itself as a modus vivendi of modern insurgency. It is effective; it is cheap in cost; it is demoralizing. It has convinced hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese who would otherwise (for selfish, not ideological, reasons) be for us of the prudence of "playing both sides." And an extremely high proportion do "play both sides." The VC has a new trick in Saigon: a hand grenade with the detonating lever (spring loaded) taped down with ordinary Scotch tape; the pin is pulled; the grenade is gently dropped in the gas tank of a truck; in a matter of time, depending on how much tape is wrapped around the lever, the gas dissolves the adhesive on the tape; the bomb explodes with far greater effectiveness because of the gasoline. The weapon is cheap, simple, imaginative, and effective. Best of all, it can be inconspicuously deposited in a gasoline tank at night by any teenager. (The bomb that almost got us was tossed by a 15-year-old boy.)

11. The sad fact is that the ARVN's (Army of the Republic of Vietnam) are pretty generally ineffective. True, they die, sometimes with heroism, and I do not mean to denigrate the quality of their sacrifice when it is made. But wars have a way of being won by the living, not by the dead. Corruption and inefficiency have beeen complicating factors. A greater problem is the fact that most lieutenants and captains of experience have been killed off. The Ky regime has a tendency to look for new cadre and combat officers from the ranks of an educated class; they are loathe to promote a country boy of demonstrated leadership ability under combat conditions. Having an elite class of educated officers is all very well, but lieutenants have a notoriously high attrition rate in combat, as we discovered in Korea, and it is getting increasingly difficult to find South Vietnamese officers who have been schooled in Switzerland.

12. Many old hands in Saigon, who know far more about it than I, are convinced that the VC could step up systematic terrorism tenfold if they should so desire. A multiplicity of factors reluctantly impel me to the same conclusion. There has been a suspicious restraint about not bombing some targets which are more than inviting to them, surely. One reason, of course, is public opinion. But there is more to it than that. There is more than a little evidence that some of this restraint has been out of a conviction that some obvious targets will be needed as soon as they are captured. At any rate, we just literally could be sitting on a bomb so far as increased terrorism is concerned.

13. May I mention for a moment our consistent failure to use psychological warfare to an advantage. As you know, I believe passionately in the power of words, and I am more than aware of the human tendency to overrate those things in which we are most interested. But I believe that words and ideas are very substantial and tangible things indeed. The effectiveness of the VC soldier, frequently clothed in a loincloth, barefoot, hungry with but little stale rice, demonstrates to what lengths a man will fight with great dedication on a diet of words. Ho Chi Minh has traveled very far on a road paved with words like "freedom" and "liberty." Yet an American colonel I know, a good leader whose men have had a frightful casualty rate (up to 40 percent in some units), had to fight to get one old loudspeaker to use to speak to the VC at night when they surround his camp and come up close. He also uses a hand-held transistorized megaphone. This program has been instituted at his own initiative, with no cooperation from officialdom. Yet it has netted a couple of dozen defections recently. I think this is an enterprising officer. More has been done recently, but still little. Forgive me for overemphasizing this, but it is one symptom of our singular obsession with the use of force. I question both our original involvement and the deepening of our commitment. But so long as we are there it would seem vitally incumbent that we speak and speak with sincerity to these people; and not in terms of defending them against communism, either, which, rightly or wrongly, strikes most of them as a bit silly.

To those of us who believe that America has a message to proclaim or, if you will, a "product" to "sell," the failure to do so seems hard to explain.

To countless millions America has stood as a shining example of a nation that is basically revolutionary. This has been true for generations, and, thankfully, is still true today to our admirers, and we have many. We have been revolutionary not only because we were cast from the cauldron of revolt, we have been revolutionary politically, ideologically, technologically. Paine and Jefferson and Lincoln (the latter is a big name in Asia, by the way, even among people who dislike us) were but the first in a long line of iconoclasts to which some would add the name FULBRIGHT. The mass-production of Whitney and later Ford have had a more profound effect upon the masses of agrarian societies than have most Marxists. From vaccination to the vacuum tube, from Singer's sewing machine to the self-starter, from telegraphy to the transistor, from movies to mechanized farming, and from the Founding Fathers to Fulbright scholarships, America has been the great destroyer of the outmoded old and the great builder of the bountiful new. To most of the underdeveloped nations of the world, Edison will still outsell Lenin any day of the week if the product is properly packaged. If not, then Lenin may fill the void. At any rate, America has always stood, thank God, not for slow mutation, but for sudden and violent change, and for anything but the status quo. How infinitely sad it is that when many nations cried out for sudden emergence, we chose to issue pallid policy statements from State on stability. It is fundamental in the affairs of men that when you see the imminent and inevitable death of an ancient regime, that you go to the funeral, but you are amiable to the heirs and do not sit forever holding hands with the corpse in necrophilial devotion.

Sorry to dwell on this point.

14. Finally, this is something that is distasteful and impolitic to write, but it needs saying. Before I do let me reassure you that I am for victory if possible and have always, of course, wanted to prevent the spread of communism to any area because of its monolithic nature and denial of the right to the pluralistic society that I hope will be the universal destiny of all mankind. Having said that, here is the sad truth: Father Ho is a great leader who I happen to believe with considerable evidence is more admired in the south than any other Vietnamese. Were a plebiscite to be held today, he would still win resoundingly over Bao Dai, or the late Ngo Dinh Diem—or, yes, even Premier Ky. Ho, the former cook at the Carlton in London is so strong with the peasant that ever were he to be killed, his posthumous influence as a living legend would sharply imperil our interests. Numerous very loyal American commanders have admitted as much to me privately. Expressed as a simple syllogism, it comes out like this: (1) It is fundamental and I believe generally conceded that we cannot win the war without the Vietnamese people; (2) in view of the force and magnitude of Ho's appeal and of the limited and diffuse nature of our own appeal as liberators, it is highly questionable whether we can ever get more than token support, and that largely the result of our money; (3) ergo, it is highly questionable whether we can ever have victory.

Conclusions: As to solutions, I have none, and do not pretend to. But having just returned from there, I am very frightened. I could talk about bright spots; there are many. I do not think they override the stark, terrifying realities of a stalemate, at best, purchased at inconceivable cost and coupled with humiliating setbacks and losses. Then always, and I do not say this lightly, there is the unlikely but ever-present possibility of catastrophe. The road from Valley Forge to Vietnam has been a long one, and the analogy is more than alliterative: there are some similarities, only this time we are the British and they are barefoot. Too long have we taken our invincibility for granted.

Ho Chi Minh is not only the translator (into Vietnamese) of the tactics of Mao Tse-tung; he has gone beyond Maoist tactics and usual concepts of insurgency. His classic metaphor should be taken seriously: that the people are the sea, and the Vietcong are the fish that swim within the sea, omnipresent, clandestine, invisible.

I once again know of no easy solutions and were I gifted with such apocalyptic inspirations I would not presume to advise others. But if I had the responsibility to make the decision—and I am thankful I do not—I believe I would take a couple of drinks and then agree, covertly probably, to direct negotiations with the Vietcong (which we have not yet agreed to) and possibly consider major concessions with regard to Hanoi's third point.

By the time you read this, the world will probably know the answer as to the success or failure of the President's peace offensive, which has been theatrically impressive to most of the world's press (including the Asian). But in view of the deteriorating

American situation I have just seen there, I cannot view with optimism the likelihood of immediate peace without further compromises.

In short, I would rather America err on the side of being overly generous than on the side of military miscalculation of inconceivable cost.

For what, the world might well ask should we win the gamble, have we won?

Glad to be able to say hello and talk about all the things that I cannot broadcast about to someone who is openminded enough to understand the difficulty of our position and that it is not necessarily un-American to ask questions about what is wisdom or have doubts about destiny or wonder about the world.

Warm regards,

PUBLIUS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., ADDS A MAJOR LEAGUE HOCKEY TEAM TO ITS BIG LEAGUE SPORTS GALAXY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, St. Louis, Mo., is proud of its Cardinals baseball and football teams and its Hawks basketball team.

To this big league sports galaxy has now been added what I am sure will be bright new star; namely, a major league hockey team.

The new team is named for a song synonymous with Missouri's largest city, the St. Louis Blues. Its home will be the Arena, scene of many ice extravaganzas.

St. Louis and the National Hockey League are both fortunate that the Missouri city was the final selection in a six-team expansion of the league which also added Philadelphia, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and Pittsburgh to the league.

Mr. William Jennings, president of the New York Rangers hockey team and chairman of the league's expansion committee, announced that selection of St. Louis was unanimously approved by the league.

In welcoming St. Louis into major league hockey, he also stated that he felt the St. Louis group which was awarded the franchise is outstanding.

Knowing these men personally, I certainly agree with Mr. Jennings' assessment of them, and I am sure that my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] who could not be present today because of official duties as a representative of the Senate at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, and who is on a study visit to the NATO countries, would also agree.

President of the St. Louis Blues is Mr. Sidney Salomon, Jr., president of Sidney Salomon, Jr. & Associates. Board members are Mr. Robert Wolfson, chairman of the board of GEM International; Mr. Sidney Salomon III, of Sidney Salomon, Jr. & Associates and a member of the Missouri State Athletic Commission; Mr. James R. James, Jr., chairman of the board of the Clayton Bank; Mr. Preston Estep, chairman of the board of the Bank of St. Louis; Mr. Elliott Stein, president of Scherck, Stein & Franc; Mr. John Soult, president of Fruin-Colnon Construction Co.; Mr. Stanley H. Rosensweig, chairman of the board of Electronic Wholesalers, Inc., and Mr. Louis Menk, president of the Burlington Railroad Co.

The addition of major league hockey should contribute substantially to the sports boom in St. Louis which is keyed to the huge new Busch Memorial Stadium which opens this year on the riverfront.

It rounds out a major league sports program for a major league town which is observing its 200th anniversary.

AID FOR DROUGHT-STRICKEN INDIA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I was pleased and proud as an American to hear President Johnson's response to Mrs. Gandhi's worldwide appeal for help for her drought-stricken nation.

The President has responded in the humanitarian traditions of this Nation, and I feel privileged to pledge him my support of this far-reaching program to assist our sister democracy.

It is tragic and ironic that a nation which has done so much to help itself must now be halted in its truly impressive economic progress by a natural disaster.

We are told that the drought which has struck India is the worst the world has seen since our own water-starved years of the early thirties.

India's appeal to the world for aid to survive this disaster is a justified appeal, and I was pleased to hear the President couple his pledge of generous aid from this country with an appeal to other nations of the world to contribute the maximum they can in food, in fertilizers, in shipping, or in funds in order to buy these requisites.

The food needs of a drought-stricken nation as large and as populous as India are such that other nations of the world must help us to help her. The President's report that Canada is now prepared to provide a million tons of wheat and flour to India is encouraging, indeed.

INCREASE IN SUPPORT LEVEL FOR MILK MANUFACTURE TO BENEFIT BOTH CONSUMER AND FARMER

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, in announcing an increase in the support level for manufacturing milk today, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman took action that will benefit both consumers and the Nation's dairy farmers during the coming year.

The new support level of $3.50 per hundredweight will help bring higher production of milk, butter, cheese, and other dairy products. These additional supplies will mean lower retail prices for consumers next fall and winter than they otherwise would have been. If the support level had been increased by only the minimum required by the Agricultural Act of 1949—$3.34 per hundredweight—production during the coming year would have been smaller and retail prices likely would have been pushed higher. The new support level, however, is well under current market prices. The price of manufacturing milk in February averaged $3.65 per hundredweight.

Dairymen will benefit from the new support level because it lessens the risks of seasonal price decline, and provides a more realistic basis on which to carry out production increases.

Larger production of milk and dairy products during the coming year also will mean larger supplies for both domestic and foreign programs. Distribution to needy families and the school lunch program can be larger. Supplies of nonfat dry milk to aid in strengthening the economies of developing nations can be more plentiful.

PROPER ENFORCEMENT OF HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, last year the Congress enacted Public Law 89–285, the Highway Beautification Act. As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I supported the bill both in the subcommittee and later in the full committee. Members of the committee labored diligently to produce legislation to achieve highway beautification, but at the same time properly to consider the legitimate interest of those in the advertising industry and other people who were affected by the bill.

To the committee's credit, every line of every page was carefully gone over and as a result, the committee was able to recommend a good bill.

Mr. President, along with other Members of the Congress, I continue to be concerned with the proposed draft standards which were published by the Department of Commerce in the January 28 Federal Register. Publication of these standards prompted the distinguished Senators RANDOLPH, MUSKIE, Moss, and others to take the Senate floor and express their feelings that the standards contravened the intent of Congress when it enacted the highway beautification bill.

I concur in and support the earlier remarks of the Senators. These standards are now the basis for hearings throughout the country. Beginning in March, the hearings have been held, or will be held, in all the 50 States. It is my understanding that the hearings for the State of California will be held on April 12 at the State Resources Building in Sacramento.

Although I am cognizant that the Department of Commerce says that the draft standards were "intended solely as guidelines for consideration and discussion purposes at the public hearings and do not represent any conclusions or even tentative conclusions on the part of the Secretary of Commerce," my correspondence indicates that the Commerce Department's assurances have not alleviated the fears that the so-called draft standards will, in fact, become the rules and regulations under which the Department of Commerce will administer the act.

I for one hope that this is not the case, and if so, the Department will be acting contrary to the will and intent of the Congress.

That the draft standards are in violation of the intent of the Congress is made clear by a review of the legislative history.

As introduced by the administration, the bill proposed no controls for billboards in zoned commercial and industrial areas. On the other hand, unzoned areas of commercial or industrial use would be determined "in accordance with the national standards to be established by the Secretary."

Mr. President, much of the time of the Senate Public Works Committee was spent in examining this provision. Members were concerned that the provision would place too much power in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce. As a result of the committee's concern, an amendment was offered and adopted giving to the State legislatures the right to define unzoned industrial and commercial areas rather than the Secretary of Commerce. I now read from the Senate Public Works Committee report regarding the amendment:

The committee has given long and deliberate consideration to this subsection, and particularly to the question of unzoned industrial and commercial areas. The basic postulate of this provision is that outdoor advertising is an integral part of the business and marketing function and an established segment of the national economy; as a legitimate business, it should therefore be allowed to operate where other industrial and commercial activities are conducted.

This principle was recognized in the draft legislation proposed to the Congress by excluding industrially and commercially zoned areas from control. However, the legislation as originally proposed recommended that unzoned areas used predominantly for industrial and commercial activities be "determined in accordance with national standards to be established by the Secretary."

It is the committee's opinion that this is primarily an issue of land use which should not be left to an administrative decision. It is an extension of the concept of zoning and therefore more appropriately belongs to the same authority—i.e., the legislatures of the States. The committee believes that the State legislatures, because of their more detailed knowledge of the topography and land use patterns of the States, are in a better position to define an industrial and commercial area for their respective States than is the Secretary of Commerce.

To the surprise of the members of the Public Works Committee, the administration at the last minute objected to the committee amendment and Senator RANDOLPH, at the request of the administration, on September 15 offered an administration substitute for the committee amendment. The administration amendment also gave the State legislatures the right to define unzoned commercial and industrial areas, but unlike the committee bill, it made the decision by the State legislatures subject to the approval of the Secretary.

The administration amendment interjected for the first time in the legislation the matter of billboard control criteria. Signs permitted in zoned and unzoned commercial and industrial areas were to conform to "criteria determined by the States subject to concurrence by the Secretary concerning the lighting, size, and number of signs and other requirements as may be appropriate."

When Senator RANDOLPH offered the administration amendment, a heated and prolonged debate occurred on the Senate floor. As a result, Senator RANDOLPH wisely withdrew the administration amendment. The opposition to the amendment, of course, was based on the fact that the administration amendment was contrary to the careful deliberation and recommendation of the Senate Public Works Committee in giving the States the power to make the zoning determinations.

The following day, Senator RANDOLPH offered a modified amendment making this determination of an unzoned commercial and industrial area by agreement between the several States and the secretary. The same was true as to the control standards regarding size, lighting, and space of billboards within such areas.

It should also be pointed out, Mr. President, that the catchall phrase "and such other requirements as may be appropriate" was eliminated and the control criteria in the modified amendment was limited only to "size, lighting, and space."

With this background, Mr. President, it seems quite clear that the Senate did not desire to give the Secretary of Commerce the authority to eliminate advertising in industrial and commercial areas zoned or unzoned. To the contrary, both in committee and on the Senate floor, everyone was concerned with the possibility of arbitrary and capricious action on the part of the Department that might jeopardize the outdoor advertising industry which the committee in its report recognized as an "integral part of the public and marketing function and an established segment of the national economy; as a legitimate business it should therefore be allowed to operate where other industrial and commercial activities are conducted."

Further, in reading the letter to Congressman KLUCZYNSKI, chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, from Secretary Connor, it seemed clear that the Department desired no such authority and that the substitute amendment offered by Senator RANDOLPH would not be so construed by the Secretary. Thereafter, this modified substitute amendment passed by a narrow margin of 44 to 40.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1965.

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads, Public Works Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for an explanation of the criteria to be used in determining approval of State actions defining unzoned commercial or industrial areas for purposes of the President's highway beautification bill and the criteria to be used in the regulation of billboards in those areas as well as those areas actually zoned under State law as commercial or industrial.

It should be kept in mind that under the administration bill the States have full authority under their own zoning laws to zone areas for commercial or industrial purposes, and the action of the States in this regard will, of course, be accepted for the purposes of this act.

The purpose of the administration language is to make sure that "unzoned" commercial or industrial areas along our interstate and primary highways will be defined on the same basis as those which are actually zoned. The administration feels that in order to avoid an obvious inequity, those areas which are actually used for commercial or industrial purposes should be treated as if they were zoned for such purposes. In reviewing the actions of the States in defining unzoned areas for the purposes of this act, the Bureau of Public Roads would look at the standards followed by the particular State concerned in zoning an area commercial or industrial. It is believed there will be few, if any, instances where the Bureau would not be able to give full approval to the definitions made by the States on unzoned commercial or industrial areas.

The policy of the Bureau in reviewing State determinations of unzoned commercial or industrial areas would be developed only after full consultation with the States as well as with interested private business, and every effort would be made to achieve equitable treatment.

The criteria to be followed in setting the standards for billboards in both zoned and unzoned areas, designated as commercial or industrial, would be designed to assist the advertising industry to achieve an orderly development of this important and legitimate business enterprise.

In order to prevent an unchecked proliferation which not only results in a public eyesore but undoubtedly impedes the effectiveness of billboard advertising, reasonable standards pertaining to size, spacing, and number of billboards would be developed. Our great new highways are opening up vast areas of inestimable value for commercial and industrial activities. The standards for outdoor advertising would be aimed at assuring a pattern of reasonable development as the advertising industry reaches new dimensions.

It is expected that, in the interests of effectiveness of billboards, to say nothing of the esthetic results, there should be some regulation on the size of billboards or signs, and their spacing. It is obvious that lighting arrangements which clearly pose a highway safety problem should be curtailed. It is not possible to spell out in detail exactly what kind of reasonable regulation this will be, since we will continue to have new and ingenious types of signs and devices brought forth in the future which may or may not present a hazard. In regard to spacing, obviously some regulation is desirable to prevent a conglomeration of highway signs in the vicinity of an intersection or interchange which might involve a traffic hazard.

In any event, regulations will not be adopted without thorough consultation with the States, with reasonable provisions for public hearings and with full opportunity for private businesses to express their views and have them taken into account. It is the intention of the administration that the regulations, insofar as they are consistent with the purposes of this act, shall be helpful to the advertising industry and that, for instance, standards of size which may be adopted would be insofar as possible consistent with standard size billboards in customary use.

Under the administration bill there would be ample time for full consultation with the States, with the industry, and with other interested persons before any final determinations are made in this respect, and it would be expected that the refinement of these standards would be a continuing process for the benefit of both the traveling public and

private business concerns serving the motorists.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MURPHY. Also, Mr. President, the committee, in eliminating the "other requirement" phrase from the control standards pertaining to size, lighting, and spacing of billboards within zoned or unzoned commercial and industrial areas, meant just that.

Further light on the sentiments of the Congress in this regard may be seen by examining the action by the House. Not only did the House amend the Senate bill requiring the Secretary of Commerce to hold hearings in all the States, as is now being done, but it also further limited the powers of the Secretary by the adoption of the Tuten amendment, requiring that size, lighting, and spacing standards for signs be "consistent with customary use." Senator RANDOLPH, when the conference report was before the Senate, explained the House amendment as follows:

The words "consistent with customary use" were not contained in the Senate version of S. 2084. The sponsor of this amendment explained during the course of the House debate on S. 2084 that it was his purpose to write into the statute the interpretation stated in the letter from the Secretary of Commerce. Certainly, it seems to me that any regulations which the Secretary adopts in agreement with the States should, consistent with the purposes of this act, be helpful to the advertising industry. Any regulations or criteria with respect to size, spacing, and lighting of outdoor advertising signs should, insofar as possible, be consistent with customary use in the industry. Therefore, I cannot perceive any valid objection to this particular language in the House approved bill.

Yet, Mr. President, the draft standards as published on January 28 in the Federal Register are not confined to size, lighting, and spacing. They include such matters as height, setback, and animation. It is my understanding that acceptance of the draft standards would be disastrous to the advertising industry in my State, so I am naturally concerned with these standards and it would be well to have inserted at this point the remarks of Senator RANDOLPH regarding the draft standards:

Mr. President, the draft standards published in the Federal Register are at variance with that statement and with the intent of Congress as evidenced in the committee action in both bodies and in the floor debates on the measure. Furthermore, these proposals are a departure from the declared intent of the Secretary of Commerce, as expressed in his letter to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Roads. They are not in accord with our oral understanding when the administration amendments were pending in the Senate. Finally they are in violation of the language of the act itself, as amended by the House of Representatives and finally enacted by the Congress.

As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I, for one, and I know my feelings are shared by many other committee members, intend to thoroughly examine the transcript of the hearings and will also study carefully the final standards that are issued by the Commerce Department to make certain that the Highway Beautification Act is administered according to the will of the Congress. I hope the final standards, Mr. President, will reflect the intent of the Congress, and I share the sentiments of the floor manager of the bill, Senator RANDOLPH, when he stated he hoped "that these proposals are not an augury of how the Highway Beautification Act will be administered."

REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, with the annual attempt to repeal fair representation in State legislatures almost upon us, it is worth while to note the dramatic shift toward equal representation in our State legislatures which has taken place in the last few years.

The Christian Science Monitor of March 26, 1966, in a summary of reapportionment activity, commented on the rapid progress being made toward eliminating the rotten borough system of State legislative apportionment which has paralyzed State action for decades.

The Monitor notes:

Next year, for the first time in history, lawmakers from cities and populous suburban areas will outnumber those from small towns in many State capitals.

This is true even though the urban population has outnumbered the rural population for nearly half a century.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Christian Science Monitor articles entitled, "Now Your Vote May Count for More," and "How It Used To Be," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 26, 1966]

NOW YOUR VOTE MAY COUNT FOR MORE

(By George B. Merry)

BOSTON.—Rural Americans are fast losing their once-firm grip on the reins of State governments.

Next year, for the first time in history, lawmakers from cities and populous suburban areas will outnumber those from small towns in many State capitals.

In a few States the change in legislative control already has taken place. And this trend seems sure to continue.

After decades of looking the other way, Federal and State courts are insisting that legislatures be revamped to meet one-man, one-vote standards.

The big reapportionment push began 4 years ago today when the Supreme Court of the United States entered the picture.

In its ruling the Court said that the so-called equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution entitles citizens to certain protections with respect to the apportionment of legislatures. Federal courts, it decreed, have the power to enforce them.

But the Supreme Court justices in their 6-to-2 decision did not spell out what action district courts might take to assure fairer apportionments. Nor were any standards set for determining whether a districting pattern is unconstitutional.

SINGLE BASIS FOR ALLOTMENT

In June 1964, however, the Supreme Court went an important step further. In a series of related verdicts it ruled that population should be the only basis for allocating seats and in both branches of a State legislature.

This one-man, one-vote directive has proven to be even more far reaching than the decree handed down in *Baker* v. *Carr*, the Tennessee taxpayers' suit, March 26, 1962.

Few court decisions have touched off more political and judicial fireworks.

Now before Congress is a constitutional-amendment proposal that would permit a State to apportion one branch of its legislature on some other basis than population. It failed to pass last year, but a new try is being made this year.

Major developments over the past few years include—

One or more lawsuits in all but two States—Maine and South Dakota—challenging the allotment of legislative seats.

Eighty-five legislative branches in 45 States reapportioned.

Efforts now underway to redistrict five senates or houses in three States.

Redistricting involving another five legislative bodies in three States also may be tackled during the next few months.

The remaining four (49 States have two-house legislatures, Nebraska only has a senate) legislative branches—the Massachusetts Senate, the Oregon Senate and House, and the South Carolina House—were revamped prior to the *Baker* v. *Carr* ruling but appear to meet court standards.

In a number of instances State constitutions have been changed to conform districting standards to the one-man, one-vote principle. Geographical considerations, long a factor in more than two-thirds of the States, have been brushed aside.

Because of the obvious political quicksands involved, most legislators—especially those from overrepresented rural areas—were reluctant to redistrict.

Yet they had little real alternative, as many found over the past few years.

While some legislatures beat the courts to the punch and voluntarily put their houses in order, many ignored their malapportionment problems until faced with a court order.

Few of them made it on the first try, Florida lawmakers, for example, have recently completed their fourth reapportionment plan since mid-1962. The three earlier ones were tossed out by a Federal court panel.

PANELS UNDERTAKE TASK

In several States, where legislators appeared hopelessly bogged down, courts have stepped in and done the job.

The first judicial redistricting involved the Oklahoma Senate and House in 1964. Since then court panels have revamped 16 other legislative branches in 9 States. The latest action of this type took place within the past 2 months in Arizona, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Some States have taken apportionment out of the hands of the legislatures and given it to a special commission. In Illinois a 10-member bipartisan commission, appointed by the Governor, redistricted the house after the legislature had tried and failed.

For some 20 years the Missouri Senate has been revamped from time to time in this way. And on February 13, Missouri voters approved a constitutional amendment providing for a similar method for reapportioning the house. And the special commission has just completed its assignment.

Michigan's new State constitution, adopted in April 1963, also took apportionment controls away from the legislature and provided for a bipartisan commission to do the job.

But this approach, too, has produced problems: Democratic and Republican members of the new special agency could not agree on a districting revamp.

Finally, in June 1964, the Michigan Supreme Court ordered the commission to adopt a reapportionment plan for both the senate and house which had been drafted by two of the commissioners.

A special board appointed for the purpose handled Alaska's redistricting job. Panels comprising top State officials did the reapportionment in Arkansas and Ohio.

The courts rejected earlier redistricting efforts in Ohio.

REDISTRICTING HAMMERED OUT

With reapportionment orders still ringing in their ears and anxious jurists looking over their shoulders, lawmakers in at least six States have hammered out redistricting plans in recent weeks. Besides both branches in Florida, these involve the Idaho Senate and House, the Kansas House, the New Mexico Senate, the North Carolina Senate and House, and the South Carolina Senate.

At the same time Maine legislators, meeting in special session, approved a constitutional amendment, which if accepted by the State's voters at the November election, will pave the way for a more equitable districting of the senate.

In Rhode Island a legislative commission is trying to work out an acceptable reapportionment plan. New Jersey has a constitutional convention in session tackling a similar assignment.

The court of appeals in New York has just approved a redistricting plan drafted by a five-member bipartisan commission. The task force was appointed by the court after Empire State lawmakers failed to agree on a new apportionment earlier this year.

In trying to comply with the one-man, one-vote dictum, many States have been forced to overlook provisions in their constitutions guaranteeing representation to each county or town.

Vermont, for example, used to allot every city or town, no matter how large or small, one and only one seat in the State's house of representatives. Under this system tiny Stratton, with only 38 residents, had a voice equal to Burlington, with 35,531, more than 920 times its size. Less than 12 percent of the total Vermont population lived in those towns which could elect a majority of the house members.

The new setup chopped the number of house seats from 246 to 150 and grouped smaller towns for the first time into districts. Also, cities got additional representation according to population.

ADJUSTMENTS MADE

At least 15 other States made adjustments in the size of one or both of their legislative bodies.

Connecticut abolished its town-by-town representation in its house and reduced house membership from 294 to 177.

In Nevada, every county used to have one senator, and 8 percent of the State's population elected a majority of the 17 senators. The revamp increases the senate membership to 20 and ups the size of the house from 35 to 40.

The latest Florida reapportionment expands the senate from 38 to 48 and increases the house from 95 to 117. Dade County (Miami) picks up seven more senators and four more representatives. Duval County (Jacksonville), Hillsborough County (Tampa), and Pinellas County (St. Petersburg) add three senators apiece.

House reapportionment in Kansas, completed earlier this month, was the State's first full-scale redistricting in 100 years, although adjustments had been made from time to time. When the new legislature is elected this fall, each county will no longer have at least one house seat.

POLITICAL IMPACT

Besides shifting the balance of power away from rural areas to cities and suburban sections, legislative reapportionment has, in some instances, altered the political structure and given new or increased representation to various racial and ethnic groups.

In Georgia eight Negroes won seats last year in the redistricted house. They are the first of their race to serve in that body since 1907. (One of the eight, Julian Bond, was barred from taking his seat after he criticized American policy in Vietnam.) At the same time Republicans boosted their strength from 7 to 22 in the still heavily Democratic chamber.

Reapportionment has spelled gains for the Democrats, too. The 1964 districting change in Michigan is believed to have helped the Democratic Party gain control of both Houses of the legislature for the first time in 26 years.

New districting patterns in several Northern States, including Indiana, Wisconsin, and Ohio, are expected to result in more Democrats in the legislatures chosen this November.

Despite the bustle of activity now under way in a few States and that just completed, the reapportionment pace appears to be slowing down.

The big year was 1965. During its 12 months both branches of the legislatures in 23 States—Alabama, Arkansas, Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, and Washington—were reapportioned.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION

Redistricting also was carried out in one legislative body in five other States—Georgia House, Missouri Senate, Nebraska Senate, New Mexico House, and Wyoming Senate.

The 1965 Florida and Idaho plans were later tossed out by the courts and done over again this year.

While it is too early to gage what the long-term impact might be from the reapportionment revolution, results so far seem to indicate more emphasis on so-called social legislation.

In Michigan the reapportioned, now Democratic-controlled, legislature liberalized the State's workmen's compensation program to the point where it is believed to be the most generous in the Nation.

More attention has been focused on urban problems. But farm legislation has not been overlooked as had been feared by some observers. A statewide meat-inspection law was passed and a milk-pricing bill almost made it.

The reapportioned general assembly in Delaware has a number of new lawmakers, including several from organized labor. Measures approved last year included the granting of tax-exempt status to a union-sponsored housing development for the elderly in Wilmington.

Since redistricting, the new legislature in Iowa increased municipal home rule and passed several liberal, labor-backed bills but refused to repeal the State's so-called right-to-work law.

While some reapportioned legislative bodies were elected in 1964 or 1965, most States will give their revamped districting its first test in elections later this year. At least 32 States, and possibly several more, are involved. These revamped legislatures will go to work next January.

Many of the legislative branches redistricted over the past 4 years had not been altered substantially for decades, in some instances more than 50 years—and this despite major population shifts within the States.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 26, 1966]

HOW IT USED TO BE

When the Supreme Court handed down its one-man, one-vote criterion for voter representation in State legislatures, it was saying in effect to the States:

"A majority of your legislators must be elected by a majority of the voters."

This had not been the case for decades in most States. In many cases the total of legislators from sparsely populated elective districts outnumbered those from urban districts. Rural voters outranked city voters.

The table below shows how far out of representational whack some legislatures were:

Each figure shows the percentage of the State's population living in the least-populous elective districts from which a majority of legislators was chosen as of March 26, 1962, date of the Court's original landmark ruling.

Under the Court's subsequent one-man, one-vote criterion, the ideal percentage would be slightly over 50 percent—a majority of voters electing a majority of legislators. Most of the reapportioning in the past 4 years has come close to, if not within, acceptable bounds.

Alabama	25.1	27.2
Alaska	35.0	48.9
Arizona	12.8	45.8
Arkansas	43.8	33.3
California	10.7	44.7
Colorado	29.8	32.1
Connecticut	33.4	12.0
Delaware	22.0	18.5
Florida	12.3	15.1
Georgia	21.4	22.5
Hawaii	[1] 25.9	[1] 44.6
Idaho	16.6	32.7
Illinois	28.7	39.9
Indiana	40.4	34.8
Iowa	35.2	26.9
Kansas	26.8	18.5
Kentucky	42.0	34.1
Louisiana	[1] 33.0	34.1
Maine	[1] 46.9	39.7
Maryland	14.0	31.7
Massachusetts	[1] 44.6	43.6
Michigan	29.0	44.1
Minnesota	[1] 40.1	[1] 34.5
Mississippi	34.6	29.1
Missouri	47.7	20.3
Montana	16.1	36.6
Nebraska	36.6	----
Nevada	8.0	35.0
New Hampshire	45.3	43.9
New Jersey	19.0	46.5
New Mexico	14.0	27.0
New York	36.9	38.2
North Carolina	36.9	27.1
North Dakota	31.9	40.2
Ohio	41.0	30.3
Oklahoma	24.5	29.5
Oregon	[1] 47.8	[1] 48.1
Pennsylvania	33.1	37.7
Rhode Island	[1] 18.1	[1] 46.5
South Carolina	26.6	[1] 46.7
South Dakota	38.3	38.5
Tennessee	26.9	28.7
Texas	30.1	38.6
Utah	21.3	33.3
Vermont	45.1	11.6
Virginia	37.7	36.8
Washington	33.9	35.3
West Virginia	46.7	40.0
Wisconsin	45.0	40.0
Wyoming	26.9	35.8

[1] Branch has not been reapportioned since the Court's ruling. Nebraska has no house.

MRS. GANDHI'S VISIT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun hailed the meeting here between President Johnson and Prime Minister Gandhi of India, stating it "could be of lasting importance to both countries."

Declaring that the American people have shown in many ways their respect for the Indian Government's example in democracy, the Sun declared:

Mrs. Gandhi and Mr. Johnson should benefit in their talks from the area of common understanding which has been developing among the people of India and America.

Knowing that many Senators will wish to read this timely editorial on the recent meetings, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

PRIME MINISTER GANDHI

Mrs. Gandhi's talks with President Johnson, beginning today in Washington, promise to be useful. Mrs. Gandhi has come here as the new Prime Minister of a great country which is struggling with the task of meeting its complex social and political problems within the framework of a free, democratic system of government, and with the task of meeting its urgent economic problems by a wider and more intensive application of today's equipment and techniques. Mrs. Gandhi and Mr. Johnson should benefit in their talks from the area of common understanding which has been developing among the people of India and America. The American people have shown in many ways their desire to help India to help herself, and their respect for the Indian Government's example in democracy.

As a kind of senatorial prelude to the Prime Minister's visit, Senator TYDINGS spoke in the Senate last Friday of his own observations in India and of his belief that the United States should substantially increase its economic aid to India. The Maryland Senator made the point, among others, that the United States should keep the war in Vietnam in perspective, and should not permit the war to overshadow the larger issues in Asia which center on the extent and degree to which Communist China will be able to expand its influence and control. India knows the pressure of Chinese expansion and is resisting it, even though its attitude toward the war in Vietnam differs from ours.

President Johnson has been trying to find a firmer basis for American economic relations with India, in the light of the emphasis on self-help (in increasing food production, for example) he has given to our foreign aid program. The Tashkent declaration, which has not settled the Kashmir issue with Pakistan but was clearly a useful step, made it possible for the United States to give immediate help to meet India's urgent and immediate food shortage. Now it will be possible for the President and Mrs. Gandhi to look further ahead, too. This is a meeting which could be of lasting importance to both countries.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR BRINGING CERTAIN DANGEROUS DRUGS INTO THE UNITED STATES FOR ILLEGAL SALE OR USE AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT UNITED STATES-MEXICO NARCOTIC COMMISSION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted into the record a telegram which I received late yesterday, April 5, from the U.S. Bureau of Customs concerning the seizure of millions of pep pills being smuggled into this country from Mexico.

The seizure of this vast quantity of drugs in a single action has direct bearing on a bill I introduced on Tuesday that would particularize the smuggling of these drugs into the United States and provide stiffer penalties for those convicted of its violation. The bill will be on the table for several more days for those of my colleagues who would like to join in its sponsorship.

I commend the Federal, State, and local officials along with the Mexican authorities who participated in the investigation which led to the recent conviction of the conspirator who masterminded the smuggling of these pep pills on such a grand scale.

The smuggling of pep pills, goof balls, marihuana, heroin, and other drugs across the 1,200-mile common border between Mexico and this country has caused severe law enforcement problems for the authorities in the Southwest and for those in California in particular.

California bears a disproportionate share of the cost of, both in dollars and cents and broken bodies, this drug smuggling which by its international nature is a Federal rather than a State problem. I have been told repeatedly that these pills are so widely abused by our young people that we may well be rearing a generation of pill heads.

These contraband chemicals were just recently brought under strict control here in the United States by the Drug Control Amendments of 1965 which will seriously curtail the domestic supply available to illicit users. For law enforcement at all levels to effectively cooperate in crushing this traffic we must give them the tools. My bill now before the Senate, would be one important tool. It would close off a pipeline of supply to American drug peddlers.

I ask my colleagues to give serious thought to this matter, join in sponsoring this legislation and come to the aid of hard-pressed law enforcement officials.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 5, 1966.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD,
Chairman, Juvenile Delinquent Subcommittee, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

In December 1965, customs agents learned that large shipments of amphetamines, apparently made in Mexico, were being sent by air from Mexico City to Tijuana. Subsequent investigations disclosed that these were finding their way into the hands of one Henry Brulay, an American who was operating an income tax service in San Ysidro. Indications were that these shipments of amphetamines had amounted to at least 5 tons.

Meanwhile, Congress had passed the drug abuse control amendments of 1965, approved on July 15, which gave additional regulative and enforcement power to the Food and Drug Administration. Its officers had been actively engaged in making buys from several distributors in Los Angeles and other cities, having on one occasion purchased a keg of 50,000 pills. When it became apparent that this contraband was coming from Brulay, the investigation was unified with participation of customs agents, Food and Drug officers, the Los Angeles sheriff, and State narcotics officers.

Apparently Brulay somehow became aware of this interest in him, and was about to move a large quantity of amphetamines which he had accumulated in Tijuana for introduction into the United States. Arrangements were accordingly made to have him arrested in Mexico on January 28, with the result that amphetamines weighing 118 kilos were found in his car, and another 890 kilos in his home in Tijuana. This is equivalent to about 2,500,000 pills, with a street value of some under $250,000. Under interrogation he made a number of incriminating admissions.

In lieu of prosecution in Mexico, Brulay was, on February 3, deported as an undesirable alien, and arrested in the United States for violation of 18 U.S.C. 371, conspiracy to smuggle amphetamines. To American officers he made no admissions whatever; but when he came to trial on March 25, the Mexican authorities provided witnesses and investigative reports, plus written and taped records of his statements made to them. At the conclusion of a 3-day trial a jury found him guilty after deliberating only 30 minutes. He is to be sentenced on April 25.

The investigation has yielded a great mass of evidentiary material, with the names of many people, apparently including the supplier, middlemen, and distributors, as well as aliases used by Brulay himself. Some of these individuals, including Brulay's son, have been arrested, and many more arrests are expected when the evidence in hand has been sorted out and organized.

LAWRENCE FLEISHMAN,
Assistant Commissioner,
Bureau of Customs.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND TO CALIFORNIA GRAPE & TREE FRUIT LEAGUE, SAN FRANCISCO, MARCH 26, 1966

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, recently, my State of California was honored by a visit from our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida, and Mrs. Holland. Senator HOLLAND had graciously agreed to deliver the principal address before the annual meeting of the California Grape & Tree Fruit League in San Francisco on March 26, 1966.

I know that all of Senator HOLLAND's friends in the Senate and certainly also those attending the convention in San Francisco were saddened by the family illness which cut short his visit and prevented him from delivering his address in person. The speech was delivered by an assistant to the Senator, and I have had many favorable comments concerning the thought-provoking remarks of this devoted public servant and experienced friend of our Nation's agriculture industry.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address by Senator HOLLAND printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA GRAPE & TREE FRUIT LEAGUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., MARCH 26, 1966

Ladies and gentlemen of the California Grape & Tree Fruit League, I am delighted at the opportunity to visit with you and to speak again to this fine organization. It was a high honor when you asked me to visit you some years ago, but to be invited back a second time after you have heard me once is indeed a rare distinction. My wife, Mary, is also most happy to be your guest and we both want you to know of our deep appreciation of your kindness.

As a Senator from Florida and the "third Senator from California," an honorary title bestowed upon me by some of you which pleases me greatly, I speak to you today on what I know are issues of common interest to your league, to our two States, and to all agricultural groups in the Nation.

As second ranking member of the legislative Senate Agriculture Committee, and chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture, it is my pleasant duty to deal day after day with agricultural problems. I know that the problems of agriculture are increasing in number and difficulty, partly because the number of people in agriculture is diminishing in proportion to the rest of the Nation, and party because of the vast number of complexities attendant upon agricultural production and marketing. I bring Florida greetings and some Florida sunshine to the golden State of California. I am sure our mutual interest in agriculture and in improving our posture in this important field is even stronger than our traditional interest in expounding to each other the climatic attractions of our two great States. It has been my fixed opinion for many years that without the two good States of California and Florida, the bouquet of States of this great Nation would lose a very great deal of its color and fragrance.

May I first mention the great record which your junior Senator, GEORGE MURPHY, is already making in the U.S. Senate where, among other things, he has performed yeoman's service to the agricultural interests of California and the Nation. He has aided immeasurably in bringing the problems of agriculture to the Senate floor and to the attention of the Nation. He has already appeared as the principal speaker at the annual meeting of a great Florida agricultural organization—the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association—where he was warmly welcomed as a devoted friend of all agriculture. It has been a joy to me to stand with GEORGE MURPHY on the floor of the Senate and to see him fighting there every minute for the interests of agricultural producers.

I have great admiration, too, for your senior Senator, THOMAS KUCHEL, the minority whip of the Senate. He has stood side by side with us in fighting for agriculture, though his duties as a minority leader have not permitted him to spend so much time in this field as he would have liked.

May I mention, also, another agricultural activity in which your State has contributed much. I speak of the National Fruit Export Council formerly headed by your president, Mr. Marion Newton, which is continuously making efforts to recapture the foreign agricultural markets which we had before World War II, and to enlarge those outlets for our products. The Fruit Export Council has performed an outstanding job in close cooperation with the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and with agriculturally minded Members of Congress. We have not yet reached the level of exports for which we are striving, but I am confident that under the council's leadership we will continue to increase our exports of fresh, canned, concentrated, and dried fruits and fruit juices.

Cooperation, as exemplified in the Export Council, and in the working together of our two States in the Congress and elsewhere with many other States has been responsible for much of the progress which has been made, not only as to exports, but in every other field affecting the production and marketing of agricultural products and the welfare of agricultural producers. There has never been a time when such cooperation was more important than it is today. I need not remind you that there are no commodities in the field of fruits and vegetables which are big enough in themselves to command much influence in the Congress. But by the joint efforts of all of those who are interested in any of these many products in which our Nation is so rich we can assemble sufficient strength in both Houses of Congress to protect ourselves against unfair attack and to accomplish the passage of legislation or appropriations which are necessary to our well-being.

So, I shall speak to you on several points which I believe are so important to all of agriculture as to require our full, continuing cooperation.

My first point relates to the so-called Dirksen resolution, proposing a constitutional amendment by which the people of each State would be allowed to decide for themselves whether they want to have one house of their State legislature apportioned on a basis other than strict population. Since the beginning of the Republic over 175 years ago and up until June 1964 the people had, as a matter of right, the power to determine for themselves the composition of their State legislatures. But now, as the result of the decision of the Supreme Court on this subject, and despite the warning of Justice Felix Frankfurter against the Court's entering this "political thicket" as he called it, State after State is embroiled in the predicament of reapportioning one or both houses of its legislature.

Chaos is evident everywhere and guidelines and deadlines for reapportionment vary widely and inconsistently. The so-called one-man, one-vote edict of the Supreme Court calls for an immediate change in the structure of legislative representation within most of the States. The Dirksen amendment provides the necessary instrument through which all interests, large or small, agriculture, forestry, manufacturing or labor, may continue, in the sole discretion of the people of each State, to have a direct voice in fixing the membership of one house of the legislature.

The immense progress which our States have made and which the Nation has made under the same system, as existing in Congress, should show clearly the value of this kind of representation which includes not only representatives of the great masses of people in the cities, but also representatives and neighbors of the people in the thinly populated geographical areas and of those people concerned with special economic undertakings. Big city interest should not and must not be permitted to decide the future of all interests. Vital questions call for proper and full debate in which direct representation of all areas shall have a part. I support the Dirksen amendment, since it offers the way by which States can preserve balanced legislative representation, balanced in keeping with each State's individual and peculiar needs which its own people can decide for themselves.

I bring this matter before you since I believe that agriculture, always primarily a rural industry, has a major stake in the course of action to be taken to determine whether its future will be dominated by big city bosses and labor unions.

Consider the case of your neighbor State of Nevada. More than half of its people are in the counties where Reno and Las Vegas are located, yet much of the State is relatively undeveloped even though it has had statehood since 1864. Or look at Arizona, where more than half of the people are in Maricopa County. Hawaii, with over four-fifths of its people on one island, in one county, presents an even more extreme case. Alaska, with more than twice the area of Texas, and more than half of its people in two counties, with communications very difficult, presents an interesting case. Is there any reason why the people of each of these States should not have the right, in their discretion, to allow their citizens living in remote areas to have direct representation by neighbors whom they know and with whom they can discuss their problems? As to your own great State I am sure that your agricultural interests strongly desire active representation by people from their own communities in one house of the California Legislature. I believe that the people of your great cities would help them attain this fair objective.

My second point: One of the gravest hazards that now confronts agriculture is the proposal to amend the Wage and Hour Act so as to include agricultural workers under the coverage of the minimum wage provisions. We all know how hurtful this would be. We have had a full demonstration this last year of the tremendous difference between the efficiency and productiveness of workers who want to work, know how to work, and take some pride in their production—contrasted with the output of other workers recruited from the ranks of the unemployed in the cities, many of whom are mere time servers, caring little about the amount or the quality of their work.

When we read the statements of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Senator Hugo Black—the originators of the Wage and Hours Act—in which they carefully confined the philosophy of the act to cover only workers in manufacturing, we wonder what has happened to the thinking of our so-called ultraliberals of this day.

Agriculture is still subject to the weather, to the changing and uncertain demands of the market, to the necessity to move perishable crops when they mature, to the competition of producers of similar crops, to the perils of infestation by insects and diseases, in short, to many unpredictable uncertainties which do not prevail in the field of manufacturing.

Traditionally, and always successfully up to this time, agriculture has been united in fighting off the inclusion of its work force under the provisions of the Wage and Hour Act. I hope that we may take that same position again unanimously and successfully. It will be an evil day for agriculture, and for the consumers of the Nation as well, if we do not succeed again in defeating this ill-conceived effort.

I hardly think it necessary after your recent hearings in California to point out the kind of control to which farm labor would be subject, not only by its radical leadership in many labor organizations, but also by the extremely partisan attitude of Government agencies which administer labor laws.

It would be unthinkable to me that in this great State producing agricultural values of about $3½ billion a year, your agricultural interests could possibly take any other position than to fight aggressively and unceasingly against a step which not only neglects all of the essential differences between agricultural production and other types of work, but also would give encouragement to those who would seek to bring agricultural labor into labor organizations and under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board.

It is my strong hope that this league, along with all of the other groups in California agriculture, will work closely with other agricultural producers in our Nation in insisting that agricultural labor be again exempted from the coverage of that act. I cannot think of anything which would be more harmful to agriculture than to take this step so long urged by the more radical labor leaders and now supported, I regret to say, by the official efforts of national labor officials, including the Secretary of Labor himself.

A third matter which I know is of compelling concern to all of you, is the arbitrary action of the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Willard Wirtz, concerning supplemental foreign labor. At the beginning of 1965 we were shocked to find that many of the radical liberals misinterpreted the refusal of Congress to extend Public Law 78, the Bracero Act, beyond 1964, as a mandate against the continued use of foreign labor and that some of the officials of the Department of Labor expressed this same feeling. So Senator MURPHY and I, and others, took the floor last year on five or more occasions to point out the great harm being done by decisions of Mr.

Wirtz in this field and to document the losses and frustrations of agriculture due to inability to obtain timely and adequate labor. In particular, we documented the clear intent of Congress to continue to use Public Law 414, the General Immigration Act, for the importation of needed supplemental farm labor after Public Law 78 expired. We quoted statements made on the floor of the Senate by leading opponents of Public Law 78 to the effect that Public Law 414 would continue in force and could be used after the expiration of the Bracero Act to bring in needed labor.

Notwithstanding this fact, the Secretary of Labor imposed so many hardships on agriculture, particularly in California and Florida, that I offered an amendment to the farm bill of 1965 to place the determination as to the use of foreign labor in the Secretary of Agriculture.

This amendment was adopted in committee and debated on the Senate floor on September 13. While the amendment was defeated, it required the vote of the Vice President to break a Senate tie vote of 45–45. From that moment, this placed the responsibility squarely upon the national administration itself with regard to the foreign labor problem, and I hope that such fact may produce this year a more reasonable attitude on the part of Secretary Wirtz and his associates.

It is interesting to note that while this subject was not before the conference of the House and Senate on the farm bill of 1965, the conferees nevertheless adopted a strong statement which I offered on foreign labor.

This statement indicated strong dissatisfaction on the part of members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees in the way the foreign labor problem was being handled by Mr. Wirtz and strong insistence that the Secretary of Agriculture was the proper person to handle problems of farm labor and that his advice should be sought and followed in the determinations made by the Commissioner of Immigration on the admission of supplemental foreign workers.

Secretary Wirtz is a kindly gentleman, but his handling of the farm labor problem has been highly impractical and has shown little understanding of critical farm problems. Unless much more adequate handling of this problem is shown within the next few weeks or months, the producers of perishable crops throughout the Nation must renew their battle in this matter on an even stronger basis than last year.

I shall not enumerate here all the difficulties of last year. Some of them were the actual plowing under of mature crops, the reduced plantings of other crops, the removal of plantings from our country to Mexico and the Bahamas, the removal of processors from this country, the reduction in the work force of American labor employed in the processing and transportation of farm crops and the virtual destruction of the most meaningful mutual aid program which we had with our neighboring nations.

I do want to call attention, however, to the fact that the original drive for total elimination of supplemental farm labor has apparently been blunted. To cut our sugarcane crop in Florida for 1965–66, we have been allowed to bring in 8,468 workers from the British West Indies. When we had a freeze which seemed to offer great damage to our midseason orange crop, Secretary Wirtz immediately certified 1,000 British West Indies workers as fruit pickers, though only 665 were actually brought in.

The admission of Basque sheep herders for the sheep ranchers of the West has continued and there were 1,455 of these in the country on January 31 of this year. The employment of woodcutters for the New England States and New York authorized from January 1 to March 11 totalled 3,179. The total number of workers to help the maple producers of Maine admitted in this year was 800. In the fall of 1965, Secretary Wirtz certified 4,500 Canadian workers for the potato industry in Maine besides 2,430 Canadian and British West Indies workers for the apple growers of New England, New York, Virginia, and West Virginia.

I understand that some Japanese workers have already been certified for your date industry this year. It is clear that Secretary Wirtz is gaining a better understanding of the imperative needs of agriculture for supplemental farmworkers from abroad.

You know the California situation much better than I, but I have secured from the U.S. Commissioner of Immigration a report that 17,653 so-called green card Mexicans were engaged in agricultural work in the Southwest in January of this year and that the number of illegal "wetbacks" increased so greatly last year that the burden of excluding them was greatly increased; 22,314 wetbacks were deported in 1965 as contrasted with 11,429 in 1964.

In other words, there are some favorable indications in this picture now. It is clear to me that the cooperation of all agricultural groups in the Nation must be sought and their united efforts placed behind the adequate recognition of the need for supplemental alien farmworkers, particularly at this time when the number of unemployed in this Nation is so small and when many industries are crying for additional qualified, domestic workers. At this same time the President is calling for an enlarged food-for-freedom program, under which we are asked to produce greatly increased amounts of food to feed the hungry people of the world.

The undeniable facts are with the producers of perishable food crops—and the time is favorable. I urge you to join in an insistent effort with all other producers in your State—with those in my State and all the producing States in the Nation—in pressing your rights under Public Law 414 to have supplemental foreign workers in this year when you will need them badly. I believe that success will surely crown our efforts.

The administration which has assumed full responsibility in this matter by defeating my amendment by the single vote of the Vice President, will surely listen carefully and sympathetically in this election year. Aggressive action and complete unity will get the desired result to which I say again, you are clearly entitled under Public Law 414.

It has been a great pleasure to be with you—I close by assuring you that I shall continue to fight the battle of agriculture in the Senate—believing that its economy is of vast importance to our Nation and its productive power the greatest asset that our Nation has in its international dealings during these perilous days.

APPRECIATION DINNER HELD FOR JAMES G. PATTON, RETIRING PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION; SPEECHES OF TONY DECHANT AND JOSEPH D. KEENAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday, March 28, 1966, an appreciation dinner was given here in Washington, D.C., for James G. Patton, retiring president of the National Farmers Union.

James Patton has been president of the Farmers Union for 26 years—since 1940—and during that time he has distinguished himself as one of the outstanding leaders of this Nation. He pioneered rural electrification and rural housing programs and has long fought the battle to preserve the family farmer.

James Patton has been more than a president of the National Farmers Union, he has been the vision and inspiration of an entire movement dedicated to the betterment of life in rural areas and justice for the American farmer.

I am proud that James Patton is my personal friend.

As a tribute to this great American, I ask unanimous consent that the program from that dinner, along with the remarks of Tony T. Dechant, new president of the National Farmers Union, and Joseph D. Keenan, international secretary of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, be printed in the RECORD.

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

IN APPRECIATION JAMES G. PATTON—PROGRAM

Presiding: P. L. (Roy) Siemiller, international president, International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.

Invocation: Rev. Shirley E. Greene, Commission on Church and Economic Life, National Council of Churches of Christ, U.S.A.

Music: Morgan Baer.

Introductions.

Addresses: Tony T. Dechant, national president, National Farmers Union; George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Presentation.

Response: James G. Patton.

SPONSOR

George Meany and P. L. (Roy) Siemiller, cochairmen; I. W. Abel, United Steelworkers of America; Joseph A. Beirne, Communications Workers of America; Joseph Curran, National Maritime Union of America; A. J. DeAndrade, International Printing Pressmen's and Assistants' Union of North America; David Dubinsky, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union; John J. Grogan, Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America.

Paul Hall, Seafarers International Union of North America; Ralph Helstein, United Packinghouse, Food and Allied Workers; M. A. Hutcheson, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; Paul Jennings, International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers; Joseph D. Keenan, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Herman D. Kenin, American Federation of Musicians; Lee Milton, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada; Paul L. Phillips, United Papermakers and Paperworkers.

Jacob S. Potofsky, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Walter P. Reuther, International Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, William F. Schnitzler, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; Peter T. Schoemann, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada; James A. Suffridge, Retail Clerks International Association; David Sullivan, Building Service Employees International Union; Hunter P. Wharton, International Union of Operating Engineers.

INTRODUCTION—PATTON TESTIMONIAL SPEECH

(Remarks of Joseph D. Keenan, International Secretary of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers)

It is a real privilege for me to be here to pinch-hit for the great leader of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations to pay tribute to another forward-looking organization, the

National Farmers Union, and to honor its leader for so many years, Jim Patton. He and the organization he has served so well have stood side by side with American labor in fighting for the welfare of American workers, both on the farms and in the cities.

To most Americans who follow agricultural affairs to any extent—and certainly to Members of Congress—the National Farmers Union is "that other" farm organization.

The National Farm Bureau Federation, year in and year out, in Washington and in the State capitals, thunders against every piece of social legislation designed to help the people in general, and wage-earners in particular. They are as predictable as the National Association of Manufacturers—and they are almost always on the same side.

They have successfully created an image of the American farmer as a dyed-in-the-wool reactionary, concerned only with his narrow self-interest. Worse than that, a reactionary who always has his hand in the public purse, but who is a skinflint toward everyone else.

This image has been so widely accepted that many citizens, I am sure, are vaguely surprised that the National Farmers Union exists at all. For the NFU, as we all know, has just as consistently spoken out for the well-being, the continuing progress, of wage-earners as well as farmers.

But those who are surprised by a liberal, progressive farm organization don't know much about American history.

Let us remember how Emerson described the opening battle:

"By the rule bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood
And fired the shot heard round the world."

Now those farmers weren't shooting at the redcoats for the sake of high subsidies and low wages.

They had some other objectives in mind—the kind of objectives that have been exemplified, over the years, by the National Farmers Union.

You may be thinking that I am oversimplifying the case, by going all the way back to 1775 for a comparison. Actually, this was just the beginning of a long tradition.

Through most of the 19th century, the movers and shakers, the idealists and the reformers, came from the farms, not from the cities. The bitterest enemies of slavery—giving full marks to the New England intellectuals—were the free and independent farmers, North and South, who measured a man, not by his color, but by his performance in the endless struggle with the forces of nature.

When wage earners were an unorganized, voiceless mass, it was the farmers who inspired and supported the Populist movement, that terrified the industrial moguls of the time—the malefactors of great wealth," as Theodore Roosevelt would call them later.

These barons weren't afraid of their workers. With the help of the law, the courts, the official and unofficial police, they could crush any uprising of their own employees. What scared them was the farmers—the free, independent farmers, who demanded an end to the domination of American life, and the American economy, by the Morgans and the Carnegies and the Rockefellers.

Nothing has ever been said about Samuel Gompers or Philip Murray or even John L. Lewis that compares with what was said about William Jennings Bryan.

Even Eugene Debs was less of a threat. Debs could be attacked as a socialist, a "Red," a spokesman for a strange new ideology. But Bryan was the symbol, the standard bearer, of a radical reform movement that was undeniably 100 percent American. And it had its roots in the soil.

Consider that desolate period after World War I—the so-called roaring twenties, the jazz age of flappers and bootleggers. If we base our judgments on the movies and the television, it was a glamourous and exciting time. It was a time when every young man had a Stutz Bearcat and a raccoon coat and a silver flask full of bathtub gin. And every girl was beautiful, confused, and available.

Maybe that's the way it was in Princeton and New Haven, in Greenwich Village, or Hollywood. But for workers and for farmers it was a decade of stagnation, from the "return to normalcy" to the "chicken in every pot."

Of course, hardly anybody paid any attention to workers and farmers in those days. Almost everyone was getting rich in Wall Street.

But there were a few who were paying attention. There were a few, lonely voices who pointed out that a slogan like "the business of America is business" didn't really include all of us.

These weren't labor voices alone. No, the major voices of dissent in that long, bleak decade went by such names as La Follette and Norris and Borah, Wheeler, and Johnson, and Nye. They were not always right on every issue, but they were the voices that kept alive the spirit of social progress when so many others had given up the fight.

And when the long political drought ended with the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, where did the new President look for help? Not just to the college professors; he also called in the heirs and survivors of the Populist and Progressive movements, men like Harold Ickes and Henry Wallace—and like Harry Truman.

So I say that the National Farmers Union is not really "that other" farm organization. On the contrary, it represents the true spirit, the real principles, of the independent, self-supporting farmer, as demonstrated by almost two centuries of American history.

Now this obviously brings me to the area of practical politics; so let me say a few words on that subject.

The whole philosophy of the National Farmers Union, as I understand it—and if I am wrong, I will certainly be corrected in a very few minutes—is that what is good for America is good for farmers.

This happens to coincide with the philosophy and program of the AFL-CIO.

We say that what is good for America is good for the AFL-CIO.

Clearly we can't be very far apart.

But at the same time, neither the National Farmers Union nor the AFL-CIO lays claim to any special sanctity. We are not asking anyone to fit us with a halo.

We are simply operating according to the principles of enlightened self-interest.

It seems simple enough to me. A farmer who is well off, who has a reasonable chance to sell his crops at a reasonable price, will be a better customer for tools and tractors, textiles and toothpicks, than the fellow who is constantly faced with foreclosure.

In the same way, a wage earner who can meet his rent—or his mortgage payments—without strain, who can clothe his family and pay the electric bill, will also buy more meat and bread and vegetables and eggs.

Therefore—and this is so simple there must be something wrong with it—the AFL-CIO is for prosperous farmers and the NFU is for prosperous workers.

I offer this bold new concept, without charge, to the Farm Bureau.

Seriously, I think this concept needs a good deal of development; and if I may say so, the need is greater among the farm population.

I was very pleased to read that the NFU is now going to intensify its organizing efforts. That's fine. We in the labor movement can tell you that organization and education are inseparable. As you recruit you will educate, to the benefit of all.

The plain truth is that there is no conflict of interest between farmer and worker. What the farmer gets has very little relation to what the worker pays for food in the supermarket. What the worker earns an hour has almost nothing to do with the price of a harrow. The rivalry is imaginary, cleverly fomented by those who want both farmers and workers to get less.

Earlier I recalled that the most eloquent spokesmen for the liberal cause, in past years, were often farmers. I think it is fair to say that the labor movement has now taken over a large part of that role. It has fallen to us to be the people's lobby, the voice of the voiceless. We accept the obligation gladly.

Yet we would be stronger in this role, and the national interest would be furthered, if more of the farm population joined in the quest for a better America.

We look forward to the day when there will be a bigger, stronger and even more influential National Farmers Union at our side.

Our guest of honor tonight has devoted most of his life to creating the foundation. For a generation, Jim Patton has symbolized the true spirit of the American farmer—an independent spirit, but a progressive spirit as well.

I think it is highly appropriate that the National Farmers Union and Jim Patton were born in the same year—1902. Measured by the calendar, they grew up together. But the real growth of the National Farmers Union, in both size and influence, began when they got together in a literal sense.

This is easy enough to understand, for as you look over his career, it almost seems as though Jim Patton spent his first 38 years preparing to lead the NFU. He started young; his father was a Populist and a follower of William Jennings Bryan, and I am sure this helped to shape his thinking during his Colorado boyhood.

He had financial troubles early in life; after the death of his father he had to quit college and go to work, in order to support his mother and three younger sisters. He had hardly recovered from this setback when the depression cost him his job as a typewriter salesman.

This proves that the depression wasn't all bad. Because it was only a short time later that we find him with the Colorado Farmers Union, setting up a cooperative insurance program. That was the real beginning.

From the start of the New Deal, Jim Patton has been an adviser and a source of ideas for the Federal Government. He has not only supported the social programs adopted during the last generation, in an amazing number of cases, he thought of them first.

I won't attempt to recite the list. Let me give only one example. In August 1951, Jim Patton proposed that the United States send farmers and technicians to live abroad and teach their skills to the peoples of undeveloped lands. Ten years later, John F. Kennedy founded the Peace Corps.

In his ideas and in his career, Jim Patton has been an eloquent spokesman for the common interests of farmers and workers in the ultimate achievement of the American dream. As we honor him tonight, let us rededicate ourselves to that goal.

Let me conclude with just one more thought—one that I know President Meany intended to express, if he had been able to be here. It is simply this: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, and of every wage earner, we say to you, Jim Patton, "Thank you; thank you, from the bottom of our hearts."

REMARKS OF TONY T. DECHANT, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, TO JAMES G. PATTON APPRECIATION DINNER, MARCH 28, 1966

I am deeply grateful and highly honored to be asked to say a few words to this distinguished gathering.

We are assembled here this evening to do homage to a great American—a truly great citizen of this world.

The entire membership of the National Farmers Union is deeply honored that you here this evening, and those you represent, are honoring Jim Patton.

Our Jim Patton is revered wherever there is a dedication to the fight for human decency, freedom, and progress.

He has left the Farmers Union a truly great heritage. Indeed, he has left me, as his successor, a mighty big pair of shoes to fill.

In the few minutes I have this evening may I make the record vividly clear as to the path ahead which will be occupied by the Farmers Union under my direction, as assisted by our able vice president, Ed Christianson, our executive committee, board of directors, and membership.

In my acceptance speech less than 2 weeks ago, I pledged my enthusiastic acceptance of our democratically formulated policies and rededicated my every effort to their implementation.

This includes, first, a major campaign to increase the income of our Nation's family farmers to bring them at least equal to that of other citizens. In this regard, we welcome your continued and most capable support.

The Farmers Union will not decrease its efforts to bring about a true and effective recapitalization of rural America. Advanced programs of housing, rural electrification, credit, conservation, cooperative development—all geared to the complete elimination of poverty—are of the highest priority, since 48 percent of our poverty is found in rural America.

We will not cease in our efforts to develop the best possible food-for-peace program—geared to assist the developing nations of a troubled world—but not saddling the costs of the program on the backs of our farmers.

The Farmers Union, pioneer in the development of our school milk and school lunch programs, is opposed to any ill-conceived reduction and this afternoon I testified for funds to strengthen these programs—not reduce them.

We will rededicate our efforts in behalf of all our people. We support the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. We want the Congress to pass truth-in-packaging, truth-in-lending, strong antipollution measures. We will join with you in labor to bring about improved medical care at lower costs, to beautify our great Nation, to make our highways a safe place to travel and our cars more safety styled.

We will work with you in efforts to expand educational programs, control the monopolizers, and develop a full-employment economy.

And we will ask your support as we strive to enact a "Wagner Act for farmers" designed to strengthen the bargaining position of farmers through Government-supervised agricultural marketing authorities which should regulate production and represent farmers in their price dealings with buyers.

Farmers Union has been proud to have been allied for many years with the efforts of the labor movement in behalf of many of the measures I have mentioned above.

We have been proud, also, to have supported measures geared to increase the minimum wage to an adequate level and expand its coverage to all employees, including agricultural workers, to improve unemployment compensation laws, and to support enactment of legislation to protect the rights of all of those who work for employers to organize, bargain collectively and protect their organization.

Legislative provisions should be strengthened regarding wage rates, health, safety, and housing conditions for domestic migratory farm labor and for the education of the children of migrant families.

The Farmers Union wants a progressive America. That is why we vigorously opposed the candidacy of Barry Goldwater in 1964 and actively oppose the John Birch Society and other rightwing extremists today and tomorrow.

We do not endorse political parties, but certainly grade the duly elected representatives and support, when possible, those who back the programs we back.

With the AFL-CIO operating on the high plane of issues in the cities and the Farmers Union operating on similar high ground in the countryside we can win the struggle for economic and social survival.

I thank God for Jim Patton. I thank Jim Patton for the broad base upon which to build. I pledge to you the continued cooperation of the National Farmers Union.

Thank you.

PRIORITIES AND PRUDENCE ARE REQUISITES IN SPENDING, BUT WATER AND LAND PROJECTS MUST NOT BE NEGLECTED; PRESIDENT'S LEADERSHIP IS COMMENDED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in addressing a conference of Mid-Atlantic States soil conservation committees at Cacapon State Park, W. Va., earlier this week, I described what I construed to be the "realistic picture of trends in the national economy and in Federal programing." I pointed out the exceptionally active and able leadership President Johnson is providing in the efforts to offset inflationary influences.

After noting that the President had summed the situation which prevails by stating that "our economic policy must be to balance the gains of prosperity against the dangers of overheating," I cautioned that we must plan and build within the framework of the conditions which prevail. And I said that in doing so, we must realize that all of our favorite programs cannot be and will not be carried on at the levels to which we have been accustomed—but we must not despair or surrender.

Even though the shaving of a billion dollars from expenditures scheduled for this year has been a challenge issued by the President to Federal departments and agencies, and even though such reductions should occur, the central fact remains that priorities must be set and prudence must be practiced in the selection of categories of public spending, and in appropriations.

For my part, I said then, and I reiterate today, water and land are so basic that they must not be neglected. Hence, my voice will be strong among the advocates of maintaining the best pace possible in our soil stabilization and water resource plans and actions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of my April 4, 1966, remarks to the Mid-Atlantic States Conference of Soil Conservation Committees.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT MID-ATLANTIC STATES SOIL CONSERVATION COMMITTEES CONFERENCE, CACAPON LODGE, CACAPON STATE PARK, W. VA., APRIL 4, 1966

Problems—especially as they were placed in perspective over the weekend—give cause for all of us to make reassessments. Here are the reasons:

Last Tuesday, following the announcement by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of a major jump in the cost of living, President Johnson appeared for a question-and-answer session with a group of White House fellowship award recipients. It was then that the President spoke of specific contingency plans for a tax rise.

He mentioned three ways in which the prevailing inflationary spiral could be curbed. One, he said, would be to impose wage and price controls—another, to pare down Government spending—and the other, to increase taxes.

The President seemed almost immediately, however, to rule out rigid controls on the economy. Then he remarked that although an attempt is being made to reduce Federal spending, he questions whether the possible cuts would be enough to stem the tide of inflationary pressures. Thus, it appeared that the President was surely laying a foundation for an almost immediate tax increase. In fact, he asserted that if prices continue to move up for another 30 to 90 days, a tax hike would be needed to remove some of the heat from the economic factors behind the price increases and upward spiral of the cost of living.

Last Wednesday, the stock market reacted sharply downward. The President again reacted, too. A series of followup statements came from the White House emphasizing that a final decision definitely had not been made to raise taxes. Every possible means of stemming inflation would be made before the President would ask Congress to increase taxes, White House spokesmen assured Wall Street and the country. The stock market reacted more favorably at the close of the week.

Meanwhile, it came to light that the President also had been engaged the early part of last week in close discussions with industrial and business leaders, asking them in the interest of national welfare to reexamine their plans for business expansion. His suggestion for a voluntary curb on big business spending for expansion was repeated to the Business Council last Wednesday night.

President Johnson followed the next day—Thursday—by carrying his plea for fiscal self-restraints directly to the American public through an address to the mayors and others attending a legislative conference of the National League of Cities.

The President seemed to be addressing all segments of the population—business and labor, congressmen, public officials at all levels, and the housewives—asking all to join in the fight against inflation. He even suggested that buyers and consumers be selective and not patronize items that seem to climb steadily in price.

On Friday, President Johnson asked his Cabinet to join the fight by cutting a billion dollars out of their spending plans this year—not next year, but this year. (Next year will be even more stringent, perhaps.)

The Secretary of the Treasury explained at the end of the week that the President and his administration had devoted the week to fiscal discussions and warnings for two principal reasons; namely, these—

First, there is some chance that by creating an acute public awareness of the problem of inflation—by, in effect, creating a selective buyers' strike against items with inflated price tags—a substantial anti-inflation counterpressure can be created.

Second, if—as appears likely—the President finds it absolutely necessary to turn to Congress for a tax increase of approximately $5 billion—the American people will not have been taken by surprise.

So, that is the picture as March 1966 gave way to April 1966—and it is better that we look at the situation realistically.

We are in military action in southeast Asia at a time when the domestic economy is booming—and extra spending for the Defense Establishment always adds heat to the boiling pot of inflationary ingredients.

When spending already is high, both in the private and the public sectors, price and cost distortions grow like unwanted weeds among the fresh spring flowers. The President has advised wisely in suggesting selective buyers' and consumers' strikes against price-inflated items which generate increases in the cost of living.

Likewise, one cannot fault the President for urging the Departments and Agencies of the executive establishment to pare spending by a billion dollars while, at the same time, he is asking industry and business to cut back on capital expenditures for expansion.

The fact is, of course, that these are "delicate times"—for we are in a period in which there must be superb national and international leadership, and an era when there must be cooperation between nations and teamwork between the constitutionally independent branches of government of our own Republic. Perhaps it is too much to hope for, but there is equal need for patriotism to supplant partisan politics—even in this election year.

With De Gaulle's France threatening the NATO Alliance, and with our efforts to halt communistic aggression in southeast Asia through the actions in Vietnam involving us in expensive problems, diplomatic strictures, and divisiveness in domestic debate, our President and our Government cannot devote total attention to domestic economics. Yet, the problems of the domestic economy are so acute as to require almost full time attention.

It was my experience to have entered the Congress in 1933 when the Great Depression developed conditions which required correction through use of the uplifting influence of so-called massive spending. The New Deal administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt was responsive to the needs of the times. I developed a real appreciation for the value of public works to make permanent improvements while, at the same time, building props under a sagging economy until the private sector would be capable of expanding and becoming healthy.

The seniors among us know what World War II did to overstimulate the economy and bring on price controls, as well as the need for us to make massive injections of foreign aid to physically and economically rehabilitate countries abroad.

We were not overly successful in the immediate post-World War II years in managing the inflation which was further heated by the costs of the Korean affair, so there developed in the mid-1950's and late 1950's a condition which was described as "recession." I returned to the Congress as a Member of the Senate at a time when the need to reheat a cooled-off economy was a priority requirement.

The Kennedy and Johnson administrations did, indeed, achieve 5 years of steady progress and it is understandable that President Johnson does not wish to see those years of progress give way to either inflation or recession. His efforts, understandably, are centered on flattening out the boom and prolonging prosperity without the intrusion of inflation.

The President has summed the situation with the comment that "our economic policy must be to balance the gains of prosperity against the dangers of overheating."

The President knows, and we must all realize, that we are in a war on two fronts—a struggle to contain communism in Vietnam and a continuous battle against discrimination, despair, poverty, disease, and illiteracy in our society at home.

We must all do our part to help achieve success on both fronts.

So we must plan and build within the framework of the conditions which prevail. In doing so, we must realize that all of our favorite programs cannot be and will not be carried on at the levels to which we have been accustomed—but we must not despair or surrender.

Even though the shaving of a billion dollars from expenditures scheduled for this year should occur, and even though budgets for the next fiscal year undoubtedly will be tighter, the central fact remains that priorities must be set and prudence must be practiced in the selection of categories of public spending, and in appropriations.

For my part, water and land are so basic that they must not be neglected. Hence, my voice will be strong among the advocates of maintaining the best pace possible in our soil stabilization and water resource plans and actions. This means, simple stated, that I favor high priorities for flood control and watershed projects. We dare not permit our soils and our precious waters to be swept away to the oceans because of neglect or flooding which might otherwise be controlled. Even now, time is not on our side because we have done too little about soil erosion and have been too conservative in our actions to conserve and improve the quality of our water supply in this country.

As the population explosion persists, we must see that the land and the water necessary to serve the population is not dissipated by erosion, over-stripping for minerals, or carried off to the oceans by floods.

But I must point out that this same population explosion creates other vast problems—the need for more classrooms for education, the requirement that the highway expansion program keep pace with the increased utilization of roads and bridges by many, many more automobiles, and the essentiality of keeping our professional and health services and facilities from lagging farther behind the rate necessary to keep pace with utilization by more and more people.

I have noted that my distinguished Senate colleague, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, a member of our Committee on Appropriations, has set a goal to achieve an increase in the amount of $26 million nationwide for flood control and soil conservation purposes under the programs of the Soil Conservation Service. Not only do I commend my dedicated colleague for setting his sights on that goal—I give assurance that I will support all efforts and all ways and means available to achieve it.

There are no more satisfying experiences in my official life than those of breaking ground for or dedicating new water supply facilities under the program of the Farmers Home Administration—new watershed facilities under the Soil Conservation Service activities—new river locks and dams and reservoirs under the Army Corps of Engineers flood control and navigation assistance programs—new educational facilities under the recently liberalized aid-to-education programs of the Federal Government—new highways under the Federal-aid highway program—or new institutions to improve public health and to provide better medical and institutional care for our citizens.

Those are the services and facilities which are basic to the good life in these United States. We must not permit them to be sold short, even in time of war on communism, in war on inflation, or in war on recession. Our water, soil, traffic arteries, educational and health services and facilites should have the prime attention of our Government at all times. I certainly will be among those insisting that authorizations and appropriations by the Congress reflect their priority positions.

EXTENSION OF HATCH ACT TO EMPLOYEES OF VISTA AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I continue to receive favorable comments and enthusiastic support both from constituents and editorials throughout the country regarding S. 2908, which I offered on February 8, along with 24 other Senators, to extend the Hatch Act to employees of VISTA and the community action programs, who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal funds. I feel strongly that this amendment should be accepted this session. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the various editorials that I received be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Glendale (Calif.) News-Press, Feb. 19, 1966]

MURPHY AMENDMENT: POLITICS AND POVERTY PROGRAM

Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Republican, of California, has taken a commendable step toward keeping politics out of the poverty program.

He has introduced an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which would place executives who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal poverty funds under the Hatch Act. This act is supposed to prevent politicking by Federal employees.

The "Murphy amendment" needs to stick this time. He introduced a similar proposal last year. It was accepted unanimously by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and passed the Senate without a dissenting vote. But this much needed protection was cut out in conference.

The need for keeping politics out of the poverty program is plain to see. As MURPHY said in a letter to his colleagues soliciting their support:

"The war on poverty is in danger of becoming bogged down by bickering and partisan political activities. This, of course, is most regrettable, and I am convinced that unless steps are taken to keep the program free from politics, the poor will benefit little, if any, from the program."

The extra year of experience since Congress eliminated MURPHY's amendment last year should provide ample grounds for keeping it intact this time.

[From the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook, Feb. 24, 1966]

DOWN THE "HATCH" WITH THEM

It sometimes appears that the only way the Federal Government can win the war against poverty is for Sargent Shriver to order his program executives to beat "need" to death with their salary-swollen wallets. But maybe there is another way—Senator GEORGE MURPHY's way.

Senator MURPHY, our junior Senator from California, has announced that he will introduce legislation requiring that executives of the poverty program who are paid more than one-half of their salaries from antipoverty funds be placed under the Hatch Act.

If Senator MURPHY is successful in amending the Economic Opportunity Act, all poverty war administrators, coordinators and expediters who draw the bulk of their pay from funds intended to relieve the poor will be prohibited from political activity.

This, of course, would be a grievous blow to the patronage dispensers who now divert

antipoverty funds to a motley crew of wardheelers, nepotists and professional hangers-on who buzz around the battlefields of the poor like bees in a flower garden.

Deprived of their political reasons for existence the poverty "fighters" might have no choice left except to go to work in behalf of the poor. They would, in fact, be forced to safeguard the intent of Congress in establishing the antipoverty program.

Senator MURPHY is a realist and undoubtedly has no illusions about the chances for his reform amendment. He remembers the last session of Congress when administration pressure killed similar legislation he sponsored. When the poor are pawns of an administration bent on perpetuating itself and its ordained successors in power, the public interest be damned, or so the last Congress demonstrated.

But Senator MURPHY will try again, confident that he has the strong support of the people who underwrite the billions now being wasted—the taxpayers.

Only if legislators like Senator MURPHY prevail will the antipoverty program be saved from political prostitution.

[From the Burbank (Calif.) Review, Feb. 10, 1966]

POLITICS BAR SOUGHT IN POVERTY WAR

WASHINGTON.—Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Republican, of California, has reintroduced legislation to bar local officials of the antipoverty war from partisan politics.

MURPHY'S proposal was adopted last year by the Senate but later dropped by a House-Senate conference from a package of amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

The measure would place workers in the Community Action and VISTA programs under the Hatch Act, the Federal law restricting political activity by U.S. workers.

All executives of the two programs who receive most of their salaries from Federal poverty funds could be covered.

MURPHY tried to drum up support for the amendment in letters Wednesday to all his Senate colleagues.

"I am convinced that unless steps are taken to keep the $2 billion poverty program free from politics the poor will benefit little—if any—from the program," he said.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News, Feb. 23, 1966]

GOOD IDEA

Senator GEORGE MURPHY of California has come up with an idea that could cut down on the politics in the antipoverty program.

Senator MURPHY has introduced a bill (S. 2908) which extends the Hatch Act to cover employees of the community action program and the VISTA volunteers who receive the principal part of their salaries from the Federal Government.

The Hatch Act, in force since 1939, bars Federal employees from using their offices to influence voters or taking an active part in politics or political campaigns.

During the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, the law has been openly flaunted. Washington bureaucrats twist the arms of their employees for donations to the Democratic Party, and for party support at the polls. Postal clerks and employees thumb their noses at the law and politic openly.

Nevertheless, it is the law, and violators can be brought into court—if any politician has the intestinal fortitude to do it.

The antipoverty program has turned into a huge Federal patronage service, a political pork barrel, and those in the program have openly used poverty funds for political purposes. Extending the Hatch Act to cover them, would, at least, make what they are doing clearly illegal and would give communities a weapon in case poverty politicians attempted to exert pressure on local governing bodies and officials.

As the Washington Star said this week in endorsing the Murphy proposal, it may be a remedy although probably not a cure. To people who have no respect for law, laws mean nothing unless enforced.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) News, Feb. 15, 1966]

POLITICS AND POVERTY

Poverty program personnel would be barred from political activity under a proposal offered by Senator GEORGE MURPHY.

The Senator would amend the Economic Opportunity Act to provide that community action agency employees who receive more than half their salaries from Federal poverty funds, and employees of the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program would be placed under the Hatch Act.

The Johnson administration has indicated a desire to divorce the program from politics. If that is indeed the case it should have no objection to barring those who operate the program from political activity.

The Job Corps, which operates under the Hatch Act, has largely avoided getting bogged down in politics.

The war on poverty is too important to be jeopardized by political finagling.

Putting poverty workers under the Hatch Act will not solve all the problems of the program, but it should have a beneficial effect.

Adoption of the Murphy amendment would serve notice on poverty program personnel that they are there to help the poor, not the politicians.—Los Angeles Times

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Press, Feb. 11, 1966]

"HATCH" THEM

Since the outset, some phases of President Johnson's war on poverty have been complicated, if not disrupted, by squabbling and grabbiness among local politicians.

Senator GEORGE MURPHY, of California, thinks he have a remedy, although probably not a cure.

He said he will introduce a bill to apply the Hatch Act to all administrators in the so-called community action and VISTA aspects of the program. These are the places where the most trouble has turned up.

The Hatch Act, on the books since 1939, bars Federal employees from using their offices to influence voters or taking an active part in politics or political campaigns.

Senator MURPHY doubts his proposal would solve all the problems, but he hopes it would make them pay more attention to the needs of the poor, and less to politics.

There isn't any sound reason at all why Congress shouldn't apply the same limitations to antipoverty employees as to other Government people. In fact, in the case of the antipoverty employees, the restrictions are especially needed.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Post & Times-Star, Feb. 11, 1966]

HATCH ACT AND POVERTY

Since the outset, some phases of President Johnson's war on poverty have been complicated, if not disrupted, by squabbling and grabbiness among local politicians.

Senator GEORGE MURPHY, of California, thinks he may have a remedy. He said he will introduce a bill to apply the Hatch Act to all administrators in the so-called community action and VISTA aspects of the program. These are the places where the most trouble has turned up.

The Hatch Act, on the books since 1939, bars Federal employees from using their offices to influence voters or taking an active part in politics or political campaigns.

Senator MURPHY doubts his proposal would solve all the problems, but he hopes it would make them pay more attention to the needs of the poor, and less to politics.

In Cincinnati, one group in the Cincinnati Action Commission, responsible for the War on Poverty program, has fought desperately against a proposed local Hatch Act. Their strange argument has been that it would deprive the director and his aids of their citizenship rights.

We fail to see why employees of this contractual agency should be exempt from the rules which govern Government employees who spend Federal money and operate Federal programs.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION ON MAIL ORDER GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD some supplementary information on the mail order gun legislation now pending before the Senate. It is an article appearing in the April 3, 1966, issue of This Week magazine, a Sunday supplement which is distributed in a number of newspapers across the Nation.

Entitled "Murder in the Mail," and authored by Jerome Wilson, the article deftly outlines for the public how the availability of firearms to virtually anyone who can sign his name and spend a few dollars contributes to the criminal use of firearms in a Nation already plagued by a growing crime problem.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The author speaks of the implements of war and death: pistols, rifles, sniper equipment, bazookas, cannons, tanks, riot guns, derringers, artillery pieces and so forth which are being sold across this country much the same as a housewife buys a pound of butter.

During the 5 years we have been investigating this trafficking in firearms we have been constantly harassed by a hard-core minority of the populace spending fortunes in time and money to confuse the public, distort the issues and divert attention from the main issue. And the issue is a simple one. It is the administration's proposal to place reasonable, rational controls over the indiscriminate sale of firearms to felons, addicts, the mentally ill, and others who should not be armed. It in no way infringes the rights of others.

However, the free flow of arms to others who do misuse them, who can be expected to misuse them, and to those who may not know the difference between right and wrong infringes on the rights of the law abiding.

In testimony to the fact that this does happen, all too frequently, I ask unanimous consent that a short series of news articles concerning the misuse of firearms, easily procurred, also be included in the RECORD.

And I add that these news items represent only a small part of the mayhem wreaked on our law-abiding populace during a 1-week period from March 3 through March 29, 1966.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Apr. 3, 1966]

MURDER IN THE MAIL

(By Jerome Wilson)

Anyone (even a kid, if he tells enough lies) can buy a deer rifle or an antitank gun right out of a catalog.

Last October a Brinks armored car company's vault in Syracuse, N.Y., was blasted open with an antitank cannon by thieves who stole $400,000.

In December 1964, a high-powered bazooka shell exploded in the East River in New York City just short of the United Nations building, at which it had, fortunately, been carelessly aimed.

On January 30, 1964, a mentally disturbed mother in Wheaton, Md., killed her three teenage children and herself with a .38 revolver, and on January 29, 1965, a 15-year-old boy in Baltimore used a .38-caliber foreign revolver to murder his mother, father and younger sister.

These shocking, bizarre and dissimilar acts of violence had one thing in common: the deadly weapons involved were purchased from dealers in surplus military goods, who peddle their merchandise as cheerfully as used-car salesmen, and at lower prices. The bazooka cost $35, the antitank gun $99.50, the foreign revolver only $16.95.

No one asked the buyers what use they intended to make of their purchases, and no one found the sellers guilty of any wrongdoing.

The 15-year-old boy was not told that he was too young to buy a gun, because he ordered it by mail and gave a false name and a post office box number—just as Lee Harvey Oswald did when he bought an old Italian army carbine for $19.95 and used it to kill the President of the United States.

HOW DO THEY GET WEAPONS?

How does it happen that children, criminals and psychotic assassins are able so easily to acquire the weapons they use to build up our annual toll of murders, suicides, and accidents? It happens, first, because there are no effective laws in the United States to control the traffic in arms and, second, because the sale of firearms has become a well-organized, money-making business.

Much of the evidence that the interstate trade in arms is a serious national problem was gathered by a U.S. Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, headed by Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut. The committee began hearings in Washington in early 1963. After the assassination of President Kennedy on November 22, 1963, firearms-control bills were introduced in both Houses of Congress but died in committee.

There was strong support for the legislation from influential Senators and Representatives, but there was also vocal and successful opposition from organized sporting interests, gun collectors, and businessmen worried about their profits—this in the face of official figures that show more than 2,000 fatal firearms accidents every year in the United States—FBI reports on almost 5,000 gun murders a year (70 percent committed with concealable handguns)—and evidence that half our suicides and 56 percent of our murders are committed with firearms.

ONE ANSWER TO THE PROBLEM

At this time Senator DODD is readying a new bill. It would limit the interstate mail-order sale of firearms to licensed dealers, prohibit the sale of handguns to anyone under 21 and forbid a dealer to sell handguns to out-of-State customers. The importation of military surplus and the sale of bazookas, antitank guns, grenades, bombs, and other weapons not suitable for sporting purposes would be curbed. Effective State laws and local enforcement will still be necessary even if the bill is passed. But law officers will no longer face some of the odd and dangerous situations they do today in keeping the peace.

Last October, for example, a man in Tucson, Ariz., called the police to report that he had seen two young men carrying what appeared to be a large machinegun into a roominghouse near the University of Arizona campus. Armed with a search warrant, the police entered the room of an engineering student and found a heavy Finnish antitank gun of the type used in the Finnish-Russian war. The student produced a receipt from a local store for $156 for the gun and 25 rounds of 20-millimeter ammunition.

Police had to let him keep it—they could find nothing in Federal, State or local statutes forbidding the possession of a semiautomatic tank killer and armor-piercing ammunition.

It was this same type of gun that destroyed the Brinks vault in Syracuse. In this case, the weapon was bought by two criminals who walked in and paid cash at a gun store in Alexandria, Va. Although the store owner became suspicious and notified the FBI, the weapon was shipped to Plattsburgh, N.Y., and stolen from the express office there. The arms dealer in Alexandria defended his role in the transaction by pointing out, correctly, that selling a large-bore rifle is no different in the eyes of the law then selling a deer gun.

Tracing the source of the Finnish weapon and other foreign arms led investigators to a businessman named Samuel Cummings, president of International Armaments Corp. A U.S. citizen and a resident of Monte Carlo, Mr. Cummings has nine warehouses on the Potomac, a mile from Washington, which are stocked with some 400,000 rifles and pistols.

Mr. Cummings told the Dodd committee that he has other warehouses and offices in England, Finland, and Switzerland, and that during the last 10 years he has imported 125,000 weapons annually into the United States and sold them to 6,000 dealers in 50 States. He testified that this military surplus included 4,500 mortars, bazookas, antitank rifles and artillery pieces.

When asked about the Finnish tank destroyers, Mr. Cummings said that he had imported 1,000 and that "those are, generally, used by collectors and long-range shooters for their own private recreation and experimental purposes."

HIGH-POWERED SALES PITCH

Some of the catalogs and advertisements of army-navy stores and mail-order sporting goods houses make stimulating—though not necessarily authoritative—reading. A dealer in New Jersey offers "the original bazooka used by German troops to smash American-British forces all over Europe," an automatic rifle "used by fanatic SS snipers during the Battle of the Bulge in 1944," a pistol of the type used by Russian secret police "to terrify and kill enemies of the state," an "almost new" German cannon, for $400, which will "stop any vehicle or light tank within a mile," and is "ideal for use as a home protection weapon."

A single issue of Shotgun News, national trade paper of the weapons business, advertises purse-size tear-gas guns, Nazi and Luftwaffe automatic rifles, throwing knives and bayonets, police-type billy clubs, riot guns, derringers, daggers, blowguns, and pellet guns. A blueprint and parts list for building your own .45 target pistol is $2.

Unless his State or local laws require a permit, a mail-order purchaser simply signs a statement that he is over 21, of sound mind, and not a convicted felon. In 1962 Dodd subcommittee investigators checked the names of District residents who filled out such forms and ordered pistols by mail. Twenty-five percent had criminal records, and two had been committed as mental cases.

Millions of Americans live with the comforting misapprehension that they are protected by State and Federal laws governing the purchase and possession of weapons. New Yorkers think so, for example, because theirs is the only State where an annual license is required to own a pistol. But every day last year the police investigated four or five complaints of assault with a gun.

Many of the owners of these weapons acquired them on shopping trips to other States or by filling out a mail-order coupon. The records of one large gunshop in Chillum, Md., revealed that in 1964 and part of 1965, 58 percent of its handgun sales were to residents of the District. Of these, a further check showed that 40 percent of the purchasers had criminal records.

GUN LAWS GO BACK TO THIRTIES

Today's Federal weapons laws date back to the 1930's and were drawn mainly to discourage the sale of submachineguns to gangsters. One piece of almost 28-year-old legislation allows anyone other than a felon to acquire a Federal dealer's license in firearms—for $1. It is held by thousands of individuals who have never sold a gun but who like to order them at wholesale prices without filling out bothersome forms. The Dodd bill would raise the dealer licensing fee and restrict licenses to those who have a legitimate place of business.

According to Thomas C. Lynch, Attorney General of California, Federal dealers' licenses are particularly popular in his State with members of such groups as the Minutemen and the Christian Defense League, which claim to be preparing to defend this Nation from communism. How they collect their arsenals—automatic rifles, machineguns, mortars, land mines, booby traps, powder and ammunition by the case—was illustrated last year when police and Federal officers arrested a pair of men who had arrived in Los Angeles from Delaware in two 5-ton trucks loaded with arms and more than 950,000 rounds of ammunition for an antitank cannon.

Another group that finds it easy to stockpile arms and ammunition is the Ku Klux Klan. The Dodd committee discovered that last year one federally licensed dealer who was involved with the Klan in Mississippi bought 18 Russian Tokarev rifles and 10,000 rounds of ammunition by mail from a retail outlet in Alexandria, Va.

On January 28, 1966, a former Klan member from Greenville, N.C., testified before a House Un-American Activities subcommittee that members of his Klavern were instructed to arm themselves for defense and pick up guns wherever they could be bought without a permit. On one occasion, he said, about $300 was collected to order surplus Army rifles from a dealer in Norfolk, Va.

It should not be forgotten that the Dodd subcommittee was created for the purpose of investigating juvenile delinquency. The ready availability of lethal weapons plays an important part in the rising youth crime rate, and the weapons of delinquency have become increasingly sophisticated. A Los Angeles police lieutenant describes brass knuckles, knives, and clubs as passé. "It is guns they are after," he told the committee. A New York City official reports that the homemade zip gun has declined sharply in popularity among youth gang members because it is easier to buy a cheap six-shot starter pistol.

The most popular juvenile weapon today is a starter pistol designed to fire harmless blank cartridges but easily convertible to shoot .22 bullets. In 1963 and 1964, 127,000 of these pistols were imported from abroad; one Los Angeles importer brought in more than 80,000 of them, ordering at the same time the steel barrels which would convert them to serviceable handguns.

In 1962 New York City detectives arrested a man, handy with tools, who bought the starter pistols from an out-of-State sporting goods store for $5.80 each, then bored out the barrels and enlarged the cylinder chambers to take .22 cartridges. His salesmen peddled them on street corners for $20, and he had disposed of about 100 when apprehended.

"THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS"

Opponents of stricter firearms laws often quote the second amendment to the U.S.

Constitution, which says: "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Usually they forget the first clause referring to "a well-regulated militia" and remember only the second part of the sentence. Prohibition of the sale of pistols to minors, or the control of firearms in interstate trade, or the requirement that a licensed dealer know to whom he is selling a weapon, will scarcely weaken the security of the State.

Other critics claim that no matter how many laws are passed, criminals will still find ways to get guns and only the law-abiding citizen will be disarmed. They say "it is not guns that kill people; people kill people."

True enough. But licensing automobile drivers has not eliminated highway accidents, and no one proposes that children and incompetents should be encouraged to drive.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Mar. 23, 1966]

BLANK CARTRIDGE FIRED IN FACE OF CLERGYMAN

The Reverend Canon Alfred Vail, of the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania, was shot at yesterday as he stood on the corner of 19th and Walnut Streets.

Canon Vail told police at central detectives, that he and a friend, John Houston, 48, of 332 Lindsey Drive, Berwyn, were on the corner at 2:30 p.m. when a car drove up, a man leaned out and fired pointblank into his face. He said he felt a sting on his face, but was uninjured.

Police said it was apparently a blank cartridge.

Canon Vail, who is 46 and lives at 245 West Highland Avenue, and Houston got into Houston's car and followed the car with the assailant to 19th and Lombard Streets where they lost him.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 24, 1966]

ALERT STUDENTS HELP POLICE IN GUN BATTLE

Metropolitan Police captured four housebreaking suspects yesterday in a chase that erupted into a gun battle and kept the area around 50th and C Streets SE. in an uproar much of the morning.

Pupils watching the spectacle from Nalle Elementary School spotted one of the suspects darting into a house and alerted police.

Principal Phyllis W. Ford ordered the school doors locked when the action began so the children wouldn't get out and in the way of the whizzing bullets, running policemen, snarling K-9 Corps dogs and police cruisers with loudspeakers warning residents to stay indoors.

But dozens of adults who weren't locked in charged out of houses for a firsthand view.

A lot of them laughed when Bronson H. Lewis 25, was brought out of 4916 B Street, SE. at gunpoint, hollering: "Police brutality. Ask them if they have a warrant."

What neither the grownups nor the students noticed was the beginning of the whole thing at 10:40 a.m. According to 14th Precinct Capt. Vernon H. Culpepper, it happened like this:

Detectives Henry A. McElvane and Robert D. Arscott were leaving 4915 Ayres Place, SE. after investigating a housebreaking in which $137 was stolen. Standing on a corner right up the street were four young men who resembled descriptions of a housebreaking gang police had been seeking.

As McElvane and Arscott approached them, the four bolted. After stopping at their car to radio for reinforcements, the detectives ran after them.

Arscott had almost caught up with two of them when one turned and stopped. The detective no sooner started frisking him than he pulled a .45-caliber pistol, backed up a few steps, and fired, the detective said.

The shot missed, as did the four Arscott fired from his .38-caliber service revolver as the man weaved and darted and escaped into the B Street house, where nobody was at home.

By this time, about 25 police with an assortment of dogs and cruisers were surrounding the area and even the teachers at Nalle had forgotten about lessons.

Detective Lt. Marvin J. Sears, accompanied by Culpepper, acted on the tip from the school and searched the house, finding Lewis hiding in a bedroom between a mattress and box springs.

A K-9 dog, meanwhile, was flushing a 16-year-old out of the basement at 4914 B Street SE., biting him in the process.

At the same time McElvane was apprehending a 15-year-old and a 14-year-old and another officer was collecting as evidence the .45-caliber pistol Arscott said Lewis dropped after shooting at him.

By the time things settled down, the police had charged Lewis, who gave his address as 1332 L Street SE., with assault with intent to kill, housebreaking, and carrying a dangerous weapon. General Sessions Court Judge Charles Halleck set bond at $10,000 and ordered him held for the grand jury.

Police also had listened to the juveniles' story that they never saw Lewis before and that the reason they ran when the detectives approached was because they didn't want to get caught playing hookey. Police released them to their parents' custody but promised to continue the investigation.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 24, 1966]

ONE HUNDRED LAWMEN CONVERGE IN HUNT FOR FOUR—TWO CAPTURED AFTER $15,000 ROBBERY AT LORD & TAYLOR

(By Alfred E. Lewis and Richard Severo)

A Metropolitan policeman was killed last night during a hunt for four robbery suspects that threw the 400 block of Hamilton Street NW., in a state of siege for nearly 2 hours.

The bandit who fatally shot Pvt. Marvin Lee Stocker, 23, then stabbed himself to death in a house he invaded for refuge.

Stocker, a 12th precinct officer who was on the assignment by chance, was killed by a convicted robber, John Wansley, who had piled up a three-page arrest record in the last 6 of his 24 years, police reported.

The two deaths and the wounding of a middle-aged couple, William and Beulah P. Lax, occurred shortly after Wansley (alias John Melvin Eldridge) and three companions held up Lord & Taylor, 5255 Western Avenue NW., and escaped with $15,000 to $30,000.

ONE HUNDRED POLICEMEN IN HUNT

About 100 policemen surrounded the normally quiet block in which the Laxes have lived for 12 years at 435 Hamilton and bombarded their home with tear gas in an attempt to drive out the man who killed Stocker.

Their sirens and the half-dozen floodlights they used to illuminate the neighborhood as they sought to corner the other suspects attracted more than 400 onlookers.

Captured on the street without a struggle were Jimmie Lee Scuggs, 20, who gave his address as 2675 Douglace Place SE., and Clarence Lee Blair, 22, listed at 1323 Rittenhouse Street NW.

CHARGED WITH HOMICIDE

Scuggs was charged with homicide and Blair with homicide and robbery. They will be arraigned at 10 a.m. today before U.S. Commissioner Sam Wertleb.

Police were searching early today for the fourth suspect, a 5-foot-10 heavy-set Negro with a medium complexion in his early twenties.

Police said the suspects told them they had planned to rob the Virginia branch of Lord & Taylor but decided yesterday at the last moment to try the Washington store instead.

They and Wansley, who was listed at 705 Irving Street NW., and the fourth man drove into the store's parking lot about 6 p.m. in a stolen red 1965 Thunderbird, detectives were told.

Police gave this version of the events that ensued:

Assistant store manager, Lionel R. Stewart, of Chevy Chase, left the store about 6 p.m. shortly after it closed and got into his car.

Stewart saw two other Lord & Taylor employees—a department manager, Gerald Vaizey of Bethesda, and an engineer, Allen H. Nordgren of Falls Church—come out of a side entrance and be pushed against the wall by three men.

As Stewart started over to see what the trouble was, a fourth man stuck a gun through his car window and ordered him to take the bandits and Vaizey and Nordgren to the store's office.

In the office the gunmen forced Stewart to open the safe. Then they made the three employees lie on the floor and bound them with adhesive tape. After looting the safe of green metal cashboxes and stuffing the money in a shabby black overnight bag and a flowered pillowcase, the bandits ran out.

It took the employees about 5 minutes to loosen their bonds and call police.

DETECTIVES SPOT CAR

Two Sixth Precinct detectives, Frederick L. Callan and Melvin L. Humphries, spotted the Thunderbird at 6:20 p.m. as they were cruising near 14th Street and Missouri Avenue NW. They radioed headquarters for reinforcements and chased the car, which the suspects abandoned at Fifth and Hamilton.

The four men scattered on the street. Among the first policemen to chase them were Stocker and Robbery Squad Detectives George R. Wilson and Robert P. King.

They saw one suspect bolt into the Laxes' two-story, red brick rowhouse.

"We decided we'd go in and try to rescue the hostages," King said. "We didn't know what was happening and we didn't feel we could wait for reinforcements."

BANDIT BOLTS UP STAIRS

What was happening, police later learned from the Laxes, was that they were on the second floor with their brown-and-white collie, Skippy, when a stranger bolted up the stairs and introduced them to the most terrifying evening of their lives.

Lax, about 50, a chef at Crown's Restaurant, struggled with the intruder and fired several shots at him from Lax's snub-nosed .38-caliber revolver. The bullets inflicted only superficial wounds.

"I begged and begged," recounted Mrs. Lax, 41, a practical nurse at St. Elizabeths Hospital. "He said, 'I'm not going to hurt you,' but I was afraid he was going to turn on me."

She ran downstairs but couldn't get the door open before he caught her and started to choke her. Later he struck her on the side of the head, perhaps with his pistol, and shot her husband in the side.

"DIED IN MY ARMS"

The intruder first ran to the basement, just as Stocker, in uniform and flanked by Wilson and King in business suits, started up the Laxes' lawn. The man aimed a gun through the green latticework under the porch and fired a bullet that hit Stocker in the chest just after Stocker shot and missed.

The rookie policeman who joined the force last July, turned around, clutched his chest and said, "Man, I'm hit."

Wilson and King threw themselves to the ground and dragged Stocker two house

lengths down the street as the bandit fired at them repeatedly.

"I don't ever want to go through this again," King said later. "A young kid died in my arms."

Inside the house, the gunman was running back to the second floor, forcing Mrs. Lax to accompany him to the bathroom, where he began slashing himself with the 12-inch blade of a knife he had taken from her kitchen.

SLASHES THROAT AND WRISTS

As she screamed, he knifed himself in the throat and chest, on both wrists and on the legs, according to Dr. Linwood S. Rayford, acting District Coroner. As he slashed, he went from the bathroom to one of the three bedrooms, where he lay on the bed and then rolled onto the floor after nearly decapitating himself.

By this time, the block was filling with officers and ambulances. "Everbody was running everywhere," said Eugene Harper of 5316 Second Street NW., who was in the neighborhood when he thought he heard a backfire "and then all hell broke loose."

Many of the people who gathered to see what was happening were teenagers in a holiday mood. Some laughed when the bandit's body was carried out in a blue denim sack.

Police bundled the Laxes into an ambulance for transport to Washington Hospital Center, were Stocker was pronounced dead at 7:12 p.m.

The young officer, a graduate of Coolidge High School, lived at 5708 16th Avenue, Hyattsville, with his wife, Donna, and 16-month-old daughter.

Stocker probably would not have been on Hamilton Street last night had he not happened to be at the 12th precinct stationhouse when a cruiser returned from another assignment. One of the officers left the cruiser to make a report and, when word of the chase of the Thunderbird flashed over the radio, Stocker hopped in to take his place.

AMOUNT OF $14,282 RECOVERED

As Civil Disturbance Unit officers fired two tear gas shells into the Lax house, other policemen searched the neighborhood and found the money-stuffed pillowcase and the cashboxes in and around the Thunderbird.

When District firemen later blew the gas from the house with ventilators, police found the black bag the intruder had been carrying when he barged in. In all, they recovered $14,282.81.

Wansley, whose body was identified through fingerprints, was facing a 3-to-12-year sentence for robbery. He was free on an appeal bond when he undertook yesterday's escapade. He had been arrested repeatedly on charges of robbery, housebreaking, and assault with a dangerous weapon.

NEPHEW HEARS GUNFIRE

The excitement was just dying down when Mrs. Lax's brother, Warren Payne, of 5504 Fourth Stree' NW., arrived on the scene.

Payne's son, Fred, 19, had been shopping at a nearby store when he heard gunfire and wandered over to Hamilton Street to see what was going on. Finding his aunt's home surrounded and beseiged, he ran home to tell his mother.

She telephoned Payne at his job at Freedmen's Hospital and he hurried over to find an empty, gas-filled house and a few lingering teenagers who were being told by an officer:

"Come on, come on, let's shove off, let's go. There's nothing here for you now."

[From the Evening Star, Mar 25, 1966]

MURDER OF A POLICEMAN

Marvin Lee Stocker, 23, a rookie policeman, was shot to death Wednesday evening by a man who should have been in jail. The story of this murder and the events leading up to it is, to put it mildly, a remarkable one.

Private Stocker was killed by John M. Wansley, 24, who then committed suicide.

Wansley was a participant in the Wednesday robbery of the Chevy Chase branch of Lord & Taylor. But he was no stranger to crime. His arrest record is a long one, and he had been convicted twice of serious offenses.

In December 1960, he was sent to jail under the Youth Correction Act for an assault with a knife, and was paroled in August 1963. In February 1964, he was charged with robbery and assault with a gun. Three months later he was found guilty and sentenced to serve 3 to 12 years. He never served time on that conviction, however, since he was released, pending appeal, after posting $5,000 bond.

The Court of Appeals upheld the conviction on May 20, 1965, but Wansley remained on bond while his attorney appealed to the Supreme Court, which refused to review the case on January 17, 1966. A petition for a rehearing was denied by the High Court on February 28, 1966, and at that point, at the very least, Wansley should have been picked up to begin his sentence. But it seems that the U.S. Attorney's office was not notified, and no one tried to pick up the criminal.

The story now turns back a few days. On February 21, of this year, Wansley was ordered to appear in District Court. When he didn't show up a bench warrant was issued for his arrest and his bond declared forfeited. Meanwhile, however, another District Court judge, presumably on the strength of representations concerning the petition to the Supreme Court for a rehearing (denied February 28) reinstated Wansley's bond on February 24, and he remained free. By March 1 the snarl should have been straightened out. But there was a snafu in communications and Wansley remained at large. On March 23 he murdered the policeman.

Consideration for the criminal? Plenty of it in this case. But very little protection for the public for nearly 2 years. And none for Private Stocker.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Mar. 25, 1966]

EIGHT HOURS WITH A "NICE" GUNMAN

SPRINGFIELD, OREG., March 24.—A slim ex-convict sipped sherry in the modest home of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Fawbush yesterday and evaluated his chances against the small army of officers waiting outside.

"I have three choices," Harry Acree told United Press International by telephone.

"I can take them [the Fawbushes] out as hostages."

"I can shoot my way out, although I know I will get shot.

Or I can throw the gun out the window."

But the 33-year-old gunman picked a fourth choice to end his 12-year life of crime.

After 8 hours, amid swirling clouds of tear gas, Acree sat down in the shower stall in the Fawbush bathroom and shot himself in the mouth with a .22-caliber pistol.

He died a short time later at a hospital.

His flight began just before dawn when he and two companions were stopped by two patrolmen on a routine traffic check.

Officers Terrence Wilson, 24, noticed a shotgun in the car. Acree's companions were taken into custody. But Acree opened fire and wounded Wilson.

About 40 minutes later, Acree appeared at the Fawbush home. Police immediately surrounded the house.

Fawbush, 46, who also talked to UPI on the phone, said he was just getting ready to go to his job as a truck driver.

"I went to the front door and opened it. And there was this guy with a gun," Fawbush said. "He came in and he's been real nice to us."

Mrs. Fawbush said she cooked breakfast for Acree and later played cards with the fugitive.

Acree's sister and a brother were brought to the house. The sister went inside and pleaded with Acree to give himself up.

Acree seemed on the verge of doing so, but then his mood changed.

Officers fired tear gas grenades through the windows. Bystanders thought they heard a muffled shot.

Officers donned gas masks and dashed into the house. They found the dying gunman slumped in the shower stall.

[From New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 27, 1966]

PROMINENT ARIZONA ATTORNEY SHOT TO DEATH; HIS WIFE HELD

APACHE JUNCTION, ARIZ.—John E. Madden, a prominent Arizona water attorney, was shot to death Friday night and his former wife was jailed on an open charge of murder.

Mr. Madden, 44, was a former law partner of Denison Kitchel, who managed Barry Goldwater's campaign for President in 1964.

His wife, Becky, 41, was awarded a divorce Monday.

Officials said Mr. Madden was hit in the lower chest with a single blast from a 20-gage shotgun in the couple's trailer home.

Mrs. Madden had been awarded custody of the couple's child, Michael, 10.

Mr. Madden, a graduate of Harvard Law School, was a special counsel for the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission and was to have left Tuesday for Washington, D.C., for work in connection with the lower Colorado River project legislation.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 28, 1966]

GUNMEN ROB RESTRAURANT IN CHEVERLY

Four masked gunmen held up the manager of a Howard Johnson's restaurant in Prince Georges County early yesterday morning and escaped with $303, police reported.

Orvel Robbins, the manager of the restaurant at 5820 Landover Road in Cheverly, told police he was leaving at closing time, about 1:30 a.m., when a man approached and thrust a pistol against his back.

The gunman was joined by three others, Roberts said, one of whom was armed with a sawed-off shotgun. They forced the manager to return to the restaurant and open the safe, then bound him and two other employees with tape.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 28, 1966]

ARMED BANDIT ROBS TRUCKDRIVER OF $1,500

A vending company route man was robbed of $1,500 yesterday and locked in his truck for 15 minutes in the Macke Co. parking lot at 1111 First Street NE.

Alvin C. Doak, 24, told police, a gunman pushed a revolver toward his face as he was stepping out of his truck at about 5 p.m. The bandit picked up three canvas cash bags from the floor of the truck, locked Doak in the back and fled. Doak was freed by another route man who saw him beating on the truck window.

Police broadcast a lookout for a Negro in his late twenties, 5 feet 9 inches, 150 pounds and wearing a white sleeveless sweater, light-colored trousers and a brown dress hat.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 28, 1966]

BANDIT WITH SHOTGUN ROBS DINER OF $80

A bandit wielding a sawed-off shotgun fled with $80 last night from a Little Tavern diner at 1326 New York Avenue NW.

The holdup occurred at 8:45 p.m., police said. The gunman fled out a back door and down an alley.

Police broadcast a lookout for a Negro, about 30, 5 feet 8 inches, with a mustache and dressed in a dark coat.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 28, 1966]

BANKER FATHER GETS 24-HOUR ULTIMATUM—FLORIDA BOY, 17, IS SEIZED FOR $25,000 RANSOM

SURFSIDE, FLA., March 28.—A stocky gunman abducted the teenage son of a leading banker from his waterfront home early today. warning that "you'll never see your son alive again" unless the parents delivered $25,000 ransom within 24 hours.

Tomorrow's deadline is the 18th birthday of the boy, Daniel Jesse Goldman.

Dade County police said the kidnaper, described as middleaged and bespectacled, took young Goldman from his home at gunpoint at about 5:35 a.m. He was wearing a poplin zipper jacket and green pants that might have been his pajamas.

RAMBLER

He left the stunned parents, banker-contractor Aaron Goldman and his wife, bound and gagged and fled in a white 1962 Rambler, apparently the boy's.

A bulletin describing the getaway car, the boy and the kidnaper instructed police, "do not molest vehicle if spotted."

The FBI was acting as "liaison" until it should be established a Federal crime was involved.

Surfside police said the kidnaper entered the Goldman home by some as yet unexplained means, took the boy off at gunpoint after tying the parents and telling them they must have the money by 6 a.m. tomorrow, "or you will never see your son alive again."

Neighbors said the Goldmans are "a nice quiet family, not ostentatious." They said Daniel was a high school senior planning to attend college close to home.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 29, 1966]

TWO SUSPECTS WOUNDED IN GUNFIGHT

(By Bart Barnes)

Armed with submachine guns, pistols and shotguns, Takoma Park police waged a wild shootout with three robbery suspects Sunday night and left two of the suspects wounded, one critically.

The gunfight, which broke out when 18 officers surprised the suspects after staking out the intended robbery victim's home, also left the intended victim with a minor head wound and at least 35 bullets in the bandits' getaway car, police said.

One of the suspects was captured at the scene after a shotgun blast hit him in the abdomen, police said, but the other two got away and were arrested yesterday.

In a dragnet immediately after the gun battle, one officer, Cpl. Ray D. Williams, was pushed through a window by a police dog and cut an artery in his arm, Williams was following a trail of bloodstains left by a wounded suspect.

Charged with armed robbery were James L. Killgore, 29, of 7611 Maple Avenue, Takoma Park, Jack L. Jett, Jr., 25, of Landover Hills, and Gary L. Grove, 18, of Huntington, Pa.

Grove was arrested at the scene and was in critical condition at Washington Sanitarium yesterday with the stomach wound. Jett was taken into custody at noon yesterday when he showed up at Prince Georges Hospital seeking treatment for shotgun wounds in both legs.

Killgore was seized yesterday morning near his home.

The gun battle occurred at the home of Prentice Savage, 42, at 7715 Carroll Avenue. Police said both Savage's home and his grocery store, the Savage Market at 712 Erie Avenue, had been staked out for a week after it appeared that he was the target of a bizarre robbery plot.

For several weeks, police said, Savage had been receiving mysterious telephone calls from persons who would hang up as soon as he answered. He also noticed that his home and his store were being watched, police said.

In the stakeout Sunday, officers saw the same car drive by Savage's Market 10 or 15 times. When he closed for the night and left with the day's receipts, the auto followed him.

The police followed the auto and saw two men get out, stick a gun in Savage's back, and saw Savage give them the money.

Detectives stationed in the house closed in just as the men were tying Savage up, and the gunfight started. Although wounded, Jett escaped on foot, police said. They said Killgore sped away in the car, which was found a few blocks away on the campus of Columbia Union College.

STABILIZATION OF MILK PRICES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman announced last Thursday two important actions that will help keep prices of milk and dairy products at reasonable levels for both consumers and dairymen.

The first action increases the support level for manufacturing milk to $3.50 per hundredweight for the 12 months beginning April 1. The support level has been $3.24 per hundredweight, but actual market prices for manufacturing milk have been well above this. In February prices averaged $3.65 per hundredweight.

The second action provides for seasonal declines in the price for milk received by dairy farmers supplying fluid milk in most of the 45 major metropolitan areas in the United States operating under the Federal milk order program. The effective date of the lower prices was postponed on March 1 pending hearings on the fluid milk situation. Prices usually decline in these markets during the spring month of flush production, but the announcement by Secretary Freeman provides that the seasonal decline would be smaller than in other recent years.

American housewives stand to gain from both of these actions, which will insure larger supplies of milk and dairy products, and will help hold down retail prices, particularly next fall and winter.

Dairymen, too, will gain. Those producing manufacturing milk are assured of price protection at a higher level. Those supplying fluid markets will generally have a smaller-than-usual decline in prices of milk used for fluid consumption.

Both gain from stabilization of price which will neither swing up nor down steeply.

VIEWS OF THE GOVERNORS ON FEDERAL TAX PROPOSALS FOR CONTROL OF AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on March 16 the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations filed a report entitled "Views of the Governors on Tax Incentives and Effluent Charges"—Water Pollution Control and Abatement. To ascertain the Governors' views on the desirability and advisability of Federal tax incentives to encourage industry in establishing pollution controls, the subcommittee asked the Governors of the 50 States the following questions: First, Should the Federal Government provide tax relief or other incentives to industry in addition to, or instead of, the State incentives to accelerate water pollution control? Second, If such incentives were provided, what should be their nature and amounts, and how should they be distributed or administered?

From the replies, the subcommittee found that the State Governors favored Federal tax incentives for this purpose and saw no conflict between a Federal tax incentive program and any similar State programs. The responses received by the committee indicate:

First. Thirty Governors favor Federal tax incentives to encourage industry in accelerating water pollution control, including seven States which mentioned various qualifications.

Second. Four Governors urge more study.

Third. Eight Governors oppose this idea.

In its report the subcommittee summarizes these replies from the Governors. I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the subcommittee, under chairmanship of Congressman ROBERT E. JONES, has performed a most useful task and has provided the Congress with information helpful to the Congress in better understanding the viewpoint of the States in consideration of any Federal program dealing with air and water pollution.

When the Water Quality Act was being considered by the Senate in 1963, I wrote the Governors of each State to solicit their opinions and comments on this bill, for it was my view that their comments should be given very close attention by the Congress in legislation of this nature. I was surprised to learn that in many cases the Governors had not been consulted and in those cases in which they were consulted, they had expressed views in direct opposition to many of the main provisions of the bill. As a result the House approved several important amendments to the Water Quality Act of 1965 which incorporated the views of the Governors. The House subcommittee has performed a valuable service to the Congress by obtaining the Governors' viewpoints on particular methods of dealing with pollution and bringing them to the attention of the Congress.

On February 1, I introduced on behalf of myself and Senator RANDOLPH a bill, S. 2857, which is designed to provide an incentive for industry to purchase and install equipment needed to combat air and water pollution, with the following cosponsors: Senators ALLOTT, JAVITS, KUCHEL, LAUSCHE, LONG of Missouri, PEARSON, SALTONSTALL, and SCOTT. My bill increases the present investment credit from 7 to 14 percent with respect to the costs of such equipment. In the

88th Congress, this bill was offered as an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1964 by Senator RIBICOFF, who has taken great interest in the subject and has proposed economic incentives to industry so as to provide effective methods for controlling and eliminating pollution. The Senate voted to accept the amendment, but the amendment was dropped in the ensuing conference with the House. On April 1 of last year, Senator RIBICOFF introduced a bill, S. 1670, which would encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting companies to depreciate for income tax purposes the cost of this equipment over a period of 36 months.

The House subcommittee in its report has also included a most useful summary of the bills introduced in past Congresses through the 1st session of the 89th providing tax incentives for the construction of air and water pollution facilities. I ask unanimous consent that this summary be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am encouraged by the attitude expressed in the House subcommittee report that a majority of the Governors favor a tax incentive to industry. Although the trend in legislation seems to look solely to the Federal Government to initiate a program for pollution controls through increased financial grants, I believe that we should encourage industry to play a greater role. For I believe it is only proper that where industries purchase expensive equipment and facilities to reduce pollution—which facilities bring no financial return on their capital investment to industry, but are devoted to the greater public purpose and benefit—that a portion of that cost should be borne by the public through the tax mechanism.

EXHIBIT 1

* * * * *

4. Governors generally approve the principle that the Federal Government should provide tax incentives to help industry abate water pollution.

To ascertain the Governors' views on Federal tax incentives to encourage industry to abate pollution, the committee asked:

(d) Should the Federal Government provide tax relief or other incentives to industry in addition to, or instead of, the State incentives to accelerate water pollution control? If such incentives were provided, what should be their nature and amounts, and how should they be distributed or administered?

In general, the State Governors favored Federal tax incentives for this purpose, and saw no conflict between a Federal tax incentives program and any similar State programs.

The responses received by the committee indicate:

(a) Thirty Governors favor Federal tax incentives to encourage industry in accelerating water pollution control, including seven States which mentioned various qualifications.

(b) Four Governors urge more study.

(c) Eight Governors oppose this idea.

The Governors' responses to the above question are set forth in appendix D. Illustrative comments are set forth below.

Gov. Calvin L. Rampton of Utah stated:

"If a tax or other relief system is to be considered as an incentive to industry to attain adequate pollution abatement, it should be at the Federal level—that is, applicable to all States.

"It should be recognized that incentives applied unequally across the Nation could be a deciding factor in location of new industries. In the past some local governments in Utah have used a similar device to attract industry by offering to allow sewer connections without charge. Heavy waste loads imposed on treatment plants by this means have proved to be unreasonably burdensome, making this approach unsatisfactory."

Gov. Roger D. Branigin of Indiana suggested:

"I believe that the Federal Government should provide tax relief or incentives. These should be in addition to State incentives. Tax relief should be provided for the total cost of nonproductive facilities constructed for the control of water pollution. The owner should verify the cost of such facilities to the agency responsible for administering the tax laws."

Gov. Charles L. Terry, Jr., of Delaware stressed the granting of tax incentives for small plants: "* * * The Federal Government should provide tax relief, especially for small and marginal industries. This relief should take into account byproduct recovery methods when applied as a pollution control measure. For most small marginal industries the capital outlay for waste treatment installations is nonproductive."

Gov. Samuel P. Goddard of Arizona indicated federally provided incentives might give the States a new tool: "* * * It is conceivable that such tax relief provided at the Federal level might be of real assistance to us in convincing certain industries of the need for treatment facilities. It is our opinion that most value would accrue from a system which would make the cost, or a portion of the cost, of such facilities directly deductible."

It may be significant that the four Governors who provided the subcommittee with detailed data concerning the costs of their respective State incentive programs (Governors Faubus of Arkansas; King, of New Hampshire; Evans of Washington; and Knowles of Wisconsin) expressed the view that additional tax incentives at the Federal level would be useful.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown of California called for limits to such tax relief: "* * * Any federally financed program for this purpose should be limited to older existing industries where compliance with necessary, modern standards would cause serious financial problems."

Gov. Frank B. Morrison of Nebraska suggested: "* * * that Public Law 660 [the Federal Water Pollution Control Act] should be amended to give industry the same construction grants as municipalities are now given."

Gov. Daniel J. Evans of Washington suggested a three-point program including (1) grants, (2) increased investment tax credit for programs in compliance with State programs, and (3) increased tax writeoff for capital costs.

Gov. Tim Babcock of Montana cited this reason for opposing tax relief: "In Montana our industries have already provided waste treatment facilities and the majority of these industries, particularly where the wastes are large in volume and could be damaging to our streams, have provided high degrees of treatment. To offer tax relief as an incentive at this time would penalize those that have done as they should and reward those that have been reluctant or noncooperative."

In opposing Federal tax incentives to industry, Governor Bellmon of Oklahoma said that no one has the right to pollute a natural resource belonging to all, and Governor Hughes of New Jersey said it is "difficult to justify paying industry to do what is required by law in the interest of protecting the public health and the economic environment of the State."

APPENDIX D—TEXT OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION ON FEDERAL TAX INCENTIVES

QUESTION

Should the Federal Government provide tax relief or other incentives to industry in addition to, or instead of, the State incentives to accelerate water pollution control? If such incentives were provided, what should be their nature and amounts, and how should they be distributed or administered?

RESPONSES

D–1. Alabama

As you know, we in Governor Wallace's administration do not believe in any more Federal control of business and State affairs than is absolutely necessary; however, I can see no objection to the Federal Government providing a tax incentive to accelerate water pollution control, such as special treatment on the Federal income tax of any amounts expended by industry to construct antipollution facilities.

I, of course, would not be in a position to state the exact nature and amount of such income tax incentives. I am sure that this would require careful study by tax experts and engineers.

D–2. Alaska

Continuation of the comparative study of the effluent charge system and tax incentives appears advisable to evaluate these divergent approaches to the control of water pollution.

D–3. Arizona

It is conceivable that such tax relief provided at the Federal level might be of real assistance to us in convincing certain industries of the need for treatment facilities. It is our opinion that most value would accrue from a system which would make the cost, or a portion of the cost, of such facilities directly deductible.

D–4. Arkansas

Based on the experience with the severance tax credit legislation, it appears quite feasible to provide incentive or tax relief to accelerate the abatement of gross pollution in those cases where abatement costs exceed the financial ability of those responsible because of volume, concentration, or technical limitations of conventional treatment methods. On the Ouachita River alone, this program has resulted in a 1963 salt content that was 2,350,000 pounds less than the 1958 content; the stream is now usable the year round for water supply. Should some categories of industrial operations pose a similar problem at the national level, a similar approach by the Federal Government would appear reasonable. It is somewhat difficult to extend this conclusion to all industrial operations in view of the conflict between the two opposing philosophies that (1) waste treatment is a legitimate part of manufacturing or processing operation and should be treated as all other parts; or (2) waste treatment is a nonproductive part of an industrial operation and should be exempt from taxation or allowed an accelerated depreciation on the necessary capital expenditures for treatment.

The outstanding success of the Public Law 660 grant program in accelerating the construction of municipal sewage treatment facilities proves the potential of incentive techniques. Here, however, purely public funds are involved at the local and Federal levels. Certainly, any Federal incentive offered to industry for a solution of a national problem should be additive to any State incentives which are utilized for the solution of State level problems.

D–5. California

I fully recognize and sympathize with the vastly different problem of older industry in the East. Without doubt, the cost of modern treatment facilities for old plants on "sensitive" water courses would simply force many of them out of the competitive market. Because of the importance of these older industrial plants to local communities, some financial incentives may be clearly in the public interest. I do not, however, believe that public funds should be used as an inducement to new industry to incorporate the most modern available treatment facilities necessary to attain appropriate water quality standards. This simply must be one of the costs of doing business in our increasingly complex environment.

In summary, a State program of tax relief or other financial inducements for industrial pollution control does not appear warranted in California at the present time. Any Federally financed program for this purpose should be limited to older, existing industries where compliance with necessary, modern standards would cause serious financial problems.

D–6. Colorado

Yes, both Federal and State governments should provide incentives to industry through tax relief.

D–7. Connecticut

I believe that incentives should be provided to industries and also to municipalities to encourage the installation of pollution control equipment.

I would prefer to await the report of our clean-water task force before forming opinions as to the specific form of incentive and how it should be financed.

In attacking a problem as broad as pollution, I tend to favor the cooperative municipal-State-Federal approach, each level of government contributing a share.

D–8. Delaware

Yes. The Federal Government should provide tax relief, especially for small and marginal industries. This relief should take into account byproduct recovery methods when applied as a pollution control measure. For most small marginal industries the capital outlay for waste treatment installations is nonproductive.

* * * * *

In our view there is no doubt that the Government should offer aid to encourage industry to establish pollution control facilities voluntarily. Such aids should be sponsored by the Federal Government. It is our feeling that a type of incentive such as that enacted in the Revenue Act of 1962 would be most acceptable to industry and would achieve the best results. The amount of the credit must, of course, be determined by Congress but we feel that the subject is of so much importance that a credit at least equal to the 7-percent investment incentive credit would be well justified. While we have not determined the matter on an exhaustive basis, a credit against Federal income taxes would, in our opinion, be preferable to any rapid amortization deduction which could be offered.

The condition for allowance of credit should not be so cumbersome as to discourage industries from obtaining it. We think that a properly drawn law would permit the Internal Revenue Service to determine whether or not a facility would constitute a pollution control facility for purposes of allowing the credit.

D–9. Florida

I can only say as Governor that I believe the pollution of State waters is essentially a State problem and should be left to the States to solve, with the exception that some Federal regulations may be necessary for rivers and bodies of water that embrace more than a single State. Without having made a full study of the question, I would be inclined to support some provision for Federal tax relief or some other incentive to industry to accelerate water pollution control.

D–10. Georgia

We have advocated that incentives be provided to industry from State and Federal Governments. We believe this should be some form of tax exemption or low-interest-rate loans for installation of waste treatment facilities.

D–11. Hawaii

Hawaii, however, is unique among the States in that we have no river or lake systems that are in any sense comparable to the mainland situation where many States may be affected by pollution of a single river.

Our domestic water requirements are almost entirely served from artesian sources; not from rivers or lakes.

We do have some pollution problems resulting from the discharge of sugar plantation waste material into some of our streams, and into the ocean, with the result that the material in many areas covers the beaches with cane waste and sediment. But this is a local problem which can be handled at the State level.

I offer the foregoing information merely to indicate that our experience in this State does not appear to be applicable to the problems under consideration by your committee. That is why we did not comment on proposed incentives or effluent charges in response to questions (d) and (h).

Despite Hawaii's fortunate conditions which relieve our State from involvement in this problem area, I recognize the national and interstate importance of this matter and certainly commend the thorough measures which you and your committee are taking to develop adequate and pertinent information.

D–12. Idaho

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—The Governor's letter did not answer this question.]

D–13. Illinois

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—The Governor's letter did not answer this question.]

D–14. Indiana

I believe that the Federal Government should provide tax relief or incentives. These should be in addition to State incentives. Tax relief should be provided for the total cost of nonproductive facilities constructed for the control of water pollution. The owner should verify the cost of such facilities to the agency responsible for administering the tax laws.

D–15. Iowa

In regard to paragraph (d) concerning tax relief or other incentives to industry to accelerate water pollution control, you may recall a letter to you dated January 13, 1964, from Mr. Paul J. Houser, director of our State department of health engineering division, in which he states, "* * * we have consistently been strong advocates of aid to the smaller industries such as creameries and cheese factories, for financing waste treatment or other pollution control facilities, particularly when such industries are not connected to municipal sewers. In some cases, the cost of providing such facilities is almost prohibitive. Furthermore, those industries connected to a municipal sewer receive indirect benefits from a construction grant to the municipality under provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Thus, the industry with separate waste disposal is handicapped to some extent competitively. Over a period of years, there have been several bills in Congress providing for an early tax writeoff on waste treatment facilities. Whether this is the answer, we are not qualified to say. However, some financial assistance should be provided, and since the Federal Government is already in the business of providing aid to municipalities and the industries therein, it would appear that the aid to the other industries should come from the same source." This letter was in answer to your request for information concerning the water pollution control program in Iowa. Later at your committee hearing in Kansas City, Mo., May 22–23, 1964, Mr. Houser expressed this same opinion in his statement.

D–16. Kansas

It appears that any proposal to provide tax relief or other tax incentives on the Federal level to encourage the acceleration of industrial pollution control should be carefully studied. Any such measure should be weighed in terms of its effect on present State pollution abatement programs as well as being considered in the context of the present Federal-State tax structure. Attention should be given to a study of the present tax status of industrial research which is directed toward improvement of pollution abatement as well as to the tax status of industrial capital improvements which are wholly, or in part, aimed at decreasing the amount of pollutants contributed by a given industry. Joint Federal, State, and private consideration should be given to the possible effects of any proposed tax measures.

D–17. Kentucky

It is impossible to give a "Yes" or "No" answer to a question such as this. There is some question as to whether the incentives should be given in order to meet the basic minimum requirements of a water pollution act. If this is to encourage degree of treatment beyond basic minimum standards, then it should be considered in light of such requirement. The nature and amounts would depend entirely on the stringency of the requirements beyond the minimum.

D–18. Louisiana

In response to this item, I quote from correspondence from the Louisiana Department of Commerce and Industry, Louisiana's Industrial Development Board, "I do not think the Federal Government should provide tax relief or any other incentives to industry to accelerate water pollution control."

D–19. Maine

The Federal Government could, of course, provide tax relief in the form of quick writeoffs and for some time the industries of this area leaned toward this solution exclusively. However, during the past year or two there appears to be a shift to favoring some more direct form of aid. It would be in some ways difficult to justify direct aid to a manufacturing company whose waste is contaminating a stream, but at the same time there is little difference from assistance to communities. Wet industry in Maine's larger categories appears to be able to finance recovery processes more readily than destructive processes even though the cost may be many times higher. We are of the opinion that from the standpoint of financing and of operation as well the eventual good of the pollution abatement program it would be better to encourage municipal systems to accommodate the wastes of their industries in every practicable case, perhaps modifying or extending present statute to do so.

D–20. Maryland

We would consider a system of "tax relief or other incentives to industry * * * to accelerate water pollution control," granted by the Federal Government, to be highly desirable and very helpful in achieving improved water pollution abatement in Maryland. These incentives should be in addition to any incentives provided by the State in accelerating water pollution control.

One possible procedure for such Federal incentives would be permission granted to industry to depreciate, more rapidly than

permitted at present, buildings, facilities and equipment purchased, constructed and installed to control water pollution—provided that the purpose of such equipment and structures was so certified by the State water pollution control agency.

D–21. Massachusetts

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—Subcommittee did not receive an answer to its letter of November 17, 1965, and its followup letter of January 10, 1966, at time of printing.]

D–22. Michigan

I am increasingly persuaded that tax relief is reasonable and desirable and I expect that legislation to provide such relief may be introduced in the 1966 session of the legislature. I would think that Federal tax relief would also be appropriate.

I am aware that there are certain inherent problems in tax exemptions of this nature where some facilities may serve other purposes as well as waste treatment. However, I believe these problems can be adequately coped with by the administrative agency.

D–23. Minnesota

This is a matter of policy which can be resolved only after careful study. I believe that any proposal which has the potential for accelerated water pollution control including tax relief and other incentives to industry, should be given serious and careful consideration. I would caution, however, that unless any penalties that might be imposed on industry exceed the cost of pollution control, imposition of such penalties might have the effect of delaying control measures where industry elects to pay the penalties rather than install the necessary control facilities. I would also caution that in establishing any incentives or tax relief, care must be taken to insure that pollution control remains the primary responsibility of the industry involved and the incentives should not become a device for merely transferring an industry's responsibility to the taxpayers.

D–24. Mississippi

It would be well for the Federal Government to permit industry a rapid depreciation charge over a period of years at the option of the industry.

D–25. Missouri

Industry in this State has not voiced to us an opinion concerning tax incentives; accordingly we have no information on which to base an answer to your question.

D–26. Montana

In Montana our industries have already provided waste treatment facilities and the majority of these industries, particularly where the wastes are large in volume and could be damaging to our streams, have provided high degrees of treatment. To offer tax relief as an incentive at this time would penalize those that have done as they should, and reward those that have been reluctant or noncooperative.

D–27. Nebraska

It is our opinion that tax relief should be provided to industry as an incentive to provide both air and water pollution control measures and that Public Law 660 should be amended to give industry the same construction grants as municipalities are now given.

D–28. Nevada

The State tax sources are sales and use tax, and a property tax, probably not amenable to an incentive tax of this kind. If a tax were applied, it could only be effected after appropriate legislation, possibly a penalty type charge acting as an irritant to the polluter. In the few instances we have where there is inadequate waste treatment, it is a community which is already so financially pressed that such a tax would, on a State level, be difficult to apply. The tax might be a penalty providing funds to make the connections necessary, but this could better be accomplished by creating an improvement district and financing the connection with revenue bonds.

D–29. New Hampshire

While we consider that industrial waste treatment needs in general should be satisfied in the municipal system, we also realize that occasions arise where inplant treatment must be provided before discharging to the municipal collection facilities. If the cost of inplant treatment is minor, there is no real problem, but, if major, it may well develop that small industries cannot afford to absorb the total cost of such facilities. In these situations it would seem that the most equitable means of relief is through an accelerated depreciation schedule, under the Internal Revenue Code. To meet varying circumstances, industry should be allowed to elect the period over which the depreciation will be spread, perhaps anywhere from 1 to 5 years would be a reasonable approach.

D–30. New Jersey

To date, however, there has not been sufficient sentiment in favor of such proposals to effect any legislative enactments along these lines.

There appears to be considerable room for debate on this issue. One form of opposition is to the effect that it is difficult to justify paying industry to do what is required by law in the interest of protecting the public health and the economic environment of the State. On the other hand there is considerable sentiment to the effect that some incentive (tax relief or otherwise) might be well worth the investment in order to accelerate water pollution control. The problem in a State such as New Jersey is complicated by the fact that many millions of dollars have been invested by industry for water pollution control projects during the past 25 years or so. Some of the waste-water treatment facilities constructed during this period for industrial waste treatment and disposal remain in operation and continue to be effective. Others have become outmoded and ineffective and must be replaced or expanded or otherwise modified. There is a further factor which apparently would apply throughout the country, not merely in the highly industrialized States such as New Jersey. I refer to the local significance of the discharge of polluting materials. To illustrate, the discharge of a million gallons of a waste of a certain concentration into a very small stream would be of much more significance than the discharge of the same waste into a very large stream. Obviously, the investment required to effect the desirable and necessary degree of treatment in the former situation could be many times greater than in the latter case. Inherent, therefore, is a tremendous advantage or disadvantage to competitive industries depending upon their location in relation to the volume of receiving waters available for effluent dilution. This problem is further complicated by the use to which the receiving waters are expected to be put downstream from points of discharge of effluents. This factor is subject to change so that it is beyond the control of industry. Industry, of course, has a choice of locations before becoming established, but once established, it has little or no control over factors of environment such as I relate.

D–31. New Mexico

It may be desirable for the Federal Government to provide tax relief or other incentives to industry to accelerate water pollution control. As New Mexico income tax laws are based on Federal income tax laws and regulations, any deduction provided by Federal income tax laws would result in proportionate reductions in State income tax liability.

D–32. New York

I have repeatedly suggested that the Federal Government provide tax incentives in addition to and similar to those enacted by the State under the State corporate franchise tax as part of the pure waters program. Such a Federal tax incentive should take the form of a 1-year depreciation writeoff for new industrial waste treatment facilities under the Federal corporate income tax.

D–33. North Carolina

We believe the provisions of chapter 1100 have proven beneficial to the North Carolina water pollution control program as well as to the industries which have been required to provide costly waste treatment works. It is also believed that Federal legislation of a similar nature would prove beneficial and would recognize the problems of industry in this area of activity. The State has in the past and will continue to support the passage of similar legislation by the Congress.

D–34. North Dakota

This department believes it far better to provide tax relief or other incentives to industry for construction and operation of adequate water pollution control treatment works than to tax water polluters. It is conceivable that some industry might prefer to pay tax for discharge of wastes than construct a treatment plant. This might be especially true in certain wastes that are very difficult to treat (such as wastes from food processing, sugarbeet plants, and cheese plants).

D–35. Ohio

I regret that it is not appropriate for the Governor to make the specific comments you request at this time as their subject matter lies in the area with respect to which he has asked for advice from the Ohio Water Commission. To do as you request would in effect nullify the assignment given to the Ohio Water Commission.

D–36. Oklahoma

We feel that neither the State or Federal Government should provide incentives to industry to clean up or prevent pollution. Our position is that no individual or corporation has a legal right to impair or destroy a natural resource in the conduct of his activities.

D–37. Oregon

We have vigorously resisted efforts to "legalize" such pollution, either through establishment of so-called "effluent charges" or tax incentives.

D–38. Pennsylvania

The sanitary water board has always favored tax relief for industrial waste facilities. Some consideration might also be given to Federal incentives or regional pollutional abatement efforts, such as are being carried out in the German Genossenschaften.

D–39. Rhode Island

The question of imposing such controls or giving such incentives can be complex, but I believe that industries, especially those isolated from public sewer systems, should be given tax relief as an incentive for the construction of water pollution control facilities. Under the present system of Federal grants to municipalities, industries, discharging their waste into a municipal system enjoy indirectly the benefits of the grant program, where those isolated from public sewer systems do not.

* * * * *

I think it best that any move along these lines come from the Federal Government. Because of the limited and diverse effect on State taxes, tax relief must be granted on a much broader base than the States can offer. I also think that it will be difficult politically for a State which may be in competition with other States for industry to enact and en-

force laws that may be effective. Finally, it seems to me it would be easier for the Federal Government if it were serious about the problem, to institute controls against States and municipalities and other governmental instrumentalities which ought to be included that were polluting public waters.

D–40. South Carolina

If further Federal tax relief were given industry, it should act as an incentive to speed construction of waste treatment facilities.

D–41. South Dakota

At the present time it is our thinking that tax relief or other incentives should not be provided to industry to accelerate water pollution control. South Dakota is primarily an agricultural State and, while we have several water-using industries with pollution control problems, we have many other industries such as feed lots, agricultural operations, such as fertilization, pest and weed control spraying, and similar activities, pollution from which (1) is a factor of runoff from rain and snow, (2) is almost impossible to pinpoint by location or cause, (3) does not lend itself to tax relief incentives as control efforts. We feel that all industries, agricultural and otherwise, should be treated essentially alike. We are not particularly agreeable to the general idea of tax relief or similar incentive for pollution control because (1) the followup policing action is impractical, (2) tax relief qualifications and definitions for all industry, agricultural and otherwise, would be almost impossible of administration, (3) equity among all industries cannot be envisioned and any tax relief incentives on other than an all-industry coverage would be discriminatory, and (4) kinds, sources, and intensity of pollution, effects upon water users generally, and public interests vary greatly.

* * * * *

The question of who is to receive tax relief (pay effluent charges) in what amount for what service to be rendered by the pollutor from (to) what administrative organization seems to be impractically complex.

It seems better, in our viewpoint, to invest equivalent net dollars (tax relief or effluent charge collections, or both, less administration costs: or vice versa) in present pollution control efforts.

D–42. Tennessee

Tennessee is in favor of Federal income tax relief as an incentive to industry to control water pollution. This relief could go so far as to permit industry, for corporate income tax purposes, to charge the cost of nonproductive waste treatment facilities as expenses. This suggestion was a specific proposal of the National Technical Task Committee on Industrial Waste in 1962. However, as you know, bills providing rapid amortization of industrial waste treatment facilities for tax purposes have been proposed many times in Congress without success.

D–43. Texas

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—Subcommittee did not receive an answer to its letter of November 17, 1965, and its followup letter of January 10, 1966, at time of printing.]

D–44. Utah

The question of incentives to industry for acceleration of water pollution controls is a difficult one to answer. Adding costs of necessary pollution control to cost of product manufacture would appear to be a sound philosophy, but if it fails to achieve necessary protection of water resources, something else obviously must be done. Our experience in Utah is too limited to date to provide us with a definite answer.

If a tax or other relief system is to be considered as an incentive to industry to attain adequate pollution abatement, it should be at the Federal level—that is—applicable to all States.

It should be recognized that incentives applied unequally across the Nation could be a deciding factor in location of new industries. In the past some local governments in Utah have used a similar device to attract industry by offering to allow sewer connections without charge. Heavy waste loads imposed on treatment plants by this means have proved to be unreasonably burdensome, making this approach unsatisfactory.

D–45. Vermont

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—Subcommittee did not receive an answer to its letter of November 17, 1965, and its followup letter of January 10, 1966, at time of printing.]

D–46. Virginia

The Virginia Water Control Board has generally opposed grants for construction of municipal waste treatment facilities. However, since this program has been in effect since 1956, it appears that some consideration may be given to providing incentives or tax relief for industries, existing and new, that have to or desire to construct waste treatment facilities. This tax relief might be on a par with the 30-percent grant for municipalities, and administered similarly to the Federal water pollution control grant program, with the Virginia State Water Control Board recommending the industry or industries before any tax relief is allowed by the Federal Government.

D–47. Washington

Suggested incentives include—

1. The establishment of a Federal construction grant matching fund program administered jointly by the Federal and State water pollution control authorities with grants to be approved by the State agencies when proposed projects are in compliance with State programs and priorities for pollution control.

2. Increased investment tax credits with programs to be in compliance with State programs and priorities for pollution control.

3. Increased tax writeoff rates for capital costs of pollution control projects incurred in order to comply with State programs and priorities.

Accurate cost estimates for construction of new pollution control facilities by industry are not presently available but these could amount to more than $20 million in the State of Washington during the next 10 years.

D–48. West Virginia

We would favor a Federal tax relief for treatment facilities which are meeting State, interstate, and Federal requirements. The relief should be subject to withdrawal upon failure to maintain compliance with the standards or requirements. Relief should be available on existing treatment plants as well as those to be constructed in the future.

D–49. Wisconsin

Tax relief in the form of rapid amortization at the Federal level would provide a substantially greater incentive than does the same at the State level. Furthermore, the shorter the amortization period the greater the incentive due to greater immediate tax savings for industry.

D–50. Wyoming

If such incentives are to be provided, they should be provided by the States in preference to the Federal Government.

D–51. Guam

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—The Governor's letter did not answer this question.]

D–52. Puerto Rico

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—The Governor's letter did not answer this question.]

D–53. Samoa

[SUBCOMMITTEE NOTE.—Subcommittee did not receive an answer to its letter of Nov. 17, 1965, at time of printing.]

D–54. Virgin Islands

The Federal Government should provide tax relief to industry for water pollution control instead of the State. This should be in the form of a "tax writeoff" within 5 years. The amount should not be less than 30 percent nor greater than 50 percent of the cost of the waste treatment facilities. The State health department should certify the adequacy of the treatment facilities.

EXHIBIT 2

* * * * *

APPENDIX G—BILLS INTRODUCED IN CONGRESS TO PROVIDE TAX INCENTIVES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF AIR AND WATER POLLUTION FACILITIES, 77TH CONGRESS TO 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION (1945–MARCH 1, 1966)

SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

None found.

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

None found.

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

S. 1536: Mr. Kilgore; November 1, 1945 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance). In order to encourage the prevention of stream pollution, amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste may be deducted in computing net income. Effective from December 31, 1945, to January 1, 1952.

H.R. 3972: Mr. Bailey; September 10, 1945 (referred to House Ways and Means Committee). See digest of S. 1536, 79th Congress.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

S. 244: Mr. Kilgore; January 15, 1947 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance). In order to encourage the prevention of stream pollution, amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste may be deducted in computing net income. Effective from December 31, 1947, to January 1, 1954.

H.R. 1047: Mr. Kee; January 16, 1947 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 244, 80th Congress.

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

S. 1118: Mr. Wiley; February 28, 1949 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance). In order to encourage the prevention of stream pollution, amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste may be deducted in computing net income. Effective from December 31, 1948, to January 1, 1955.

H.R. 1343: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; January 13, 1949 (Ways and Means). See digest of S. 1118, 81st Congress.

H.R. 5089: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; June 9, 1949 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Allows amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes to encourage prevention of water pollution. Authorizes an amortization deduction at the election of the taxpayer for a period of 60 months.

H.R. 5091: Mr. Chatham; June 9, 1949 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 5089, 81st Congress.

H.R. 6434: Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania; October 14, 1949 (referred to the Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 5089, 81st Congress.

H.R. 6677: Mr. Tollefson; January 9, 1950 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 5089, 81st Congress.

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

S. 1472: Mr. Kefauver; May 14, 1951 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance).

Allows amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes to encourage prevention of water pollution. Authorizes an amortization deduction at the election of the taxpayer, for a period of 60 months.

H.R. 1555: Mr. Tollefson; January 15, 1951 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Allows amounts paid for any facility, equipment, etc., for disposal of sewage or industrial waste to be amortized at an accelerated rate (60 months) for income tax purposes, in order to encourage the prevention of water pollution.

H.R. 2752: Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania; February 19, 1951 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 1472, 82d Congress.

H.R. 5474: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, September 25, 1951 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 1472, 82d Congress.

H.R. 5742: Mr. ABBITT; October 16, 1951 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 1472, 82d Congress.

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

S. 3115: Mr. KUCHEL; March 11, 1954 (referred to the Senate Committee on Finance). Permits accelerated depreciation to be taken for all devices, buildings, machinery, or equipment for the collection at the source of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants based on a period of 60 months. Prorates the deductions over the allowable period. The taxpayer may make an election to take this deduction and at any time terminate his election. The adjusted basis for depreciation shall be only that part of the construction properly attributable to the purpose named after June 30, 1953, as certified by a State, territorial, or local agency charged with the enforcement of laws relating to abatement of hazards.

H.R. 234: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; January 3, 1953 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Allows amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes to encourage prevention of water pollution.

H.R. 606: Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania; January 3, 1953 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Allows amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes to encourage prevention of water pollution. Authorizes an amortization deduction at the election of the taxpayer, for a period of 60 months.

H.R. 2535: Mr. Elliott; February 3, 1953 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 606, 83d Congress.

H.R. 2720: Mr. Hinshaw; February 6, 1953 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 3115, 83d Congress.

H.R. 2743: Mr. Paulson; February 6, 1953 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 3115, 83d Congress.

H.R. 7170: Mr. Bailey, January 14, 1954 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits amortization of industrial waste treatment facilities, the construction, reconstruction, of erection of which is completed after June 30, 1954, and before January 1, 1958, over a 60-month period provided such facilities have been certified by the Surgeon General as contributing to the abatement of the pollution of interstate waters and by the appropriate State of interstate water pollution agency as being in accord with its stream pollution abatement program. Equates the amortization, with respect to each month of the amortization, with respect to each month of the amortization period within the taxable year, to the adjusted basis of the facility at the end of such month, divided by the number of months remaining in the 60-month period.

H.R. 7703: Mr. LIPSCOMB; February 3, 1954 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 3115, 83d Congress.

H.R. 8361: Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin; March 11, 1954 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 7170, 83d Congress.

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

S. 917: Mr. Martin of Pennsylvania and others; February 4, 1955 (referred to the Senate Committee on Finance). Encourages the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes. Specifically permits such amortization at an accelerated rate of 60 months. Provides for controls which would permit only those facilities which are installed on the basis of demand from a local governmental body to qualify for certification. Further provides that in order to qualify, a facility must be a part of an overall program aimed at elimination of the present-day scourges of air and stream pollution.

H.R. 523: Mr. Hinshaw; January 5, 1955 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits accelerated depreciation to be taken for all devices, buildings, machinery, or equipment for the collection at the source of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants based on a period of 60 months. Prorates the deductions over the allowable period. The taxpayer may make an election to take this deduction, and at any time terminate his election. The adjusted basis for depreciation shall be only that part of the construction properly attributable to the purpose named, as certified by a State, territorial, or local agency charged with the enforcement of laws relating to abatement of hazards.

H.R. 1558: Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania; January 6, 1955 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 523, 84th Congress.

H.R. 2016: Mr. LIPSCOMB; January 11, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 523, 84th Congress.

H.R. 2417: Mr. McDonough; January 17, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 533, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3547: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3548: Mr. ABBITT; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3549: Mr. Bentley; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3550: Mr. FORD; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3551: Mr. Hinshaw; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3552: Mr. Jackson; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3553: Mr. LIPSCOMB; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3554: Mr. Pillion; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3555: Mr. Ray; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3556: Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania; February 3, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3662: Mr. Dondero; February 7, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3778: Mr. Hinshaw; February 8, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 523, 84th Congress.

H.R. 3906: Mr. LAIRD; February 10, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 4313: Mr. Miller of New York; February 23, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

H.R. 4711: Mr. Nelson; March 8, 1955 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 917, 84th Congress.

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

S. 1627: Mr. KUCHEL; March 18, 1957 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance). Encourages the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes. Specifically permits such amortization at an accelerated rate of 60 months. Provides for controls which would permit only those facilities which are installed on the basis of demand from local governmental body to qualify for certification. Further provides that in order to qualify, a facility must be a part of an overall program aimed at elimination of the present-day scourges of air and stream pollution.

H.R. 1082: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; January 3, 1957 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 1627, 85th Congress.

H.R. 1174: Mr. McDonough; January 3, 1957 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits accelerated depreciation to be taken for all devices, buildings, machinery, or equipment for the collection at the source of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants based on a period of 60 months. Prorates the deductions over the allowable period. The taxpayer may make an election to take this deduction and at any time terminate his election. The adjusted bases for depreciation shall be only that part of the construction properly attributable to the purposes named, as certified by a State, territorial, or local agency charged with the enforcement of laws relating to abatement of hazards.

H.R. 2463: Mr. LIPSCOMB; January 10, 1957 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 1082, 85th Congress.

H.R. 4134: Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania; January 30, 1957 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of S. 1627, 85th Congress.

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

H.R. 332: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; January 7, 1959 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Encourages the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes. Specifically permits such amortization at an accelerated rate of 60 months. Provides for controls which would permit only those facilities which are installed on the basis of demand from a local governmental body to qualify for certification. Further provides that in order to qualify, a faculty must be a part of an overall program aimed at eliminating the present-day scourges of air and stream pollution.

H.R. 1277: Mr. McDonough; January 7, 1959 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits accelerated depreciation to be taken for all devices, buildings, machinery, or equipment for the collection at the source of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants based on a period of 60 months. Prorates the deductions over the allowable period. The taxpayer may make an election to take this deduction, and at any time terminate his

election. The adjusted basis for depreciation shall be only that part of the construction properly attributable to the purpose named, as certified by a State, territorial, or local agency charged with the enforcement of laws relating to abatement of hazards.

H.R. 2409: Mr. LIPSCOMB; January 15, 1959 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 332, 86th Congress.

H.R. 3611: Mr. BLATNIK; January 29, 1959 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 332, 86th Congress.

H.R. 4248: Mr. ASHLEY; February 9, 1959 (referred to the House Ways and Means Committee). See digest of H.R. 332, 86th Congress.

H.R. 7566: Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER; June 4, 1959 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Provides a tax reduction for the amortization of air pollution control facilities at the election of the taxpayer over a 60-month period.

H.R. 7654: Mr. Oliver; June 10, 1959 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 332, 86th Congress.

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

H.R. 730: Mr. McDonough; January 3, 1961 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits accelerated depreciation on all devices, buildings, machinery, or equipment for the collection at the source of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants based on a period of 60 months. Prorates the deductions over the allowable period. Permits taxpayers to elect commencement and termination of such deduction. Provides that the adjusted basis for depreciation shall be only that part of the construction properly attributable to the purpose named, as certified by a State, territorial, or local agency charged with the enforcement of laws relating to abatement of hazards.

H.R. 924: Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; January 3, 1961 (referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means). Encourages the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes. Permits such amortization over a 5-year period. Provides for controls to permit only those facilities which are installed on the basis of demand from a local governmental body to qualify for such amortization. Requires a facility to be a part of an overall program aimed at eliminating the present-day scourges of air and stream pollution.

H.R. 2398: Mr. ASHLEY; January 13, 1961 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 924, 87th Congress.

H.R. 2493: Mr. LIPSCOMB; January 12, 1961 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 924, 87th Congress.

H.R. 6370: Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER; April 17, 1961 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an amortization deduction based on an accelerated period of 60 months for certain facilities for the control of air pollution. Permits taxpayers to elect commencement and termination of such deduction. Provides that the adjusted basis shall only include that part of the construction begun on or after the enactment of this bill.

H.R. 7320: Mr. VANIK; May 24, 1961 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 924, 87th Congress.

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

S. 736: Mr. RIBICOFF and others; February 7, 1963 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance). Permits deduction from Federal income tax of expenditures for the construction or acquisition of treatment works to control water and air pollution.

H.R. 5167: Mr. BLATNIK; March 28, 1963 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits every taxpayer to take at his election, a deduction from taxable income for expenditures for construction of waste treatment work to control water pollution.

H.R. 5849: Mr. GIAIMO; April 24, 1963 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). See digest of H.R. 5167, 88th Congress.

H.R. 8884: Mr. LESINSKI; October 22, 1963 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Allows an income tax deduction with respect to the amortization of any waste treatment works used to control water pollution and any air purification facility used to control atmospheric pollution over a period of 60 months.

H.R. 11021: Mr. ST. ONGE; April 23, 1964 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works.

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

S. 1670: Mr. RIBICOFF and others; April 1, 1965 (referred to Senate Committee on Finance). Amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1964 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

H.R. 4223: Mr. CLARK; February 3, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction or erection, installation, or acquisition of treatment works to control water or air pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 4787: Mr. MONAGAN; February 10, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits deduction from Federal income tax expenditures for the construction or acquisition of treatment works to control water and air pollution.

Permits such deductions to be deferred and treated as having been incurred during any of the taxable years after made.

H.R. 5317: Mr. SMITH of New York; February 23, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits the cost of water pollution control facilities to be amortized for income tax purposes over a life of 5 years.

H.R. 5681: Mr. ST. ONGE; March 2, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works.

H.R. 7065: Mr. Lindsay; April 1, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce). Provides for research programs relative to controlling air pollution resulting from gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles and establishes a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory to carry out such programs. Provides for the appointment of a technical committee to encourage the development of the low-cost techniques to reduce offensive byproducts of sulfur combustion.

Requires all new gasoline-powered vehicles to be equipped with blowby systems to keep hydrocarbon emissions down to certain percentages. Prohibits the importation of any gasoline vehicles not meeting the standards herein. Authorizes the Surgeon General to conduct a study to determine the effect of air pollutants on human health. Provides that such study be submitted to Congress.

Gives taxpayer a deduction for expenditures and an increased investment credit for the acquisition, construction, or installation of water and air pollution control devices.

H.R. 7394: Mr. MCVICKER; April 13, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce). See digest of H.R. 7065, 89th Congress.

H.R. 7418: Mr. SWEENEY; April 13, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

H.R. 7656: Mr. OTTINGER; April 27, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

H.R. 9659: Mr. HELSTOSKI; July 7, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction or erection installation, or acquisition of treatment works to control water or air pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 10029: Mr. GIAIMO; July 22, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

H.R. 10805: Mr. KING of New York; September 1, 1965 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

H.R. 11866: Mrs. BOLTON; January 10, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Amends the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works.

H.R. 12455: Mr. CONTE; February 2, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of treatment works to control water pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 12478: Mr. HORTON, February 2, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of treatment works to control water pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 12481: Mr. MATHIAS: February 2, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction, erection, installation or acquisition of treatment works to control water pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 12486; Mr. MORSE; February 2, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of treatment works to control water pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 12499: Mr. STAFFORD; February 2, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). Permits expenditures in connection with a trade or business for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of treatment works to control water pollution to be used as a deduction for income tax purposes. Permits the taxpayer to elect the year for such deduction over a 4-year period.

H.R. 12839: Mr. HARSHA; February 16, 1966 (referred to House Committee on Ways and Means). To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I cannot predict which method the Congress may prefer in providing industry with some assistance in establishing pollution controls: that is, investment credit, accelerated depreciation, a combination of these two methods, or some other method. But I do believe that some form of incentive should be provided private industry and I urge the Finance Committee to give this matter their close consideration and I am hopeful that hearings may be held on these proposals in the near future.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the Senate that the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works has announced a 10-day hearing schedule on water pollution commencing April 19 and continuing through to May 5. I note that among the industry representatives scheduled to appear are the following: National Association of Manufacturers, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Manufacturing Chemists, the soap, and detergent industry, the iron, and steel industry, and the paper industry. I would hope that these industry representatives in discussing various methods for controlling and abating pollution would also include a discussion of their views on the use of tax incentives as a method of accomplishing this purpose.

In this connection, Mr. C. H. Gebhardt, manager of the tax department of the Mead Corp., has prepared a useful chart analyzing current tax proposals relative to water and air pollution controls so as to determine the measure of financial assistance that would actually be given to business if a particular proposal should be adopted. For each $100 outlay for pollution control facilities, Mr. Gebhardt concludes that the bill I introduced with Senator RANDOLPH would provide an incentive equal to 6.7 percent of the cost of pollution control facilities. Other methods provide for incentives of 1.1 percent, 6.1 percent, 7.8 percent, and 14.5 percent of the cost of these facilities. I ask unanimous consent that this table be included in the RECORD.

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

Comparison of various approaches to water and air pollution control incentives via changes in the Federal income tax law (using a $100 outlay for pollution control facilities as an example)

	Alternative approaches to incentives					
	Existing tax treatment [1] (for comparison purposes)	1-year writeoff and 7-percent investment credit	1-year writeoff and 14-percent investment credit	3-year writeoff and 7-percent investment credit	Existing [1] writeoff and 14-percent investment credit	1-year writeoff and no investment credit [2]
Cost of facility	$100.00	$100.00	$100.00	$100.00	$100.00	$100.00
Tax benefits:						
48 percent (present top rate on corporations)	48.00	48.00	48.00	48.00	48.00	48.00
7-percent investment credit [3]	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	None
Additional 7-percent investment credit proposed [3]			7.00		7.00	
Total tax benefits	55.00	55.00	62.00	55.00	62.00	48.00
(a) Net cost of facility before considering the time value of money	45.00	45.00	38.00	45.00	38.00	52.00
(b) Net cost of facility considering the time value of money [4]	54.90	47.10	40.40	48.80	48.20	53.80
(c) Advantage of each alternative compared to existing tax treatment		7.80	14.50	6.10	6.70	1.10
(d) Amount of incentive as a percent of the cost of the facility [5]		7.8	14.5	6.1	6.7	1.1

[1] Depreciation writeoff over 16 years using 1 of the accelerated methods permitted for tax purposes (sum-of-years-digits) has been used.

[2] A 1-year writeoff with no investment credit is shown only for comparative purposes. It illustrates the importance of full investment credit, otherwise a quick writeoff, whether in 1, 3, or 5 years is ineffective if this results in a loss of the investment credit.

[3] Investment credit has been applied to the total outlay although under present law it applies only to equipment; not to land and buildings. It is hoped that any incentive legislation would extend the credit to all outlays, if it is to be an effective, even though modest, incentive.

[4] It is obvious from line (a) above that there is no difference in net cost of a facility, after tax benefits, under the various alternatives other than for those which obviously allow an additional 7-percent investment credit. The timing of a company's recovery of tax benefits is most important, however, and this is reflected in lines (b), (c), and (d) where the dollars involved have all been stated in terms of present worth (i.e., their value today). (A 4-percent after-tax discount rate, with tax benefits realized commencing 1 year after the date of investment is the technique used.)

[5] These incentives should be compared with the 30-percent Federal grants available (with certain qualifications) to municipalities for construction of facilities. There have also been a number of recommendations to increase such grants as the full environmental improvement program is implemented. Note that in appropriate situations industrial plants will (and do) utilize such public facilities, thus deriving some benefit from Federal grants. The incentives outlined above would serve, in some degree, to treat equitably those industrial plants which for technical and other reasons must install and pay for their own facilities.

EDUCATION TAX CREDIT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a matter that has been of great interest to me and many Members of the Senate for a long period of time, has been the proposed tax cut for higher education. I am happy to see the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in the Chamber. We had quite a discussion on this matter when we voted on the tax credit some time ago. I have assured him, and others, who were in opposition to this program, that I have no intention of giving up the fight. It may be that I will bring the tax credit up again this year. If the Senator from Connecticut does not wish to join me, I may do it on my own.

I am absolutely convinced that the American system of education needs some assistance and freedom of choice in granting that assistance. In my opinion, the tax credit approach, is the best way to accomplish this.

There has been some implication from time to time that perhaps the American people are not familiar with the tax credit approach and do not support this concept.

Mr. President, last night CBS conducted another of its popular national testing programs. The purpose of these shows has been to discover the thoughts, feelings, and habits of the American people. The way that the program works is to first test a representative group of people. Then television viewers throughout the Nation take the test and compare their own thoughts with the results of the national poll. These programs have previously covered many subjects. Last night, questions were asked on the subject of taxation.

One of the questions asked was.

Should a tax credit or deduction be given to help meet the costs of a college education?

I am gratified to know that 70 percent replied "yes—they do favor such relief." only 17 percent were opposed, while 13 percent had no opinion.

Last month, when we were considering the Tax Adjustment Act, I told my colleagues in the Senate that there was widespread support for an education tax credit. I indicated, at that time, that educational expenses constituted a staggering burden to millions of American families who were trying to educate their

sons and daughters. This CBS poll is further proof that our American people want a tax credit. I might note that 83 percent of those favoring the education tax credit were in the middle income classification with annual incomes ranging from $5,000 to $7,000 a year. These are the people who have to pay the rising costs of education. These are the ones who have to pay the bills. And these are the ones who overwhelmingly support the tax credit.

Senators may remember that in the progress of the debate on this subject it was stated that a poll had been taken of the presidents and trustees of the colleges in this country, and the percentage of those favoring it, among those who responded to the poll, was in excess of 86 percent.

Last month, I also stated to the Senate that strong support for such a measure is shared by parents and students. So if the educators, the parents, the students, and now the general public favor the proposal, it seems and understatement to say that an overwhelming group of people in this country would like to see progress made in this field.

However, the wishes of the public have been ignored. The administration has been opposed to the tuition tax-credit bill. It has gone to great lengths to make certain that it is not passed. I, for one, do not intend to let the people down. I plan to continue the fight which I have begun and to do my best to assure the people that their opinions will not be swept aside by the opinion of one man who happens to reside in the White House.

I hope that all Senators will join in the struggle to make our Government responsive to the wishes of the people in this highly important field, a field which is an investment in American opportunity and American education.

UNIFORM CLOSING TIME OF POLLING PLACES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have today introduced a bill designed to solve a problem that has developed in connection with our national election process.

It is common knowledge that people like to be on the winning side in any contest. Even though they may not fully agree with a candidate for public office, they like to be able to say they voted for him when he wins. This psychology is important in elections, and candidates on both sides usually try to cultivate the feeling publicly in advance of an election that they will win.

With this in mind, I have become concerned at the mass effect of the early reporting of election returns from large sections of the United States.

The fact that the polls close in some parts of the country at an earlier time than they do in other parts could very well decide the outcome of a presidential election.

This is especially true because of the technological advances enabling the mass communications media, through the use of computers, to project election returns for the Nation as a whole from returns in a few States.

I want to make it clear that I am not objecting to the dissemination of information about the outcome of an election as soon as the votes are in and counted.

I have no objection to the reporting of partial returns as the ballots are counted or after the polls are closed.

I do not object in any way to the manner in which the various newspapers, wire services, and radio and television networks cover the news about the outcome of elections, because I think they do a good job of informing people of the results.

I do not feel the communications media should withhold information.

I do feel that we can make our presidential election process more fair for both political parties and all candidates by establishing a uniform closing time for all polling places.

If the advance reporting of results convinces great numbers of people that the outcome is a foregone conclusion, it influences citizens who have not voted.

There are some who would not vote because they are faced with considerable difficulty getting to the polls, and they think their vote would not make any difference.

They might be factory workers who are tired after a long day on the job, housewives who would have to go to the expense of hiring a babysitter so they could go vote or farmers who would have to drive some distance to the polls.

People who plan to work for a candidate as long as the polls are open tend to let up when they are told their candidate already has lost, or does not have a chance.

Then there are great numbers of people who respect the opinion of the majority. They conclude that if the majority decides a certain way, the majority probably is right and therefore they will cast their vote with the majority.

Thus, when people are told the election is decided before the polls are closed, and become convinced of it, there is interference with the right of people to vote freely and independently. In short, it amounts to unfair campaigning.

My proposed legislation would require all polls in the United States to close at the same time for the election of electors for President and Vice President and for the election of U.S. Senators and Representatives.

It would take effect with the election of 1968 and would apply to every presidential election after that.

The closing time would be 9 p.m. in the eastern standard zone, 8 p.m. in the central standard zone, 7 p.m. in the mountain standard zone, 6 p.m. in the Pacific standard zone, 5 p.m. in the Yukon standard zone, 4 p.m. in the Alaska-Hawaii standard zone and 3 p.m. in the Bering standard zone.

I am not unaware that this calls for a rather early closing in Alaska and Hawaii. I believe, however, that we are faced with a serious national problem and that the national interest must prevail. The fact that the bill would not become effective until 1968 would not only give the State legislatures an opportunity to act next year, but it would give a long time to advertise this change.

It must also be borne in mind that a good portion of the important business of the country is transacted during limited hours, such as banking and business at a post office window and paying taxes. And, of course, there is no Federal law proposed as to how early the polls could be opened.

The voters who reside where Pacific standard time prevails or in the Yukon time zone, or in Alaska or Hawaii or in the Bering time zone, have a right to cast their vote without the problem that arises when voters feel that the election is over and their vote will be of no avail.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on H.R. 6319.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6319) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries, which was read, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. TWO-MONTH EXTENSION OF INITIAL ENROLLMENT PERIOD FOR SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR THE AGED

"(a) The first sentence of section 1837(c) of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking out 'January 1, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 1, 1966', and (2) by striking out 'March 31, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'May 31, 1966'.

"(b) Section 1837(d) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out 'January 1, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 1, 1966'.

"(c) Section 102(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by striking out 'April 1, 1966' each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 1, 1966'.

"(d) In the case of an individual who first satisfies paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1836 of the Social Security Act in March 1966, and who enrolls pursuant to subsection (d) of section 1837 of such Act in May 1966, his coverage period shall, notwithstanding section 1838(a)(2)(D) of such Act, begin on July 1, 1966.

"SEC. 4. COVERAGE, UNDER STATE AGREEMENTS, OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS ENTITLED TO SOCIAL SECURITY OR RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS.

"(a) Subsection (b) of section 1843 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof (after and below paragraph (2)) the following new sentence:

" 'Except as provided in subsection (g), there shall be excluded from any coverage group any individual who is entitled to monthly insurance benefits under title II or who is entitled to receive an annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirment Act of 1937.'

"(b) Section 1843 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) (1) The Secretary shall, at the request of a State made before January 1, 1968, enter into a modification of an agreement entered into which such State pursuant to subsection (a) under which the second sentence of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to such agreement.

"'(2) In the case of any individual who would (but for this subsection) be excluded from the applicable coverage group described in subsection (b) by the second sentence of such subsection—

"'(A) subsections (c) and (d)(2) shall be applied as if such subsections referred to the modification under this subsection (in lieu of the agreement under subsection (a)),

"'(B) subsection (d)(3)(B) shall not apply so long as there is in effect a modification entered into by the State under this subsection, and

"'(C) notwithstanding subsection (e), in the case of any termination described in such subsection, such individual may terminate his enrollment under this part by the filing of a notice, before the close of the third month which begins after the date of such termination, that he no longer wishes to participate in the insurance program established by this part (and in such a case, the termination of his coverage period under this part shall take effect as of the close of such third month).'

"(c) Section 1840 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(i) In the case of an individual who is enrolled under the program established by this part as a member of a coverage group to which an agreement with a State entered into pursuant to section 1843 is applicable, subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section shall not apply to his monthly premium for any month in his coverage period which is determined under section 1843(d).'"

That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the title of aforesaid bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, both the House and the Senate have agreed to the principal features of the bill. They relate to the tax treatment of expropriation loss recoveries. The chairman of the Committee on Finance, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], explained these provisions in considerable detail when the bill was before the Senate on April 1. There is no reason to repeat the explanation of the tax features at this time.

In addition, no change has been made in the basic part of the bill as it passed the Senate at that time or in the bill as it passed the House.

An amendment added to the bill by the Senate extends the period for enrolling under part B of medicare for 2 months—from March 31 until May 31.

The House has agreed to the Senate amendment with technical modifications designed to facilitate medical insurance coverage of elderly persons who are receiving both social security benefits and public assistance. We have examined the House amendment and believe it is in keeping with the Senate provision. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has indicated that it, too, approves the House amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
April 6, 1966.

Hon. RUSSELL LONG,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for a report on the amendments to the Social Security Act reported out by the House Committee on Ways and Means, which are to be considered as amendments to H.R. 6319. The Department supports the amendments recommended by the House committee.

We trust that the Senate will be able to act on this legislation as promptly as possible. We strongly urge the adoption of this legislation as amended.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House and that the bill as agreed to be immediately sent to the White House, so that elderly persons who were unable to file for medical coverage by the March 31 deadline will have a further opportunity to file.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, a member of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Florida has just mentioned, the 60-day extension was recommended by the Committee on Finance. The House accepted that amendment, as I understand, but with an amendment that should a State desire to make contributions to take care of persons who are on social security, or who are receiving public assistance and are not able financially to pay for it, the State, of its own volition, may make those payments.

Mr. SMATHERS. The understanding of the Senator from Kansas is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Personally, I think that is a good amendment. I heartily approve it. I hope it will be unanimously approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

VIETNAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD, OF CONNECTICUT, AT AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., MARCH 30, 1966

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a week ago today the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] delivered what I believe is a very important speech before the Air Force Academy, in Colorado Springs. His speech is entitled, "The Meaning of Vietnam." With his usual flare for forthrightness, forcefulness, and accuracy, the Senator from Connecticut analyzed what the United States is doing in Vietnam and what the problems are, including the problems that arise from the dissension we see in our own country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this well thought through speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE MEANING OF VIETNAM

(Remarks of Senator THOMAS J. DODD at the Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo., Wednesday, March 30, 1966)

Your invitation to address this assembly of the Air Force Academy is an honor which means very much to me.

We are today involved in a worldwide battle with an enemy ever whit as evil and every whit as ruthless as the Nazis. How long this struggle will endure no prudent man can today predict. But it is clear that the very survival of freedom depends on the outcome of the critical battles which are today being fought and which are bound to be fought on many fronts over the years to come.

In these battles, you, as graduates of the Air Force Academy will play a role of signal importance.

Ever since the Battle of Britain, the men who fly have made contributions and suffered sacrifices that are out of all proportion to their actual number.

The future years, I am afraid, are pregnant with heavy responsibilities for all of you. I know that you will not shrink from these responsibilities. I am certain that you will accept them gladly, in the spirit of those who have gone before you.

After all the nonsense that has been spoken by the critics of our Vietnam policy, it is a most refreshing experience to be here with you today.

Here there are no faint hearts, no divided counsels, no tortured self-doubting, no appeasement masquerading as something noble and humanitarian.

You understand that Vietnam is a testing ground and that the outcome of the battle now being fought there may determine for centuries to come the fate of our country and of all mankind.

You understand—as the critics of our Vietnam policy fail to understand—that peace can never be assured by timidity or appeasement or retreat, and that freedom cannot survive unless we who enjoy its blessings are prepared to stand up to Communist aggression, and to match the Communists in dedication and ardor and sacrifice.

You understand that if we fail to hold the line against Communist aggression in Vietnam, we will be faced on the morrow by a dozen Vietnam crises in various parts of the world.

You understand, in short, that, in the complex world in which we live, freedom is indivisible and that our unrivaled strength as a nation imposes on us the responsibility of assisting every nation, great and small, that seeks to maintain its independence in the face of Communist aggression.

Although I know I do not have to convince you of all these things, I want to address my remarks today to a few of the many arguments that have been advanced against our Vietnam policy.

1. THE PACIFISTS

First of all, there are the pacifists, who oppose our intervention in Vietnam because they hold that it is wrong to kill under any circumstances. While the ideal of pacifism may be an admirable thing when regarded abstractly, I frankly fail to understand how any intelligent man can seek to apply this abstract ideal to the world of politics.

To be truly consistent, a pacifist would have to abjure violence of all kinds, not

merely in the relations between nations, but in his personal relations with his fellow man. And this kind of truly consistent pacifism, in my opinion, is virtually nonexistent.

How many pacifists for example would consider it their duty to stand idly by if some maniac embarked on a berserk orgy of killing in the streets? And how many pacifists, in their devotion to nonviolence, would limit themselves to simple remonstration if they saw some criminal assault their wives?

The harsh fact is that, as much as we may abhor violence and love peace, there are situations in the relations between nations, just as there are situations in our everyday lives, when the employment of violence becomes a moral imperative in the defense of life and liberty.

It was so when the free world mobilized its resources to meet the threat of Nazi aggression. It was so in the Korean war. And it is so in Vietnam again today.

2. THE FRAUDULENT PACIFISTS

But even more numerous and more confused than the pacifists are those fraudulent pacifists who supported the war against Hitler, but who now lecture us on the wickedness of resorting to force in Vietnam. As Prof. John Roche, former president of Americans for Democratic Action, has pointed out, the true pacifist is precluded by his beliefs from having any favorite wars.

3. THE FRIENDS OF THE VIETCONG

Then there are those critics of our Vietnam policy who are so bemused by the word "revolution" that they tend to sympathize, openly or covertly, with the Vietcong, regarding them as bearers of social and political progress who truly reflect the aspirations of the Vietnamese people.

I can understand a Communist sympathizing with the Vietcong, because this is the attitude to which his perverted philosophy inevitably leads him. But I find it exceedingly difficult to understand the attitude of those non-Communists who, on the one hand, damn the Saigon government as reactionary and, on the other hand concede the banner of progress to the Vietcong.

If progress means anything, it should mean the betterment of the human lot, the progressive expansion of freedom and justice, and the rejection of force as an instrument of national policy.

Accepting these criteria of progress, the Communist regimes in every country would have to be put down as among the most reactionary in history.

Wherever they have come to power they have obliterated every vestige of human freedom, regimented every aspect of the lives of the people, and massacred hundreds of thousands of opponents and imprisoned many more.

On top of this, the incentive desert which characterizes Communist rule has everywhere resulted in reduced food production and in a lowered standard of living.

And, finally, communism is the total antithesis of progress because of its commitment to subversion and aggression.

But just as there were many people who once assured us that the Chinese Communists were agrarian reformers, there are those who today insist on regarding the Vietcong as progressives, or as true revolutionaries.

4. THOSE WHO SAY WE CANNOT WIN

Then there are those who have no illusions about the nature of the Vietcong, but who hold that we cannot possibly police the world. They tell us that we are already overextended and overcommitted; that southeast Asia is too remote to be of immediate concern to us; that the security of the United States does not stand or fall with Vietnam or southeast Asia; and that the Vietnam war, in any case, is one we cannot possibly win.

I have always replied to these critics, by first of all getting them to agree—as they invariably will do—that it is necessary to draw a line somehow, somewhere, against the further advance of Communist imperialism.

I then remind them that, as remote as southeast Asia may appear to be, Iwo Jima and Guadalcanal and the Solomon Islands were equally remote.

And finally, I ask them where they propose to draw the line if Vietnam should fall.

For let there be no mistake about it: If we fail in Vietnam, through our own weakness or through the weakness of our Vietnamese allies, it will be exceedingly difficult to draw an effective line against the advance of communism anywhere in the Far East.

As for the argument that this is a war we cannot fight and cannot win, I say that we are fighting this war exceedingly well, that we have succeeded in seizing the initiative and holding it, and that we have already begun to win.

The American soldiers have shown an amazing ability to adapt themselves to guerrilla warfare.

The concept of air cavalry, which had never before been tried in battle, has given us a mobility that constantly confounds the enemy. It has enabled us to confine the insurgency with a manpower advantage of less than 3 to 1, compared with the figure of 10 and 15 to 1 which had heretofore been considered essential in dealing with guerrilla uprisings.

Our air arm has devised new tactics to deal with every type of contingency, and these tactics are constantly being refined.

Our commanding officers have succeeded in coordinating land, sea, and air power in a manner never before achieved in this kind of warfare—and the indications are that the Vietcong are still groping for a way to deal with this awesome orchestration of military power.

The morale of our forces is high. Indeed, from all accounts I have heard, I do not think it has ever been higher in any war. They know why they are in Vietnam. They are genuinely fond of the Vietnamese people. And their proficiency in antiguerrilla operations improves with each passing month.

On the other side, the difficulties of the Vietcong have grown by leaps and bounds.

Because they are scraping the bottom of the manpower barrel in the areas under their control, they have been obliged to accept massive support from regular North Vietnamese army units, which have been crossing into South Vietnam at the rate of 4,000 to 5,000 a month.

This accretion of northern manpower has serious disadvantages as well as advantages for the Vietcong.

The South Vietnamese have always disliked and resented the North Vietnamese. The large-scale entrance of regular units of the North Vietnamese army into the battle for South Vietnam, has alienated many of the peasants and has produced serious friction between the North Vietnamese regulars and the South Vietnamese guerrillas. It has also greatly increased the logistical problems of the enemy, so that our airmen more frequently discover enemy convoys and our armed forces more frequently uncover Vietcong stores of food and ammunition.

There are many evidences of deteriorating Vietcong morale.

The rate of defection from the Vietcong has now risen to almost 2,000 per month. And whereas intelligence was previously difficult to come by, there is now a massive and increasing flow of intelligence from areas under Vietcong control.

So, while the road ahead may still be long and difficult, there is every reason to believe that the situation in Vietnam will continue to improve, until ultimately the Communists will be obliged to abandon their aggression—as the Greek Communists were once compelled to abandon their insurgency and as the Huk guerrillas at a later date were obliged to do in the Philippines.

So much for the argument that we are overextended and that we cannot possibly win the war in Vietnam.

5. THE APPEASERS

Then there are the appeasers, who urge us to be reasonable with the Communists and to be prepared to compromise with them, just as the appeasers of pre-Munich days insisted that peace could only be preserved if we were prepared to compromise with the Nazis.

I know that they resent being called appeasers—but then, if my memory serves me, Neville Chamberlain and the Clivdon set in Britain regarded themselves as exceedingly virtuous human beings and repudiated with equal vehemence the charge that they were appeasers.

The essence of modern appeasement is the attempt to purchase peace with aggressive dictatorial regimes by making concessions to them at the expense of other peoples. And in this sense, I see absolutely no moral or political difference between those who in 1939 urged that we placate Hitler by giving him part of Czechoslovakia, and those who today urge that we seek to placate the Vietcong by making significant concessions to them.

As Gen. Maxwell Taylor said in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "How does one compromise the freedom of 15 million people?

6. THE QUESTION OF A COALITION GOVERNMENT

The most common form of appeasement at this juncture in our national Vietnam debate is the proposal that we enter into negotiations with the Vietcong for the purpose of establishing a coalition government with their participation.

I find it difficult to believe that those who have made this proposal have studied the record of coalition governments between Communists and no-Communists, or have given adequate thought to the implications of their proposal or to its potential consequences.

First of all, I would like to answer the argument that our refusal to envisage this kind of solution places us in the position of demanding unconditional surrender from the Communists.

All we have ever asked of the Communists is that they call off their aggression against the people of South Vietnam.

We demand no reparations, nor does the Government of South Vietnam.

We seek no territory.

We ask no political conditions.

We have not even asked that North Vietnam permit the holding of free elections in its territory, in return for the holding of free elections in South Vietnam.

And while we demand nothing, we offer much.

I am certain, for example, that the South Vietnamese Government would be prepared to consent to a general amnesty covering all those who have participated in the Vietcong insurrection.

I say that I am certain of this because such an amnesty would simply represent an extension of the Chieu Hoi program, under which all Vietcong who come over to the government side are automatically granted amnesty.

The combination of a general amnesty and the promise of a free election at an early date would enable members of the Vietcong movement to test their true degree of popular support by competing for elected office.

Beyond this, we have on our own side publicly committed ourselves to bring North Vietnam into the Mekong River development

plan so that she may benefit from the tremendous potentialities that will be unleashed through the harnessing of the Mekong River.

If words have any meaning at all, I do not see how these terms could, by any stretch of the imagination, be described as "unconditional surrender." On the contrary, I can recall no war in which terms as generous as this have been offered to those guilty of aggression—and this in advance of any negotiations.

Those who say that anything less than an offer of a coalition government constitutes a demand for unconditional surrender are, whether they realize this or not, demanding a settlement that is tantamount to surrender by our side.

Even if we could talk our South Vietnamese allies into accepting a coalition government with the Communists, there is little reason for believing that such a solution would put an end to the fighting in South Vietnam—and there is much reason for fearing that it would turn South Vietnam over to complete communist control in very short order.

I recall that we used our influence in the postwar period to persuade our friends in the central European countries to enter into coalitions with the Communists. In every instance, the outcome was disastrous.

Let there be no mistake about it: If we endeavor to overrule the instincts and wishes of our South Vietnamese allies by forcing a "coalition government" solution down their throats, we will not receive the cooperation of a single self-respecting Vietnamese leader.

If, despite this, we were to persist in this folly, we would wind up with a so-called coalition government which, apart from the Vietcong, would include only a handful of second- and third-rate opportunists, of whom the Communists would make short shrift.

Such a coalition government would turn out to be a Vietcong government virtually from the word "go."

I implore those sincere Americans who are advocating a coalition government in Vietnam to rethink the implications of their proposal.

I implore them also to give some thought to the fact that all this talk of recognizing the Vietcong and of forcing a coalition government on Vietnam encourages the Vietcong to persist, while it strikes dismay into the hearts of our Vietnamese allies.

I implore them to consider what the verdict of history will be if their recommendations should prevail and if the Communists should then take over, as they have done in so many other countries where we have played the perilous game of coalition government.

There are certain issues on which we can compromise and certain issues on which we cannot compromise.

We cannot compromise on the principle that aggression must never be rewarded. Because I take this stand, I repudiate with all my strength the suggestion that we should seek peace in South Vietnam by offering the Communists half the country or half control over its government.

On a moral level I consider this proposal tantamount to suggesting that we purchase peace with the American underworld by permitting them to legally retain a portion of the loot they have obtained by criminal means, or by giving them representation in our Government.

As there can be no compromise with crime, there can be no compromise with aggression.

As much as I may disagree with them, I believe that the critics of our Vietnam policy have performed a public service by raising the question of a coalition government at this time. They have helped to clear the air of rumors that such a solution was being given sympathetic consideration by the administration.

The ringing declarations of Vice President HUMPHREY, of Under Secretary Ball, of Mr. McGeorge Bundy, and of other key members of the administration team, have established beyond the possibility of doubt that the Johnson administration has understood the bitter lesson to be drawn from the experience with coalition governments in the postwar period.

The administration has made it clear to friend and foe alike that it will not abandon its commitment to the people of South Vietnam, that it will not buy peace through any dishonest or equivocal formula which compromises the position of our allies, and that it will not yield to the clamor of the tiny misguided minority who demand that we pull out of Vietnam.

If the Communists think otherwise, then they have gravely misread both the history and the present temper of the American people.

I wish to close with a quotation from Winston Churchill which I never tire of repeating.

During the dark days of the Battle of Britain, Churchill took time off from his duties to address the boys of his old school, Harrow. This was his message to them:

"Never give in. Never, never, never, never. Never yield to force and the apparently overwhelming might of the enemy. Never yield in any way, great or small, large or petty, except to convictions of honor and good sense."

The American people, and especially our Vietnam critics, would do well to take this advice to heart today.

FUNERAL SERVICES FOR HON. LESLIE BIFFLE, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the funeral services for Hon. Leslie Biffle, former Secretary of the Senate, will be at 11 o'clock a.m. on Saturday, April 9, 1966, in the Bethlehem Chapel of the National Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul. Burial will be private at Fort Lincoln Cemetery.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1022, Senate Joint Resolution 103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, debate on the proposed constitutional amendment will not start until the Senate returns from its Easter recess, which will be 1 week from today.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 7, 1966, at 9 o'clock a.m.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 6 (legislative day of April 5), 1966:

The nomination sent to the Senate on February 16, 1966, of Wayne A. Wray to be postmaster at Barnes, in the State of Kansas.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 6 (legislative day of April 5), 1966:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Otis H. Moore, Jr., Sterrett.
Bessie J. Bragg, Ward.

ALASKA

Maudrey J. Sommer, Tanana.

CALIFORNIA

William R. Lackey, Bass Lake.
Paul J. Lay, Beaumont.
Shirley E. Ames, Bodega Bay.
Earl O. Good, Jr., Fullerton.
Irma L. Wyly, Jacumba.
Dorothy E. Birkhead, Morro Bay.
Carl L. Backlund, Torrance.
Betty J. Raper, Westend.

COLORADO

Rallin R. Gibson, Collbran.
Harry N. Pearson, Ignacio.

CONNECTICUT

Julia A. Wharton, Colebrook.
Edward W. Gray, Riverton.
Manuel W. Vetti, Stamford.

FLORIDA

James F. Myers, Casselberry.
James F. Bridges, Jr., Fort Pierce.
Francis A. Wynn, Homestead.
Franklin C. Smith, Interlachen.
John A. Norden, Lake Mary.
Maxwell E. Scott, Marco.
John O. Hampton, Melbourne.
Shearod W. Williams, Niceville.

GEORGIA

Mary B. Goolsby, Carlton.
Wilma G. Lawrence, McCaysville.
William B. Price, McIntyre.

ILLINOIS

James C. Stanley, Fairfield.
Norman A. Rutter, St. Libory.
Charles H. Gunier, Sheridan.

INDIANA

Earl F. Ley, Clay City.
Charles L. Powell, Denver.
Larry D. Garrison, Kingsford Heights.
Richard P. Gerhard, Kokomo.
N. Artelle Lassiter, Windfall.

IOWA

William H. Merkle, Fayette.
Clarita F. Witham, Truesdale.

KANSAS

Durward E. Smith, Admire.
Florence W. Kelley, Chanute.
Orval M. Siefers, Dorrance.
Louise L. Atwell, Kismet.
Effie M. Dunn, Meriden.

Evelyn M. Caldwell, Preston.
Earl K. Pennington, Rantoul.

KENTUCKY

Victor D. Headrick, Tompkinsville.

LOUISIANA

John W. Vining, Amite.
Doland Vincent, Kaplan.
Jesse P. LeBlanc, Lockport.
Gerald J. Marquette, Napoleonville.
Nita S. Dabadie, Ventress.

MAINE

Frank L. Reynolds, Brooks.

MASSACHUSETTS

Nelson T. Cotter, Hanover.
Patrick J. Windward, Jr., Sterling Junction.
James F. Alley, West Tisbury.

MICHIGAN

Wallace J. Reed, Flushing.
Vern W. Bemus, Hazel Park.
Elmer A. Behrend, Powers.

MINNESOTA

James M. Pederson, Echo.
Thelma A. Reynolds, Holloway.
R. Vron Muir, Jackson.

MISSOURI

Walter J. Stuesse, Beaufort.
Archie L. Williams, Carl Junction.
Edward L. Rogers, Jr., Robertsville.
Winifred M. Puchta, Rockaway Beach.
Victor F. Mudd, Silex.
J. Walter Jones, Sweet Springs.

MONTANA

Fred W. Schepens, Glendive.

NEBRASKA

Howard D. Clements, Hay Springs.
Theodore R. Gaedke, Wellfleet.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

John T. Richardson, East Barrington.
Walter P. Kretowicz, Keene.

NEW JERSEY

Louis J. Rossi, Avenel.
Joseph M. Gondola, Clifton.
Thomas F. Flynn, Emerson.

NEW MEXICO

Jenkins A. McRae, Jr., Alamogordo.
Alberto Romero, Mora.

NORTH CAROLINA

Boyce W. Cloninger, Catawba.
William P. Hudgins, Sunbury.

NORTH DAKOTA

Vernon L. Hansen, Kenmare.

OHIO

David F. Tootle, Frankfort.
Howard R. Van Scholk, Hilliard.
Joseph D. Buchanan, Norwich.
Matthew J. Dowling, Perrysburg.
Robert L. Booth, Tiffin.
Charles H. McGovney, West Union.

OKLAHOMA

James A. Maddux, Cheyenne.

PENNSYLVANIA

Steve A. Gavorchik, Fairchance.
Michael A. Hrehocik, Glassport.
Mary K. Hertzog, Lyon Station.
Harry W. Stark, Manchester.
J. Richard Hartman, Roaring Spring.
Louella J. Hanna, Spring Church.
Ralph J. Brooking, Starrucca.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John H. Atkinson, Jr., Myrtle Beach.

SOUTH DAKOTA

James W. Cheatham, Aurora.
Thomas R. Lyons, Brookings.
Stanley K. Baird, Frankfort.
Robert S. Kuni, Huron.

TENNESSEE

Florence A. West, Collegedale.
Edith T. Webb, Orlinda.

TEXAS

Charlie L. Carter, Jr., Bon Wier.
Calvin H. Davis, Brownfield.
Douglas R. McGraw, Del Rio.
Jewel L. Newbrough, Hargill.
Frank N. Simpson, McLean.
Delbert F. Arndt, New Ulm.
Bernie M. Smith, Pantex.
Irene A. Yarbrough, Princeton.
Ward V. Hollingshead, San Angelo.
Elmon J. Jacobs, Spearman.
Jack P. Meredith, Teague.
Margaret L. Cooke, Waskom.
Mary K. Herring, Whitharral.
Erna L. Boggus, Yancey.

VERMONT

Donald A. Frail, Hartland.

VIRGINIA

Randall J. Wilmarth, Danville.
Edna A. Josey, Disputanta.
Charlie M. Jeffries, Warrenton.
Carol B. Miller, Washington.

WASHINGTON

Irma S. Nordquist, Lakebay.
Lenard A. Smith, Leavenworth.
Gordon G. Johnson, Olympia.
David L. Gray, Reardan.
Robert A. Leadon, Yakima.

WEST VIRGINIA

Roy K. Hatton, Huntington.
John W. Almond, MacArthur.
Ivan N. Hunter, Nirto.

WYOMING

Verne S. Parman, Sinclair.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Conservation Districts and Rural Fringe Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, not long ago most people looked upon soil and water conservation as something for the farmers to worry about. But not today.

As cities spread out, many rural areas in their path face the need for guidance in land-use decisions.

In Illinois, we face the problems of rapid development in the areas stretching out from Chicago—and I am glad to say that we are facing them head on.

The Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission is charged with the responsibility of developing a broad framework plan. The plan will be a guide to the orderly and intelligent development of land and water resources in the six northeastern counties of Illinois. In carrying out this responsibility the commission calls on other groups to assist in their various technical fields.

Included in this all-out effort is help under a cooperative agreement the commission has entered into with the five soil and water conservation districts in the area and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service.

Through these organizations, the commission will receive technical assistance in connection with a land resource study that will become part of a comprehensive development plan for the area.

Soil Conservation Service assistance includes interpretations of soil surveys made by them which will be used as a basis for land-use planning.

Farmers for many years have relied on soil survey information to determine proper use and treatment of their land. Today, with somewhat different interpretations, the soil survey information is invaluable to the urban planner, builder, or engineer. It is used to determine the best sites for not only housing, industry, and parks, but for recreation areas, roads, utility lines, and sewerage systems.

The soil facts help avoid wrong land-use decisions that lead to deterioration of streets and highways, overtaxed water-disposal systems, silted reservoirs and streams, sediment-clogged sewers, cracked walls and inoperative septic tanks, and a host of other problems.

These problems are faced by mounting numbers of people—not only in northeastern Illinois but everywhere that rural land is shifting from agricultural uses. They are costly problems. But they can be avoided by advance planning more cheaply than they can be corrected—if, indeed, they can be corrected.

I am extremely gratified with the cooperation that these organizations are showing in providing the guidance that will not only avoid costly mistakes but lead to a much more satisfactory environment for human living and enjoyment.

I hope there will be no delay, either because of slow administrative action or because of our failure to provide adequate funds, in completing up-to-date soil surveys for all areas where they have not been done in recent years.

Mr. David Russ of Kingsport, Tenn., Winner of National Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend congratulations to a young Tennessean who has recently distinguished himself by speaking in behalf