"Chief U.S. Delegate Adrian S. Fisher told the 18-nation disarmament conference the system involves analysis of fission-product gases which slowly leak to the surface after such an explosion. Fisher claimed such gases could only result from a nuclear explosion and analysis of the surface would soon show whether the country concerned had cheated.

" 'This would make it impossible for a country to get away with secret tests by thoroughly cleaning up the surface of the explosion area to deceive on-site inspectors, he said.' "

Clearly the impression the newsmen received in Geneva is contrary to what you state was your intent. I am happy, therefore, to have your present elucidating remarks pointing out that your major purpose was to demonstrate the need for on-site inspections in connection with a treaty to ban underground nuclear explosions. I must say, however, that in reading the Swedish delegate's speech of April 14 which is, at least in part, a response to your April 4 speech, I see no evidence of your having convinced that delegate of the necessity for onsite inspections.

In fact, Mrs. Myrdal's insistence on the "verification by challenge" would seem to indicate a lack of appreciation as to the effect of delays in making an onsite inspection. Perhaps a greater degree of candor on the part of the United States with regard to steps that can be taken to cover up evidence of a nuclear explosion would have been more convincing.

Returning now to your current letter, you state that "Present technology provides a good probability of locating seismic events within an area of about 250 square miles unless unknown anomalies exist in the times for seismic signals to travel through the earth in particular areas." I do not know how to quantify "good," but I can assure you that a 50 percent probability is not my idea or most people's idea of what is "good" when our national security may be at stake. You also speak of unknown travel time anomalies, as if these are rare. I recall that every time we detonated an underground nuclear explosion in a new location—New Mexico, Mississippi, and most recently, Alaska—we have found anomalies in the seismic travel times that were unknown before. In the vast area of more than 12 million square miles that are under the control of the Soviet Union and Communist China, there are undoubtedly many areas that give rise to anomalous travel times. The Soviet Union alone has 8,660,000 square miles.

You speak of the considerable importance of the "Longshot" event in our ability to locate seismic events and, in particular, how initial analysis failed to locate this event within 15 miles (an area of 707 square miles, by the way), but that analysis of the anomalies removed the error. This means, of course, that we knew exactly where we shot the event, and when we used this information to establish what the seismic travel time anomalies were, we brought down the circle of location to 113 square miles. Knowing where we shot Long Shot, I'm surprised we couldn't have done even better.

I would like to call your attention to some technical facts regarding the seismic location of the Long Shot event, of which apparently you are not aware. The unclassified report on Long Range Seismic Measurements on Long Shot dated January 5, 1966 and prepared for the Nuclear Test Detection Office of the DOD's Advanced Research Projects Agency shows the following: When the seismic data were limited to long range seismic stations and the Vela observatories (the best we know how to build and this includes the 500 element array in Montana), the location of Long Shot was off by 63 kilometers (40 miles). This is an area of more than 5,000 square miles. When all stations were used—including some very close in—the location made was down to 26 kilometers (16.3 miles, an area of 830 square miles).

Interestingly enough, however, considering the seismic data of "all stations," the analysis shows Long Shot to have been at a depth of 76.2 kilometers (this is more than 47 miles deep). Now everyone knows you can't fire a nuclear explosion that deep, and so Long Shot would have been interpreted as a natural seismic event, not even being suspected of being nuclear, on the basis of "all stations." I am certainly concerned with such data having to be used as a basis for deciding on a violation of an underground test ban treaty.

A similar story with regard to seismic data location is true for the Salmon event, detonated in Mississippi. It had been estimated for that event that even with travel time corrections, the 90 percent confidence ellipse turns out to be 950 km.^{2} (371 square miles).

In contrast to the technical facts known about our capabilities to detect and locate seismic events (not even mentioning identification) in areas for which we obviously do not have good seismic data, the views you present are clearly unwarranted overstatements of our abilities.

I do, as you indicate, disagree with you with regard to a comprehensive test ban treaty. The reasons are simple. We cannot adequately verify such a treaty on the basis of an unwarranted amount of optimism and a handful of on-site inspections. To go into such a treaty without a better capability than we now have is a danger to our Nation's security.

You have asked that your letter be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am inserting your letter and this reply.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Charles Robert Harrah, minister of the Colonial Church of Bayside, Bayside, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth.—Psalms 8: 1.

Our gracious Heavenly Father, whose name is most excellent in all the earth, we heartily praise Thee and thank Thee for all that Thou hast done for us throughout every moment of our lives.

We dare to come before Thee this morning, not because of our faithfulness unto Thee, but because of Thy faithfulness unto us. Thus do we adore Thee and commit ourselves to Thy sovereign power and careful watchfulness over all things in heaven and on earth.

Continually grant, we beseech Thee, unto our President, Thy servants here and in the Senate, their advisers, assistants and colleagues in every department of the Government of this great Republic, to all the people of our beloved Nation, and indeed, to all mankind, the saving knowledge of Thy eternal grace revealed in Jesus Christ our Lord, in which knowledge there is wisdom and strength to properly pursue public duty and private living, and in whose blessed name we also pray for earthly peace and the realization of Thy kingdom come—on earth as it is in heaven. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 5, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 4, 1966:

H.R. 1903. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons and James R. Simmons.

On May 5, 1966:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3283. An act to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1308. An act to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on May 5, 1966, approved a prospectus for the construction of the following projects, which prospectus was transmitted to this committee from the General Services Administration:

Nebraska, Lincoln: (1) Post office building, (2) courthouse and Federal office building and parking facility.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Member of Congress, Chairman.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY ADDRESSES ASSOCIATED PRESS ON OUR ROLE OF WORLD LEADERSHIP

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, the Vice President of the United States delivered an important address before the Associated Press in New York.

I do not believe the role that this country seeks to play in the world today, our progress in foreign and domestic affairs up to the present, or the goals we envision for the future have ever been stated more clearly or eloquently.

Identifying the three major tasks confronting us as the pursuit of peace, narrowing the gap between the rich and poor nations, and sustaining the American economy so that it can bear the burden of our commitments, the Vice President has given clear and concise answers to these and other questions.

The views of Vice President HUMPHREY are always of great interest to Members of the Congress and everyone throughout the Nation. So that all may have the benefit of his wisdom concerning the critical issues of the day, I place the full text of his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY BEFORE THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 25, 1966

It is always a risk to speak to the press: They are likely to report what you say.

Today I will take that risk. For I have some thoughts I am quite willing to have repeated.

Today our America stands as the most powerful, the most prosperous, and the freest Nation in the history of the earth.

And in our power, wealth, and freedom, we stand as leader of the Western World.

As a nation cautioned from the first against entangling alliances, this role is not an easy one.

And, indeed, to many other nations of the world we remain a relatively unknown quantity.

For it has been only in recent years that we have ventured into the world with any real seriousness.

And thus we hear questions asked: Are we overreaching ourselves? Will we tire of our tasks? Will our economy be able to support the burdens we carry at home and abroad? Are we equal to the role of world leadership?

Fair enough questions they are.

For the answers affect the great majority of nations and the great majority of the world's peoples—not only because of the weight of our power, but because of the things we stand for. In Tom Paine's words: "The cause of America is in great measure the cause of all mankind."

In the final analysis, the questions asked about us can only be answered by how we measure up to the challenges before us.

Today we face three great and interrelated tasks in the world: the pursuit of peace; the effort to narrow the gap between the rich and poor nations; and the necessity of sustaining an American economy able to carry a thousand future burdens here and around the world.

Our search for peace finds its best expression in our support for the kind of world envisioned in the United Nations Charter—a world where large and small nations might live alike in harmony without threat of external coercion.

No nation has done more for peace than has ours since World War II. The U.N., the Marshall plan, Point Four, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, the Asian Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, Food for Peace, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—these have come from initiatives worthy of our position of leadership.

These have come from our search for peace.

But other initiatives, too, have come from our search for peace: Firmness in Berlin; aid to Greece and Turkey; the founding of NATO, CENTO and SEATO; resistance to aggression in Korea; the determination that nuclear missiles should not be introduced into the hemisphere.

For we have long since learned that peaceful development cannot exist in an environment of violence, aggression, and fear.

Today peace is at stake in Asia.

Peace is at stake in a hundred thousand Asian villages, in the struggle of peasants against a millennium of poverty, disease and despair.

Peace is at stake in a tortured South Vietnam, in the struggle against the classic power tactics of communism.

We must not lose the peace in either struggle.

That is why we have committed once more—as we have had to do before—men, money, and resources to help the nations of Asia help themselves toward security and independence.

It won't be easy. It will be frustrating and at times heartbreaking. But, if we are not to deny our leadership, if we are not to deny the principles in which we believe, we must stay and see it through. And the free nations of the world need to know that we have the vision and the endurance to do so.

Those who threaten their neighbors in Asia should know it too. They should know that we will resist their aggression.

But they should also know that we bear no consumptive hate against their people, that we have no design on their sovereignty. We look only toward the day when all nations may choose to live in harmony with their neighbors—when they may turn together their energies to building a better life for their people.

For this is, after all, the second great task before us: The desperate need to narrow the widening gap between the rich and poor nations of the world.

I give you the words of Pope John 23d in his encyclical Mater et Magistra:

"The solidarity which binds all men and makes them members of the same family requires political communities enjoying an abundance of material goods not to remain indifferent to those political communities whose citizens suffer from poverty, misery, and hunger, and who lack even the elementary rights of the human person.

"This is particularly true since, given the growing interdependence among the peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic and social inequality among them persist.

"We are all equally responsible for the undernourished peoples. Therefore, it is necessary to educate one's conscience to the sense of responsibility which weighs upon each and everyone, especially upon those who are more blessed with this world's goods."

We sit here today comfortably examining this situation. But for the disinherited and left out of this world, it is no matter for examination: It is a matter of day-to-day survival.

Today there are families spending their last day on earth because they haven't the strength or health to keep going.

But those who remain—and you can be sure of this—those who remain will take to the streets—they will turn to any master—they will tear the fabric of peace to shreds, unless they have some reason to believe that there is hope for life and hope for justice.

To put this on a more immediate and practical level, let me call to your attention the foreign aid request now before the Congress.

The expenditure for the first year of the Marshall plan was about 2 percent of our gross national product, and 11½ percent of the Federal budget. Today—thanks to the growth of our American economy—our foreign aid request is for only .29 percent of our gross national product and about 1.9 percent of the Federal budget—that is, about 2 cents out of every tax dollar. Yet we hear the same doubts and complaints today that we heard 20 years ago.

If someone has a substitute for foreign aid, I'd like to hear about it. The investment we make in foreign aid—in preventive medicine, if you will—is certainly less than that necessary to treat the symptoms of massive economic crisis and disorder and, yes, of war.

The Marshall plan saved Western Europe and the peace. It created a great new economic market for us.

But there is more: the revived nations of Western Europe have not only repaid their Marshall plan debts, they have already provided more aid to the developing countries than they ever received from us.

The rewards can be just as great tomorrow in other continents.

If there are questions asked about our ability to meet this task, I think they must be answered affirmatively and without equivocation.

We do not seek to do this task alone nor should we. But how can we expect others to follow if we do not lead?

President Eisenhower described the third great task we face today: "The firm base for the problem of leading the world toward the achievement of human aspirations—toward peace with justice in freedom—must be the United States."

We must fashion an America so strong, so free, so able to lead, that there may be no question about our purposes or our endurance.

Basic to this is the necessity of building an economy of growth, and opportunity, yet stable in time when it is tested.

I need not remind this audience of the Communist belief—I suppose some of them still hold it—that the United States was teetering on the brink of economic chaos * * * that it was just a matter of time until our production lines would grind to a halt, until an army of unemployed would seize the state, until economic warfare among the Western nations would open the door to communism.

I think by now some of the Communist doctrinists have come to realize that Lord Keynes was speaking to them as well as others when he wrote: "Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist."

The American economic miracle is the world's greatest success story.

Last year alone we increased our gross national product by $47 billion, increased our total personal income by $39 billion, and increased our Federal cash receipts by $8½ billion.

All this did not happen by accident.

Part of it is certainly due to the influence of Mr. Keynes and the so-called new economics.

But I believe the basic, underlying reason behind our economic success is this: There is today a creative partnership for prosperity among those in our society who used to think of themselves as natural antagonists.

We are dispelling old myths.

How long has it been since we've heard old empty labels such as "labor boss" and "economic royalist."

The fact is that American government, business and labor are increasingly united in the premise that a stronger and better America will be to the common benefit of all.

Among other things, we are united in our determination to accomplish something that no nation has previously dared to try: To make every citizen in our society a full and productive member of our society.

And so today we make national investments in our country and in our people—investments in productivity, in opportunity, in enterprise, in greater social justice, in self-help.

That is what our Great Society programs are all about.

Education, medical care, war against poverty, programs of retraining and redevelopment, better cities and transportation, an even more productive agriculture, yes, equality at the ballot box and before the law—these are the most basic investments of all in an America able to keep its commitments both at home and abroad.

As the President has said so often, it is not a matter of a Great Society of fulfillment of our international responsibilities. It is not a matter of guns or butter, foreign aid, or domestic education. They are tied together and you cannot separate them.

If we can build a society operating on all its cylinders, others in the world may have some hope of doing the same. If we cannot, what hope may others have?

To make our free system work—to sustain it—to keep our pledges all the while: This indeed is the way to erase any doubts the world may have about our ability to fulfill the responsibility of leadership.

In closing, may I say a word about the nature of that responsibility.

Leadership in today's world requires far more than a large stock of gunboats and a hard fist at the conference table.

Leadership today requires more than the ability to go it alone—although we must not be afraid to do so when necessary.

Leadership today requires understanding of the problems we face, of the resources at hand, and of the objectives we seek.

It requires the ability, perhaps even more, to lead and inspire others—to lead and inspire in a sense of common enterprise.

For as strong and rich as we may become, our goal of a just and peaceful world will never be achieved by America alone.

It will be achieved only when the resources of strong and weak, rich and poor alike are allocated, in the most efficient manner possible, to challenges that are far too great for any one nation or group of nations to attempt to overcome.

This, then, is the test of ourselves: Not to march alone, but to march in such a way that others will wish to join us.

I will add one caveat: In none of this should we expect either friendship or gratitude.

We have already eaten breakfast to the accompaniment, in our morning newspapers, of too many "Yankee Go Home" signs, too many riots, too many denunciations of ourselves to believe that leadership can reward us with international laurel wreaths.

I think the most we can expect is this: That those who question us will one day find no reason to question; that in the world there may be no doubt that Americans have the vision, the endurance, and the courage to stand and see it through for what we believe in.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

AUTOMOBILE AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the question of automobile and highway safety is a matter of concern we all share. I am, however, shocked by the implications resulting from recent congressional hearings and news reporting on this subject that the automobile manufacturers are not concerned about the safety of their products. These companies are continually on the alert for possible mechanical defects and are quick to remedy them. A reading of recent news reports regarding the recall of cars for the correction of defects, most of them very minor, leaves the impression that labor and management are careless in the manufacture of their products. This just is not true. The industry should be commended for its diligence in correcting any known defects. I am amazed that they are not more numerous considering the millions of cars produced and the complicated manufacturing required. Probably no industry today has better quality control than that found in the auto industry.

I can foresee an unfortunate economic impact unless this whole problem is placed in its proper perspective. We are all interested in making, not only our cars but highways as well, as safe as humanly possible. The facts will indicate, however, that the real villain is the driver. Human errors can never be totally eliminated but we must place greater emphasis on safe driving. This in cooperation with the manufacturer's attempts to build safer cars and the design of safer highways can do much to reduce traffic fatalities and injuries.

It is time this entire problem be realistically approached and the hysteria recently generated by publicity seeking individuals be quieted before irreparable damage is done to our economy.

APPOINTMENT OF BERNARD BOUTIN AS ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

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

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

The was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Bernard L. Boutin as Administrator of the Small Business Administration represents the initial step toward the restoration of the Small Business Administration and its programs. From his credentials, Mr. Boutin seems to be eminently qualified for this position. I believe I speak for every Member of this body when I state my extreme pleasure at the President's announcement in filling this long vacant position, and in the appointment of one whose years of successful public service presage a better day for the agency.

The appointment of a capable and dynamic Administrator was urged months ago by the minority members of the Select Committee on Small Business and the minority leadership of the House of Representatives. It would appear that at this late, but hopefully not too late, hour, our request has been granted.

Mr. Boutin, in assuming his new post, faces an extremely difficult task to rebuild the agency to the fine organization it once was known to be. Most urgent of the many tasks before him is the restoration of the business loan program, the major responsibility of SBA. This program, contrary to the specific direction of the Congress, has been radically altered and virtually abandoned. The business loan program should operate and receive applications for the maximum amount as provided by law, which is $350,000. It should not operate and receive applications based upon some suggested administrative ceiling as to amount. It should be specifically understood that the Congress desires this business loan program to operate upon the basis that the Congress enacted it. If additional funds are required, then additional funds should be requested. It behooves Mr. Boutin to restore this vitally needed assistance to the Nation's 4.7 million small businesses.

The diminishing proportion of Government purchases from qualified small businesses, due in part to the cessation of procurement set-aside assistance is a matter of extreme concern to small manufacturing and service businesses. Renewal of SBA as the voice of small business, fostering the efforts to obtain a great share of Government procurement, is essential.

Other problems of major importance exist; Employee morale is known to be at rockbottom, the heavy demands upon the agency due to disaster administrative services, the growing demands of the present economy. Under proper and aggressive leadership, each of these problems can be met.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Mr. Boutin should once and for all settle the question, and by this appointment, I believe the President has given us the assurance that the independent status of SBA will be preserved. Those of us who argued strongly against the suggestion of merging the interests of the small business community with the interests of the

big business community in the Department of Commerce stressed that it would indeed have been a tragic error. Therefore, Mr. Boutin's appointment argues well with the minority in more than one respect.

It is our sincere hope that he may prove, and I sincerely hope he does, the capable and dedicated leader the agency so desperately needs, and I suggest that Mr. Boutin resist all efforts that may be suggested that he preside over the dissolution of this agency, which is the small business spokesman in government.

Mr. Boutin's assignment is obviously difficult; however, he presents new hope for small business. He is most welcome.

THE REVEREND CHARLES ROBERT HARRAH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today this House has been privileged to hear the opening prayer by the Reverend Charles Robert Harrah, minister of the Colonial Church of Bayside. Reverend Harrah is a distinguished member of the clergy. He is esteemed by his parishioners and fellow churchmen; he is admired and beloved by the community wherein he serves and where he has been recognized as an outstanding leader in community affairs. I am honored indeed, Mr. Speaker, to have so great a human being as a constituent and one whose dear mother, I should point out, Mr. Speaker, is a constituent of our distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Yes, I am proud indeed that my colleagues have had the opportunity to hear these words of inspiration and blessing today.

THE 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, last month, in my home city of Dallas, Tex., the Air Force Association held its 20th annual convention, which I was pleased to attend. One of the most outstanding events of the convention was the Secretary of the Air Force luncheon at the Sheraton-Dallas Hotel, at which I was privileged to be seated next to the Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. J. P. McConnell. Both General McConnell and I were quite impressed with the invocation given by Msgr. William F. Mullally, of St. Louis, Mo. We agreed that his inspiring message should be shared with all Members of Congress:

Incomprehensible Creator, the true fountain of light, and only author of all knowledge, vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, to enlighten our understanding and to remove from us all darkness and ignorance. Bless those who teach, and those who are taught, those who lead, and those who follow, so that what they teach and learn and direct and accomplish, may redound to Thy honor and glory.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the House the fact that tomorrow, in addition to the program already announced, a conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill will be called up.

AID TO IMPROVE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 437

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Seven months ago, Public Law 89–10, providing massive aid to improve elementary and secondary education, went into effect. At that time we called upon leaders of education in States and local school districts to translate this financial assistance into educational services for the millions of disadvantaged children in our schools: the children who desperately need additional attention if they are to overcome the handicaps of poverty.

I am happy to transmit to you the first report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Their comments on the progress which has been achieved by States and local schools reveal that educators from all levels of Government are working together to provide equal educational opportunities for all.

I am particularly encouraged by the major focus of activities identified in the report: to improve language skills in the early years. Nothing could be more fundamental than this work in assisting children who have been denied normal educational opportunities through poverty or neglect.

The commission members have not failed to point out areas in the program that need additional attention. I have pledged that every effort will be made to meet these problems—and I am confident that the Congress will join in these efforts.

We have begun a major campaign to solve a longstanding problem. The first year of this work has proved that we are on the right road, but we still have far to go.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1966.*

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REGULATION OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 13558) to provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, including the examination, licensure, registration of certified public accountants, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13558

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known and may be cited as the "District of Columbia Certified Public Accountancy Act of 1965".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "certified public accountant" means a person who is the holder in good standing of a certificate of certified public accountant issued under the laws of any State or Territory of the United States authorizing him to practice as a certified public accountant in such State or territory. A "certified public accountant of the District of Columbia" is a person who is the holder in good standing of a certificate of certified public accountant issued under the Act of Congress approved February 17, 1923, as amended (42 Stat. 1261, ch. 94), or who is the holder in good standing of a certificate of certified public accountant or of an endorsement of certificate of certified public accountant issued pursuant to section 6 or 8, respectively, of this Act authorizing him to practice as a certified public accountant in the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia sitting as a board or their authorized agent or agents.

(c) The term "Board" means the Board of Accountancy.

(d) The term "person" includes partnerships, corporations and associations as well as natural persons.

(e) The term "he" and the derivatives thereof shall be construed to include the word "she" and the derivatives thereof.

SEC. 3. (a) No natural person shall assume or use the title or designation "certified public accountant" or the abbreviation "C.P.A.", or any other title, designation, words, letters, or abbreviations tending to indicate that such person is a certified public accountant, or is likely to be confused with "certified public accountant" or "C.P.A.", unless such person is a holder of a certificate of certified public accountant. No natural person shall engage or hold himself out to the public as

being engaged in the practice of public accountancy as a certified public accountant in the District of Columbia, unless such natural person is the holder of a certificate of certified public accountant of the District of Columbia or an endorsement of certificate of certified public accountant as provided in sections 6 and 8 of this Act.

(b) No partnership shall assume or use the title or designation "certified public accountants" or the abbreviation "C.P.A.'s" or any other title, designation, words, letters, abbreviations, sign, or device tending to indicate that such partnership is composed of certified public accountants, unless such partnership is registered as a partnership of certified public accountants under section 10 of this Act.

(c) No corporation shall assume or use the title or designation "certified public accountant" or the abbreviation "C.P.A." or any other title, designation, words, letters, abbreviations, sign, card, or device tending to indicate that such corporation is licensed as a certified public accountant or likely to be confused with "certified public accountant" or "C.P.A."

(d) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit any person, partnership, or corporation from practicing public accountancy either gratuitously or for hire: *Provided*, That such person, partnership, or corporation does not assume the title of "certified public accountant", or the abbreviation "C.P.A." or any other titles, designations, or abbreviations likely to be confused with "certified public accountant" or "C.P.A."

SEC. 4. (a) The Commissioners are hereby authorized and empowered to establish a Board of Accountancy, composed of three certified public accountants of the District of Columbia, to serve as their agent and to delegate to such Board of Accountancy any of the technical and professional functions vested in the Commissioners by this Act. Each of the members of the Board of Accountancy shall be registered in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of this Act and, at the time of appointment to the Board, shall have been engaged in the practice of public accountancy as a certified public accountant for a period of not less than ten years, at least five years of which shall have been in the District of Columbia. The requirements of the preceding sentence shall not apply to those persons who are members of the Board of Accountancy on the date of enactment of this Act. The length of terms for Board members shall be three years and no person shall be appointed to the Board for more than two terms. The Commissioners shall have the authority to determine from time to time the amount of compensation to be paid to Board members.

The Commissioners may remove any member of the Board of Accountancy for neglect of duty or for other sufficient cause.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners are authorized to adopt from time to time such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including, but not limited to, rules of professional conduct and grounds for denial, suspension, or revocation of any certificate, endorsement, or registration applied for or issued under this Act. The Board of Accountancy shall make recommendations to the Commissioners concerning the adoption of such rules and regulations. No such rules or regulations shall be adopted until after the Commissioners shall have held a public hearing thereon.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioners are authorized to issue a certificate of certified public accountant of the District of Columbia to any applicant furnishing to the Commissioners satisfactory proof that he has the following qualifications:

(1) Is at least twenty-one years of age;

(2) Is a citizen of the United States, or has declared his intention of becoming such citizen;

(3) Has actually and continuously resided in or has been domiciled in the District of Columbia or has been regularly employed in the District of Columbia on a continuous full-time basis for a period of not less than one year immediately prior to the date of filing an application, or, in the case of an employee of a certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants registered to practice in the District of Columbia, has been a bona fide resident of a foreign country for a period of not less than eighteen months immediately preceding the date of filing an application and is not qualified to be examined and to receive a certificate of certified public accountant in the State of last residence solely because of the aforesaid residence abroad;

(4) Has had the education and experience specified in section 7 hereof;

(5) Has successfully completed an examination in accounting and such related subjects as prescribed by the Commissioners;

(6) Is of good moral character; and

(7) Has paid all required fees.

(b) Applications for certificate of certified public accountant by examination approved prior to the effective date of this Act by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, created under prior law, shall be regarded as applications filed under this Act, and the terms and conditions governing carryover credits for having passed a part of the examination in effect at the effective date of this Act, shall control with respect to such applications.

(c) A person who holds a certificate of certified public accountant issued under the laws of the District of Columbia on the effective date of this Act shall not be required to obtain an additional certificate under this Act, but shall otherwise be subject to all the provisions of this Act and such certificate shall, for all purposes, be considered a certificate issued under this Act and subject to the provisions hereof. The holder of a certificate of certified public accountant which is in full force and effect, shall be styled and known as a certified public accountant and may also use the abbreviation "C.P.A.".

SEC. 7. (a) Commencing on the effective date of this Act and for one year thereafter the educational and experience requirements shall be:

(1) Completion of a four-year course of study at an approved high school, or the equivalent of such a course of study, and

(2) Completion of a resident course of study satisfactory to the Commissioners at an institution, junior college, or school of accountancy, or combination thereof, of not less than sixty semester hours of which a minimum of thirty semester hours shall have been in accounting theory and practice, in auditing, and in commercial law as affecting accountancy, and the remainder of the semester hours shall have been in subjects satisfactory to the Commissioners, and

(3) Not less than one year's experience satisfactory to the Commissioners in the full-time employment of a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia or of any State or territory of the United States, regularly engaged in the full-time public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant, or in the full-time employment of a firm of certified public accountants all the partners of which are certified public accountants of the District of Columbia or of some other State or territory of the United States, and said firm is regularly engaged in the full-time public practice as certified public accountants.

(b) Commencing one year from the date of enactment of this Act, the educational and experience requirements shall be:

(1) (A) Completion of a four-year course of study at an approved high school, or the equivalent of such a course of study, and

(B) Completion of a resident course of study satisfactory to the Commissioners at an institution, junior college, or school of accountancy, or combination thereof, of not less than sixty semester hours of which a minimum of thirty semester hours shall have been in accounting theory and practice, in auditing, and in commercial law as affecting accountancy and the remainder of the semester hours shall have been in subjects satisfactory to the Commissioners, and

(C) Not less than four years' experience satisfactory to the Commissioners in the full-time employment of a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia or of some other State or territory of the United States regularly engaged in the full-time public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant or in the full-time employment of a firm of certified public accountants, all the partners of which are certified public accountants of the District of Columbia or of some other State or territory of the United States, and said firm is regularly engaged in the full-time public practice as certified public accountants, or

(2) (A) Completion of a four-year course of study at an approved high school or the equivalent of such a course of study, and

(B) Completion of a resident course of study satisfactory to the Commissioners at an institution, junior college, or school of accountancy, or combination thereof, of not less than ninety semester hours of which a minimum of thirty semester hours shall have been in accounting theory and practice, in auditing, and in commercial law as affecting accountancy, and the remainder of the semester hours shall have been in subjects satisfactory to the Commissioners, and

(c) Not less than three years' experience satisfactory to the Commissioners in the full-time employment of a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia or of some other State or territory of the United States regularly engaged in the full-time public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant or in the full-time employment of a firm of certified public accountants, all the partners of which are certified public accountants of the District of Columbia or of any State or territory of the United States, and said firm is regularly engaged in the full-time public practice as certified public accountants, or

(3) (A) Completion of a four-year course of study at an approved high school or the equivalent of such a course of study; and

(B) Completion of a resident course of study satisfactory to the Commissioners at an institution, junior college, or school of accountancy, or combination thereof, of not less than one hundred and twenty semester hours with a major in accountancy satisfactory to the Board, or what the Board determines to be substantially the equivalent thereof, and

(C) Not less than two years' experience satisfactory to the Commissioners in the full-time employment of a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia or of some other State or territory of the United States regularly engaged in the full-time public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant or in the full-time employment of a firm of certified public accountants all the partners of which are certified public accountants of the District of Columbia or of some other State or territory of the United States and said firm is regularly engaged in the full-time public practice as certified public accountants.

(c) Commencing with the effective date of this Act, the Commissioners may, upon recommendation of the Board of Accountancy, except for any required year of certified public accountant employment as set forth in subsections (b) (1) (C), (b) (2) (C), (b) (3) (C) of this section, one and one-half years of actual and continuous experience of any person (1) in auditing the books and accounts of other persons in three or more distinct lines of commercial business in accordance with

generally accepted auditing standards, or (2) in a combination satisfactory to the Board of the experience described in (1) above together with auditing the books and accounts or activities of three or more governmental agencies or distinct organizational units in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and reporting on their operations to a third party, to the Congress, or to a State legislature, or (3) in reviewing financial statements and supporting material covering the financial condition and operations of private business entities to determine the reliability and fairness of the financial reporting and compliance with generally accepted accounting principles and applicable Government regulations for the protection of investors and consumers. Nothing in this subsection shall be interpreted as precluding consideration of Government experience for recognition under this subsection.

(d) In general, the educational and experience requirements specified in this section shall be those in effect on the final date for accepting applications for the examination for which the applicant first sits, but the Commissioners may permit exceptions to the general rule in order to prevent what they determine to be undue hardship to applicants resulting from changes in the educational and experience requirements made by this Act.

(e) The Commissioners are authorized and empowered to alter, amend, and otherwise change the educational and experience requirements specified in this section at any time, but in altering, amending, or changing said standards the Commissioners shall not be permitted to lower the same below the standards herein set forth.

SEC. 8. (a) The Commissioners may, in their discretion, waive the examination specified in section 6 of this Act and may issue an endorsement of certificate of certified public accountant, renewable periodically but no more frequently than annually, to an applicant who—

(1) is a certified public accountant of a State or territory of the United States, or who is the holder of a certificate of certified public accountant, or the equivalent thereof, issued in any foreign country, provided the requirements for such certificate are, in the opinion of the Commissioners, equivalent to those herein required; and

(2) meets the qualifications specified in clauses (1), (2), (4), (6), and (7) in subsection (a) of section 6 of this Act: *Provided, however,* That an applicant who is a certified public accountant in good standing of a State or territory shall not be required to meet more extensive educational and experience qualifications than those required by the District of Columbia at the time when such applicant was granted his certificate of certified public accountant by such State or territory; and

(3) declares his intention under oath of opening and maintaining or being employed in an office in the District of Columbia for the purpose of engaging in the full-time public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia.

(b) The holder of endorsement of certificate of certified public accountant, in full force and effect, shall have all of the privleges of the holder of a certificate of certified public accountant issued under section 6 of this Act and shall be subject to all of the provisions of the Act.

SEC. 9. Every certified public accountant engaged in or who proposes to engage in the public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant in the District of Columbia is hereby required to register periodically but no more frequently than annually with the Commissioners. A certified public accountant in the District of Columbia employed in the District of Columbia by another certified public accountant registered under this section or by a partnership of certified public accountants registered under section 10 of this Act, shall be regarded as a certified public accountant engaged in public practice and shall be required to register. Failure of a certified public accountant or registrant to apply for such original or renewal registration shall deprive him of the right to engage in or continue to engage in the public practice of his profession as a certified public accountant unless and until he subsequently applies for and obtains such registration.

SEC. 10. (a) A partnership which maintains an office within and engages in the full-time practice of public accountancy or a partnership which may hereafter wish to practice as such in the District of Columbia, may apply for registration, renewable periodically but no more frequently than annually, with the Commissioners as a partnership of certified public accountants, provided it meets all of the following requirements:

(1) Each partner thereof is a certified public accountant in good standing of the District of Columbia or of some State or territory.

(2) At least one partner or the resident manager thereof is a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia engaged in the full-time practice of public accountancy in the District of Columbia.

(3) Each partner thereof engaged in public practice as a certified public accountant in the District of Columbia is a certified public accountant of the District of Columbia.

(b) A registered partnership of certified public accountants, and only such partnership may use the title "Certified Public Accountants" and the abbreviation "C.P.A.s" in connection with the partnership name in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 11. After notice by registered or certified mail and reasonable opportunity for a hearing, the Commissioners are authorized and empowered to revoke, or suspend for not more than three years, any certificate, endorsement, or registration issued by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of this Act, or to refuse to grant or renew, any certificate, endorsement, or registration applied for in accordance with the provisions of this Act, or may censure the holder thereof if the applicant or holder thereof violates the rules of professional conduct or other rules and regulations adopted pursuant to this Act, or for other sufficient cause: *Provided,* That said denial, suspension, or revocation shall be made only upon specific charges in writing. A certified copy of any such charge and at least twenty days' notice of the hearing of the same, shall be served upon the holder of or applicant for such certificate, endorsement, or registration.

SEC. 12. The Commissioners are hereby authorized and empowered in connection with any hearing conducted pursuant to authority contained in section 11 of this Act, to subpena any necessary witnesses, books, papers, records, and documents. Any such hearing shall be considered an investigation of a municipal matter within the meaning of the Act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 591; D.C. Code, sec. 1–237).

SEC. 13. After notice and hearing are given as provided for in section 11 of this Act, the Commissioners may revoke or suspend the registration of a partnership or may censure a registered partnership for any of the causes described in section 11 of this Act, or for any of the following additional causes:

(1) failure to maintain the qualifications prescribed by section 10 of this Act;

(2) the revocation or suspension by the Commissioners of the certificate or endorsement of a certificate of certified public accountant of any partner; or

(3) the cancellation, revocation, suspension or refusal to renew the authority of the partnership or any partner thereof to practice public accountancy in any State or territory.

SEC. 14. The Commissioners shall adopt and prescribe administrative procedures for public hearings for the purpose of denial, suspension, or revocation of a certificate, endorsement, or registration.

SEC. 15. Upon application in writing and after hearing pursuant to notice, the Commissioners may issue a new certificate or endorsement of certificate of certified public accountant to a person whose certificate or endorsement of certificate shall have been revoked, or may permit the registration of a partnership or of a practicing certified public accountant whose registration has been revoked.

SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this Act shall prohibit any natural person not a certified public accountant from serving as an employee of or an assistant to a certified public accountant or a partnership of certified public accountants.

Nothing contained in this Act shall prohibit a certified public accountant or a partnership of certified public accountants of another State from temporarily performing specific accounting engagements in the District of Columbia on professional business incident to regular practice outside the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That such temporary practice is conducted in conformity with the rules of professional conduct promulgated by the Commissioners.

SEC. 17. Any person who violates any provision of section 3 of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Commissioners have reason to believe that any person is liable to punishment under this section, they may refer the facts to the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia, who may cause the proper proceedings to be brought, if, in his judgment, such as warranted. Prosecutions for violations of any provision of section 3 of this Act shall be conducted in the court of general sessions for the District of Columbia in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants.

SEC. 18. The use, display, or uttering by a person of a letterhead, listing, card, sign, advertisement, directory classification, or other printed, engraved, or written instrument or device, bearing a person's name in conjunction with the words "certified public accountant" or "certified public accountants" or any abbreviation thereof, shall be prima facie evidence in any action brought under section 17 of this Act that the person whose name is so displayed caused or procured the display or uttering of such letterhead, listing, card, sign, advertisement, directory classification, or other printed, engraved, or written instrument or device, and that such person is holding himself out to be a certified public accountant or partnership of certified public accountants.

SEC. 19. All statements, records, schedules, working papers, and memorandums made by a certified public accountant or by a partnership of certified public accountants incident to or in the course of professional service to clients, except reports submitted to clients, shall be and remain the property of such certified public accountant or partnership in the absence of an express agreement between such persons and the client to the contrary. No such statement, record, schedule, working paper, or memorandum shall be sold, transferred, or bequeathed, without the consent of the client or his personal representative or assignee, to anyone other than one or more surviving partners or new partners of such persons.

SEC. 20. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or to any circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this Act which can be given effect

without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Act are declared to be severable.

SEC. 21. The Commissioners are authorized and empowered, after public hearing, to establish, abolish, increase, or decrease, from time to time, fees and charges necessary to defray the approximate cost of administering the provisions of this Act. All funds derived from fees and charges collected relevant to the administration of this Act shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 22. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of revenues of the District of Columbia such funds as may be necessary to pay the expenses of administering and carrying out the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 23. The Act entitled "An Act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved February 17, 1923 (42 Stat. 1261), as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 24. This Act shall take effect ninety days after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

1. Page 1, line 5, strike out "1965" and insert in lieu thereof "1966".

2. Page 14, line 16, strike out "in" and insert in lieu thereof "of".

3. Page 14, lines 20 and 21, strike out "shall be regarded as a certified public accountant engaged in public practice and".

4. Page 14, line 21, immediately after "shall" insert "also".

5. Page 19, strike out line 1 and insert in lieu thereof "the District of Columbia court of general sessions in".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill—to be known as the "District of Columbia Certified Public Accountancy Act of 1966"—is to repeal present law—approved February 17, 1923, 42 Stat. 2161, District of Columbia Code, title 2, section 901—and set up new, improved, and modern standards for certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, to conform to those in most of the States. Thirty States now require higher qualifications for certified public accountants than does the District.

The present law providing for the regulation of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, and which created a Board of Accountancy in and for the District of Columbia, has been on the statute books without change since its passage in 1923, over 43 years ago. Most of its provisions have been outmoded as a result of developments in the profession and of changes in economic, social, and political conditions during the period since its adoption.

The primary purposes of the proposed new law are: First, to establish residence requirements for the taking of the examination for certified public accountant in the District of Columbia; second, to raise the education and experience requirements for eligibility to take such examination; third, to provide for the recognition of accounting experience gained in self-employment or with the Government; fourth, to provide for the certification of a certified public accountant in the District of Columbia by endorsement of his certificate from another jurisdiction; fifth, to provide for the registration of practicing certified public accountants; and sixth, to provide for the licensing in the District of Columbia of partnerships of certified public accountants where the partners who reside in the District of Columbia are certified in this jurisdiction and the other partners are certified in some State.

Existing law either fails to provide such requirements, or its provisions are inadequate with respect thereto.

The reported bill, in the judgment of your committee, eliminates these shortcomings.

PUBLIC INTEREST

It is in the public interest to raise the standards governing the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia so that they may be generally equivalent to those that now prevail over the major portion of the United States.

CPA standards are important to the public because the practice of certified public accountants constitutes a professional function intimately affecting the public interest. Business management, stockholders, credit and investment analysts, banks and other financial institutions, legislators, Government agencies—all must depend on certified financial reports. The CPA certificate is a mark of professional competence, integrity, and independence.

If an auditor's opinion, certifying that a financial statement fairly presents the position of a company is signed by a CPA, it means—

First. That the statement has been examined by a person who is fully qualified to express an expert opinion;

Second. That enough supporting evidence has been examined to justify the opinion;

Third. That the statement has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles; and

Fourth. That the auditor stakes his reputation on the soundness of his opinion.

The public's confidence in the ability and the integrity of the CPA must be continuously justified by the maintenance of high standards such as this bill provides.

ENDORSEMENT OF LEGISLATION

At a public hearing before your Subcommittee No. 4 witnesses were practically unanimous in support of this legislation. Your committee was advised that such legislation has been under consideration for over 8 years by the District of Columbia Board of Accountancy and by others in the public accounting profession, and that it has the overwhelming support of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia. The bill is deemed urgent and necessary by the Comptroller General of the United States; it is endorsed by the Securities and Exchange Commission; and recommended by over 15 State societies of certified public accountants.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, through their spokesman at the hearing and in correspondence, have stated that they are in accord with the purposes of this legislation. In fact, they recommended a number of specific amendments to improve the bill, which your committee adopted and which are contained in the reported bill.

The Commissioners further recommended that the committee consider general enabling legislation covering over 20 professions and occupations, including physicians, dentists, dental hygienists, nurses, practical nurses, physical therapists, optometrists, pharmacists, podiatrists, veterinarians, certified public accountants, architects, barbers, persons participating in boxing contests, cosmetologists, plumbers and gasfitters, steam engineers, professional engineers, real estate and business chance brokers and salesmen, undertakers, and electrical and refrigeration and air-conditioning contractors.

No bill has been introduced incorporating these proposals. However, in view of the number of professions and occupations included therein, it would take months of hearings and committee consideration before any determination thereon could be made by your committee. Further, your committee at this time has reached no decision to delegate to the Commissioners the revision of the various acts governing all these professions and occupations. Hence, it was the judgment of your committee to defer any conclusion as to general legislation until some more appropriate opportunity. Meanwhile, a fair case having been presented on behalf of the local certified public accountants for revision of their law, your committee finds no reason to postpone action on this specific legislation awaiting some possible action later on the general legislation referred to.

CONCLUSION

It is the judgment of your committee that the proposed legislation will protect the public interest by increasing the educational and experience requirements for certified public accountants in the District of Columbia to reasonable levels; it will make it easier for CPA's of the District to obtain reciprocity registration in other States; it will prevent the District from being used as an instrument for evading the legislative standards of the States; and it will simplify the work of the Board of Accountancy by providing for registration of all CPA's practicing in the District.

MY BILL IS LIMITED TO CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the proposed new law is of the permissive type—that is, it does not deal with public accountants other than certified public accounts—as is the 1923 act.

The District of Columbia Board of Accountancy advised your committee that it was of the unanimous opinion that the licensing of public accountants would create confusion and unnecessary and undesirable dual standards for the professional practice of public accountancy. The Board also concluded from conferences within the profession and other conferences with representatives of the business community that there was insufficient evidence of public need to warrant such licensing.

QUALIFICATIONS OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY

In recognition of the fact that the duties and responsibilities of Board members require substantial experience and exposure to the problems and aspirations of the profession, as well as the public interest, the bill—section 4—requires that each member of the Board of Accountancy shall have been engaged for at least 10 years in public practice as a certified public accountant, at least 5 years of which shall have been in the District of Columbia. This provision is similar to exiting laws as they apply to other professions; for example, the Board of Examiners and Registrars of Architects and the Board of Registration for Professional Engineers.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

The bill provides that applicants for the District of Columbia CPA certificate by examination must be residents of the District of Columbia or be employed therein for a minimum period of 1 year.

Under present law, the Board is required to examine all qualified applicants who are citizens of the United States no matter where they live or are employed.

Since all the States and territories of the United States now have duly constituted boards of accountancy which give the uniform CPA examination as does the District of Columbia, there seems to be no reason why the District of Columbia should provide facilities for examining applicants and issuing CPA certificates to those who do not reside or work in the area. In some cases, this now places the Board in the position of being the vehicle for the circumvention of the laws and regulations of other States, because some nonresident applicants for the District of Columbia certificate do not qualify for the examination in their home States.

Also, testimony before your committee was that experience has shown that many nonresidents who receive the District of Columbia CPA certificates use them as the basis for obtaining certificates from other States by reciprocity. These certificate holders do not live or practice in the Distict of Columbia and, accordingly, do not need District of Columbia certificates. Moreover, such persons are apt to be beyond the reach and control of the District of Columbia Board of Accountancy. It is understood that all or nearly all the States and territories have a residence requirement of applicants.

EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE

The education and experience requirements of present law are a high school education or equivalent, plus first, a diploma from some recognized school of accounting and 1 year's experience in the employment of a practicing certified public accountant; or second, 3 years' experience in the employment of a practicing certified public accountant, or third, 5 years of public accounting experience as a sole practitioner.

The reported bill—section 7—sets new requirements as follows:

A transitional period of 1 year after enactment, during which the requirements would be high school education or equivalent, at least 60 semester hours of study in an accountancy course, and 1 year's experience in the full-time employment of a practicing certified public accountant.

After that 1 year, the requirements may be met from a choice of the following combinations, added to high school education or equivalent:

First. Completion of a course of study of not less than 60 semester hours and 4 years' experience in the full-time employment of a practicing certified public accountant; or

Second. Completion of a course of study of not less than 90 semester hours and 3 years' experience in the full-time employment of a practicing certified public accountant; or

Third. Completion of a course of study of not less than 120 semester hours and 2 years' experience in the full-time employment of a practicing certified public accountant.

Raising the training and educational requirements for the CPA certificate is the principal means of furthering the standards of the public practice of the certified public accountant. The ever-increasing complexities of our economic environment require that the certified public accountant be more versatile and proficient than ever before.

Thirteen States now require an applicant to have obtained a college degree: Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, South Dakota, Utah, and West Virginia.

Thirteen other States have enacted laws requiring a college degree after a specified future date—generally 1967: Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Massachusetts, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Four other States require at least 60 college hours: Alaska, Iowa, Maryland, and North Carolina.

Thus, there are 30 States which have educational requirements greater than those required by law in the District of Columbia, and virtually all the States have more extensive experience requirements than the 1 year required under existing law in the District. Therefore, not only is it in the public interest to raise the requirements here but also it will only be a matter of time before a District of Columbia certificate of certified public accountant will not be recognized elsewhere if we do not keep pace with the States.

RECOGNITION OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTING AND GOVERNMENTAL ACCOUNTING EXPERIENCE

Under present law the experience requirement can only be met by, first, completion of a minimum of 1 year's employment with a practicing certified public accountant or a firm of certified public accountants; second, not less than 5 years' continuous self-employment in auditing the books and accounts of other persons in three or more distinct lines of commercial business.

Existing law does not authorize the Board of Accountancy to accept experience gained during employment by the Government. Some Government experience is of the type which prepares a prospective applicant for professional practice as a certified public accountant. Where this is the case, it should be recognized.

Under the bill—section 7—the experience requirement to sit for the CPA examination can be met by, first, employment with a practicing certified public accountant or a firm of certified public accountants; or, second, suitable experience in auditing the books and accounts of other persons in three or more distinct lines of commercial business in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards; or, third, a combination of the foregoing experience together with auditing the books and accounts or activities of three or more governmental agencies or distinct organizational units in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and reporting on their operations to a third party, to the Congress, or to a State legislature; or, fourth, in reviewing financial statements and supporting material covering the financial condition and operations of private business entities to determine the reliability and fairness of the financial reporting and compliance with generally accepted accounting principles and applicable Government regulations for the protection of investors and consumers.

Nothing in this provision, the bill states, shall be interpreted as precluding consideration of Government experience for recognition hereunder. In fact, the language of the original bills—H.R. 7624 and H.R. 9815—in this regard was changed by your committee upon the recommendation of the General Accounting Office, to permit full consideration by the Board of Accountancy of the experience of Government accountants, as shown in three above. Already a number of the States which require experience recognize the professional nature of the General Accounting Office work and accept General Accounting Office experience meeting eligibility standards required for their CPA certificates. Many of the GAO professional staff have already obtained their CPA certificates on the basis of General Accounting Office experience. Three hundred and ninety-one GAO staff members are holders of the CPA certificate, and 61 others who have passed the required examination will receive their certificates upon completion of their experience requirement.

The Securities and Exchange Commission reported to your committee that the above-referred-to provisions of the bill would make it possible for accountants employed by the Commission who regularly review financial statements filed with the Commission to fulfill the experience requirements referred to, and that this would be a long-needed improvement in the law as it would recognize what it believed to be a wide variety of high quality experience obtained by accounts employed by the Commission.

The Federal Government has become a major user and stimulator of independent audits. Inquiry to 26 Federal agencies reveals that 38,000 audits are stimulated or used each year by these agencies in 53 separate programs as compared with about half that number of

engagements just 5 years ago. The Securities and Exchange Commission alone uses 11,825 such audits annually. Other major users include Housing and Home Finance Agency, Interior Department, Small Business Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and Farm Credit Administration.

ENDORSEMENT OF CPA CERTIFICATES ISSUED BY OTHER JURISDICTIONS

Under present law, the Board of Accountancy may, and does as a matter of policy, waive the examination otherwise required and issue District of Columbia certificates to qualified holders of State certificates who want to practice as CPA's in the District of Columbia on a full-time basis. No distinction is made in the form of certificate issued in such cases from that issued to applicants who have passed the examination given by the Board.

The bill—section 8—provides that CPA certificates will be issued only to those who pass the examination given in the District of Columbia. However, qualified holders of certificates of other States would be granted reciprocity through the medium of endorsements, renewable periodically, attachable to their original certificates. No change in principle with respect to reciprocity is involved.

REGISTRATION OF PRACTICING CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

At present, the Board of Accountancy has no means short of complete periodic circularization of all certificate holders—which procedure was carried out by this Board for the first time about 6 years ago—of knowing what CPA's are in practice in the District of Columbia. It has been stated that perhaps the majority of District of Columbia certificate holders are either nonpractitioners or nonresident practitioners.

The bill—sections 9 and 10—provides for registration of CPA practitioners, including partnerships, with the Board as a condition precedent to public practice.

Your committee believes the law must be implemented with some such provision to enable the Board to discharge the continuing responsibilities imposed on it. It is not enough for the Board to exert control over those who enter the profession; it is legally as well as morally bound to protect the public and other practitioners against those in practice who may violate the law and generally accepted standards of professional practice and conduct. In order to discharge the latter duty, it goes without saying that the Board must know who is in practice.

It is understood that registration, such as is provided for in this section, is required of other professional people in the District of Columbia. Many jurisdictions in the United States also require registration of certified public accountants.

CPA FIRMS WITH NONRESIDENT PARTNERS

Under present law, firms having partners who are not District of Columbia certificate holders, but who hold CPA certificates in other jurisdictions, are not permitted to practice as CPA's in the District of Columbia. As a result, such firms classify themselves in the District of Columbia telephone and other directories and practice here as "public accountants."

The bill—section 10—remedies this situation by permitting firms to practice as CPA's provided all partners are CPA's of some State, and resident partners or resident managers are CPA's of the District of Columbia.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Remaining sections of the bill provide authority for rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of the law.

Others deal with revocation and suspension of certificates, endorsements, and registrations; hearings, notice, procedure, and review; reinstatement; acts declared unlawful; ownership of working papers; repeal of the present law and other legal matters. These matters are not adequately dealt with in present law.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House be permitted to insert their remarks in the RECORD immediately after each bill is passed today.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 9824) to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9824

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1132, as amended, 77 Stat. 347; title 35, section 410, D.C. Code, 1961 edition) is hereby amended by striking therefrom the first sentence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the reported bill is to amend section 11 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, as amended—title 35, section 410, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition—to permit insurance companies to make prompt public announcement of their financial standing.

STATEMENT

Under the insurance laws of the District of Columbia, domestic and alien insurance companies are presently prohibited from advertising or publicly announcing their financial standing except in exact conformity with the last preceding statement filed by them with the Superintendent of Insurance. Financial statements are required to be filed by March 1 each year for the year ending the preceding December 31. Statements are customarily filed on or shortly before March 1 each year.

Under the law as presently in force, an insurance company is precluded from making public announcement or advertisement of its financial standing for a given year until 2 months after the year ends. An extreme case may be cited as an example: if a company were to publish an advertisement or otherwise publicly announce its financial standing at any time prior to March 1, 1966—when its statement for 1965 is required to be filed—it would be constrained to publish only that information in the last annual report filed with the Superintendent—March 1, 1965—which would cover only the year ended December 31, 1964.

The public interest is best served when the companies can publish interim statements of current financial figures. No purpose is served by requiring the publication of outdated information which is from 1 year old to 14 months old.

The proposed amendment to section 11 of chapter II abolishes the requirement of publishing or advertising anachronistic data pending the filing of the statement for the most recent year ended. It would permit updated reporting to the public by allowing insurance companies to publish interim reports of operations and financial standing.

PRESENT LAW

The provision of present law—title 35, section 410, District of Columbia Code—which is deleted by this bill, reads as follows:

Every advertisement or public announcement and every sign, circular, or card issued by any domestic, foreign, or alien company doing business in the District representing its financial standing shall exhibit the amount of the capital stock actually paid up in case, the assets owned, the liabilities, including therein the premiums and loss reserves required by law, and the amount of surplus, and shall correspond to the next preceding verified statement made by such company.

Your committee is of the view that the public is properly protected against false or misleading statements through other provisions of present law vesting in the Superintendent of Insurance power to revoke or suspend a company's certificate of authority to do business should it misrepresent its status. This is because section 6, chapter II of present law—title 35, section 405, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition—remains unchanged. Pertinent provisions thereof are as follows:

The Superintendent shall have power to revoke or suspend the certificate of authority to transact business in the District of any company which has failed or refused to comply with any provision or requirement of chapters 3–8, or which—

* * * * *

(k) has made, issued, circulated, or caused to be issued or circulated any estimate, illustration, circular, or statement of any sort misrepresenting either its status or the terms of any policy issued or to be issued by it, or the benefits or advantages promised thereby,

or the dividends or shares of the surplus to be received thereon, or has used any name or title of any policy or class of policies misrepresenting the true nature thereof.

HEARING

At a public hearing before Subcommittee No. 4 on October 7, 1965, enactment of this legislation was urged by representatives of the outstanding domestic life insurance companies and by a representative of the District of Columbia Commissioners. No opposition to the bill has been expressed to your committee.

The favorable report of the Commissioners is set forth in full in the committee report—House Report No. 1479.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H.R. 13703 to make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13703

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 19–308 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "survivors" and inserting in lieu thereof "survivor".

SEC. 2. Section 20–2301(b) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "The United States attorney for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 13703 is to make certain technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code.

The need for these amendments arises because of errors in connection with the codification of titles 18, 19, 20, and 21 of the District of Columbia Code as enacted during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, act of September 14, 1965, Public Law 89–183.

Section 1 of the bill corrects an error made in the codification of section 19–308 of the District of Columbia Code, by striking out the word "survivors" and inserting the word "survivor" to conform with the provision of the existing law at the time the codification was undertaken.

Amendment in section 2 of the bill is to correct a reference to a section of the District of Columbia Code in the act of November 8, 1965, Public Law 89–347. Early in the 89th Congress, the House of Representatives approved legislation which was finally enacted on the above date. In the interim between action by the House and action by the Senate, title 20 of the District of Columbia Code was recodified and the section reference contained in the pending legislation was repealed and a new section designation was given in the codification. The amendment provides the proper section reference for the act of November 8, 1965.

Favorable report of the Commissioners on the proposed legislation is as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, April 5, 1966.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report H.R. 12966, a bill "To make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code." The purpose of the bill is to correct certain errors in phraseology inadvertently made in the codification, under Public Law 89–183, approved September 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 785), of part III of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Decedents' Estates and Fiduciary Relations."

Section 1 of the bill amends section 19–308, District of Columbia Code, by striking the word "survivors" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "survivor", so as to make clear that in the case of a person who dies intestate leaving no child, or descendent, his entire estate is to be distributed equally between his father and mother or the surviving parent. The singular form of the word was used in the corresponding provision of law formerly found in section 18–708, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, and no substantive change was intended in the codification thereof.

Section 2 amends section 20–2301(b), District of Columbia Code, by striking out "The United States attorney for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia". The amendment provides that the Corporation Counsel shall be made a party to any petition filed, pursuant to subsection (a) of section 20–2301, for the appointment of a receiver for the property of absentees and absconders from the District of Columbia. The substitution of parties provided by section 2 of the bill was, in fact, believed accomplished by section 10 of the act approved November 8, 1965 (79 Stat. 1309; Public Law 89–347), which made a similar amendment to former section 20–701, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition. However, section 20–701 had already been repealed by the act of September 14, 1965, and reenacted as section 20–2301, effective January 1, 1966. Section 2 of the bill is designed to remedy this oversight.

Section 3 of the bill provides effective dates for the amendments made by sections 1 and 2.

The Commissioners recognize the necessity for the clarification of law provided by the proposed technical amendments and recommend that the bill be passed.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Comissioners, District of Columbia.

PRESERVATION AND USE OF OLD GEORGETOWN MARKET

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 14205) to declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14205

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the real property, together with all structures thereon on the date of enactment of this Act, described as lot 800, square 1186, of the District of Columbia, commonly known as the Old Georgetown Market, is hereby declared a historic landmark, and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to preserve such property as a historic landmark and to operate and maintain it as a public market, except that the Board is authorized to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the use of a portion of such property as a museum to be operated by the Secretary in connection with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. Such property shall not be used under authority of any provision of law for any purpose not provided in this Act, unless (1) such law is enacted after the date of enactment of this Act and (2) specifically authorizes such property to be used for such other purpose.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of legislation which would restore the Old Georgetown Market to the function for which it was deeded to the District of Columbia in the first years of the past century, and which, in addition, would recognize the worth of this structure as a historical site.

As the committee knows, I sponsored similar legislation, in the interest of the farmers of Virginia who have brought their produce to Washington for many years; and, despite the suggestion of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that this type of merchandising was out of date, and not to be encouraged, have found a ready market.

The committee, in its hearings, found, as its report has reflected, that there not only continues to be a market for the produce of these farmers—from Virginia and Maryland—but that there also is an acceptance of a merchandising center for their wares close to one of the residential areas of the highest value in the city.

It is in recognition of this fact, I am sure, that the committee has brought to the House a bill to return this worthy old structure to the purpose for which it was

intended—that of a public market—which not only honors the deed under which the property passed into public ownership, but also, recognizes the present acceptance of a facility of this kind in Georgetown.

Additionally, I should like to compliment the committee on its amendment of the various bills introduced to include a feature providing for a museum function in the structure. The old building not only could be restored to its original use under this bill but also could serve as a visitor center for the historic Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, which is located only a few yards behind the building.

On behalf of the Virginia farmers—and I know my Maryland colleagues join in the interest of their farmers—I want to compliment the committee on its careful consideration of this legislation, and on the form of the bill which it has brought to the floor—and which I support.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, in today's age of exploding scientific miracles, there seems to be a concerted rush to automate everything from combs and can openers to entire factory complexes. Sometimes, in our zeal for the fastest, the biggest, the superefficient, we forget that there is still room in many cases for the so-called "old ways" which may not necessarily be the best ways, but which still may offer their own unique advantages.

I think we have such a situation in the nearly worldwide disappearance of the old farmers' market concept. Even the internationally known Les Halles in Paris has finally succumbed to the inevitable march of progress and the encroachments of the supermarket. Right here in Washington we have the opportunity today to preserve what is believed to be the oldest public market on the eastern seaboard, the Old Georgetown Market on M Street.

One of the District of Columbia measures we are considering today would preserve the market at the same time declaring it a historic landmark, to be converted in part for use by the Department of the Interior for a museum in connection with the C. & O. Canal.

The bill would insure that District of Columbia residents and our area farmers would be able to avail themselves of the unique advantages of a permanent farmers' market in the increasingly rare atmosphere of our historic past. I support H.R. 14205 and urge my colleagues to save this 160-year-old link with the past.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, while it is true that this bill bears my name, many of our colleagues indicated their enthusiastic endorsement of this positive idea by themselves introducing companion bills aimed at the restoration of the Old Georgetown Market.

This bill, H.R. 14205, would restore the Old Georgetown Market to its former use as a live, useful, and colorful marketplace wherein the fresh farm produce from the nearby Virginia and Maryland farm communities could be marketed firsthand. Additionally, a portion of the restored market would be used as a museum portraying the historical aspects of this venerable marketplace which dates back to the year 1802. This bill would require the District government to restore to active use this property in Old Georgetown which was deeded in perpetuity to the District of Columbia with the firm stipulation that this property be used solely as a public market; the deed is quite clear on this point.

The numerous witnesses—farmers and District citizens—who appeared before your committee convincingly attested to the need for such a market outlet for farm and specialty produce from the nearby farming areas. Your District Committee unanimously agreed.

Mr. Speaker, the sole opposition to this bill was offered by the District Commissioners who felt that the market would not pay for itself. Their contention is arguable. Nonetheless, the Commissioners did see merit in preserving it as a market museum and historical landmark. Now, it seems to me that if money can be had to restore the market as a historical landmark, why not restore it to active, colorful and productive use? The need is there. The income from rentals would help amortize the $185,000 which the District government estimates it will cost for alterations and repairs. As far as paying customers are concerned, many District civic groups and private citizens appeared before your committee with the appeal that the market be usefully restored and assured the committee that patronage would not be lacking. The Georgetown Citizens Association—for instance—certainly a group hypersensitive to any facility which might possibly mar the historical traditions and architecture of Old Georgetown, testified that it strongly endorsed the preservation of the Old Georgetown Market—not only as a historical landmark but also as a useful, functioning enterprise. The Georgetown Association, as did others, expressed the solid conviction that patronage for the market would not be lacking and that the very fresh produce trucked in from the nearby farms would be a most welcome treat for the tables of our District citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia is full of quiet, beautiful and restful museums and galleries dedicated to the arts and to the past—and rightly so. But, here we have a rare opportunity to combine the best of both worlds—historic restoration combined with a living and productive contact with the here and now.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when both farmers and consumers generally need help, I strongly urge my colleagues to act favorably on this very desirable bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] to call up any bills reported from his subcommittee.

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL JUDGES TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS AND INCREASE RETIREMENT SALARIES OF CERTAIN JUDGES

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 2263) to establish a traffic branch of the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to provide for the appointment to such court of five additional judges, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2263

An act to establish a Traffic Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and to provide for the appointment to such court of five additional judges

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 11 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by adding immediately after chapter 11 of such title the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 12—TRAFFIC BRANCH OF COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

"Sec.

"11–1201. Establishment of branch.
"11–1202. Judges; assignments.
"11–1203. Sessions.
"11–1204. Jurisdiction; powers.

"§ 11–1201. Establishment of branch

"The Traffic Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions is hereby established as a branch in the criminal division of the courts.

"§ 11–1202. Judges; assignments

"The Traffic Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall consist of two judges of the court, who shall serve in that branch during their tenure of office. The chief judge of the court may, if he finds the work of the Traffic Branch will not be adversely affected thereby, assign any of the judges of the Traffic Branch to temporarily perform the duties of any of the other judges of the court. The chief judge of the court shall also have the authority to assign any of the other judges of the court to serve temporarily in the Traffic Branch if, in the opinion of the chief judge, the work of the Traffic Branch requires such assignment.

"§ 11–1203. Sessions

"The Traffic Branch, with at least one judge in attendance, shall be open for the transaction of business every day of the year (including night sessions), except Saturday afternoons, Sundays, and legal holidays.

"§ 11–1204. Jurisdiction; powers

"The Traffic Branch and each judge sitting therein shall have the same jurisdiction over, and exercise the same powers in connection with, offenses arising out of violations of laws or regulations of the District of Columbia relating to the operation, licensing, registration, inspection, or parking of motor vehicles; the regulation and control of motor vehicle traffic; the issuance, suspension, or revocation of motor vehicle operating permits; and motor vehicle safety responsibility, as that lawfully had or exercised by the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions on the date immediately preceding the effective date of this section."

SEC. 2. The Traffic Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall have jurisdiction over all offenses arising out of any such violations referred to in section 11–1204 of the District of Columbia Code pending in the Court of General Sessions on the effective date of section 11–1204 of the District of Columbia Code.

SEC. 3. Section 11–904 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "section 11–1103" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 11–1103, 11–1203,".

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 11–902 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "fifteen associate judges" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty associate judges".

(b) Two of the judges appointed to the additional positions authorized by the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section to section 11–902 of the District of Columbia Code shall, during their tenures of office, serve as judges of the Traffic Branch of the Court of General Sessions.

SEC. 5. The table of contents of part II of the District of Columbia Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure", is amended by inserting immediately after

"11. Domestic Relations Branch of Court of General Sessions___ 11–1101"

the following:

"12. Traffic Branch of Court of General Sessions_____ 11–1201".

SEC. 6. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall become effective sixty days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

1. Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 11–902(a) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out 'fifteen' and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty'.

"SEC. 2. Section 11–1701(a) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(8) A judge receiving retirement salary pursuant to this section shall be entitled, for any period for which he performs full-time judicial duties under this subsection, to receive the salary of the office in which he performs such duties, but there shall be deducted from such salary an amount equal to his retirement salary for such period.

"'(9) A judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals or the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions who has retired prior to the effective date of section 306 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 shall receive an increase in the retirement salary to which he is otherwise entitled under this section in the same percentage as the increase in salaries provided in section 306(i)(2) and section 306(i)(3) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 for judges who are serving on the effective date of such section 306 on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.'

"SEC. 3. The increases in compensation authorized by the amendments of this Act shall be retroactive to July 1, 1964."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the gentleman from North Carolina a few questions.

Does this bill propose five additional permanent judges; or does it propose to make possible the use of retired judges—or does it propose to do both?

Mr. WHITENER. I will say to the gentleman, the bill does provide for five additional judges in the court of general sessions of the District of Columbia.

As to the second inquiry, under existing law retired judges of the court of general sessions are subject to recall for duty as members of that court. However, under existing law there is a limit of 90 days that a retired court of general sessions judge may be required to serve.

This bill would have the effect of permitting retired judges who spend their full time or a portion of their time to be compensated for their service.

Mr. GROSS. So that this bill would provide for five additional permanent judges. The authority already exists for calling in retired judges, as I understand it, but the call is circumscribed by the inability to take care of the retirement pay; is that not correct?

Mr. WHITENER. The situation we now have is that there is one judge who has been retired for some time and for the past 2 years he has held court on a full-time basis without compensation other than the retirement pay that he earned prior to his retirement.

I might point out to the gentleman, knowing of his interest in financial matters, that this is one area in which there is no cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now that raises an interesting question—no cost to the taxpayers. Because fines are levied, you say that compensates for the costs of these judges or more than compensates for them. I read that in the report. But how about charging off some of the revenues collected by way of fines to pay police officers who arrest the culprits in the first place, thereby providing the courts with the business from which the revenue is derived? I do not believe it is quite as simple as saying that because a judge levies a fine that his salary and all other costs are being paid out of revenue collected.

Somebody had to get the criminal or the culprit there in the first place or the court would not have that opportunity. I think the costs of law enforcement officers should also be given some consideration.

Mr. WHITENER. Let me say to the gentleman that one of the sources of revenue of the court of general sessions is from the civil side of the court where the law enforcement bodies no not necessarily come into play.

If the gentleman will remember, a few years ago we passed legislation here which increased the jurisdiction of the court of general sessions from $3,000 to $10,000 in civil actions. At the time we did not increase the judicial manpower. This increase in jurisdiction has resulted in a tremendous increase in the civil proceedings in the local court and at the time we had our hearings the statistics were rather startling, that the court has been able to do as well as it has.

I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the orderly administration of justice requires an adequate amount of judicial manpower, and without passing this legislation, we would further add to the unfortunate situation which exists.

Mr. GROSS. It was not so long ago that one of the judges of the court system in the District of Columbia publicly stated that some of the judges were not working the hours that they ought to be working; that it was hard to find some judges in their courtrooms after 3:30 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon, if I remember the newspaper accounts correctly.

Did the committee go into this and, if so, did they find that all judges are spending the hours we could reasonably expect the judges to hold court?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. I will be happy to answer the gentleman in the words of Chief Judge John Lewis Smith, of the court of general sessions, who testified before the committee as follows:

Judge SMITH. I might say, as far as the court of general sessions is concerned, our judges are authorized 36 days' leave a year. That is computed on the basis of their availability for Saturday assignment. They work a five-and-a-half-day week. Ordinarily we would be entitled to 26 days' leave. We do not take a recess during Easter. We work a staggered schedule during Christmas holidays. We discontinue civil and criminal jury trials only. All our statutory courts are in operation all through our Christmas holidays. But, as a practical matter, our judges take an average of 21 days' leave a year.

Mr. GROSS. Aside from that, will the gentleman agree with me that if they are not continuing the operation of their courts beyond 3:30 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon, they are not spending the time that we should reasonably expect them to spend in their courtrooms?

Mr. WHITENER. From my experience in the courts, I do not think you can operate courts on a timeclock basis. Many circumstances arise which call for early recessed courts from day to day. There are many occasions when judges might call a court into session early in the morning. There are some judges who take an hour for the luncheon recess, others who take 2 hours, and some in between. I just do not believe that you can——

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is an attorney; I am not an attorney. How many hours a day does the gentleman think a judge ought to spend on the bench?

Mr. WHITENER. Down my way, in the actual trial of cases in cities, we usually go from 10 o'clock to 12:30, and from 2:30 to 4 or 5 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. I was astounded by a statement of one of the judges in the District of Columbia that some of the judges were leaving, I believe, around 3:30 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon; that it was difficult to find certain judges operating after 4 o'clock in the afternoon. It seems to me that with the heavy backlog of cases, which the report indicates, they ought to be on the job. I call the gentleman's attention to page 4——

Mr. WHITENER. May I interrupt the gentleman to say this. We have no evidence before our subcommittee which would indicate that they are not on the job.

Mr. GROSS. I refer to the last sentence on page 3 and carrying over into page 4, which indicates that for the first 6 months of the current fiscal year, there were 45,285 criminal cases filed as compared with 39,137 in the same period last year. Can these figures possibly be correct? This represents almost a 16-percent increase in criminal cases in the District of Columbia in a 6-month's period. Can this be correct?

Mr. WHITENER. Of course, the gentleman understands that these figures include the traffic offenses, which are rather numerous.

Mr. GROSS. Even so——

Mr. WHITENER. I do not know that we have a breakdown which would satisfy the gentleman as to the nature of the cases. Certainly some of them are serious offenses. Some of them are traffic offenses.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman that this is a situation officials of the District of Columbia should find difficulty in boasting about or trying to alibi out of.

Mr. WHITENER. Of course, I am sure the gentleman did not mean to imply that the Committee on the District of Columbia is trying to alibi crime.

Mr. GROSS. Not at all, but these figures are shocking. I am glad the District of Columbia Committee put them into this report, because I think they are most revealing.

Mr. WHITENER. Also we can commend the Police Department for the splendid work they are doing in the apprehension of those engaged in crime.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman, but there is something left to be desired as to responsibility on the part of some citizens of the District in view of the fact that such a situation exists.

Mr. WHITENER. I agree with the gentleman in his last remarks.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of S. 2263, as amended, are twofold as follows:

First. To authorize an increase in the number of associate judges in the District of Columbia court of general sessions from 15 to 20. This is designed to expedite the administration of criminal justice, thus lending aid to the war on crime in the Nation's Capital, and also to provide the citizens of the District of Columbia with swift justice in civil cases;

Second. To bring the compensation of the retired judges of the District of Columbia court of appeals and the District of Columbia court of general sessions in line with the pay raises granted, as of July 1, 1964, by Congress to all the other judges of these courts. It is the opinion of your committee that such legislation is necessary and appropriate in order that the same salary ratio between active and retired District of Columbia judges under present law be retained.

I. AUTHORITY FOR ADDITIONAL JUDGES

BACKGROUND

The District of Columbia court of general sessions is unique in that it performs judicial functions which would normally be handled elsewhere by both municipal and State courts. It is required to dispense justice in criminal cases in the nature of misdemeanors and also to hear most civil cases in which damages up to $10,000 are sought. This court operates in two divisions, civil and criminal, and is further organized into the landlord and tenant court, traffic court, the domestic relations branch, and the small claims and conciliation branch.

At present, the District of Columbia court of general sessions is beset with serious and substantial caseloads and docket delays in both the civil and the criminal divisions. Despite the best efforts of the chief judge and the associate judges, the court has not been able materially to diminish this problem, even though crash programs have resulted in short-term reductions of docket time. The problem is simply a shortage of judicial manpower adequate to cope with the problem, which results from the coincidence of a number of factors.

In 1957, the rate of incidence of crime in the District of Columbia was at an all-time low. However, the ratio has risen steadily since that time, and in 1965 reached its highest point in the history of the city. This increase is continuing steadily during the present year, with the figures each month setting a new shameful record in the number of criminal acts committed in the Nation's Capital. A considerable number of these offenses are misdemeanors rather than felonies, and hence are assigned to the court of general sessions.

Prior to 1963, the present District of Columbia court of general sessions was designated as the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and its civil jurisdiction was restricted to those cases in which not more than $3,000 in damages was sought. However, Public Law 88–60, approved July 8, 1963 (77 Stat. 77), changed the name of the court and also increased its jurisdiction to include all civil cases involving damages up to $10,000. Prior to that time, all civil cases in which damages in excess of $3,000 were sought were assigned to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Despite this extensive new jurisdiction which was thus vested in the court of general sessions, with the inevitable result of a substantial increase in the caseload, no increase was authorized in the number of judges for the court. Thus, the court of general sessions has been laboring since that time with a judicial staff which had been established in 1956, consisting of one chief judge and 15 associate judges.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

During the past 10 years, there has been an increase of 61,169 cases filed annually in the court of general sessions, which represents an increase of 35.08 percent in the caseload. Over the same period, the annual collection of fees, fines, and forfeitures has increased by $2,546,434.74, or 117.15 percent.

In fiscal year 1965 alone, 235,535 new cases were filed in the criminal and civil divisions—an increase of 9,403 cases over the number filed in fiscal year 1964. Fees, fines, and forfeitures totaled $4,720,010.80, an increase of $550,523.01 over the comparable figure for fiscal 1964. During the first 6 months of fiscal 1966, 122,621 new cases were filed—an increase of 8,937 cases or 7.86 percent over the corresponding period of the previous year. Fees, fines, and forfeitures totaled $2,426,996.77—$158,243.29 more than in the first 6 months of fiscal 1965.

ESTIMATED COST

It is estimated that the annual cost of adding five new associate judges to the court of general sessions, including supporting personnel, will be $398,665.70. However, it should be noted that the court is one of the few self-sustaining branches of the local government. In fiscal year 1965, court revenues—fees, fines, and forfeitures—totaled some $4,720,010. During the same year, the operating expenses of the court amounted to only $1,981,642. Thus, it is anticipated that the full cost of expanding the court will be more than met out of revenues developed by the court.

CONCLUSIONS

Your committee feels strongly that a clear need exists for increasing the size of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, in order to guarantee to all parties before the court the swift and equitable administration of justice in all cases, civil and criminal.

The constantly increasing volume of cases coming before this court, in the opinion of your committee, has reached a point which prevents the proper disposition of the cases by normal procedure and also prohibits the satisfactory preparation of cases by attorneys for the Government in the public interest. This problem has become intolerable and must be resolved.

It is the belief of your committee that more expeditious handling of the caseload of the court of general sessions will prove an important weapon in the war against crime in the Nation's Capital. Further, more rapid disposition of all cases will aid materially in solving the problem of witnesses' lack of cooperation or departure from the jurisdiction because of numerous continuances of cases set for trial. Also, this will effectively reduce the man-hours spent by police in court and thus return more police to the streets for the all-important work of crime prevention.

It is the conviction of your committee, supported by the unanimous testimony of reliable witnesses, that the acquisition of the five additional associated judges which this bill will authorize, will enable the District of Columbia court of general sessions under the proven administrative skill of the present chief judge to cope effectively with the judicial responsibilities incumbent upon it. Accordingly, your committee earnestly hopes that the bill will receive favorable action by this body and that the additional judges may be appointed without undue delay.

REASONS FOR AMENDMENTS

As passed by the Senate on August 24, 1965, S. 2263 contained two major provisions which are not included in the bill as amended and reported by your committee.

The first of these provisions would have established a separate traffic branch in the criminal division of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, to be served exclusively by two of the five new

judges authorized by the bill. The bill as passed by the Senate would have permitted the chief judge to assign these two traffic court judges temporarily to other branches of the court of general sessions when such assignment would not adversely affect the work of the traffic branch, or to assign other judges of the court to serve temporarily in the traffic branch when the work in the traffic branch required such extra manpower. However, this limited authority would not permit the usual rotation and assignment of these two judges by the chief judge, as is presently authorized on a regular basis for all judges, into all branches of the court.

At a public hearing conducted by Subcommittee No. 5 on March 14, 1966, the chief judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions expressed objection to this provision, and particularly to the requirement that two of the new judges authorized by the legislation be assigned permanently to the traffic branch. He expressed the view that it would be a serious mistake to infringe in any way upon the flexibility of assignment of all the associate judges according to the shifting needs of the court, as this system of rotation and assignment is in accord with sound principles of judicial administration and highly essential to the effective operation of this court. Further, the chief judge expressed the opinion that it would be very difficult to obtain the services of any new judges of desirable caliber if they were offered exclusive assignment to the traffic branch. In this connection, the witness pointed out also that not one of the present 15 active judges in the court of general sessions has expressed a willingness to accept a permanent assignment to the traffic branch, and that past experience as chief judge has convinced him that judges perform most efficiently when assignments are rotated.

On this subject, the chief judge received unanimous support from all the other witnesses, who represented the U.S. Department of Justice, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the American Bar Association, and the District of Columbia Bar Association.

The second of these provisions deleted from the bill by your committee would have required the traffic branch to hold a set schedule of night sessions.

The traffic branch of the court was established by the Traffic Act of 1925, and since that time there has been a full-time judge operating in this area. There was a night court in operation from 1925 until 1929. At the end of this 4-year period, however, inquiry by the appropriations committees of the Congress as to the effectiveness of this night court brought forth the opinion of the chief judge that there were not a sufficient number of people coming into the night sessions to make them worthwhile. As a result, night sessions of the traffic court were discontinued at that time and have not been resumed.

As a matter of fact, the chief judge has the authority to order night sessions of any branch of the District of Columbia court of general sessions whenever he deems it expedient to do so. However, there has been very little necessity for such night sessions. In fiscal year 1965, for example, out of 26,000 cases filed in the small claims and conciliation branch, only 58 requests were made for night trials. These were disposed of by one night session per month.

The traffic branch meets regularly 5 days per week and on Saturday mornings, and its docket is current at the present time.

In view of these facts, it is the opinion of your committee that a requirement of night sessions for the traffic branch on any regular basis would serve no useful purpose and thus would involve a needless expense, and that the additional five associate judges which this bill would provide will enable the chief judge within his present authority to administer the court to the satisfaction of the public interest.

Also in this connection, all the witnesses at our hearings concurred with this view, and in fact expressed approval of the entire bill as amended and reported by your committee.

II. INCREASE COMPENSATION OF RETIRED JUDGES

The 16 judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, and the 3 judges of the District of Columbia court of appeals are all included in the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964—H.R. 11049, passed by the Congress. However, through inadvertence, no provision was included therein to cover the two retired judges—one in the court of appeals and one in the court of general sessions. Inasmuch as each of these judges has continued to perform active service in the two courts named, it is felt that in fairness and justice they should be entitled to a proportionate raise in their compensation.

By the reported bill, those judges who have heretofore retired will have their retirement salary computed under the same formula and at the new rate of compensation as will be the case with judges who may in the future retire under Federal Employees Salary Act—Public Law 88-426. In other words, there will be, and in the opinion of your committee there should be, no difference in the status of presently retired judges and judges who may retire in the future, at least insofar as such retirement occurs under the existing law.

In addition, when retired judges are called upon to perform full-time judicial duties, under this bill they will receive active duty salary of the office in which they perform such duties.

BACKGROUND

The Consolidation Act—Public Law 512, 77th Congress, 2d session—approved April 1, 1942, provides—in section 11—for retirement of judges after serving 20 years or more, with compensation in equal monthly installments in the sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge on the date of such retirement that the total of his aggregate years of service bears to the total of 30 years.

Paragraph (b) of the same section provides that any judge receiving retirement salary may be called upon by the chief judge of either court to perform such judicial duties as may be requested of him for a period up to 90 days in any year. But there is no provision therein for full salary for active duty pay.

Your committee believes that it has been firmly established by the Congress that Government employees, whether judicial, military, civilian, or other, should receive full pay when performing full active duty.

The fact of the matter is, as stated, that both the retired judges have continued to perform active service, and one of them has given full time on the bench for the last 2½ years, due to court vacancies, sickness, and vacations, and, of course, neither has received the compensation of a full-time judge, even though he has worked full time. The reported bill would obviate such injustice.

Except for the provision giving full salary for active duty, this bill is identical to H.R. 12198 of the 88th Congress, which passed the House on August 11, 1964—House Report No. 1726—and to H.R. 1066, which passed the House on February 8, 1965.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "An act relating to the composition of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, and to increasing the retirement salaries of certain judges, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFERRING CERTAIN FUNCTIONS FROM U.S. DISTRICT COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1611) to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1611

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 561 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1279), as amended (sec. 1-504, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking "United States District Court for the District of Columbia or a judge thereof", and inserting in lieu thereof "Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent."

SEC. 2. Section 563 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1279), as amended (sec. 1-506, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended to read as follows: "Each notary public

shall file his signature and deposit an impression of his official seal with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent, and the Commissioners or their designated agent may certify to the authenticity of the signature and official seal of the notary public."

SEC. 3. Section 572 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1280), as amended (sec. 1–515, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking "United States District Court for the District of Columbia", and inserting in lieu thereof "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions".

SEC. 4. Section 573 of the Act approved March 3, 1901, as amended (sec. 1–516, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking "clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia", and inserting in lieu thereof "Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent".

SEC. 5. The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 13 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia", approved May 28, 1924, as amended (sec. 2–513, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting a period in lieu thereof, and striking the remainder of the sentence.

SEC. 6. Sections 877, 878(b) and 878(f) of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1333), as amended (secs. 48–101, 43–302, and 48–306, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), are amended by striking "clerk of the United States District Court for", and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of".

SEC. 7. (a) The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate in the District of Columbia the traffic in, sale, and use of milk bottles, cans, crates, and other containers of milk and cream to prevent fraud and deception, and for other purposes", approved July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 809), as amended (sec. 48–201, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking "clerk of the United States District Court for" wherever that term appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of".

(b) The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize associations of employees in the District of Columbia to adopt a device to designate the products of the labor of their members, to punish illegal use or imitation of such device, and for other purposes", approved February 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 50), as amended (sec. 48–401, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking from the second sentence "clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and the clerk", and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and the Recorder"; and by striking the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "A certified copy of the drawing may be obtained upon the payment of $1 for each certification.".

SEC. 8. Subsection (a) of section 15–101, District of Columbia Code is amended by striking from clause (1) the word "or"; by striking from clause (2) "District Court—", and inserting in lieu thereof "District Court; or"; and by inserting immediately following clause (2) the following:

"(3) civil division of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, if the judgment or decree was rendered on or after the effective date of this clause—".

SEC. 9. (a) Subsection (a) of section 15–102, District of Columbia Code, is amended by striking from clause (2) the word "and"; by striking from clause (3) "forfeited—" and inserting in lieu thereof "forfeited;"; and by inserting immediately following clause (3) the following:

"(4) recognizance taken by the criminal division of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, or judge thereof, from the time when it is declared forfeited (if the forfeiture occurred on or after the effective date of this clause); and

"(5) judgment or decree rendered in the civil division of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions after the effective date of this clause—".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 15–102, District of Columbia Code, is amended by striking "after being forfeited," and inserting in lieu thereof "forfeited prior to the effective date of subsection (a)(4),".

SEC. 10. Subsection (a) of section 15–132, District of Columbia Code, is amended by striking "(a) A" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) (1) Except as provided by section 15–101, a"; and by inserting at the end the following:

"(2) A judgment entered on or after the effective date of this paragraph in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions may not be docketed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The provisions of this title relating to enforcement of judgments, executions thereon and writs and proceedings in aid of execution thereof, are applicable to judgments entered on or after the effective date of this paragraph in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions."

SEC. 11. Section 15–310, District of Columbia Code is amended by striking from the first sentence "An" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) An"; by striking from the second sentence "It" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, it"; and by inserting at the end the following:

"(b) An execution issued on a judgment entered on or after the effective date of this subsection in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions may be levied on real estate."

SEC. 12. Section 15–311, District of Columbia Code, is amended by striking from the first sentence "The writ" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) The writ"; and by inserting at the end the following:

"(b) A writ of fieri facias issued from the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions upon a judgment entered in that court on or after the effective date of this subsection may be levied on legal leasehold or freehold estates of the debtor in land."

SEC. 13. (a) Sections 1288, 1290, 1291, and 1293 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1392), as amended (secs. 30–106, 30–108, 30–110, and 30–112, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), are amended by striking "United States District Court for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions".

(b) Section 1288 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1392) as amended (sec. 30–106, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is further amended by inserting at the end of the following: "The clerk of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and such deputy clerks of the court as may, in writing, be designated by the clerk of the court and approved by the chief judge, are authorized to celebrate marriages in the District of Columbia."

(c)(1) The fifth paragraph under the heading "Hygiene and Sanitation in the Public Schools" under the caption HEALTH DEPARTMENT" in the first section of the Act entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes", approved February 25, 1929 (45 Stat. 1285), as amended (sec. 30–115, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is repealed.

(2) The clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall transfer all marriage records in his custody (including marriage records transferred from the health department) to the clerk of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.

(d)(1) Paragraphs (11), (12), (13), and (14) of section 15–706(e) of the District of Columbia Code are repealed.

(2) Chapter 7, title 15, District of Columbia Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

§ 15–717. Marriage license and related fees

"For each marriage license, the fee shall be $2; for each certified copy of a marriage license return, the fee shall be $1; for each certified copy of applications for marriage license the fee shall be $1; and for registering authorizations to perform marriages and issuing certificate, the fee shall be $1.

"The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions may, by rule of court, increase or decrease fees provided by this section."

(3) The analysis of chapter 7 of title 15 preceding section 15–701 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by inserting at the end:

"15–717. Marriage license and related fees."

SEC. 14. Subsection (e) of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, authorize appropriations, and for other purposes", approved August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 946), as added by the Act approved June 4, 1943 (57 Stat. 100, 109, 110), as amended (sec. 46–304, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking from the second and from the penultimate sentences "clerk of the United States District Court for" and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of".

SEC. 15. (a) Sections 1238, 1239, and 1241 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1384, 1385), as amended (secs. 38–102, 38–103, and 38–105, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), are amended by striking "clerk of the United States District Court for" and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of".

(b) Sections 1238 and 1246 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1384, 1386), as amended (secs. 38–102 and 38–110, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), are amended by striking "clerk" and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds".

(c) In addition to fees otherwise provided for, the Recorder of Deeds shall charge and collect the following fees:

(1) for filing and recording each notice of mechanic's lien, $1;

(2) for entering release of mechanic's lien, 50 cents for each order of lienor; and

(3) for each undertaking of lienee, 75 cents.

SEC. 16. The Act entitled "An Act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens", approved June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 990, 991), as amended (secs. 38–202 and 38–305, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking from sections 2 and 5 "clerk of the United States District Court for" and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of"; and by striking the second sentence of section 5 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Recorder of Deeds shall index the same in the name of the injured person and shall charge and collect a fee of $1 for recording, indexing, and releasing the lien so filed."

SEC. 17. Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 6323 of subchapter C of chapter 64 of the Act entitled "An Act to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States", approved August 16, 1954 (68A Stat. 779; 26 U.S.C. 6323), is amended to read as follows:

"(3) WITH RECORDER OF DEEDS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—In the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, if the property subject to the lien is situated in the District of Columbia."

SEC. 18. Section 6 of title I of the Act entitled "An Act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 673, 674), as amended (sec. 47–1406, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by striking "clerk of the

United States District Court for", and inserting in lieu thereof "Recorder of Deeds of"; and by striking "said court" and inserting in lieu thereof "the United States District Court for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 19. Paragraphs 16 and 18 of section 15–706(e), District of Columbia Code, are repealed.

SEC. 20. Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this Act are authorized.

SEC. 21. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which is at least ninety days after the date of approval of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

1. Page 3, line 4, strike out "877, 878(b), and 878(f)" and insert in lieu thereof "878b, and 878f".

2. Page 10, strike out lines 9 through 13, and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 17. (a) Section 6323(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:".

3. Page 10, immediately after line 17, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) Section 548a of the Act approved March 3, 1901 as added by the Act of April 27, 1945 (59 Stat. 100), is amended by striking 'SEC. 548a.' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'SEC. 548a. (a)' and by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

"'(b) The Recorder of Deeds shall accept for filing any notice of Federal tax lien or any other document affecting such a lien if such notice or document is in the form prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate and could be filed with the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The fee for each such filing with the Recorder of Deeds shall be the same as the fee charged by the Recorder of Deeds for filing a similar document for a private person. The Recorder of Deeds shall bill the district director of Internal Revenue on a monthly basis for fees for documents filed by such district director. Any document releasing or affecting any notice of Federal tax lien which has been filed with the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia prior to the effective date of this Act shall be filed with such clerk.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill—submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia—is to transfer a number of functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia.

The functions transferred by the terms of this bill are all of a nature which are not customarily performed by a U.S. district court, but rather by a local court or by some local administrative agency.

The bill, in providing for the transfers of functions, carries out specific recommendations contained in a study submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, and which such committee directed be made pursuant to House Report No. 1708, 85th Congress. The study and the recommendations included in such study were prepared by representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, and the government of the District of Columbia.

FUNCTIONS TRANSFERRED

Notary public: The bill designates the District Commissioners, in lieu of the clerk of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, as the depository for filing papers, records, signatures, and District of Columbia court of general sessions, rather than the U.S. district court, to remove a notary public for cause.

Trademarks, trade names: Designates the office of the District of Columbia Recorder of Deeds, in lieu of the clerk for the U.S. district court, as the depository for filing trademarks, trade names, labels, and brands.

Judgments: Makes extensive changes respecting the docketing of judgments and decrees rendered in the District of Columbia court of general sessions.

Recordation of liens: Designates the Office of Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia in lieu of the clerk for the U.S. district court, as the depository for mechanics liens, Federal tax liens—United States Code, section 6323—District personal property tax liens, District of Columbia unemployment compensation tax liens, and hospital liens.

Marriage licenses: Transfers from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the court of general sessions, the function of issuing and recording marriage licenses, licensing persons to celebrate the rites of marriage, and fixing the fees in connection with the issuance thereof. Also authorizes the transfer from the U.S. district court of all marriage records to the custody of the clerk of the District of Columbia court of general sessions. Provision is also made for the said clerk and the deputy clerks of such court, when designated by the chief judge, to celebrate marriages in the District of Columbia, which follows the practice now provided for in Maryland and in several counties in Virginia.

Optometry: Relieves the U.S. district court of the responsibility of receiving for filing certified copies of optometrists' registrations. Retains the Department of Occupations and Professions of the District of Columbia government as custodian of such records.

COST OF LEGISLATION

Our committee is advised that the enactment of S. 1611 will involve some additional cost to the District government. The District of Columbia Commissioners estimate that the cost will amount to approximately $13,856 for the first year, and that such cost occurs as the result of marriage license and lien recordation functions being transferred to the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to the Office of Recorder of Deeds.

AMENDMENTS

In addition to the technical amendments to section 6, your committee amended section 17 of the bill as passed by the Senate to authorize the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia to receive for filing Federal tax liens and related documents so that the forms prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury for use by the Internal Revenue Service could be received by the Recorder as they are in other jurisdictions.

Thus, the Recorder of Deeds shall accept for filing any notice of a Federal tax lien or other document affecting such a lien when it is on such form and bears such signature as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The charge made by the Recorder of Deeds for such filing shall be the same as the fee for filing of a similar document by a private person. On a monthly basis, the Recorder of Deeds shall bill the District Director of Internal Revenue for fees for documents filed.

Where any notice of a Federal tax lien has been filed with the Clerk of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia prior to the effective date of this act, any document releasing or affecting such notice of Federal tax lien shall be filed with the clerk of such court.

ENDORSEMENT OF LEGISLATION

On June 9, 1965, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia held public hearings on S. 1611. Representatives of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and of the District of Columbia Bar Association testified in support of the bill. Letters recommending enactment of this proposed legislation were received by your committee from the Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, from the chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, and the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. Approval was expressed also by the Judicial Conference of the United States during its session on March 18, 1965. Your committee is aware of no opposition to the enactment of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 846, Rept. No. 1485), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 846

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14732) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as

ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 846, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 846?

The question was taken, and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 846.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 88]

Abernethy	Feighan	Morse
Adair	Findley	Moss
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fino	Multer
Bandstra	Fisher	Murphy, N.Y.
Baring	Flood	Murray
Bingham	Fogarty	Nedzi
Blatnik	Fraser	Nix
Bolling	Frelinghuysen	O'Brien
Brademas	Giaimo	O'Neill, Mass.
Brock	Goodell	Pepper
Brown, Calif.	Grabowski	Philbin
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Greigg	Pickle
Broyhill, N.C.	Griffin	Powell
Burleson	Gubser	Quie
Cabell	Hagan, Ga.	Quillen
Cahill	Hall	Randall
Callan	Hansen, Wash.	Resnick
Callaway	Harvey, Ind.	Rivers, S.C.
Carter	Hawkins	Roberts
Casey	Helstoski	Rodino
Celler	Herlong	Rogers, Colo.
Chelf	Hull	Roncalio
Clark	Huot	Rooney, N.Y.
Cleveland	Hutchinson	Rosenthal
Clevenger	Ichord	Rostenkowski
Cohelan	Irwin	Rumsfeld
Collier	Jacobs	St Germain
Colmer	Jennings	St. Onge
Conte	Jones, Ala.	Schneebeli
Conyers	Karsten	Scott
Cooley	Kee	Shipley
Corman	Kelly	Slack
Culver	Keogh	Stafford
Curtin	King, Utah	Sullivan
Curtis	Kluczynski	Sweeney
Diggs	Kornegay	Talcott
Dingell	Kupferman	Thompson, N.J.
Donohue	Laird	Toll
Dorn	Leggett	Tunney
Dow	Long, La.	Tupper
Dowdy	McCarthy	Utt
Downing	McDowell	Vanik
Duncan, Oreg.	McEwen	Vigorito
Edmondson	McVicker	Waggonner
Edwards, Calif.	Macdonald	Walker, Miss.
Ellsworth	Mackay	Watkins
Fallon	Mailliard	Whalley
Farbstein	Martin, Mass.	White, Idaho
Farnsley	Mathias	Williams
Farnum	Michel	Willis
	Monagan	Wilson, Bob
	Morgan	Wolff

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 278 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 846 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 14732, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

H.R. 14732 would authorize appropriations for the AEC for fiscal year 1967 for operating expenses in the amount of $1,964,128,000, and for plant and capital equipment in the amount of $295,830,000, making a total authorization of $2,259,958,000.

The Atomic Energy Commission's authorization request for fiscal year 1967, as originally submitted, called for authorizations of $1,978,820,000 for operating expenses, and $295,500,000 for plant and capital equipment, making a total requested authorization of $2,274,320,000.

Later the AEC transmitted a proposed amendment to section 106 of its authorization request, which increased the request for plant and capital equipment by $500,000. The Commission's amended total request, therefore, became $2,274,820,000.

You will note that the amount authorized in H.R. 14732 is $14,862,000 less than the amount requested by the AEC.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will go into details of the bill during debate, and I urge that House Resolution 846 be adopted in order that the bill H.R. 14732 may be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule which would make in order the consideration of this bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1967.

Hearings on this bill were begun, before the committee of which I am a member, on last January 25, a day after the President's budget message had been received. Those Members who have read the report will see that in over 20 hearings, consuming more than 42 hours, all of the aspects of this bill have been thoroughly discussed by witnesses representing both industry and the Government.

Because it is my privilege to serve not only on the Committee on Rules but also on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I wish to take just a moment to pay tribute to the distinguishd chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who I believe deserves the real appreciation and tribute of this House for the dedicated work he has carried on not only in connection with this bill but also in connection with all the oversight functions of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As the gentleman from Texas said, this bill does carry with it a slight reduction in the amount which was requested in the budget for the Atomic Energy Commission.

One question which has been put to me today—a question which I know is of great interest to many Members—is, What does the bill do so far as the 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator is concerned? Actually, there is very little money in the bill for that purpose; I believe there is $2.2 million to carry on some design studies. It will not actually provide for the architect and engineering or construction work which ultimately will be required if this accelerator is to be constructed.

I believe this is a sound authorization bill. The hearings were full and complete.

I believe the House should overwhelmingly today approve not only the rule but also the authorization bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14732) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14732, with Mr. BURKE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] will be recognized for 1 hour. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 14732, is to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1967. Pursuant to section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Joint Committee has considered the authorization for both operating and plant and capital equipment funds for the AEC for the next fiscal year. Our committee has considered this subject exhaustively over a period of 7 weeks. At the conclusion of our hearings the Joint Committee reviewed the AEC's requested authorization and filed a com-

prehensive report which recommends a number of changes in the AEC's request, and offers policy guidance to the executive branch in a number of important areas.

H.R. 14732 was reported out by the Joint Committee without dissent. It represents the unanimous judgment of Members from both sides of the aisle and from both Houses. As chairman of the Joint Committee I am confident that this is a prudent authorization bill.

The bill provides for the following authorization for the AEC:

For operating expenses	$1,964,128,000
For plant and capital equipment	295,830,000
Total authorization	2,259,958,000

This represents a reduction of about $15 million from the amount requested by the AEC. By way of further comparison, the total AEC authorization recommended by our committee for fiscal year 1967 is $295,563,000 less than the authorization recommended by our committee and approved by Congress for fiscal year 1966. In general, the AEC's program has been characterized by substantial declines in the amounts requested and authorized for the raw materials, special nuclear materials, and weapons programs, whereas the AEC's other programs have continued at about the same funding level, or increased.

Section 101(a) of H.R. 14732 would authorize appropriations of $1,964,128,000 for operating expenses for the AEC's major programs. I would like to explain several highlights of the committee's recommendations with respect to this authorization.

First. In the nuclear weapons program, the committee recommends the addition of $10 million to the AEC's authorization request. The additional funds are needed for the AEC's underground nuclear weapons testing program, to help assure an effective, comprehensive, and aggressive program. I should note that even with the $10 million increase recommended by our committee, the AEC's total weapons program operating costs for fiscal year 1967 would be $53,400,000 less than the amount approved by Congress for fiscal year 1966.

Second. In the reactor development program, the committee has recommended a net reduction of $365,000 from the AEC's operating fund request. In this connection I wish to report that major changes have taken place in the civilian power reactor development program in the past year. As of January 1, 1965, there were approximately 1,000 megawatts of nuclear-powered electrical generating capacity in full operation in the United States. This amounted to about one-half of 1 percent of our total installed electrical generating capacity.

During 1965, orders were placed for approximately 4,700 megawatts of additional nuclear-generating capacity, about one-fifth of the total generating capacity ordered during this period. Moreover, during just the first 4 months of 1966, utilities announced firm contracts for the addition of approximately 3,700 megawatts of nuclear-generating capacity, approximately one-half of the total generating capacity additions announced during this period. In addition, plans have been announced for the construction of 1,600 megawatts more capacity, for which firm contracts have not been executed. All of the announced nuclear capacity additions were boiling and pressurized water reactor types.

The significant increase in the number and size of nuclear reactors ordered is encouraging. It is also cause for particular vigilance. In our report, the Joint Committee has urged the nuclear industry to give the closest attention to design and construction factors, in order to assure that requirements are met and that a high degree of reliability is built into these plants so that they will become, in the minimum period, economical additions to utility systems.

As I have stated, our report on the AEC's authorization bill summarizes increases in planned additions of nuclear-generating capacity in the last year. We think this is a significant increase in such a new technology.

Some have expressed concern that the growing application of nuclear power will result in a decrease in the use of coal-fired powerplants. I think the history of our growth in overall needs for power clearly shows that we will need all the power we can get from all sources. For example, the data put together by the National Coal Association show that in 1964 we consumed 479 million tons of coal while in 1965 we consumed 510 million tons, which is an increase of 6.4 percent in 1 year. The March 1966 issue of the Mining Congress Journal contains an article which factors in the growth of nuclear power and states that coal consumption is expected to double during the period between 1960 and 1980.

I recently heard of a report prepared for internal use by the General Electric Co., which may be causing people in the coal industry some concern. I got in touch with Mr. James Young, vice president of the General Electric Co., to find out what this matter was about. He told me that it concerned a study which had not gotten the attention of the responsible people in his organization and was based on erroneous assumptions. Due to these erroneous assumptions the erroneous conclusion was reached that coal demands would drop to zero by the year 2060. I asked Mr. Young to write me a letter explaining this, which I am including in the RECORD at this point:

GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.,
May 9, 1966.

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding there has been circulated a General Electric report entitled "Energy Inputs to United States, 1800–2060," that concludes that the demand for coal will go to zero by the year 2060.

As I mentioned to you on May 7, 1966, this report was produced by a GE long-range planning component, not associated with the divisions of the company responsible for our energy business; nor was it reviewed by the management of these divisions, as is the normal policy. The report was produced for internal consideration; and was inadvertently released.

The avowed intent of the report was to evaluate the domestic energy demand in all sectors, and the associated distribution of supply from the competing energy sources, for 1800 to 2060. The conclusions reached do not agree with the company position relative to the demand for coal and resulted from largely erroneous assumptions without regard to the realities of the future environment.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. YOUNG,
Vice President and General Manager, Atomic Products Division.

The past year has also witnessed a continuing shift in emphasis away from Government support of light water reactors being offered on a commercial basis. The Government is now concentrating its research and development program on the more advanced reactor types, particularly the fast breeder reactors. These are the reactors which truly hold forth promise of providing this Nation and the world with a limitless supply of energy. In order for nuclear power to contribute significantly to the solution of our long-term energy needs, it is essential that breeder reactors be developed. AEC's budget request for this year contains a significant increase for fast breeder reactor development work. The committee vigorously endorses an increased level of effort in the fast breeder reactor program, and urges the Commission to complete its formulation of this program at the earliest practicable date.

During our authorization hearings we were also informed of an increase in private industrial support of fast breeder reactor development. The committee has strongly encouraged nongovernmental support of work in this field, and increased commercial competition. We hope this trend will continue.

The Joint Committee views the civilian reactor development program as a dynamic one requiring changes in effort as progress is made. The new developments which have occurred in the last year or so—such as the sharp increase in the number of power reactors ordered and progress in the fast breeder area—are cause for an updating of the overall program plans which have provided guidelines for the Government's efforts. For this reason, the committee has urged the AEC to update its 1962 report to the President on the civilian nuclear power program. It may well be that such a review would show that increased effort is called for in certain areas—such as fast breeder work.

In this connection, the committee has asked the Commission to reconsider the advanced converter reactor program, under which a number of reactor concepts have been supported. One of these concepts is the heavy-water, organic-cooled reactor. Although approving the full amount requested by the AEC for heavy-water, organic-cooled reactor development for fiscal year 1967, including $2 million requested for preliminary architect-engineer work on a prototype, the committee has cautioned the AEC to continue to maintain the closest surveillance and direction of this work, and to eliminate effort not directly required to establish the technical feasibility of using this concept for the competitive generation of power.

Technical problems have also been experienced with the other two reactor concepts being developed as part of the AEC's advanced converter program. These concepts are the seed-blanket reactor and the high-temperature gas-cooled reactor. As explained in our committee's report, the seed-blanket reactor program has been reoriented from a cooperative demonstration project to a research and development base program. A significant amount of information has been developed by Admiral Rickover concerning this concept during the past year. Admiral Rickover also continues to have confidence that a successful seed-blanket breeder core design can be developed. The potential benefits to be derived from breeding in a uranium-thorium fuel cycle, with a light water reactor, are very great and the committee has approved this reorientation. With respect to the high-temperature gas-cooled reactor program, our committee's report observes that careful attention should be given by the AEC to all relevant technical and economic data before any decision is made to proceed with construction of a reactor prototype.

In this respect, I should like to reiterate our committees' views that the AEC's civilian nuclear power program is a development program which is intended to ascertain the advantages and disadvantages of particular reactor systems. Successes or failures of particular projects cannot accurately be predicted in advance. If they could, there would be no need for the project in a development program. The committee's main concern is that the AEC outline all of the data that are developed in the various phases of the program and base its future actions on the technical and economic facts which are learned. Lines of effort which do not appear to be feasible or promising, or which do not offer significant advantages over alternate systems should be promptly dropped.

Included in the AEC's reactor development program is the sum of $500,000 for study work on the application of nuclear propulsion to merchant vessels. The Joint Committee is disappointed that the AEC and the Maritime Administration still have not completed their evaluation of the application of nuclear power to merchant vessels. Accordingly, research and development effort cannot be supported at this time and further efforts must be limited to studies. The AEC recently reported to our committee that the executive branch is still studying this problem to determine if the potential benefits are worth the costs involved. The committee was informed that if the study indicates that effort in this field was justified, and if an agreement is reached with the Maritime Administration on the objectives of such a program, research, and development effort involving actual systems and hardware will be initiated. During our authorization hearings, representatives of the maritime industry asked for an opportunity to testify concerning the application of nuclear propulsion to merchant ships. The committee stated in response to this request that hearings would be held as soon as possible. Subsequently, industry representatives asked that the proposed hearings on nuclear merchant ships be deferred. The Joint Committee has, therefore, postponed immediate hearings.

Third. In the physical research program, the committee has recommended authorization of the full amount requested by the AEC. I would like to emphasize in this connection that 42 percent of the Commission's physical research budget is for high energy physics research, which is a frontier research program. As our committee report pointed out last year, high energy physics is an expensive program which is national in scope and not related solely to the mission of any one agency. Operating costs of $109.8 million are projected for fiscal year 1967. The AEC is acting as the manager of this national research effort, and the Joint Committee agrees with Dr. Donald F. Hornig—the President's science adviser—that the AEC is uniquely fitted to carry out this management role. However, our committee wishes to reiterate our intent that desirable expansion in the Nation's high energy physics program shall not be at the expense of other vital AEC activities.

I wish to add for the information of the Members that included within the high energy physics budget is the sum of $2.2 million for continued advanced accelerator design studies for the proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator. However, the AEC has not requested, nor has the committee authorized, funds for engineering design or construction for the 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator. The AEC is at present evaluating the six locations for this accelerator that were recommended by the National Academy of Sciences.

Fourth. For the biology and medicine; training, education, and information; and isotopes development programs our committee has recommended cuts totaling over $2 million. We believe these important programs can continue at an effective rate notwithstanding these reductions.

Fifth. In the Commission's plowshare program, involving peaceful use for nuclear explosives, the Joint Committee has added $1.5 million to the AEC's budget request for the conduct of an experiment involving a contained underground nuclear explosion to demonstrate the feasibility of increasing natural gas production. Our committee believes there are significant advantages to be derived from this experiment, which is to be conducted on a cost-sharing basis with private industry. If this experiment is successful it can point the way to substantial increases in our natural gas reserves, and in revenues to the Federal Government from the leasing to private industry of Federal lands containing natural gas deposits.

I will now summarize very briefly the remaining sections of H.R. 14732.

Section 101(b) authorizes $246,530,000 for plant and capital equipment obligations for the AEC.

Sections 102, 103, and 104 are general provisions similar to those contained in previous AEC authorization acts.

Section 105 would amend the AEC's Authorization Act for fiscal year 1958 by extending for an additional year—to June 30, 1967—the date for approving proposals under the third round of the AEC's cooperative power reactor demonstration program.

Section 106 would increase by $49,300,000 the amounts authorized for certain projects approved in prior years. This amount is included within the total authorization for the AEC which I mentioned at the outset.

Section 107 would amend the AEC's fiscal year 1966 Authorization Act by rescinding the authorization for the large seed-blanket reactor cooperative project, except for funds heretofore obligated. As I have already said, our committee feels that continued research and development work on the seed-blanket concept is warranted.

Mr. Chairman, we on the Joint Committee are fully mindful of our responsibilities to Congress and the people of this country when we consider a matter of such vital importance as the AEC's authorization bill. This bill provides funds to insure our continued preeminence both in the military and the civilian uses of atomic energy.

I reiterate that H.R. 14732 was reported out by the Joint Committee without dissent, and I urge its enactment in its present form.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I shall be glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. In connection with that line of thought on the part of the gentleman from California what agency or what program is responsible for information with respect to the equipment of satellites for instance with nuclear warheads and the ability to detect nuclear warhead satellites—to detect them and perhaps to explode them in space?

What agency, what committee, and what program has the direct responsibility for this?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The Department of Defense is responsible for stating the requirements for detection equipment. Those requirements, if they are in the field of research and development, will be conducted under research projects in the Atomic Energy Commission laboratories, to the greatest degree possible. In some degree there might be a development program in the laboratories of the Department of the Air Force. However, there would be close coordination by both. The eventual manufacture of the hardware would be a request of the Department of Defense, which request would go to the regular Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, how about the research and development for the detection of such a device put in orbit by an unfriendly country or any other country for that matter?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, we have certain satellites which gather intelligence at this time that are actually in orbit. But most of their intelligence is in the way of weather intelligence and certain

photographic ability as well as meteorological data, and that sort of thing. We have equipment developed by the AEC laboratories which is flown in satellites to detect nuclear explosions in space. We have not at this time developed a satellite that can detect whether a nuclear weapon is aboard an orbiting satellite.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the subcommittee which handles these research and development projects.

Mr. PRICE. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I can assure the gentleman from Iowa that this matter is being worked on by both the AEC and the Department of Defense. However, unfortunately, it is the type of matter which we cannot go into in detail, except I shall be very happy to discuss it with the gentleman from Iowa later.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further—I do not expect to get any specific details on the House floor with respect to this matter. Is NASA involved in this too?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. NASA is a civilian agency and they are involved in weather satellites and that sort of thing. Of course, in the developing of weather satellites, that is, weather satellites which can be used for civilian purposes, the data obtained is available to the military agencies as well.

Mr. GROSS. I greatly hope that we are making progress in this field. It seems to me this is far more important than any trip to the moon or landing on the moon. I think we ought to dedicate a lot of effort to this, and to some system of detection and some system for disposing of any weapons, any nuclear weapons, that may be put in space by some country—and certainly if they are put in space by some unfriendly country.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I assure the gentleman that the Member now speaking in the well of the House shares that view 100 percent and we are watching it closely.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], the ranking member, and all other members of the committee for bringing to us such a constructive report. At the same time that I am commending the members of the committee, of course, I wish to commend the staff, because the staff has placed in this report all the information that is necessary to understand what is being done in this particular field, as well as what is proposed to be done during fiscal 1967.

I think it is one of the most constructive reports that has been put out from time to time. As the committee has considered this legislation and has considered the appropriations which will be made under the authority that has been granted in this legislation, it seems to me that any Member who is interested should be able to get his answers from this report, to any questions he may have in this field.

I wish to join my colleagues from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in urging enactment of H.R. 14732, to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the next fiscal year. As the chairman of the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Raw Materials, I also wish to discuss an important aspect of the Commission's budget; namely, the uranium procurement program.

Since 1946, the AEC has spent about $5.4 billion to purchase uranium from domestic and foreign sources. This material represents a great national asset which does not deteriorate in stockpile. The vast majority of this material has been used in connection with the military aspect of the atomic energy program. However, an increasing amount is being used for civilian purposes, primarily in central station nuclear powerplants. In all cases of civilian nuclear powerplants, the Federal Government is paid on a full cost recovery basis for uranium consumed.

I believe the Government's uranium procurement program has been a successful one in terms of fostering the development of a natural resource. During and immediately after World War II, the United States was a "have-not nation" as far as uranium was concerned. However, as a result of a number of incentives offered by the AEC—and resulting large-scale exploration activities by private industry—substantial deposits of uranium were discovered in this country and this vitally important material was made available for military and civilian uses.

Deliveries of uranium to the AEC have declined every fiscal year since 1960, and will continue to do so in 1967. By December 31, 1970, the AEC uranium procurement program is scheduled to end.

During the course of the committee's authorization hearings, we received considerable testimony from the AEC and others concerning domestic reserves of uranium, and requirements for uranium stemming from the rapidly expanding civilian nuclear power program. The statistics of nuclear power growth are obviously very significant from the standpoint of our uranium reserves. A large increase in these reserves is necessary to support forecast civilian power requirements. However, the history of the uranium program illustrates how the law of supply and demand can result to the discovery of substantial new deposits of valuable materials.

The apparent need for a large increase in uranium exploration activities, supported by private industry, is recognized by all concerned. Our committee believes this is a facet of the atomic energy program for which private industry should now bear the primary responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate my support of H.R. 14732.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I should like also to express my appreciation for the work of the staff and my appreciation for the cooperation that my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], the ranking minority member, and the members on his side of the aisle gave to the hearings, the consideration of the bill, and the marking up of this legislation.

The bill has received full consideration by Members on both sides of the aisle, and it is a bill that I think we can all be proud of and report to the Congress without reservation.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to take this opportunity to commend my chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and the ranking Republican on our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], and also the staff, who have worked so hard on this bill. This is a bill that every Member of the Congress can support, and I am particularly grateful to the chairman for all the hard work that he has done on this legislation.

The Joint Committee has reported out H.R. 14732 unanimously. I fully support this recommendation. I would like to take this time, moreover, to call to the attention of the Members of the House an important initiative that the Joint Committee took in connection with the AEC's request for funds for fiscal year 1967.

Included in the AEC's activities is a program for the application of nuclear explosives to peaceful purposes. This is known as Project Plowshare. The Joint Committee has pointed out in its report on this bill that such peaceful applications can contribute significantly to the U.S. economy and that these capabilities, once developed, can be made available by the United States to other nations to assist them in their excavation projects and in the development of their resources.

One of the important things that we believe nuclear explosives can accomplish is the breaking up of huge tonnage of subsurface rock. Such fracturing of underground rock may lead to the recovery of large quantities of gas, oil, and other mineral resources that we cannot presently recover economically by conventional means.

As an example of what this may mean, I would like to point out that in the western part of these United States there exist geological formations that contain great quantities of natural gas. However, most of these reservoirs cannot be stimulated by conventional means to give up this natural gas in an economical manner. The Atomic Energy Commission, its Lawrence Radiation Laboratory and the Bureau of Mines, together with the El Paso Natural Gas Co., have studied the means of applying nuclear explosives to the stimulation of these presently unproductive gas fields. They have concluded that it is feasible and safe to conduct an experiment to determine whether nuclear explosives can assist in the economical recovery of such gas. Their studies have indicated that the best place for such an early experiment

is the pictured cliff formation in northern New Mexico.

The AEC requested funds from the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1967 to carry out this experiment, but the Bureau of the Budget did not allow this request to be submitted to the Congress. In 2 days of hearings on March 11 and 15 the Joint Committee went into detailed hearings with regard to this experiment, which is known as Project Gasbuggy. Let me tell you about one of the things that we discovered during the course of our hearings. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and responsible for seeing that not only our present generation but future American generations as well have the natural resources they need to carry on a secure and vital economy, has written to the AEC in the following words:

> If nuclear explosives can be used to stimulate production by fracturing rock in * * * deep, thick, low-productivity reservoirs, as our engineers are convinced, significant increases in recovery can be effected. We estimate that, in Rocky Mountain reservoirs alone, the total increase in production may be as great as 317 trillion cubic feet. This is a greater quantity of natural gas than our present proved reserves of 281 trillion cubic feet.
>
> A total of 317 trillion cubic feet of natural gas has a potential value of about $35 billion. Many of the Rocky Mountain gas reservoirs to which nuclear-explosive stimulation might be applicable are on Federal land, from which the Government derives royalties. Funds received from leasing Federal lands for petroleum and natural gas include bonuses, land rentals, and royalties. An exact relationship does not exist between such receipts and the wellhead price, but the average is about one-eighth the wellhead price. Thus the potential income to the Government would exceed $4 billion.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that there is an immense economic potential in the use of nuclear explosives for stimulating the production of natural gas. There is also the promise that a successful experiment in Project Gasbuggy with nuclear explosives will lead the way to economical recovery of oil and other natural resources as well. In view of these facts, the Joint Committee has taken the initiative in authorizing for the Plowshare program for fiscal year 1967 an additional amount of $1½ million so that the Commission may go forward with plans for the conduct of the Gasbuggy experiment, in cooperation with the El Paso Natural Gas Co.

Now, the total cost of this project, which it is anticipated will be spent over a 2-year period, is $4.7 million. Let me point out, however, that the El Paso Natural Gas Co. is willing to contribute $1½ million of its own in drilling, technical, and other logistic services in order to see this experiment come to fruition. Let me assure you that the El Paso Natural Gas Co. will not receive any information from this experiment that is not also made available to every other gas or oil company that wishes to have this information. This cooperative effort by El Paso Natural Gas Co. is just another example of constructive and enlightened self-interest that can contribute to all. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that such enlightened self-interest is what this country needs more of.

This is a challenging and very important project that can benefit every citizen of the United States. I hope it will have the full support of this House.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, will the Chair advise how much time I have consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has consumed 21 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire and consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with other members of the committee in commending to the House the prodigious efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], the respective chairman and ranking House minority member of this committee, for the fine, outstanding work which they have done relative to this legislation.

The members of the Joint Committee on both sides of the aisle support H.R. 14732, which would authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1967. In this connection I would like to address my remarks to three general subjects, as follows:

First, accelerators: H.R. 14732 contains $150,000 for research and development to support the work of the 400-million-electron-volt linear electron accelerator for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Last year we authorized $4.6 million for construction of the machine, for which MIT is presently selecting a site. This work is in the medium energy physics program.

This House has also heard a great deal about the proposed very large accelerator—the 200 billion electron volts. Authorization for the proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator is not, as our chairman has told you, in this year's AEC request nor in the Joint Committee's recommendations.

I wish to add a few words about existing accelerators, particularly one of the high energy accelerators in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Two great universities—Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—operate for the Atomic Energy Commission and for the Nation's high energy physics program the Cambridge electron accelerator. This accelerator is, and will be until the Stanford linear accelerator becomes operative later this year, the largest electron accelerator in the United States. The electrons in the beam of this accelerator have an energy of 6 billion electron volts.

Last summer there was an unfortunate and tragic fire at the Cambridge electron accelerator that originated from a hydrogen bubble chamber used in experiments with the accelerator. Repairs have now been made to the experimental area and the Cambridge accelerator is again contributing to man's advancing knowledge of the structure of the particles in the nucleus of the atom.

The scientists at the accelerator have plans to produce beams not only of electrons, but of positrons as well. Positrons are particles having the same mass as the electron, but they are of opposite charge. That, is they have positive charges instead of the negative charges of electrons. These positrons and electrons will be accelerated to high energy in opposite directions in the accelerator. In the collision of these charges—which will represent the equivalent of more than doubling the energy of this machine—will be found new particles or photons of high energy, which are capable of probing the atom's nucleus in perhaps a new dimension.

You may ask, why make this effort? The efforts of scientists at Cambridge, and at other laboratories with high energy accelerators, are helping to assure that the United States stays in the forefront of physics research. We must remember that physics research in the 1930's led to nuclear fission. If physics research in the 1960's and 1970's were to produce similar dramatic results, the United States should learn about these results first. In the meantime, we will learn more about the source of nuclear energy—the nucleus of the atom—and we will educate physicists at such great institutions as Harvard and MIT who can and will contribute to all facets of our growing, sophisticated technological economy.

Second, naval reactors program: The bill before us contains $97,400,000 for development work on nuclear propulsion plants for both surface warships and submarines. The naval reactor development program which the committee has supported throughout its history has been one of our most successful research and development programs.

The Joint Committee completed a review of the naval reactor program in January of this year. The hearings have been published under the title "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program," dated January 26, 1966. The foreword to this hearing contains a summary of the committee's views on nuclear propulsion for warships.

We are still encountering a reluctance at certain levels in the Department of Defense concerning the utilization of nuclear propulsion. The Armed Services Committee, of which I am the ranking minority member, has taken some steps to break the bottleneck concerning the utilization of nuclear propulsion in naval warships. The bill we reported out last week recommended the addition to the authorization request of two nuclear-propelled aircraft carrier escort warships. Therefore the bill we reported out last week includes a nuclear-propelled aircraft carrier, two nuclear-propelled frigates, and five nuclear-propelled attack submarines. The authorization of these ships will provide our Navy with the warships which will assure our leadership for the decades which will follow.

The important thing to remember, I believe, is that the development work that the Congress supported throughout the years has made it possible for us to have the unparalleled security that our Polaris missile submarines, nuclear-pro-

pelled attack submarines, and surface warships provide. We must continue to have this vision which is reflected in the bill before us to continue the support of development work to further our lead in the nuclear propulsion field.

Third, food irradiation program: The bill under discussion provides $2,200,000 for the AEC's food irradiation program. Of this amount, $500,000 is for wholesomeness studies which come under the sponsorship of the Biology and Medicine Division. The remaining $1,700,000 is allocated to the Isotopes Development Division for the purpose of carrying out irradiation of fruits and marine products, marketing studies, and the design and provision of radioactive sources for use in the program.

Initially $1,870,000 was requested for the isotopes development portion of the AEC's food irradiation program. However, in view of urgent work needed on SNAP devices to be provided by the Isotopes Development Division for use by NASA and DOD, a small cutback to a level of $1,700,000 was made in the request for the food irradiation program.

Information derived from the food program continues to provide favorable indication that program goals for the preservation of fruits and marine products will be achieved. Work is continuing on the provision of both fixed and mobile irradiators for use in the program. In particular the Hawaiian food irradiator now under construction is expected to be completed by the end of calendar 1966. This irradiator will permit the irradiation of significant quantities of mangoes, papayas, and other products native to the State of Hawaii. An important element of the Hawaiian program is the disinfestation of fruit products so that they will be acceptable for shipment to the mainland.

Mobile irradiators are currently being installed in fishing ships, one to operate out of Gloucester, Mass., and the other to operate out of Baton Rouge, La. The Gloucester mobile irradiator will be used for a variety of marine products while the irradiator aboard the ship operating out of Baton Rouge will be used principally for the irradiation of shrimp.

The Federal agencies involved in the food irradiation program have been working toward the development of a cooperative project with industry which would call for the construction and operation of a pilot irradiation plant. There is still some hesitancy on the part of private industry to commit itself to significant investments in this technique of food preservation. In large part this can be attributed to the fact that very few products have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration—to date only bacon, potatoes, and wheat products.

Petitions on other foods with appropriate backup data have been submitted but no additional approvals have been forthcoming. I can understand the need for careful scrutiny of the data to insure that the food is palatable, nutritious, and has no undesired side effects. I believe, however, that human nature is such that the standards applied to irradiated foods will be far more stringent than those applied to foods preserved by other techniques. I personally have had an opportunity to consume a variety of irradiated food products and almost complete meals consisting of irradiated food. I am convinced that the AEC in its food pasteurization program and the Army in its food sterilization program will obtain the necessary information to show beyond a reasonable doubt that selected foods can be preserved by irradiation in a controlled manner which will assure an acceptable and wholesome food product.

The money allotted in this bill for the AEC's food irradiation program will permit continuation of the program at a reasonable development pace. This application represents a splendid example of the atom working in a peaceful manner with the goal of providing a unique preservation method which can permit curtailment of the present high percentages of waste in the handling of food products not only in this country but throughout the world.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire and consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in my earlier remarks when we had under consideration the rule on this bill, I paid a well-deserved tribute to the chairman of the Joint Committee. I also wish to include in my remarks the ranking Member on our side of the aisle, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], who has been consistent not only in his attendance at the hearings on this bill, but most helpful, I know, in the suggestions, advice, and the counsel that he has offered during the formulation of this legislation.

I repeat what I said earlier, that this is a good bill; that it does deserve the overwhelming support of the Members of this body.

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to say a few words about one aspect of the AEC's program that I believe was not dealt with by the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee in explaining the principal features of this bill. I refer to the AEC's joint research and development program with Euratom.

As many of you will recall the Congress in 1958 enacted the Euratom Cooperation Act, under the authority of which the United States and the six nations of the European Atomic Energy Community established a 10-year joint research and development program. The program, consisting of two 5-year periods, runs from 1959 to 1969 and involves the construction and operation of nuclear reactors selected by the AEC and the Community, to be built within the Euratom countries. During the first 5-year program, which terminated in January 1964, a total of $22.5 million was authorized and appropriated. The AEC currently contemplates a spending level of approximately $5.6 million—including fiscal year 1967 costs—during the second 5-year program. The level of expenditure of the second 5-year program is somewhat below what was originally contemplated; however, this decline is consistent with the AEC's domestic program relative to the development of light water cooled and moderated reactors.

Occasionally, Mr. Chairman, we hear complaints voiced in this Chamber that our cooperation with foreign nations is sometimes a one-way street leading out of this country. Mr. Chairman, this program is hardly susceptible to that criticism. Each and every dollar that the United States has spent on this program has been matched by our cooperating Euratom partners. In addition, all moneys contributed by the United States are spent within this country. Furthermore, the results of the coordinated research program in Europe and in the United States redound to the benefit to all participants in the program.

The program, I might add, has been a productive one. Three reactors are in operation or under construction under the program: SENN in Italy, KRB in Germany, and SENA in France. It is significant that none of the three reactor projects has requested fuel element guarantees from the United States as authorized by the Euratom Cooperation Act.

In closing I would like to point out that the same spirit of cooperation that has characterized the joint program with Euratom is exemplified by the SEFOR reactor project now under construction near Fayetteville, Ark. This facility is of vital importance to the AEC's fast breeder reactor development program. While not part of the United States-Euratom joint program, this experimental facility is being constructed by American private industry in cooperation with the AEC and with major financial contributions by Euratom and West Germany's Karlsruhe Research Center. It is my hope and that of the Joint Committee that there will be substantial additional cooperation with Euratom, both here and abroad, which will further the advancement of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to compliment the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the ranking minority member of that committee. Their devotion to duty in this technical, difficult, and detailed matter is almost beyond belief. Without their able work and their devotion to duty, it would have been a well-nigh impossible task.

Mr. Chairman, the new activity, the experiment, and the research in this great field is opening up new vistas that were undreamed of only two decades ago. We now have, not only in this country but in some other countries of the world, a power new to man. Its effects and uses are almost without limit.

Mr. Chairman, the committee is pleased to report generally on the progress which has been made in the development of civilian nuclear power. As indicated in the committee's report, the past year has brought about a major increase in plans to utilize nuclear energy. In the past year alone orders were placed for 4,700 megawatts of additional nuclear power capacity. In all the preceding years orders were placed for only 3,500 megawatts of nuclear power.

Our investigation in the development of civilian nuclear power appears to be paying off. We have for the first time available to us an addition to fossil fuels which are our primary source of energy. As pointed out in the committee hearings, with the growing needs for energy there is a growing market for all types of fuel in our future. For example a recent article in the Mining Congress Journal, which factors in the growing use of nuclear energy, points out that coal consumption is expected to double between 1960 and 1980.

We have reviewed the civilian nuclear power program in considerable detail during consideration of the AEC authorization bill. We concentrated on development projects for which additional support may not be justified. The committee looks upon the atomic energy program as a development program which requires changes as progress is made. The committee in its report endorsed the weeding out of concepts which did not measure up to the competition. The committee recommended a yardstick for the evaluation of advanced systems in the nuclear power program. The committee stated that it believes before any new concept can be justified to move forward into the construction phase with Government support, there must be a clear showing of substantial economic and technical advantages over alternate concepts. Application of this yardstick to civilian nuclear power projects in the past year resulted in the termination of two research and development projects—the experimental gas cooled reactor and the Hallam sodium graphite reactor.

The committee also, in light of the major changes which have taken place in the last few years, asked for an updating of the objectives of the civilian nuclear power program. We believe that the civilian nuclear power program has been a dynamic program, and we want to keep it that way. Our action to update the program objectives and asking for a technical review of a number of the projects is aimed at accomplishing this.

One of the development projects in the civilian nuclear power program is the organic reactor project located in Piqua, Ohio. During our hearings I closely examined the Atomic Energy Commission witnesses relative to developments in the Piqua reactor project. The Piqua reactor is the only organic-cooled power reactor that we know of in the world. The Piqua project is a research and development project with the object of demonstrating the utility of a new kind of reactor coolant for civilian power reactors. As a research and development project, AEC assistance was justified and has been provided for the project. The Government, in cooperation with the city of Piqua, has provided $23 million worth of Government assistance for this research and development demonstration project. We are learning a great deal from the Piqua reactor. Some of the things we are learning about this concept look favorable while others look unfavorable.

I was also pleased to learn from the Commission that the reactor operating staff of the city of Piqua is doing an excellent job and is contributing much to our knowledge concerning this reactor project.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss briefly a proposed nuclear power project which is not included in this authorization bill but which I understand is under active consideration and to inquire of the chairman of the Joint Committee of the procedure to be followed, if and when negotiations for the proposed project are completed, in making Federal funds available for it.

I refer to proposals for construction of 150-million-gallon-per-day water desalting plant by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, with substantial financial support from the Department of Interior's Office of Saline Water and the Atomic Energy Commission. Heat for the desalting plant would be provided by a 1,600,000-kilowatt nuclear plant. As I understand the proposal, the AEC would contribute from $12 to $15 million toward the cost of the nuclear plant in the form of a direct subsidy.

According to all of the information which I have been able to gather about this proposed project, the nuclear plant would be a light water reactor of the type which are being built or planned by private utilities in increasing number. Because these light water reactors have clearly passed out of the experimental stage and into commercial electric power production, the AEC, prodded by the Joint Committee, has adopted a policy of not extending any further direct subsidies of any kind to them. In other words, these light water reactors must now stand on their own feet.

In view of this established national policy of not granting further subsidies to light water reactors, I am disturbed over reports that AEC is now proposing to resume the subsidies for this California plant. Frankly, I can see no justification for departing from our established policy. If the water desalting project is needed in southern California, and must be tied to a nuclear plant, then the full cost of the powerplant should be borne by the sponsors. I am unalterably opposed to using the water desalting program as a back door through which Federal subsidies can be funneled, despite the adoption of what appeared to be a firm national policy to the contrary.

Therefore, I should like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee, to explain to me, if he will, the procedures which must be followed before any Federal funds can be committed for this project. Does the AEC have authority to agree to a contract without the approval of the Joint Committee of the Congress on this particular project?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The question, as I understand it, is: Could the AEC go ahead with this project without the authorization of the Congress? My answer is "No; they could not."

There has been no request for an authorization for this project brought to our committee. If there is a request for an authorization brought to our committee, we will hold hearings at which the gentleman or any other person who is interested may testify.

Subsequent to that, we would make a determination in the committee as to whether we would ask for an authorization or not; and, if we decided to, we would bring it to the floor, where there would be adequate discussion of the matter.

Mr. MOORE. In response, the chairman has indicated the regular processes must be followed. There must be an authorization and an appropriation, and we can be assured that no action will be taken until there is such a request for authorization.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Any construction for such a project as the gentleman has described would have to be authorized by the Congress and funded by the Congress.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this has turned out to be a rather appropriate day for consideration of this authorization for some $2.25 billion to carry on the activities of the AEC for the next year. This is the day the Red Chinese have exploded their third nuclear device. They exploded their first October 16, 1964, their second May 14, 1965, and the third today, about 12 months later.

The news report indicates Radio Peking claims their bomb contains thermonuclear material. Of course, that claim can be evaluated at a later time. Assuming it is true—and I would imagine it probably is—it would be logical for a country in that state of nuclear development to work on the beginning of a hydrogen bomb.

This points up the fact that we do live in a dangerous world.

Peking claims, among other things, that the developments in atomic weaponry they are carrying on are "to protect the peace of the world." I rather doubt, if indeed the objective is to protect the peace of the world, that it will be very efficacious in so doing via this route. I also feel that this route undoubtedly is not the one any sensible nation in these times would pursue to protect the peace of the world.

The limited test ban treaty was signed about 3 years ago. I made a speech about that last week, indicating on May 4 that the several test ban safeguards which were at that time promised for the protection of the national security of the United States may not be carried on as vigorously as the discussions of the promises in 1963 indicated. I believe it essential that the program of safeguards be carried on and be carried on vigorously.

These safeguards include a continuing aggressive underground test program. They include the maintenance of our weapons laboratories as going operations. They include the maintenance of a capability to resume atmospheric testing

if the national interest requires it. They also include the monitoring of tests carried on by other countries.

This test of the Red Chinese undoubtedly, as was its predecessor, was carried out in the atmosphere. Our monitoring efforts will proceed now as the days go on to attempt to determine exactly what those people did. That is all to the good. This is carrying out a safeguard. As a matter of fact, of the four safeguards monitoring is the one that has been kept and maintained at a reasonable level in relation to the kind of work being carried on in that area before the limited test ban was signed 3 years ago. Probably the reason we can ascribe for this is less to have a capability to monitor tests as promised than it is to establish some kind of monitoring system to be used to police a total test ban treaty which apparently, according to the testimony of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense given to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is one of the high-priority objectives of the present administration of our Government. Nevertheless, as I pointed out last week, there has been a drop of around 8 percent in our effort in the conduct of underground tests. For that reason the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy includes in this authorization bill $10 million more than was requested by the administration. I truly hope that that extra amount of money will be appropriated and that it will be spent. Certainly it is in the only area of testing available under the treaty where, if we are to make progress at all in meeting the weapons competition of other nations, we can go forward with experiments. Therefore, we have to spend the necessary money to take care of this need.

The committee intends that the safeguards shall not stagnate and that resources be available in fiscal year 1967 to assure the continuation of an aggressive and comprehensive underground test program. Weapons tests are essential to the development of modern nuclear weapons for the U.S. strategic deterrent. The evidence coming out of the Soviet Union is that they have developed and are producing and deploying hardened silo ICBM's and an antiballistic missile system. The United States must, therefore, enhance its offensive and defensive strategic weapon systems. The developments for accomplishing this cannot take place without a continuous effort in the Commission's weapons laboratories, together with greater efforts in the testing program.

Very important also in this regard is the fact that it takes months to drill the holes necessary for underground testing. The supply of such emplacement holes is dwindling. It is necessary, therefore, to expend funds in fiscal year 1967 to assure that emplacement holes and other necessary long leadtime resources will be available for crucial and important tests that the laboratories will have to perform in fiscal year 1968. We cannot allow a failure to fund in fiscal year 1967 to delay tests that may be critical in the following year.

On maintenance of our laboratories it appears that our effort has dropped somewhat. Likewise on the maintenance of an atmospheric test readiness capability. At this particular moment these are not areas which could this year, this month, affect the fate of the Nation, but certainly if there is a continuation in this slackening of our safeguard efforts, if the downtrend is allowed to continue, inescapably we will reach a point where the neglect of this kind of effort can seriously impair the national security of the United States. Let us take but one of this kind of safeguards and see what might happen. Take that of the operation and maintenance of our weapons laboratories. You either have a weapons laboratory that is filled with enthusiasm and has attracted and retained brilliant minds or you do not. There is no "pretty good" weapons laboratory. At one point or another, although you may continue to spend money, unless you spend enough, what you do spend will not buy anything of value by way of nuclear weapons progress. It is much like the situation of underground nuclear tests.

In connection with the safeguard for readiness to resume atmospheric tests, I think there is a disagreement between myself and the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission as to just how much test equipment you need—the question is, for example, do you need one set of aircraft to go up and collect samples, or should you have two or three sets of aircraft each to back up the other? That kind of question has not been really discussed and argued and debated. I myself, as I indicate, do not think our effort in that area is sufficient simply because if and when we do have to resume atmospheric testing, it will be under conditions of total crisis and grave emergency.

We just cannot afford not to have our testing equipment duplicated and triplicated and ready to go.

Mr. Chairman, those are some of the questions and types of things that your Joint Committee on Atomic Energy tries to think about as individuals and as members of the committee responsible to the rest of the Congress for the custodianship of this large effort of the United States of America.

And, Mr. Chairman, I know that my chairman, in the remarks that I have made, may disagree with me in some details and opinions, but I know he will agree with me when I say that I feel that no group of men of the House and of the other body, charged with a grave responsibility, attempts to exercise that responsibility more soberly and with greater dedication than do my fellow members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express to each of them my gratitude for that patriotic service to our country and for the pleasure it is to serve with them in carrying out this responsibility.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman to yield because I believe I can say almost without reservation that we are in accord on the serious things which he has brought to the attention of the Congress. There might be some difference in judgment as to degree, but there is very little on the principles that he has enunciated.

Mr. Chairman, it is because of his deep interest in this matter of testing that the committee has, at his suggestion, added $10 million to the underground testing program. We added it for the purpose of the AEC using it for underground testing. Therefore, we hope the funds which were authorized will be granted by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, this Joint Committee on Atomic Energy functions in a unique way, in my opinion. There is such a small amount of partisanship involved in it that I have been unable to find it.

Mr. Chairman, we have worked at all of these different problems in a completely bipartisan way and in a manner in which our best collective judgment would dictate to be in the interest of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express a particular satisfaction that I have with reference to the time and the effort which the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has put into his work on these complicated details of a program of this magnitude.

Mr. Chairman, I am sincere in saying that I know of no one on the committee who puts in any more time than does the gentleman from California on these problems. I look to the gentleman for advice and consultation frequently, because of his deep knowledge of the matter.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the other gentlemen on the committee who have attended our hearings and have given us the benefit of their study and their judgment on these important matters.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California, the chairman of our committee, and in relation to his remarks about me personally, I must say that I only follow his example in carrying out the work of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. GROSS. In reading the report, it is difficult to ascertain how the money for this purpose is being spread over the country.

Am I correct or am I incorrect in assuming that a large share of this money is going to the Far Western States; or is it being spread out over the country as I think it ought to be?

Mr. HOSMER. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, he has rather caught me unprepared because in the committee we have never attempted to allocate funds on a geographical basis or even considered geography in arriving at these various expenditures. We do the work where the capability exists to do it. I do know and I do recall now that considerable work is done at one of the universities in the gentleman's own State of Iowa, the institution where Professor Van Allen is located. I think perhaps there are other places in Iowa but so

far as being able to identify any proportion or any portion or any allocation of any of this budget on a sectional basis, I simply can be of no assistance to the gentleman from Iowa. But I will yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] at this point.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is extensive work that is going on in the Ames Laboratory in Iowa. It is work that is very valuable to the Commission and it has been going on for many years.

I think I can give you a little more of the feeling of this possibly. As the gentleman probably knows, there are a number of big installations in the country.

There is the Savannah River installation in the State of Georgia.

Of course, we will be glad to furnish a breakdown of this to the gentleman if he wants it.

Also in South Carolina there is a big operation.

There is a big operation at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Then in the State of New York there is the Brookhaven Laboratory and the Argonne Laboratory in Illinois.

There is considerable work being done in New Mexico and in the State of Idaho.

This involves a little over $2 billion. The breakdown by atomic energy program can be found on page 2 of the report. The biggest part of it is for raw materials, special nuclear materials and weapons. That amounts, as I am looking at it here, to over $1 billion made up of raw materials $163,015,000; special nuclear materials $354,228,000; weapons $639 million.

That is more than $1 billion or more than half. Most of that is for the purchase of uranium from the Western States and the fabrication of weapons at the Sandia Laboratory in New Mexico and the Los Alamos Laboratory.

There is also work being done in Nevada which is underground test work.

Then in the State of Idaho we have quite a large amount of work being done at the naval laboratory at Idaho Falls, Idaho.

So I would say that the gentleman is right that a considerable amount of this money is spent in some of the Western States. But there are peculiarities of terrain and wide expanses of desert where these dangerous tests take place and where these laboratories which are working with dangerous materials are isolated away from the population and, of course, we must take them to a place such as that. Thickly populated States could not do that work.

Then at Hanford, Wash., we also have a large facility for the making of plutonium.

There are a number of places scattered over the United States.

Mr. HOSMER. It would be well to add the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, part of which is located at Berkeley and part at Livermore, Calif., that carries on a good deal of the work. As a matter of fact, this is the laboratory in which plutonium was first identified and from which some of the work that later got into the Manhattan project was originated.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. These are in the nature of laboratory and experimental and research type operations rather than fabrication or mining, milling, and weapon fabrication operations which is done in these other places.

Mr. HOSMER. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Could I ask the chairman of the committee a question? My question has come up as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. That is in relation to the materials that will come from the moon.

In the current budget there has been a proposal under the Science and Astronautics Committee for a Moon Materials Research Laboratory in Houston, Tex. My question is this: Why could not we use the existing facilities, such as the Atomic Energy Commission has at various parts of the country, to do the inquiring into what these materials might be? The reason I say that we should use some of the Atomic Energy Commission Laboratories is that they are experienced in materials that have been subjected to high radiation and, of course, they work in the atomic energy fields. The moon materials, because there is no atmosphere on the moon, will probably have been subjected to decay because of radiation over millions of years.

What is the reason that none of these materials can be in any way researched in the Atomic Energy Commission Radiation Laboratories because in all, when the Apollo program is accomplished, there will simply be 82 to 84 pounds of material?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would say the gentleman from Pennsylvania is much more acquainted with the program of space exploration than I am.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman look into it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have the finest laboratories that there are in the world for the analysis of materials. We have had to have them because we have given hundreds of millions of dollars for the radiation of material of different kinds. I would assume that the quantity of material that might be obtained on the moon and returned to our laboratories would be small, and I do not believe it would tax the facilities of our scientists to analyze that material. I will be glad to look into the matter and consider any information that Mr. Finger, the manager of the space projects, will bring to us.

Mr. HOSMER. I would say also to the gentleman that at the present time the AEC laboratories, because of their capability and excellence, are being used by various other departments and agencies of the Government to carry on necessary research. As the gentleman explained the moon materials program, I am certain there would be no difficulty in it being handled by the AEC, subject, of course, to further checks so that we could reassure the gentleman with certainty.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Could I compliment you both on your statements, because we are now in a position under NASA where the proposition is to build an entirely new laboratory and, of course, we would then have to build an entirely new scientific team as well to staff the laboratory when, as a matter of fact, the Atomic Energy Commission already has the radiation installations, research materials, and laboratories as well as the personnel, and I think the scientific personnel grouping is the most important.

Mr. HOSMER. Yes; and I might say to the gentleman that not only does the AEC have the physical laboratories and materials but they have had long experience in operating this kind of effort, which, indeed, is an important factor when the success of the effort eventually comes through.

We know that the National Science Foundation, which is not really an operational group, nevertheless took on Operation Mohole to dig a very deep hole through the earth's crust. It just did not have the contracting experience, did not have the operational and executive experience, and consequently the program today is in serious danger of withering at the pocketbook.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is a very good point. NASA does not have the experience in atomic energy research that the Atomic Energy Commission has had, and yet this will be a whole new laboratory built under NASA, staffed by NASA, and working in the same field that you people are already experienced in, both in contracting and in scientific personnel.

My point is this. It is not that you can do it in each one of the installations without some modification. We do not know what the new material is.

Another point is, we have not yet finished the Surveyor and the research programs to see what new material there might be, prior to the Apollo program, so it is just a guess at this point what this laboratory should be. If the committee will bring up some sort of a report for the Congress, it will be very much appreciated.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman for bringing up this subject.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the colloquy just had between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I would hope that the members of the Appropriations Committee will take note.

I see the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] are on the floor. I hope they will take note and ask the Atomic Energy Commission for a report on the availability and competence of the laboratories to take care of this work. An authorization of some $9 million was approved by the House despite an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I hope they will probe this matter thoroughly with the objec-

tive of saving the taxpayers the substantial bill of expense of constructing still another laboratory that apparently is unnecessary—on the basis of this conversation. I hope the Appropriations Committee will delve deeply into this before making any money available for such purpose.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on page 18 of the report I notice that $40,833,000 is requested for a high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor. A few months ago, at Oak Ridge, over $100 million had been spent on the development of a reactor.

I would like to ask if there is any similarity between this requested project and the one that was abandoned at Oak Ridge after $100 million had been spent. The abandonment was made 2 or 3 months ago.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, the only similarity between them is that they were both to be cooled by gas. The other internal workings, really complicated internal workings, of the reactors involved are quite different.

It became apparent that the approach, which was, indeed, an experimental one being taken at Oak Ridge, was not promising or suitable for our commercial reactor programs. Therefore, in its wisdom the Commission recommended to the committee that the project be dropped, and that concentration be made on the alternate approach, which seems to have more opportunity for ultimate commercial success, but which itself has not been proved out.

The money that is in here at the present time will prove or disprove whether this particular high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor is worthy of the Nation's additional effort.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I had understood that there was a similar project and facilities, and that money had been invested in this project, and that this facility could be continued and used for this same project. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will secure the Joint Committee authorization hearings, in part 2, page 706, there is a complete treatment of this subject matter in great detail, covering several pages. I think he will find an answer to any question he might ask.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has explained, there is some similarity between these reactors, but actually they are completely different in their approach to the problem.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Our committee's consideration of this authorization bill has been characterized by close cooperation by all members and as the chairman of our committee has pointed out, our report on this bill was unanimous.

I will not attempt to restate the major provisions of the bill, which have already been explained. However, I would like to call to the attention of the Members several AEC programs which are of great importance to our national security and general well-being.

Included within the AEC's budget, in the so-called SNAP program, is the sum of about $45 million for the development of energy sources for satellites and other space applications, as well as a variety of terrestrial uses.

The terrestrial SNAP program includes power and heat generators for deep sea applications, surface applications and small power sources for use in a cardiac pacemaker.

As a part of its space SNAP program, the AEC has under development a plutonium 238 radioisotopic powered electricity generator—known as SNAP–27—which has been selected for use in the Apollo program as a power source for scientific equipment to be left on the surface of the moon by U.S. astronauts. In addition, the AEC at the request of the Department of Defense has studied and reported favorably on the feasibility of a polonium 210 radioisotopic powered device—known as SNAP–29—to meet a special DOD application.

The committee is encouraged by recent indications that user agencies are showing increased interest in radioisotopic SNAP devices for space applications. More importantly, this interest is evidenced by specific indications of requirements for the developed systems.

With respect to the Commission's plowshare program, involving the application of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes, I want to point out that the committee believes some very significant benefits are available to this country from this use of atomic energy. One major incentive for plowshare has been to apply nuclear explosives to the excavation of large-scale earthmoving projects, such as highway cuts and canals. The carrying out of such projects depends on the development of devices and techniques that will permit large scale use of nuclear explosives without producing amounts of radioactivity that could be harmful to the health and safety of people living in areas adjacent to the excavation, or anywhere.

In the past few years progress has been made in the development of nuclear devices for plowshare purposes. However, the demonstration of the ability to create craters by means of nuclear explosives, while containing most of the radioactivity produced, necessitates experimental excavation programs. Two such experiments were planned for fiscal year 1966. In spite of the assurances given to the Senate in 1963 during the hearings on the limited nuclear test ban treaty—that plowshare cratering experiments could be performed—the fiscal year 1966 planned experiments have not been carried out. Data from such experiments are critically needed by the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission for their consideration of the route and means of construction for the proposed sea-level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

As our committee noted in its report, we were disappointed and concerned that the cratering experiments planned by the AEC for fiscal year 1966 have not taken place. During Senate consideration of the limited nuclear test ban treaty in 1963, it was our understanding that AEC cratering experiments to further plowshare developments would continue.

These important experiments should not be canceled or unnecessarily delayed by an unwarranted interpretation of the test ban treaty. It was never intended that underground nuclear explosions contributing amounts of radioactivity to the atmosphere so small that only especially sensitive instruments can possibly detect the individual radioactive atoms, would constitute a violation of the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

I believe the other significant matters concerning H.R. 14732 were adequately covered by the gentleman from California. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a sound authorization bill here and I urge the Members to approve it.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14732, the bill authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1967. I would like to make some remarks on an important national research program—the high energy physics program—that is managed by the Atomic Energy Commission for the Nation. Members will recall that last year President Johnson submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a report covering this national research program entitled "Policy for National Action in the Field of High Energy Physics."

The President pointed out in that submittal that:

> The fundamental nature of high energy physics makes it one of the most important fields of basic science. We must continue to explore it vigorously and to maintain our national leadership.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in its current report on H.R. 14732 points out its strong support for the past and current efforts of the Commission to keep the United States as the world leader in this foremost frontier of physics research.

We are all aware of the successes of nuclear reactors for naval propulsion and electrical generation. These successful accomplishments did not occur overnight. They have a long history in the realm of basic science research. Nevertheless, in spite of our success in harnessing the energy of the atom's nucleus, scientists still do not fully understand the nature of the atomic nucleus and the forces that hold the particles in the nucleus together. I am sure that the knowledge which we will acquire from high energy physics research will provide us with a better understanding of nuclear forces. This knowledge can not only contribute to the development of a better nuclear technology but also to the advancement of other technologies, perhaps some not even dreamed of today.

During the coming fiscal year a new accelerator, the highest energy electron accelerator in the world—the Stanford linear accelerator—providing electrons

with 20 billion electron volts of energy will come into operation. Large accelerators, some new and some old, are the tools the scientists use to explore the nucleus of the atom. Because of the complexity and massiveness of these accelerators, the costs of high energy physics are very large; not only the costs of building the accelerators but also the costs of continuing to operate them and to do research with them.

The Joint Committee is authorizing $109,800,000 for operations and research with these multibillion-electron-volt accelerators for fiscal year 1967. While this is a large sum of money, it is still some $40 or $50 million less than was projected in the President's policy report submitted last year. Those projections would indicate that the costs of high energy physics will be going up.

For fiscal year 1967 the Commission has not requested and the Joint Committee has not authorized the engineering design or construction of the proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator. The President's budget, however, for fiscal year 1967 does point out that as soon as a site is selected a request for funds to construct this accelerator will be made. The Commission has testified to the Joint Committee that it will make its selection within 3 to 6 months after it receives the report of the National Academy of Sciences Site Evaluation Committee. That report was received by the Commission on March 21, 1966.

We cannot, as yet, point today to any direct contributions from the high energy physics program to our economy or our military security. Nevertheless, we should note that the early accelerators, having energies of less than one-thousandth of the current large accelerators, did provide the basic information that led to the discovery and development of nuclear fission. It is much too early to tell whether our current efforts will have equally dramatic effects in the future, but it is important that if such dramatic effects should be possible, that the United States be the first to learn about them and not let others make such significant discoveries without our ability to pursue such an effort. The Soviet Union is engaged in the construction of a 70-billion-electron-volt accelerator. This is more than twice the energy of our largest accelerator, the 33-billion-electron-volt AGS located at the Brookhaven National Laboratory in Long Island, N.Y.

Included in this year's authorization for high energy physics are funds to permit the construction of a new injector for the Brookhaven AGS accelerator which will make it possible to increase the intensity, although not the energy, of this accelerator by a factor of 10. This change will permit a more effective experimental program and broader utilization of the accelerator.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to call to the attention of the Members of the House that recently the 12.5-billion-electron-volt accelerator at the Argonne National Laboratory, in my home State of Illinois, produced the track from which researchers at the University of Michigan, working in conjunction with Argonne scientists, were able to find a new elementary particle. This particle is designated N* (3245). The 3245 means it has a mass of 3245 million-electron-volts or about 3⅓ as times as heavy as the proton—heavier than any found heretofore. While I cannot talk about the scientific significance of this discovery, I do wish to point out that scientists have been most excited about this discovery and how it may fit in with current theories in high energy physics. It is thus gratifying to know that accelerators of even modestly large energies are still capable of making important contributions to this field.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the gentleman on the other side if he has any other speakers. We have no further requests for time on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 101. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with the provisions of section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the sum of $2,210,658,000 as follows:

(a) For "Operating expenses", $1,964,128,000.

(b) For "Plant and capital equipment", including construction, acquisition, or modification of facilities, including land acquisition; construction planning and design; and acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction, $246,530,000 as follows:

(1) SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS.—

Project 67–1–a, isotopes process development laboratory, Savannah River, South Carolina, $2,000,000.

(2) ATOMIC WEAPONS.—

Project 67–2–a, diagnostic chemistry building addition, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, California, $1,600,000.

Project 67–2–b, weapons production, development, and test installations, $10,000,000.

(3) REACTOR DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 67–3–a, fast flux test facility (AE only), $7,500,000.

Project 67–3–b, modifications and addition to S1W reactor facility, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, $10,000,000.

Project 67–3–c, research and development test plants, Project Rover, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, and Nevada, Test Site, Nevada, $2,000,000.

Project 67–3–d, fast neutron generator, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, $1,900,000.

Project 67–3–e, heavy water organic cooled reactor (AE only), $2,000,000.

Project 67–3–f, modifications to reactors, $3,000,000.

(4) PHYSICAL RESEARCH.—

Project 67–4–a, low energy accelerator improvements, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, $400,000.

Project 67–4–b, accelerator improvements, zero gradient synchrotron, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, $2,000,000.

Project 67–4–c, accelerator and reactor additions and modifications, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $800,000.

Project 67–4–d, accelerator improvements, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley, California, $1,550,000.

Project 67–4–e, accelerator improvements, Cambridge and Princeton accelerators, $1,850,000.

Project 67–4–f, accelerator improvements, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, California, $400,000.

(5) BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE.—

Project 67–5–a, biology laboratory, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington, $5,000,000.

(6) ISOTOPES DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 67–6–a, alpha fuels environmental test facility, Mount Laboratory, Miamisburg, Ohio, $3,000,000.

(7) GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS.—$39,325,000.

(8) CONSTRUCTION PLANNING AND DESIGN.—$2,000,000.

(9) CAPITAL EQUIPMENT.—Acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction, $150,205,000.

SEC. 102. LIMITATIONS.—(a) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsection 101(b) (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(b) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsection 101(b)(5) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 10 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(c) The Commission is authorized to start a project under subsection 101(b)(7) only if it is in accordance with the following:

(1) For community operations, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be $100,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be $10,000.

(2) For all other programs, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be $500,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be $100,000.

(3) The total cost of all projects undertaken under subsection 101(b)(7) shall not exceed the estimated cost set forth in that subsection by more than 10 per centum.

SEC. 103. The Commission is authorized to perform construction design services for any Commission construction project whenever (1) such construction project has been included in a proposed authorization bill transmitted to the Congress by the Commission and (2) the Commission determines that the project is of such urgency that construction of the project should be initiated promptly upon enactment of legislation appropriating funds for its construction.

SEC. 104. When so specified in an appropriation Act, transfer of amounts between "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be made as provided in such appropriation Act.

SEC. 105. COOPERATIVE POWER REACTOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Section 111 of Public Law 85–162, as amended, is further amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1966" in clause (3) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1967".

SEC. 106. AMENDMENT OF PRIOR YEAR ACT.—(a) Section 101 of Public Law 89–32 is amended by striking therefrom the figure "$2,555,521,000" and substituting therefor the figure "$2,604,821,000", and subsection (b) thereof is amended by striking therefrom the figure $294,745,000" and substituting therefore the figure "$344,045,000".

(b) Section 101(b)(5) of Public Law 89–32 is amended by striking therefrom "Project 66–5–e, alternating gradient synchrotron conversion, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York (AE only) $2,000,000," and substituting therefor "Project 66–5–e, alternating gradient synchrotron conversion, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $47,800,000."

(c) Section 101(b)(5) of Public Law 89–32 is amended by striking therefrom the figure

"$1,200,000" for project 66–5–h, meson physics facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico (AE only), and substituting therefor the figure "$4,200,000".

(d) Section 101(b)(6) of Public Law 89–32 is amended by striking therefrom the figure "$2,000,000" for project 66–6–c, land acquisition, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, and substituting therefor the figure "$2,500,000".

SEC. 107. RESCISSION.—Section 106 of Public Law 89–32, except for funds heretofore obligated, is rescinded.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14732) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 846, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Whip Notice lists H.R. 14544—the Sales Participation Act of 1966—as a bill that may be before the House for consideration later this week.

This is one of the most far-reaching bills that will be before the House in this Congress. If enacted, it would permit billions of dollars of financing of Government spending programs completely outside of the administrative budget and outside of the debt limit.

It is legislation which should have the most careful scrutiny of the Congress. This has not been done by our committee and hence it will be necessary to explore the issues at stake as best we can, if and when the bill is on the floor of the House.

The bill would authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association—FNMA—to sell participation certificates on behalf of many other Government agencies. Up to the present time, FNMA has sold four issues of participation certificates, aggregating $1.6 billion, for its own account and for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The most recent issue was an offering of $410 million participation certificates of March 16 of this year.

The prospectus in connection with this offering provides valuable information as to how the program works. This information should be of help to Members of Congress and I place a copy of the last prospectus at this point in the RECORD:

PROSPECTUS: $410 MILLION PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES IN THE GOVERNMENT MORTGAGE LIQUIDATION TRUST, FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION, TRUSTEE

(Dated Apr. 4, 1966—due Apr. 1, as shown below)

Timely payment of principal of and interest on the participation certificates is guaranteed by the Federal National Mortgage Association, a corporate instrumentality of the United States. (See letter of the Secretary of the Treasury appearing later in this prospectus regarding availability of funds for such guarantee.) The participation certificates are not obligations of and are not guaranteed by the United States.

The participation certificates are serial certificates issued in registered form only, in denominations of $5,000, $10,000, $25,000, $100,000, $500,000, and $1 million. The amounts, maturities, interest rates, and offering prices of the participation certificates are shown below. The principal, together with the last installment of interest, is payable at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York upon presentation at such bank and surrender of the certificates. The interest is payable by check, semiannually, on October 1 and April 1 in each year. The participation certificates are not redeemable prior to maturity.

The participation certificates are issued by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, under the Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust established by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as trustors, pursuant to amendments which became effective September 2, 1964 to the National Housing Act and sections 1820 and 1823 of title 38 of the United States Code (Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended). In connection with the issuance on November 2, 1964, July 1, 1965, and December 1, 1965, of an aggregate of $1,200 million of participation certificates (of which $1,170 million are now outstanding), the trustors set aside on their books an aggregate of not less than $1,755 million principal amount of mortgages owned and held by them. At the close of business on January 31, 1966, the aggregate unpaid principal amount of such mortgages so set aside by the trustors amounted to approximately $1,690 million and the aggregate amount of cash, U.S. Government and Federal Agency securities (at market value) held by the trustee approximately $61 million. In connection with the participation certificates offered hereby, the trustors have set aside on their books not less than $530 million aggregate principal amount of mortgages owned and held by them. The trustors have agreed to pay to the trustee the principal and interest payments received from all such mortgages. All outstanding participation certificates have equal and proportionate benefits under the trust indenture, as supplemented. (See more complete information under "Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust" and "Maximum of Outstanding Certificates" appearing later in this prospectus.)

The mortgages have not been transferred and assigned to the trustee. In the trust indenture, as supplemented, the trustors have transferred their rights to receive future payments of principal and interest under such mortgages, which transfer will be completed upon receipt of such payments by the trustee. The participation certificates represent beneficial interests in the obligation of the trustors to pay over to the trustee such future principal and interest payments and beneficial interests in such payments when received by the trustee and in other assets held by the trustee. (See more complete information appearing later in this prospectus.)

Interest on the participation certificates is not exempt from Federal income taxes.

The $410 million principal amount of participation certificates offered hereby will be offered at 100 percent of the principal amount thereof, plus interest accrued thereon from April 4, 1966, will have serial maturities in the amount of $20 million on April 1 in each of the years 1967 through 1976 and $42 million on April 1 in each of the years 1977 through 1981, and will bear interest at the rates set forth below:

Interest rate

Years:	*Percent*
1967	5.40
1968	5.45
1969	5.50
1970	5.50
1971	5.50
1972	5.50
1973	5.50
1974	5.50
1975	5.50
1976	5.45
1977	5.45
1978	5.40
1979	5.35
1980	5.30
1981	5.25

It is expected that the participation certificates in definitive form will be available for delivery on or about April 4, 1966.

MORGAN GUARANTY TRUST CO. OF NEW YORK.
MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH, INC.
SALOMON BROTHERS & HUTZLER.
THE FIRST BOSTON CORP.

The date of this prospectus is March 16, 1966.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

History and business

The Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA) was incorporated on February 10,

1938, pursuant to the then title III of the National Housing Act. Under that act FNMA was a wholly owned Government corporation and borrowed operating funds almost entirely from the U.S. Treasury. Its business consisted then as it does for the most part now of the purchase and sale of mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration and, since 1948, mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a secondary market for such mortgages. After the enactment of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, an act of Congress, approved August 2, 1954, FNMA became a mixed ownership corporate instrumentality of the United States. In connection with its secondary market operations it has issued nonvoting preferred stock and nonvoting common stock. The preferred stock is held by the Secretary of the Treasury and the common stock is held by the public. The Charter Act empowers FNMA (1) to conduct secondary market operations in home mortgages consisting of purchases and sales of such mortgages (the "secondary market operations"), (2) to perform special assistance functions in the purchase of mortgages as authorized by the President of the United States or by the Congress to assist in financing home mortgages in instances where established home financing facilities are inadequate (the "special assistance functions") and (3) to manage and liquidate certain mortgages (the "management and liquidating functions").

Separate accountability is imposed by the Charter Act with respect to the secondary market operations, the special assistance functions, and the management and liquidating functions. Thus, each of the operations has its own assets, liabilities, and separate borrowing authority. The operation of each of the three functions is complete, separate, and distinct from the others. The special assistance functions and management and liquidating functions have no recourse to the capitalization of the corporation obtained from the sale of its preferred stock and common stock in connection with its secondary market operations.

Pursuant to amendments of the National Housing Act and sections 1820 and 1823 of title 38 of the United States Code (Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended), which became effective on September 2, 1964, FNMA and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as trustors and original beneficiaries, created as of October 1, 1964, the Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust with FNMA as the trustee. The amendment to the National Housing Act also authorized FNMA in its corporate capacity to guarantee payment of the principal of and interest on participation certificates (the "certificates") issued in accordance with the terms of the trust.

FNMA, a corporate instrumentality of the United States, was from 1950 to 1965 in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. As of November 9, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 89–174 which created the Department of Housing and Urban Development, FNMA was transferred to that Department as a corporate entity and as a corporate instrumentality of the United States.

Government mortgage liquidation trust

The trust is under and in accord with the fiduciary powers vested by section 302 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act in the corporation, under its management and liquidating functions, being created by trust indenture dated as of October 1, 1964, and supplemented by the first, second, and third supplement to the trust indenture, dated as of June 1, 1965, November 1, 1965, and March 1, 1966, respectively. FNMA is the trustee of the trust. The beneficiaries are the holders of certificates from time to time outstanding as well as the trustors, but certificate holders, having equal and proportionate benefit one with another, enjoy complete preference, priority, and distinction over the trustors as beneficiaries or otherwise. The trustors that created the trust are FNMA and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the trust indenture provides that the trust may be opened for the issuance of additional certificates on the basis of mortgages then set aside for the trust and other assets held by the trustee and additional mortgages set aside by the above trustors or any department or other agency of the United States.

In connection with the issuance on November 2, 1964, July 1, 1965 and December 1, 1965, of an aggregate of $1,200 million of participation certificates (of which $1,170 million are now outstanding), the trustors set aside on their books an aggregate of not less than $1,755 million principal amount of mortgages owned and held by them. At the close of business on January 31, 1966, the aggregate unpaid principal amount of such mortgages so set aside by the trustors amounted to approximately $1,690 million and the aggregate amount of cash, U.S. Government and Federal agency securities (at market value) held by the trustee approximated $61 million. The $1,170 million outstanding certificates have serial maturities of $30 million on November 1 of each of the years 1966 through 1974, and of $35 million on July 1, and of $25 million on December 1 of each of the years 1966 through 1980.

In connection with the certificates offered hereby, the trustors, pursuant to a third supplement to the trust indenture, have set aside on their books as of March 1, 1966, not less than $530 million aggregate principal amount of mortgages owned and held by them. The trustors have agreed to pay to the trustee the principal and interest payments received from all of the above mentioned mortgages. The mortgages have not been transferred and assigned to the trustee. The trustors retain full title to and ownership and control of the mortgages, collecting all interest and principal payments thereon and forwarding them to the trustee. However, should there be a default either actual or imminent in the payment of outstanding certificates, the trustee, in its discretion, is authorized to require the transfer of the mortgages into the corpus of the trust and under the control of the trustee for protection of certificate holders. In the trust indenture and the first, second and third supplement thereto, the trustors have transferred to the trustee their rights to receive future payments of principal and interest under all of the above-mentioned mortgages which transfer will be completed upon receipt of such payments by the trustee. The certificates represent beneficial interests in the obligation of the trustors to pay over to the trustee such future principal and interest payments and beneficial interests in such payments when received by the trustee and in other assets held by the trustee.

Proceeds from the sale of the certificates offered hereby will be paid to the trustors and will be applied by them to reduce amounts borrowed from the U.S. Treasury or otherwise to reduce the use of U.S. Treasury funds.

As payments on the mortgages are received from trustors, they will be held by the trustee and will be used to pay principal and interest on the certificates. To the extent that payments exceed the amount needed for principal and interest on the certificates, funds may be held in the trust and invested as part of the corpus, or the trustee, in its discretion, may return to the trustors any funds which it deems to be surplus.

As an incident to the trustee's consent to the sale or conversion of mortgages by a trustor or for purposes of compliance with the maximum limitations on outstanding certificates described below, the trustee is authorized, in its discretion, to require the setting aside of additional mortgages, the payment of cash or securities into the trust or the purchase of outstanding certificates.

The trust indenture defines mortgages to include "deeds of trust, vendors liens, security deeds, installment sale contracts, and other types of security instruments."

A copy of the trust indenture and of the first, second, and third supplement thereto may be obtained from the trustee or the underwriters.

Maximum of outstanding certificates

Under the trust indenture, FNMA, as trustee, is empowered to issue certificates to the public, provided that the aggregate amount of certificates outstanding at any one time not exceed 80 percent of the aggregate of the outstanding principal balances of the mortgages set aside for the trust and other assets held by the trustee. Similarly, with respect to each trustor, the aggregate amount of certificates outstanding at any one time as to such trustor shall not exceed 80 percent of the aggregate of the current outstanding principal balances of the mortgages set aside for the trust by such trustor and other assets held by the trustee attributable to such trustor.

As required by the trust indenture, maximums on amounts of outstanding certificates, including the certificates offered hereby (based on the aggregate principal balances of mortgages set aside for the trust and other assets held by the trustee as set forth above), have been established by the trustee, as follows: with respect to the trust as an entirety, $1,580 million aggregate principal amount of certificates (consisting of the certificates presently outstanding and the certificates offered hereby), $665 million of which is with respect to the trustor, FNMA, and $915 million of which is with respect to the trustor, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. No assurance is given that the ratio of principal amounts of certificates outstanding after this offering to aggregate principal balances of mortgages set aside for the trust and other assets held by the trustee will be maintained throughout the life of the trust. Such a change may come about by the issuance of additional certificates based on additional mortgages set aside for the trust on a ratio different from the above or because the above maximum is changed by determination of the trustee as permitted by the trust indenture or for other reasons, subject always to the observance of the 80 percent ratios referred to above.

Guarantee of payments due

Payment of all certificates, as to both interest and principal, at the times specified therein, is guaranteed by FNMA, and to that end the trust indenture provides as follows: "Payment of all such participations shall be and is hereby guaranteed by the Federal National Mortgage Association, in its corporate capacity, under section 306 (Management and Liquidating Functions) of the aforesaid corporate charter." Each certificate offered hereby will bear a guarantee endorsement.

FNMA borrowing authority—U.S. Treasury

FNMA, in its corporate capacity under section 306 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, may issue to the U.S. Treasury its general obligations in an amount outstanding at any one time sufficient to enable FNMA to carry out its "Management and Liquidating Functions" (and with no limitation as to amount) including performance of its obligations under its guaranty of the timely payment of the principal and interest on the certificates. The Treasury is authorized to purchase any obligations so issued.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it will make loans to FNMA, if needed, to implement the aforementioned "guarantee

of payments due" provisions as stated in the following letter:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, May 28, 1965.

Mr. J. S. BAUGHMAN,
President, Federal National Mortgage Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BAUGHMAN: I have your letter of May 24, 1965, asking whether the timely payment of interest and repayment of principal, when due, on participation certificates (whenever issued) in the Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust pursuant to the corporate guarantee of the Federal National Mortgage Association under its management and liquidating functions, are functions for which the Association may properly borrow from the Treasury.

It is the opinion of the Treasury Department that the Association may properly borrow from the Treasury for the foregoing purpose. Accordingly, the Treasury will make loans to the Association under the procedures provided for in subsection (d) of section 306 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, to enable the Association to meet its guaranty of the payment of principal and interest on the participation certificates.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

FNMA has agreed with the underwriters that in the event it is called upon at any time to make good its guaranty of the payment of principal and interest on the certificates, it will, if necessary, in accordance with section 306(d) of its charter, apply to the Treasury Department of the United States for a loan or loans in amounts sufficient to make payments of principal and interest.

FNMA, pursuant to its management and liquidating functions, is also authorized, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue its obligations to the general public to the extent that the aggregate amount of such outstanding obligations does not exceed FNMA's ownership, free from any liens or encumbrances, of cash, mortgages and certain securities under its management and liquidating functions, the proceeds from such issuance to be used in reduction of the debt of FNMA to the Treasury under these functions. No such obligations are now outstanding. This authorization to issue obligations to the general public is separate and distinct from the power to issue its obligations represented by guaranties, which power is subject to no such limitation on amount.

General

Transfers—Denominational Exchanges

The certificates are freely transferable and assignable, but the trustee is responsible only to the registered owners thereof as their names and addresses appear on the transfer books of the trustee.

Such transfer books are maintained on behalf of the trustee by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The registered ownership of certificates may be changed on the transfer books and denominational exchanges may be effected, by presentation of the certificates to be transferred or exchanged to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, without charge to the owner by the bank. The transfer books will be closed for 10 business days preceding any interest and principal payment dates prescribed by the certificates.

Procedures Governing Registration, Transfer of Certificates

For the protection of registered owners of certificates, the trustee has adopted procedures to govern the manner in which certificates may be registered, transferred, assigned, exchanged as to denominations and presented for payment. Such procedures are the same, insofar as applicable, as the regulations of the U.S. Treasury Department governing registered obligations of the United States as contained in Treasury Department Circular No. 300. Generally, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York will act for the trustee in these matters. Each certificate, when issued, must include the identifying number of the registered owner as a part of the registration. This number is the appropriate taxpayer identifying number as required on tax returns and other documents submitted to the Internal Revenue Service. A copy of circular No. 300 may be obtained upon request from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the Treasury Department, the trustee, or the fiscal agent of FNMA.

Legality of Investments

The certificates are lawful investments and may be accepted as security for fiduciary, trust, and public funds under the control of the United States or any officer or officers thereof, and are eligible as collateral for Treasury tax and loan accounts. National banks may deal in, underwrite, and purchase for their own account the certificates without regard to the limitations generally applicable to investment securities.

Tax Status

The income derived from the certificates does not have any exemption, as such, under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The certificates are subject to Federal estate and gift taxes. The Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act does not contain any specific exemption with respect to taxes now or hereafter imposed on the principal of or interest on the certificates by any State, or any of the possessions of the United States, or by any local taxing authority.

Examination and Audit

FNMA is examined by its own internal auditing staff; and in accord with the Government Corporation Control Act, it is audited for each fiscal year by the U.S. General Accounting Office. Reports of such fiscal year audits are made annually to the Congress and are available to the public.

Management

FNMA operates under its corporate officers and a Board of Directors of five members. The officers of the corporation are authorized to act for and on behalf of the trust. Pursuant to the FNMA Charter Act and Public Law 89–174, approved September 9, 1965, the Board of Directors consists of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who is chairman ex officio, and four other duly appointed members. The principal office of FNMA is located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Financial Statements

The mortgages set aside for the trust had aggregate unpaid principal balances of approximately $1,690 million as of the close of business on January 31, 1966. In connection with the participation certificates offered hereby, the trustors have set aside on their books not less than $530 million aggregate principal amount of mortgages owned and held by them. Of this total amount of $2,220 million approximately $1,013 million represents mortgages of the trustor, FNMA, and approximately $1,207 million represents mortgages of the trustor, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. At the close of business on January 31, 1966, the aggregate amount of cash, U.S. Government and Federal agency securities (at market value) held by the trustee approximated $61 million. Financial statements are prepared by the trustee not less often than annually. A registered owner of a certificate may obtain such statements from the trustee upon request.

Legal Opinions

The legality of the certificates offered hereby will be passed upon by Mr. Robert Newton Reid, General Counsel of FNMA, and by Messrs. Brown, Wood, Fuller, Caldwell & Ivey, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y., counsel for the underwriters. The then Acting Attorney General of the United States rendered an opinion, dated October 2, 1964, to the effect that "the trust indenture and the participation certificates to be issued under its provisions are valid and legally binding undertakings of the Association (FNMA), both in its corporate capacity and as trustee, and of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs."

Notice

The statements herein with respect to the certificates, the trust indenture and the first, second, and third supplement thereto are subject to the detailed provisions of the trust indenture and such first, second, and third supplement, copies of which may be obtained from the trustee or the underwriters, and the statements made herein are qualified in their entirety by reference thereto.

Notwithstanding anything herein contained, the certificates, as stated on the cover page of this prospectus, are not obligations of and are not guaranteed by the United States.

Underwriters

The certificates are offered by the underwriters when, as and if issued and accepted by them and subject to their right to reject orders in whole or in part.

Name and Address of Underwriter

Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

Salomon Brothers & Hutzler, 60 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

The First Boston Corp., 20 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.

Bankers Trust Co., 16 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

The Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

First National City Bank, 55 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association, 300 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Chemical Bank New York Trust Co., 20 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

The First National Bank of Chicago, Dearborn, Monroe, Clark and Madison Streets, Chicago, Ill.

Blyth & Co., 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Eastman Dillon, Union Securities & Co., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

Discount Corp. of New York, 58 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

Goldman, Sachs & Co., 20 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

Lehman Bros., 1 William Street, New York, N.Y.

White, Weld & Co., 20 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

First National Bank in Dallas, 1401 Elm Street, Dallas, Tex.

Harris Trust & Savings Bank, 111 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

The Northern Trust Co., 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago., Ill.

Security First National Bank, 561 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

United California Bank, 600 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

Bache & Co., Inc., 36 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Aubrey G. Lanston & Co., Inc., 20 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

W. H. Morton & Co., Inc., 20 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.

New York Hanseatic Corp., 60 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

Wm. E. Pollock & Co., Inc., 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Chas. E. Quincey & Co., 25 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

Briggs, Schaedle & Co., Inc., 44 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Alex. Brown & Sons, 135 East Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Md.

Dick & Merle-Smith, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Francis I. du Pont & Co., 1 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

R. W. Pressprich & Co., 80 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

Second District Securities Co., Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

Underwood, Neuhaus & Co., Inc., 724 Travis at Rusk, Houston, Tex.

Wood, Struthers & Co., Inc., 20 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.

Ball, Burge & Kraus, 1414 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

F. W. Craigie & Co., Inc., 616 East Main Street, Richmond, Va.

Dempsey-Tegeler & Co., Inc., 80 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

R. H. Moulton & Co., 510 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION.
(As trustee and in its corporate capacity)
By J. S. BAUGHMAN,
President.

Date of Prospectus: March 16, 1966.

AWARD BY YOUNG MEN'S BUSINESS CLUB OF GREATER NEW ORLEANS TO THE HONORABLE HALE BOGGS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Louisiana, the able majority whip, was recently honored by the Young Men's Business Club of Greater New Orleans. Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD, the resolutions conferring honorary life membership in that organization upon our colleague:

Whereas the Young Men's Business Club of Greater New Orleans, pursuant to the authority vested in its membership by the club's constitution and bylaws, has heretofore honored many outstanding citizens who have contributed in various fields of endeavor to the advancement of our community, State, and Nation; and

Whereas HALE BOGGS has been a member of the Young Men's Business Club of Greater New Orleans for almost 30 years, and during this period of time, he has demonstrated outstanding leadership and ability in the field of public service; and

Whereas Congressman BOGGS' entire adult life has been devoted to public service, from his first election to the Congress of the United States in November 1940; and

Whereas honesty, hard work, commonsense, and constructive action, have been the hallmarks of Mr. BOGGS' service in the Congress and because of his dedication and leadership he has contributed greatly to the tremendous growth and prosperity which our area is enjoying today; and

Whereas the principal accomplishment and highlights of Mr. BOGGS' career are as follows:

1. He holds the third-ranking post in the House, and the highest position ever attained by a Louisianian in the House since the State was admitted to the Union in 1812;

2. He is the third-ranking member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, which originates and acts first upon all legislation dealing with taxes, tariffs, and trade, social security and related matters. As the third-ranking member of this important committee, he sits on all House-Senate conference committees appointed to write the final form of all tax, tariff, trade, social security, etc., legislation;

3. He is the chairman of the House-Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy which conducts periodic reviews of the scope and course of our Nation's foreign economic and foreign trade policies; and as chairman of this subcommittee he directed the conduct of extensive hearings in 1961 which engendered public and congressional support for the passage of the vital Trade Expansion Act of 1962—the latest reciprocal trade agreements act enacted by the Congress;

4. He was a member of the President's Commission to Investigate the Assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy;

5. He is a vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee (since 1955) and he was the parliamentarian of the 1964 Democratic National Convention;

6. He is a founding member of International House of New Orleans, and he was the organization's first executive secretary;

7. He is the recipient of the 1957 Thomas F. Cunningham Award from International House in recognition of the invaluable service he has rendered for the United States and Latin America by his "sound, constructive interest in the liberalization of world trade;"

8. He is the recipient of the Mississippi Valley World Trade Award for 1956 in recognition of his continuing efforts to foster the growth and development of trade and commerce through the Port of New Orleans and the entire Mississippi Valley;

9. He is the recipient of the International Order of Merit of the City of New Orleans in 1958; he is the third person ever chosen as an honorary member of the International Association of Ports and Harbors (1964), this honor bestowed upon him for his constructive good works in promoting world trade;

10. In national legislation, he is the author of the Boggs-Daniel Narcotics Code of 1956 which has helped to reduce the illicit possession and sales of narcotics, particularly to minors; he is the author of the financing provisions of the Interstate Highway System which has saved the American taxpayers millions of dollars, and the author of many improvements to the national tax structure in his service on the Ways and Means Committee. In other areas of legislation Mr. BOGGS is the coauthor of every reciprocal trade agreements act enacted in the past decade; coauthor of legislation making possible construction of the Mississippi River to gulf tidewater channel which already is enhancing the expansion of trade through the port of New Orleans, and of many other flood control and inland waterways projects in south Louisiana. He also is very interested in enacting a national permanent program of disaster insurance for the American people. Such a national program, if approved as Mr. BOGGS wishes, would provide homeowners in south Louisiana and across the Nation with the opportunity to purchase Government-supported insurance for floodwater damage to property. Such a development would provide the citizens of the New Orleans area and south Louisiana with needed financial protection from floodwater damage which they did not have when Hurricane Betsy struck. Progress is being made on a study ordered by Congress in the Hurricane Betsy legislation to determine the feasibility of a Government-supported, national program of disaster insurance, and Mr. BOGGS is working with officials of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development on this study: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That HALE BOGGS, in recognition of his many and various distinguished achievements in the field of public service have conferred upon him honorary life membership in the Young Men's Business Club of Greater New Orleans, with all of the rights, privileges, and benefits thereunto, appertained.

RETURN OF FEDERAL TAX FUNDS TO STATES FOR EDUCATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which, if enacted, will provide to the States additional financial resources to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States.

The young people of our Nation are our greatest asset. It is these children of today who must ultimately mold the destiny of America. Providing the best available facilities for elementary and secondary education for all our children, as well as college, is an investment in the future of our Nation. It is an investment in which all Americans have a vital share.

The bill I am introducing will return to the States Federal tax revenue which the States will expend in accordance with their own determination of greatest need. About half of the fund created for this purpose by the proposed legislation, the educational assistance trust fund, would be returned to the States based on the number of students enrolled in their respective public schools. The other half would be allocated on the basis of the individual "effort index" of each State—the percentage of gross personal income being spent on education.

The problem of improving our elementary and secondary schools and assuring salary levels for teachers to staff these schools adequately can only be solved through providing to the States the funds necessary for this purpose.

Federal aid to education with encroaching Federal control of our State and local school systems is not the answer.

Our system of government was designed to maintain a balance between Federal, State, and local governments. Passage of legislation for the return of Federal tax revenue to the States to finance their school systems in accordance with their own determination of need would go a long way toward restoring this balance in the area of education.

I sincerely hope the Members of this Congress will give careful consideration to the concept of sharing Federal revenue with the States to assist State and local government in the area of elementary and secondary education, and will join in support of this legislation.

THE DETERIORATION OF THE CUBAN ECONOMY: CLARENCE MOORE REPORTS ON CASTRO'S PROBLEMS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the May 4, 1966, issue of the Times of the Americas—the only English language newspaper published in the United States and dedicated entirely to Latin America, is further confirmation that U.S. policy toward Communist Cuba is having a very telling effect.

The article appeared under the byline of the newspaper's distinguished publisher, Mr. Clarence W. Moore, who has long been recognized as an expert on Latin American affairs. Having published the Times of Havana in Havana for a number of years, his views are constantly being sought, and heeded, by Members of the Congress, newspaper correspondents, and other parties interested in the Latin American scene. The Times of the Americas continues the same courageous policy that Clarence Moore displayed as publisher in Havana while fighting Castro and communism and upholding the democratic principle of a free press.

The above-mentioned article is a vivid portrayal of the problems besetting the Cuban economy and is based on an interview the author had with two recent Cuban defectors. Since the latter had been top economists in the Cuban Government until just a few weeks ago, their observations are firsthand and, I believe, of interest to all our colleagues. For this reason, I would urge all of our colleagues to take a few moments to read Mr. Moore's article. Because of his expert background, knowledge, and experience his recorded general impressions are more meaningful. The article follows:

THE EASY CHAIR

(By Clarence Moore)

Sitting next to Paco Prieto 1 day last week in downtown Miami, and surrounded by a group of Cuba's outstanding business leaders in pre-Castro days, I listened to two recent defectors talk of Cuba. Both Miguel Tarrab and Jorge Alemany had been top international economists in Castro's government until a few weeks ago. They spoke candidly and without reserve. It was extraordinarily interesting to hear fresh Cuba talk from knowledgeable sources. Here, in a simple list, are some of the general impressions I got from their answers to questions that day:

1. The sudden zoom in 1963 sugar prices bailed out Cuba's small crop. There were noticeable signs of returning prosperity with European luxury items creeping back into store windows. Fidel wasted money at that time in unbelievably foolish ways but people were encouraged to observe a slight return to good living.

2. The plunge in 1965 sugar prices was somewhat counterbalanced by a larger 1965 crop.

3. Now it is 1966 with prices down, production down. Nothing is on the horizon to save Castro from certain disaster. Along with this comes a tightening of civilian control which causes still more discontent. Cubans had noted a slight increase of tolerance, or at least decrease in oppression, during the 1963 improvement period. Now it is all gone. It will not come back.

4. Castro needs something to tell the people. What he has is sugar, the only viable program in today's Cuba. All other programs such as cattle and coffee have failed and there are no other sensible programs even on the drawing board. So Castro pushes a single item: 10 million tons by 1970. He will never reach it, and there are dozens of reasons why he will not. But he needs a rallying cry and sugar has to be it.

5. Even worse, the more sugar he gets, the worse off he is, Cuba had hoped to become the world supplier of sugar for Communist countries and Castro had even invented a swingy slogan to accompany such a campaign. But Communist countries have their own sugar, and may even become exporters in the next few years as their crops increase. Only Russia can remain a purchaser, and Russia's net sugar position cannot be truly deciphered from its many statistics. But it has trouble taking today's sugar. There is no chance that it could take another 5 million tons by 1970.

6. It is impossible to defend Japan's posture as one of Cuba's biggest sugar customers. They will buy less this year, but their presence in the picture can only be explained by commenting on the general lack of connection between money and principle.

7. Castro's picture must become bleaker with each year, and there is nothing that Castro can do to reverse the process.

There was a wealth of information from two men who knew and they spoke quite willingly of the future of Cuba, answering the most obvious question—"how long"—as if it were the easiest. They say it won't be long. That it can't be long. Disaffection mounts, the people never bought communism as a concept and never intended to have it the way it is. The farmers, they noted, are just beginning to get the idea of what it is all about after 7 years and it is not what they bargained for. They don't like it. It can't last long.

PRESENTATION OF AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD TO HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR., OF MICHIGAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, our minority leader, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, and Senator SAMUEL J. ERVIN, of North Carolina, were presented the George Washington Award by the American Good Government Society on May 1, 1966, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D.C. Mr. FORD was presented his award by his longtime friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. GEORGE MAHON, of Texas. The remarks of Mr. MAHON and Mr. FORD follow:

REMARKS OF HON. GEORGE MAHON, OF TEXAS, ON PRESENTATION OF AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY GEORGE WASHINTON AWARD TO HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR., OF MICHIGAN, MAY 1, 1966

It was quite a number of years ago that "JERRY" FORD traveled the glory road in college football. Those were the days when the ball was round and the foot was more important than the arm. The incomparable FORD was selected by his teammates as the leader of the great University of Michigan squad. His teammates in Congress are still selecting him as leader. It, therefore, can be documented that football is good training for the broken-field running and blocking of opponents so essential to political life.

While Mr. FORD is now the Republican leader of the House, it is obvious to me that he has set his cap for the speakership. All that must be done is for the people to overturn the Democrats in the House of Representatives. This I do not want to see happen. Personally, I prefer a southerner as Speaker—JOHN MCCORMACK, of south Boston.

Thus, it worries me that your society has selected "JERRY" FORD for this high honor tonight. It indicates to me that you think we Democrats are threatened with defeat and you are trying to jump on the Ford bandwagon at just the right time.

While I am not advocating Mr. FORD for the speakership, I am compelled to admit that it would not be a complete disaster for the country if his ambitions should be ultimately realized.

It has been said that there is nothing in a name, but I reject that thought. FORD comes from Grand Rapids, and it is now a proven fact that he is a grand fellow and that he has been rapid in his progress up the political ladder. The name Ford has been prominent since the days of the model T. Fords have always run rather well, regardless of the model, and "JERRY" FORD is the top of the line.

In the Scriptures we are told that the Apostle, Paul, in his years of preparation in the city of Tarsus, sat at the feet of Gamaliel. FORD has sat for years at the feet of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Under DIRKSEN'S tutelage, FORD has indeed made great progress. As you know, DIRKSEN has not spared the rod, although he has applied it with delicacy and loving care. I doubt that these comeuppances have been upsetting to JERRY FORD. At times I suspect they are staged. I reason it this way, that FORD has felt that he could not lambaste us Democrats for being rubberstamps for L.B.J if he, himself, were a rubberstamp for E.M.D.

This is not to say that logic and consistency are essential to political progress.

JERRY is a devoted family man. In fact, the principal reason for his election to Congress at 2-year intervals is the love and admiration which the people of his district have for his lovely wife, Betty. The people of Michigan have every reason to love Betty and JERRY, too.

I count it in his favor that he is a Yale man. The Harvard people have had a lopsided advantage in Washington for years, and I have been glad to see a Yale man come to the fore. We need a balance of forces not only in military matters but in politics as well.

Thomas Carlyle remarked on one occasion that the history of the world is but the biography of great men. Tonight we are enlarging upon a chapter in the biography of one of our leading citizens who is himself now actively writing that chapter of his still young, but already distinguished, career.

JERRY came to Congress in 1949, and in a brief span of years he has written a brilliant record in such fields as national defense and science and astronautics.

He was named by the President to serve on the blue-ribbon Warren Commission to investigate the assassination of the late President Kennedy, and he served with distinction.

In 1949, he was selected as one of America's 10 outstanding young men by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. In 1961, he was honored by the American Political Science Association with their Distinguished Congressional Service Award.

He became the Republican leader in the House of Representatives last year. These honors were, of course, only made possible by the people of Michigan who have kept him in Congress by their support through the years.

I am pleased to be permitted to make this presentation on behalf of the society, not only because I count JERRY FORD as a cherished friend and an able leader, but because in honoring him we also have an opportunity to honor the Father of this great country.

Washington, in his Farewell Address, spoke of the spirit of party in governments by popular will. Although cautioning moderation and restraint, he spoke of it as a fire not to be quenched, yet demanding a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame. JERRY FORD is seeing to it that the political fire is not quenched. Edmund Burke said, "He that wrestles with us strengthens our nerves and sharpens our skills. Our antagonist is our helper."

Great things lie ahead for JERRY FORD in the realm of Government. He will deserve them all. He will continue to measure up to the highest traditions.

I take great pleasure in presenting, on behalf of the American Good Government Society, one of its 1966 George Washington Awards to the distinguished minority leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, JR., of Michigan.

RESOLUTION OF TRIBUTE AND HONOR TO GERALD R. FORD

Statesman and patriot, lawyer, and congressional leader, has served the people of Michigan and the United States upward of 20 years—as officer in aircraft carrier combat operations and aviation training, rising to lieutenant commander in 4 years; almost 18 years in the House of Representatives, 14 on the Committee on Appropriations and 7 on the Republican policy committee. He achieved the high post of minority leader in January 1965.

His industry and talents, his reverence for the American constitutional system, his long experience with appropriations for defense and foreign operations, have fitted him to strengthen American institutions. Under his leadership the small Republican minority has had major impact on such administration measures as medicare, public housing, social security, and immigration.

GERALD R. FORD is a resolute foe of the enemies of liberty. He is champion of all that has made the United States of America the most powerful and prosperous country in the annals of mankind.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY HON. GERALD R. FORD

Mr. MAHON, Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, honored guests, and good friends all; may I express my heartfelt appreciation for having been selected to receive the George Washington Award of the American Good Government Society. This honor is especially satisfying to me when I look back to January 1965. It was then I was elected minority leader of the House by the landslide margin of 6 votes—73 to 67. It is really gratifying to me—here tonight—to be a unanimous choice for something.

I am happy to accept this award from the hands of my good friend, GEORGE MAHON, of Texas. Let me tell you a little secret. When the Good Government Society trustees told me I was to receive this award, they asked me who I wanted to make the presentation, and I picked GEORGE—another unanimous choice—for many, many reasons.

GEORGE and I have been friends for a long time. He became chairman of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee the year I took my seat in Congress—1949. I went on the Appropriations Committee in 1951, and GEORGE taught me much of what I know today.

GEORGE is a great Texas Longhorn. And one of the things I appreciate most about him is that, unlike a fellow Texan who lives at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, GEORGE has never given me a real hard time.

I became the senior Republican on the Defense Subcommittee in 1959, and for years GEORGE and I worked together most harmoniously to build our Nation's military security—who says I can't get along with Texans?

GEORGE has said so many nice things about me tonight I am positive he didn't clear his speech with the White House or my good friend, Bob McNamara, either.

In looking over the list of previous recipients of Good Government Society's George Washington Award, I noted with pleasure the names of my colleagues, WILBUR MILLS and JOHN BYRNES. Both have had a major role in drafting most of our present-day tax legislation.

With the problems of April 15 just past and some new problems just beginning this very day—higher income tax withholding rates, you know—it seems appropriate to tell you a story about the spirit of independence that burns in the breasts of thousands of our taxpayers.

Last year a high-ranking official in the Bureau of Internal Revenue called my attention to a small blank square in the upper right-hand corner of our Federal income tax forms. Printed beneath the square is the strict directive from the Internal Revenue Service—"Do not write in this space."

"JERRY," the Internal Revenue official told me, "it's amazing how many people get through making out their returns, take another look at that space and in a fit of anger scrawl across it: 'I'll write any darn place I please.' "

We are indebted to rugged individualists of this stripe. It is this spirit of independence that has made America great.

It is a great pleasure to me to see so many people from Michigan in the audience here tonight.

There are thousands of other fine people back in the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan who have seen fit to send me to Congress ever since I ran mighty scared for a seat in the House in 1948. I've been running scared ever since. Needless to say, I am extremely grateful to the people of my district for giving me the privilege of serving them. And I want to thank them, too, for this award, because without their support I wouldn't be standing here tonight.

I want to thank, too, my mother, Mrs. Dorothy Ford, who is here tonight from Grand Rapids. I am deeply indebted to my lovely and loyal wife, Betty, who may even be getting to like politics a little bit and certainly is a tremendous help to me in my role as minority leader.

The fact that I have survived in the House for nine terms shows that all you really need to be successful in politics is an allegation of virtue, a moderate amount of hard work, and lots of luck.

This is my 18th year in Congress. The American Good Government Society is presenting these awards for the 14th time, having begun the tradition in 1953 by honoring two great Americans—Mr. Republican, the late Senator Robert A. Taft, and a strong advocate of economy in government, former Democratic Senator Harry F. Byrd.

Allow me at this time to heartily commend the American Good Government Society for its devotion to the principles of constitutional government and to strengthening the American democratic system.

There is no fixed formula for good government. It is really something of a miracle that we have fared as well as we have. That miracle has been shaped from the dreams of people who fled from the Old World to the New in quest of something precious called freedom.

Freedom is still the essential ingredient today—the never-to-be-forgotten element that pervades the constitutional form of government which has made us a proud republic. It is the hallmark of a system designed to make government the servant and not the master of the people.

It is fitting that the American Good Government Society's annual awards should be made in the name of George Washington.

George Washington is sometimes viewed as an aristocrat, the proud landowner, a rather cold and austere man. In truth, he was dedicated to the democratic process. He helped kindle the miracle that has lighted the American political scene since the Revolution that gave birth to this mighty Nation.

Perhaps relatively few people know that George Washington was so idolized by the colonists that he could have become a military dictator or a monarch in this country when the Revolutionary War ended. There were powerful persons who wanted to crown him king and make the new Nation a monarchy. But Washington rejected such proposals, went to Annapolis, and formally resigned his commission as commander in chief of the Revolutionary Army. Thus it was Washington who in the first instance determined that our Nation should become a republic.

Good government follows no fixed formula but it flows—as the Good Government Society knows—from adherence to this country's established constitutional system, from the good sense of the American people, and from men like Washington—men who provide this country with moral leadership in a time of crisis, men who unselfishly give of themselves so that freedom, law and order, good government, shall flourish.

Again, may I express my appreciation for this scroll symbolizing your recognition of one individual's small efforts in the cause of good government, hoping that during my years in Congress I have rendered service that makes me worthy of it.

DRAFT INVESTIGATION

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, some 11 weeks ago, on March 1, 30 Members of this body called for a congressional investigation of the Selective Service System, to insure that it is as well designed to meet our national manpower needs now as it was when we initiated the draft 25 years ago. The statement was well received by the public, but it has not stirred any detectable interest in the Congress.

Vietnam is not an isolated incident. The fact that the draft has had a continuous existence for the past 25 years is itself expressive of the kind of world

in which we live. An involuntary wartime device designed to meet the crisis of the early 1940's may have been reasonably well adapted to the chronic manpower drain of the cold war, or it may not; but any institution which strikes at the freedom of a select group of young men, which has an impact not only on the security of the country but also on its educational policy, its agriculture, its manpower training, should be a direct and persistent concern of the Congress. It is time we examined this institution searchingly, before it becomes a political issue, with the long-term needs and best interests of the country in view. This should have happened before draft calls were doubled last August. It should not be put off any longer.

Nor should this be left to the executive branch again, as it was 2 years ago. At that time calls for a careful reassessment of the draft met with a Presidential statement that the Secretary of Defense would reexamine the Selective Service to be sure its methods and the long-term manpower goals of this country coincide. To my knowledge, no report of this reexamination has yet been made public. Beyond this, both major presidential candidates in 1964 pledged an early end to the draft. In light of this recent history, it is clearly our responsibility, as the representative branch of Government, whose individual members daily struggle with draft problems in our home districts, to take the initiative to insure that a full and careful investigation be made so that we can certify to the American people that Selective Service, from the Director at the top to the local draft board in which so much discretion is vested is fair, efficient, and a limitation on our liberty necessary in this troubled world.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S AGRICULTURE POLICY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration has been using the farmer as a whipping boy for its own inflationary policies, and has been trying to pin the blame for rising living costs on American agriculture. Never has a case been better documented, as we have pointed out many times in the recent past.

While the Secretary of Agriculture has been depressing grain and livestock prices by dumping Government-owned commodities on the market, and expressing pleasure as prices drop, the administration's domestic fiscal policies have been pushing farm production costs to record heights.

While on one hand, the administration sets a 3.2 percent guideline for wage and price increases in the rest of the economy, on the other it increases cheese and sugar imports, restricts hide exports, and sharply curtails purchases of pork and dairy products by the military, thus reducing the income of dairy, hog, and cattle producers.

This war on agriculture is dangerous, inequitable, and completely unjustified. We, the Members of the House Republican task force on agriculture are today introducing a resolution calling on the administration to immediately stop its discriminatory activities against American farmers and ranchers, and instead, employ every facility within its power to advance the best economic interests of American agriculture.

This resolution can and should be supported by every Member of Congress. Farm prices are now at 80 percent of parity, and the farmer is earning only about 60 percent as much as his city cousin. The administration's widespread attack on American agriculture, if not stopped at once, will seriously endanger this country's future food supply. This in itself is a major reason why city Congressman as well as Members from rural areas will certainly want to support our resolution. We strongly urge every Member of Congress to do so.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all my colleagues may have the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the merits of the task force resolution, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

H. CON. RES. 635

Whereas the present administration is using American farmers and ranchers as "scapegoats of inflation":

(1) by domestic fiscal policies which unduly increase farm production costs, such costs having increased 15 percent since the year 1952; and

(2) by market price manipulations which have decreased prices received by farmers, such prices having decreased 6 percent since the year 1952 with the result that the April 1966 parity ratio stands at only 80; and

(3) by failing to recognize that increased consumer prices have not been caused by farmers, such consumer prices having increased 16 percent since the year 1952; and

(4) by recommending and seeking to implement drastic cuts in Congressional appropriations for vital agricultural programs that serve the national interest such as the school milk, school lunch, land grant colleges, and others; and

(5) by the Secretary of Agriculture dumping huge quantities of grain upon the domestic market in order to break and depress grain and livestock market prices; and

(6) by the Secretary of Agriculture's expressions of pleasure with the fact that the prices of farm products had dropped recently; and

(7) by the Secretary of Agriculture's action to increase imports of raw sugar into the United States, such action being designed to lower market prices for U.S. sugar producers; and

(8) by the Department of Commerce action of March 7, 1966, imposing restrictions on the export of cattle hides, calf and kip skins, such action causing lower domestic livestock prices, notwithstanding subsequent increases in shoe and other footwear prices; and

(9) by a large and unilateral increase in Cheddar cheese imports without seeking or attempting to secure reciprocal trade concessions from other nations to expand U.S. agricultural exports overseas; and

(10) by a sharp curtailment of purchases of pork and dairy products by the Department of Defense; and

(11) by permitting or condoning price and wage increases for other segments of the national economy;

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that in the public interest the Administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free-world prosperity.

TAX FREEDOM DAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I introduced legislation to make May 1 a national holiday in celebration of the freedom of the American taxpayer to keep the fruits of his labor. This is the first month of 1966 when a taxpayer can call a dollar his own. Before May 1, every paycheck of 1966 has gone to pay some form of taxes. In other words, the average American's tax load is one-third of his income.

The originator of the movement to establish a national tax freedom holiday is a neighbor and constituent of mine from Winter Park, Fla., Mr. Dallas L. Hostetler, executive director of the Florida State Retailers Association.

Mr. Hostetler's long interest in taxes stems from the fact that his association's prime objectives are the encouragement of good government, sound and prudent fiscal policy, and less waste and extravagance. This holiday, which he has proposed and for which I have attempted to get official national sanction, has won for Mr. Hostetler the Freedoms Foundation George Washington Honor Medal Award.

In connection with his studies Mr. Hostetler has come up with some interesting facts. He points out for instance that much of our tax expenditure is in hidden taxes. Prices of items such as bread, milk, cars, gasoline, and telephone service represent not only the cost of the item, but a myriad of taxes along the way of their distribution and sale.

He cites over 150 different taxes on such varied items as a suit of clothes and a bar of soap and over 50 taxes on a loaf of bread. At this rate, he predicts, "dollars to doughnuts will soon be an even bet."

As a cause for much of this he points further to the growth of the Federal bureaucracy which has multiplied itself at several times the rate of the population.

Two of Mr. Hostetler's favorite quotations are from the writings of John Stuart Mill and Thomas Jefferson and I would like to commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

In his essay on representative Government, John Stuart Mill had this to say:

A people may prefer a free government, but if, from indolence or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if by momentary discouragement, or temporary panic, or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet of a great man, or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions; in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty; and though it may be for their good to have had it even for a short time, they are unlikely long to enjoy it.

On the subject of debt, Thomas Jefferson said:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

PANAMA CANAL: 1966 ENCYCLOPAEDIA AMERICANA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House on April 26, 1966, I quoted an article on the Panama Canal by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., U.S. Navy, retired, former captain of the port, Balboa, C.Z., 1941–44, in charge of marine operations in the Pacific sector of the canal and former head of the Isthmian Canal Studies, Navy Department, 1946–49, in the 1966 edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. It was, therefore, with the greatest interest that I have read another highly pertinent and informative article on the same subject written by Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., Governor of the Canal Zone and president, Panama Canal Company, in the 1966 edition of the Encyclopaedia Americana.

Written by officers of different training and backgrounds of experience, the two articles deal with the canal question from different viewpoints and thus serve, in some respects, to complement each other.

In the section of Governor Fleming's article on "American Work on the Canal," I note the statement that, after the resignation of John F. Stevens and the appointment of Col. George W. Goethals to succeed him as chairman and chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, "the project was completed with Army engineers." In the interests of historical accuracy as to this point, it should be observed that the reorganized Canal Commission as of April 1, 1907, consisted of the following:

Lt. Col. George W. Goethals, C.E., U.S. Army, Chairman and Chief Engineer; Maj. David D. Gaillard, C.E., U.S. Army; Maj. William J. Sibert, C.E., U.S. Army; Rear Adm. Harry H. Rosseau, C.E., U.S. Navy; Lt. Col. William C. Gorgas, M.C., U.S. Army; Jackson Smith, a civilian; Hon. Joseph C. S. Blackburn, also a civilian, and who was succeeded by Maurice H. Thatcher, a civilian, in charge of civil affairs of the Canal Zone.

During most of the construction era, the engineering work was organized into three major divisions, with Major Sibert in charge of the Atlantic; Major Gaillard, of the central, and Mr. Sydney B. Williamson, a civilian, of the Pacific. The greater portions of the lower professional positions in these divisions were held by civilians. Thus, the work was completed with a force consisting not only of Army and Navy engineers but as well of civilian engineers and officials.

The indicated article of Governor Fleming follows:

[From the Encyclopaedia Americana, 1966 edition]

PANAMA CANAL

(By Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., U.S. Army)

The Panama Canal is a lock-type ship canal across the Isthmus of Panama in Central America. It connects the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Built and operated by the United States under treaty with the Republic of Panama, it lies within the Panama Canal Zone, a strip of land approximately 10 miles wide that bisects the Republic and is granted to the United States in perpetuity. From Cristobal breakwater at the Atlantic terminus to a point opposite San José Rock at the Pacific end, the channel is 51.6 miles long. From shore to shore, the distance is about 40.3 miles. The channel's minimum depth is 37 feet (in Balboa Harbor, on the Pacific, at low tide) and its minimum width is 300 feet.

The canal was opened to commercial traffic on August 15, 1914. It has shortened the voyage between Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States by as much as 7,000 miles and has become a vital factor in the world's commerce.

This discussion of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone is divided into the following sections:

1. Description of the canal.
2. Canal Zone.
3. History.
4. Bibliography.

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE CANAL

Basically, the canal consists of sea level channels at each end which are separated from and connected to an elevated midsection 32 miles long by three lock systems. These locks serve the dual purpose of raising and lowering ships to and from sea level and damming up the water at Gatun Lake, which forms the midsection.

Route: The canal follows a zigzag course running generally northwest to southwest. At the Atlantic end it begins in Limón Bay, an arm of the Caribbean Sea, and runs nearly due south to Gatun locks, which have three successive sets of parallel lock chambers through which ships are raised or lowered between sea level and Gatun Lake. The surface of the lake ranges from 82 to 87 feet above sea level. The channel turns southeast, passing approximately through the middle of the lake, which is about 20 miles wide. It then enters Gaillard Cut, formerly known as Culebra Cut, 8 miles long and from 300 to 500 feet wide, which snakes through the Continental Divide. At the end of Gaillard Cut, Pedro Miguel locks, with a single set of parallel chambers, raise or lower vessels between the level of Gatun Lake and the level of Miraflores Lake, whose surface is 54 feet above sea level. About 1½ miles below Pedro Miguel locks are Miraflores locks, with two sets of parallel chambers, which raise or lower ships between Miraflores Lake and sea level. Beyond Miraflores locks the channel runs to its Pacific terminus in the Bay of Panama.

Locks: Constructed of concrete, the parallel lock chambers of the canal are separated from each other by common center walls. The successive chambers in each lane are separated by massive steel gates which swing open to permit a ship to pass from one chamber to another. Then the gates close to permit the water level to be raised or lowered to match the next level. Ships are towed through the locks by electric locomotives, commonly known as mules, but make the rest of the canal transit under their own power. The larger ships sometimes are assisted by tugs as they enter or leave the locks.

Each chamber in the locks is 1,000 feet long and 110 feet wide. The water employed to fill and empty the lock chambers is fed by gravity through large culverts in the sides and center walls of the locks. This water finally flows down from Gatun Lake into the sea as the chambers empty. A complete ship transit from ocean to ocean results in the release of 52 million gallons of fresh water from Gatun Lake into the ocean. Abundant rainfall on the isthmus during most of the year maintains the lake at the desired level. During dry periods, the Gatun Lake water supply is replenished by water from Madden Lake, 9 miles up the Chagres River from the point where the river flows into Gatun Lake at Gamboa.

Gatun Lake: This artificial lake was formed by damming the Chagres River at Gatun, near the Atlantic coast, with a combination of Gatun locks and Gatun Dam, the largest earthen dam built until that time (1907–12). The lake covers about 165 square miles and was said to be the largest artificial body of water in the world until the construction of Hoover Dam (Arizona-Nevada) and the consequent formation of Lake Mead (1936). The supplemental reservoir of Madden Lake was created in 1935 with the building of Madden Dam. Besides supplementing the Gatun Lake water supply, the Madden Lake reservoir water is used to generate hydroelectric power and control floods on the Chagres, which had occasionally interfered with ship traffic in the canal.

Traffic and tolls: Except for the restricted channel through Gaillard Cut (the so-called "big ditch" section of the waterway), the canal can handle continuous two-way ship traffic. In Gaillard Cut, safety considerations require that ships of certain sizes and types must travel without meeting or passing another oceangoing vessel.

The limitations imposed on ship sizes by the locks and the channel depth, maintained at 42 feet through Gatun Lake and Gaillard Cut, prevent a number of the world's largest vessels from using the canal. Most of these superships are tankers, ore vessels, grain carriers, and warships.

The vast majority of the world's ships, however, can make the passage. The number of transiting commercial vessels of more than 300 Panama Canal net tons rose from less than 5,000 yearly in the mid-1920's to almost 12,000 yearly in the mid-1960's.

Tolls for use of the canal are based on Panama Canal net tons, computed on the basis of 100 cubic feet of revenue space. The toll rates (90 cents a ton for laden vessels and 72 cents a ton for ships in ballast) are virtually the same as when the canal was opened. Average tolls are about $5,500 for oceangoing commercial vessels. Using the canal rather than circling South America may save shippers 10 times the cost of the passage.

2. CANAL ZONE

The Canal Zone extends generally 5 miles on each side of the Panama Canal from deep water in the Atlantic Ocean to deep water in the Pacific and includes the area to the 100-foot contour line around Gatun Lake and

to the 260-foot contour line around Madden Lake. Its area is 557 square miles (647 square miles including tidal water). It is, in effect, a U.S. Government reservation. No private business is permitted except that which is directly related to the operation of the canal, and, with few exceptions, only persons working for the U.S. Government may reside in the zone. Population: (1960) 42,122.

The Canal Zone is divided into the districts of Balboa (population 30,623) on the Pacific side, and Cristobal (11,499) on the Atlantic side. The principal towns are Rainbow City (population 3,688); Gamboa (3,489); Balboa (3,139), capital of Balboa district; and Paraiso (3,113). Cristobal (817) is the capital of Cristobal district. The administrative center of the Canal Zone is Balboa Heights (population 118), adjoining Balboa near the Pacific end of the canal.

Physical features and climate: The topography is broken and hilly, with the continental divide roughly parallel to the Pacific coast and about 10 miles inland. Geologically, the country is principally volcanic in origin. It consists of a relatively weak rock formation cut by numerous faults and intermixed with water-deposited formations of fine clay silts. See section 3. History (American work on the canal): Problems of the Work.

The climate is typically tropical, with high humidity and an even temperature ranging from 73° to 87° F. The record high is 98° F. and the low 59° F. Average annual precipitation on the Atlantic side is 130 inches. Rainfall decreases progressively southward across the isthmus to 69 inches at Balboa. The year is divided into well-defined wet and dry seasons, the wet season beginning in April and ending in December. Rainfall is heaviest in October and November. The driest months are February and March.

Transportation: Highway crossings of the canal are provided by the high-level Thatcher Ferry Bridge over the Pacific entrance, opened in 1962, and a narrow swing bridge at the north end of Gatun Locks on the Atlantic side. The Panama Railroad, built with private U.S. capital (1850–55), now part of the Panama Canal Organization, operates coast to coast in 1 hour and 20 minutes.

Administration: The Governor of the Canal Zone is appointed by the President of the United States, subject to confirmation by the Senate. He is automatically President of the Panama Canal Company, which operates the canal and the railroad. He is responsible for such civil functions as police and fire protection, postal service, schools, health, immigration, and customs. The president traditionally has named the Secretary of the Army as his representative in operating the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company. As a consequence, the Governor-President of the organization reports directly to the Army Secretary on governmental matters and to a board of directors on Company affairs. The Secretary of the Army appoints the directors of the Company, thereby assuring a unity of administration over both the operation of the canal and the civil government of the Canal Zone.

Education: School attendance is not compulsory for children living in the Canal Zone. Separate United States and Latin American school systems are maintained. The former, attended primarily by U.S. citizens, are modeled after school programs in the United States. Spanish is emphasized as a language course. The Latin American schools are attended by non-U.S. citizens and are comparable in curriculum with the schools in Panama. The curriculum is in Spanish, and English is taught as a language course.

Finance: The Panama Canal enterprise, consisting of the canal company and the zone government, is self-sustaining and operates at no cost to the U.S. taxpayer. The Panama Canal Company is a Government corporation operating out of its own funds. It is expected to be self-supporting from tolls revenue and revenue from incidental services. In addition to financing its operating costs, which include depreciation, the Panama Canal Company is obligated to pay annually to the U.S. Treasury: (1) interest on the net direct investment of the U.S. Government in the Company at interest rates determined annually by the Secretary of the Treasury; (2) the net cost of Canal Zone Government; and (3) $430,000 of the $1,930,000 annuity paid to Panama, as last increased under the terms of the 1955 treaty between the Governments of Panama and the United States.

The Canal Zone operations and capital program are financed initially by congressional appropriation. The Canal Zone Government makes charges for certain services to other agencies and to individuals for school tuition, hospital services, and similar functions. All revenues received are paid into the U.S. Treasury. The difference between expenditures and revenue, plus depreciation, or the net cost of the Canal Zone Government, is paid into the Treasury by the Panama Canal Company out of its revenue.

Military and scientific activities: The Canal Zone is the headquarters for the Southern Command, which directs the U.S. military effort over 7.5 million square miles of the Latin American land mass. It also is headquarters for the U.S. Army Forces Southern Command, for the Southern Command, for the U.S. Navy Forces Southern Command, and for the U.S. Air Forces Southern Command. These military units all operate schools for Latin American students. The U.S. Army conducts the jungle warfare and Inter-American Geodetic Survey activities. The U.S. Air Force conducts the jungle survival training. The Inter-American Police Academy at Fort Davis is under the Agency for International Development. The Smithsonian Institution operates a biological area on Barro Colorado Island in Gatun Lake. The Middle America Research Unit at Ancon (within the Gorgas Hospital complex) is under the National Institutes of Health.

3. HISTORY

Early history: The search for alternative avenues of commerce from the Western World to the Far East began after 1453, when the Turks seized Constantinople and the great land routes to India and the Orient were closed to Christian Europe. Christopher Columbus, on his fourth voyage (1502) in quest of a water route, was told by natives on the east coast of Central America of a "narrow place" leading to another sea, which he interpreted as meaning a narrow strip of water leading to the Indian Ocean. Vasco Núñez de Balboa also heard the story of a water route. Seeking it, he explored the Isthmus of Panama and discovered the Pacific Ocean (Sept. 25, 1513). Thereafter, the hunt for a water passage to the South Sea, as he had named his discovery, engaged many explorers along the coast.

Credit for first proposing an interocean canal has been given to Alvaro de Saavedra Cerón, cousin of Hernán Cortés, conqueror of Mexico. To him also has been attributed the suggestion of four possible routes—across the Isthmus of Darién, the Isthmus of Panama, Nicaragua, and the Isthmus of Tehuantepec in southern Mexico—all of which became objects of study in the 19th century. Emperor Charles V (Charles I, king of Spain) was favorable to the project, but his successor Philip II abandoned interest.

The idea of an interoceanic passage persisted, however, and received new impetus when the peoples of Central America severed their political connection with Spain in 1823. Interest was stirred in the United States. In 1826 a New York City merchant, Aaron Palmer, contracted with the new confederation of Central America to build a canal but could not raise the $5 million estimated cost. President Andrew Jackson sent Charles Biddle to examine possible routes in Nicaragua and Panama; Biddle ignored Nicaragua, and his negotiations in Panama collapsed.

Focus on Panama: El Camino Real, the Spanish trade route across Panama, had long been used to transport goods between the Old World and the west coast of the Americas. Commerce from Europe commonly used the Chagres River to the head of navigation about halfway across the isthmus, and then Las Cruces Trail to the Pacific Ocean at the city of Panama. After the Mexican cession of California to the United States and the discovery of gold there (1848), the commercial necessity of a transisthmian canal became urgent. Several prospective enterprises were halted by political difficulties.

In 1850, American interests began to build the Panama Railroad, linking the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the isthmus. This route was opened in 1855. It stimulated travel across the isthmus, and soon regular shipping lines made the railroad terminals ports of call. The need for a canal became increasingly apparent. The American Civil War (1861–65) and its aftermath prevented further planning of canal construction by U.S. citizens for several years. Before Americans were ready to consider it again, the French had undertaken to finance and engineer the project.

French enterprise: In 1876, Vicomte Ferdinand Marie de Lesseps, the builder of the Suez Canal, became head of a committee that proposed to make a thorough isthmian canal survey; a private company, the Société Civile Internationale du Canal Interocéanique du Darien, was then formed and undertook the survey. In 1878, Lucien N. B. Wyse, representing this company, obtained from the Government of Colombia, of which Panama was then a part, a concession of the exclusive right to build and operate a transisthmian canal for a period of 99 years.

Before deciding on the location and type of canal to be built, this company invited an international congress to discuss the subject in Paris in May 1879. The congress had 136 delegates, of whom 11 were from the United States. It decided that it was feasible to build a sea-level canal across Panama with terminals at Limón Bay on the Atlantic side and the Bay of Panama on the Pacific side. Construction cost was estimated at $240 million.

The Compagnie Universelle du Canal Interocéanique, with Vicomte de Lesseps as president, was organized August 17, 1879 (finally incorporated in 1881), to build the canal. It purchased the Wyse concession for $2 million and began making surveys. At first the company was capitalized at $80 million in shares of $100 each, open to public subscription. This subscription failed, but another issue in 1880 was successful. This time the initial capital was fixed at $60 million. De Lesseps approved a plan submitted by the technical commission he had appointed, which recommended a sea-level canal estimated to cost $168.6 million, to be completed in 8 years.

Work began in February 1881, but engineering problems, the inroads of tropical disease, and the scarcity of skilled labor soon magnified the task. By mid-1885 the French had excavated far less than they had hoped to accomplish in 4 years, and it was evident that the original plans could not be completed. In France there was harsh criticism of the project and of financial manipulations involved the company. In 1887, in a drastic shift of plan, the French decided to build a lock-type instead of a sea-level canal; the next year de Lesseps resigned and the French Government appointed three receivers to handle the affairs of the enterprise. A new company, the Compagnie Nouvelle du Canal de Panama, was organized in 1894 with a capital stock of $13 million, or 650,000 shares

of $20 each. To gain a time extension, 50,000 shares were given to Colombia, leaving about $12 million working capital. Assets and property of the old company were transferred to the new. After a favorable report from a commission of 11 engineers named to investigate the project, excavation proceeded slowly, but apparently without hope of ultimate success.

U.S. interest: Public sentiment in the United States had begun to favor a transisthmian canal under American control. The 68-day voyage of the battleship *Oregon* from San Francisco, Calif., to Key West, Fla., through the Strait of Magellan to join the Atlantic fleet in the Spanish-American War dramatized the need for a canal. But judgments differed. Many members of the U.S. Congress favored a Nicaraguan route. Directors of the new French company emphasized to the U.S. Government the merits of the Panama route, submitting to President William McKinley in December 1898 the full report of the company's technical committee. In 1899, after authorization by Congress in March to investigate the best route for a transisthmian canal, and with a stipulation that such a waterway should be under complete control of the United States, President McKinley appointed the Isthmian Canal Commission. This group studied the French project in Paris and Panama and tried to ascertain the terms on which the United States might acquire its property and rights. When no clear statement could be obtained, the Commission reported in November 1901 in favor of the Nicaraguan route. This report caused a stir in France. The company's president resigned, and under his successor an offer was made to the United States to sell its property and rights for $40 million. In this altered situation, the Isthmian Canal Commission made a supplementary report approving the Panama route.

Diplomacy and legislation: A diplomatic obstacle hindered the building by the United States of any transisthmian canal. The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850 with Great Britain bound both parties not to control exclusively or to fortify any such canal. In 1900, U.S. Secretary of State John Hay negotiated with the British Ambassador, Julian Pauncefote, 1st Baron Pauncefote, a treaty permitting the United States to build and own such a canal but not to fortify it. Public indignation, echoing in the U.S. Senate, doomed this agreement, but in 1901 a second Hay-Pouncefote Treaty gave the United States all rights over a canal, including that of fortification.

On June 28, 1902, Congress approved the Spooner Act, which authorized President Theodore Roosevelt to acquire the rights and property of the French company for $40 million if Colombia would cede a strip of land across the Isthmus of Panama, which the United States would control for the canal route. If these conditions were not met, the act provided, the President should approach Nicaragua.

On January 22, 1903, Hay persuaded Tomás Herrán, Colombian Chargé d'Affairs in Washington, to sign a treaty giving the United States the rights to build, operate, and control a canal in Panama. This was ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1903 but was rejected by Colombia in August. On November 3, 1903, a revolt in Panama created an independent nation. On November 6, the United States recognized the new Republic, and on November 18, Hay signed with Philippe Jean Bunau-Varilla, who had become Panama's Minister to the United States, a treaty which made possible the building of the Panama Canal. It was ratified in Panama on December 2 and by the U.S. Senate on February 23, 1904. See also Panama—History (Independence). [Not shown in RECORD.]

By article 2 of this treaty, the Republic of Panama granted to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control of a zone of land and water extending approximately 5 miles on each side of the center line of the canal. In article 3, Panama granted the United States all the rights, power, and authority within the Canal Zone which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory, to the exclusion of the exercise by Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority. For this the United States was to pay Panama $10 million and annual payments of $250,000 beginning in 1913. These annuities were increased later. See section "Later History."

American work on the canal: On May 4, 1904, in a historic ceremony at the city of Panama, the French rights and properties were purchased by and formally transferred to the United States. Included was a quantity of machinery which proved to be serviceable. Preliminary work was begun at once, but was hampered by bureaucratic confusion. The chief engineer, John F. Wallace, who had achieved much in spite of the obstacles, resigned in June 1905 and was replaced by John F. Stevens.

An inhibiting factor in these early days was indecision as to the type of canal to be built. Work had started on the plan for a lock-type canal, as approved by Congress in 1902, but engineering reports in 1904 and 1905 recommended return to a sea-level project. Stevens, however, favored the lock type, and the debate was carried into the Senate. On June 15, 1906, Congress finally approved a high-level lock canal. The digging proceeded, but Stevens resigned in 1907 and President Theodore Roosevelt reorganized the Canal Commission, naming Lt. Col. George W. Goethals, of the U.S. Army Engineers, commission chairman and chief engineer of the canal. Under Goethals' direction, the project was completed with Army Engineers.

Problems of the work: The American engineers inherited the excavation done by the French, which amounted to 78.1 million cubic yards of earth, but only about 40 percent of this cut should be used for the new canal. The magnitude of the task was increased by the soft character of some formations to be dug, particularly in the Culebra (later Gaillard) cut area, where serious earth slides occurred. One in the Cucaracha formation later in 1913 delayed the canal opening about 10 months.

Manpower: The recruiting of labor caused grave difficulties, and the human cost of the project was an impressive testimonial to the perils of the work. The United States had as many as 40,000 persons employed on the canal at one time. During the 10-year construction period more than 6,000 persons lost their lives.

Public health: The prevalence of disease, especially yellow fever and malaria, had been a major hazard to the French enterprise. By energetic measures against the disease-carrying mosquitoes, Col. William Crawford Gorgas, chief sanitary officer of the Panama Canal Zone from 1904 to 1913, succeeded in virtually eradicating yellow fever and reducing drastically the toll of malaria. Modern sanitation methods, which he introduced, achieved vast improvement in general public health. In 1906, deaths from disease were 39.29 per 1,000 employees; by 1914 the rate had been cut to 7.04 per 1,000.

Later history: By terms of the treaty for the settlement of differences (Thompson-Urrutia Treaty) between the United States and Colombia, signed in April 1914, Colombia agreed to recognize the Republic of Panama in return for an indemnity of $25 million and special isthmian transportation privileges. The treaty was ratified in 1922.

Two major treaties relating to the canal and the Canal Zone have been concluded between the United States and Panama since 1903. The General Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation in 1936 increased the annual payment by the United States to $430,000. The Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation of 1955 raised the payment to $1,930,000.

Future plans: Since its opening in 1914 the canal has undergone many improvements. The steady growth of its traffic, which is expected to reach maximum capacity before 1980, has stirred debate over the direction which its future enlargement might take. A 1960 report favored improvement of the lock canal pending replacement by a sea-level canal. In 1964, President Johnson said that the United States would seek to build a sea-level canal in Panama or in a nearby country.

The program of widening Gaillard Cut from a minimum channel of 300 to 500 feet continued, and the project was expected to be completed in 1970. Initial planning began on building a storage dam across the Trinidad arm of Gatun Lake. The Trinidad Dam would provide for future water requirements by impounding approximately 430,000 acre-feet of water. The 50-year-old lock-towing locomotives have been replaced by larger, faster, and more powerful locomotives. Also, considerable progress has been made on developing new procedures for overhauling the locks so that the period of single-lock operation during an overhaul would be approximately 24 hours instead of a matter of weeks.

See also American expansion policy; canals—major canals (Panama Canal); Clayton-Bulwer Treaty—events leading to the treaty; Colombia—15. History (Republic); Commerce—4. Interstate commerce (rates); France—31. History: The Third Republic, 1870–1940 (stabilization of the republican system): Threats to the regime; Hay-Pauncefote Treaty; Latin America—28. World affairs (independent Latin America): Isthmian trade routes; Monroe Doctrine—The doctrine as national dogma and biographical articles on principal figures mentioned. [Not shown in RECORD.]

4. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Congrès International d'Etudes du Canal Interocéanique, "Compte rendu des sèances du 15 au 20 mai 1879" (Paris 1879); U.S. Senate, Report of the Isthmian Canal Commission, 1899–1901 (Washington 1901); Wafer, Lionel, "A New Voyage and Description of the Isthumus of America (Cleveland 1903); annual reports, the Isthmian Canal Commission, governor of the Panama Canal and Panama Canal Company-Canal Zone Government (Balboa Heights, C.Z., 1904–); "Canal Record, Panama Canal Record and Panama Canal Review" (Balboa Heights, C.Z., 1907–); Anderson, C. L. G., "Old Panama and Castilla del Oro" (Washington 1911); Arias Madrid, Harmodio, "The Panama Canal: a Study in International Law and Diplomacy" (London 1911); Bunau-Varilla, Philippe, "Panama: the Creation, Destruction, and Resurrection" (New York 1914); Bakenhus, R. E., and others, "The Panama Canal" (New York 1915); Bennett, I. E., History of the Panama Canal" (Washington 1915); Sibert, William L., and Stevens, John F., "The Construction of the Panama Canal" (New York 1915); Goethals, George W., compiler, "The Panama Canal," 2 vols. (New York 1916); Gorgas, Marie D., and Hendrick, Burton J., "William Crawford Gorgas: His Life and Work" (New York 1924); Bishop, Joseph B., and Bishop, Farnham, "Goethals: Genius of the Panama Canal" (New York 1930); Miner, Dwight C., "The Fight for the Panama Route" (New York 1940); Mack, Gerstle, "The Land Divided" (New York 1940); DuVal, Miles P., "And the Mountains Will Move" (Stanford, Calif., 1947); id., "Cadiz to Cathay" (Stanford 1947); Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, 1st session (Balboa Heights, C.Z., 1947); Panama Canal Company, rules and regulations governing

navigation of the Panama Canal and adjacent waters (Mount Hope, C.Z., 1952–); Lee, William Storrs, "Strength to Move a Mountain" (New York 1958).

NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the history of America can be traced in its rivers. The earliest explorers from Europe first pierced the New World's wilderness via its water courses, and these were our country's first arteries of commerce. The Hudson, the Delaware, the Susquehanna, and the Potomac, the mighty Father of Waters and its great tributaries that drain the vast Midwest, the wide placid Rio Grande, the wild, coveted waters of the Colorado, the rushing Columbia in the Northwest, and a thousand lesser but romantic rivers in between—these waterways still are basic to the economy and the culture of our Nation. We have harnessed most of them. We have transformed and diverted them. We have polluted nearly all of them, in the process transforming ribbons of beauty into channels of filth.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is something intrinsic to the American character to be found in our Nation's unruly, untamed, natural rivers. There is something of La Vérendrye and Champlain and of Daniel Boone and Lewis and Clark in all of us that helps to guarantee that Americans will never yield our freedoms at home nor bow to the oppressor abroad.

Today we have only a few rivers left in the free-flowing, wild, and unspoiled condition that challenged and inspired our forebears. We propose now to set portions of them aside for preservation, as precious bits of our natural heritage—practically outdoor museum pieces.

The President of the United States has called for legislation to establish a national system of wild rivers. What would be the value of such a system in this age of big cities and vast technology? Why keep some scenic rivers? Hear an answer by one of America's conservation leaders, Mr. Carl W. Buchheister, the president of the National Audubon Society.

Mr. Buchheister wrote in Audubon magazine, May–June 1965:

> There is something that is both exciting and soothing to the human spirit in a clear, running stream.
>
> The water sings a varied song as it converses with the rocks, thunders in the rapids or whispers to the alders. The fish that rise to a lure in such a stream are special fish, as any angler knows. The cares and tensions of human society evaporate for the man steering a canoe through its chutes, and no sleep is so refreshing as a slumber in a tent or sleeping bag on the banks of a wild river.
>
> The voyageurs used such streams to ply their romantic traffic through the wilderness. Lewis and Clark were inspired to some of the most lyric passages in their journals by the beauty of the rivers they ascended and descended in their historic passage.
>
> To save some of the unspoiled, natural streams that we still have left for refreshment of the spirit and body of man isn't exactly a revolutionary idea. It is rather an obvious extension of the principle already established in our national park and wilderness systems, but it is an overdue extension.

Mr. Speaker, the President spoke vividly and movingly of the need for a wild rivers system in his conservation message of February 8, 1965, when he said:

> Those who first settled this continent found much to marvel at. Nothing was a greater source of wonder and amazement than the power and majesty of American rivers. They occupy a central place in myth and legend, folklore, and literature.
>
> They were our first highways, and some remain among the most important. We have had to control their ravages, harness their power, and use their water to help make whole regions prosper. Yet even this seemingly indestructible natural resource is in danger.
>
> Through our pollution-control programs we can do much to restore our rivers. We will continue to conserve the water and power for tomorrow's needs with well-planned reservoirs and power dams. But the time has also come to identify and preserve free-flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers before growth and development make the beauty of the unspoiled waterway a memory.
>
> To this end I will shortly send to Congress a bill to establish a natural wild rivers system.

But the study team named by the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to survey the possibilities and to prepare a draft of appropriate legislation must not have been listening to their President. Or they grew fainthearted and beached their canoe before they reached the rapids. The draft bill that was transmitted to the Congress was at best a timorous approach.

It recommended only six streams, or segments of them, as worthy of prompt protection in a wild rivers system, and it listed only nine others for study. It proposed no classification as to relative naturalness. Except for setting aside the licensing authority of the Federal Power Commission—which is basic—on the first six, it offered little protection for the streams it proposed to preserve.

Little wonder that the administration draft lay for a long time in the House before any Member was moved to sponsor it. The other body finally passed a version of the draft in S. 1446, but it is a weak-kneed measure that I could not in good conscience support.

Mr. Speaker, the conservation of the natural resources of America cannot be achieved by half-baked measures.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a strong scenic rivers bill (H.R. 14922) designed to meet the concerns that have been voiced by such outstanding conservation organizations as the American Whitewater Affiliation, the National Audubon Society, the Wilderness Society, the Environmental Research Institute, the Sport Fishing Institute, the Wildlife Management Institute, the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League of America, the Sierra Club, Trout Unlimited, and the Natural History Society. Regarding the inherent weaknesses of S. 1446, H.R. 14922 will provide the American people with a true scenic rivers system—it classifies certain rivers at once as scenic rivers and provides the guidelines for additions to the scenic rivers system.

I am introducing an adequate national scenic rivers bill.

It proposes scenic river status now to all the streams, or segments thereof, so designated in the measure passed by the other body, and nine others in addition to these seven; namely, the Green River in Wyoming, the Klamath in California, the Missouri in Montana, the Skagit in Washington, the Flathead in Montana, the Hudson in New York, the Wolf in Wisconsin, the St. Croix in Minnesota and Wisconsin, and the Suwannee in Georgia and Florida.

It directs the Secretary of the Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior to put each of these rivers into one of three classes or categories, according to the degree of wildness, accessibility by roads, and shoreline development that characterizes each. It directs the appropriate Secretary to administer the streams accordingly.

S. 1446 contains no such protective system of classification. This is an omission that would lead inevitably to an erosion of the beauty and wildness of the most unspoiled of the streams.

My bill also provides a mechanism for reclassifying a scenic river to a higher category when it shall have been restored and improved in natural, scenic, and recreational values.

My bill names 66 streams that will be studied for potential, future additions to the system, and unlike S. 1446, which sets no timetable for the studies, it directs the Secretaries to consult with the States and to complete the necessary surveys in 10 years.

My bill sets aside the authority of the Federal Power Commission to license dams on all of these rivers until, in the case of each, the executive branch has completed the study and Congress has had a chance to act upon the recommendations.

Unlike S. 1446, my bill provides that mines now in operation or started later on existing mining claims within a scenic river area shall be subject to regulations designed to prevent water pollution and undue scarring of the landscape. Such protective provision in the measure approved by the other body would apply only in the case of mining claims filed after the date of the enactment.

Recognizing the importance of mineral prospecting and mining to the welfare of the United States and to the economy of the communities affected, my bill specifies that any mining claim hereafter perfected within the scenic rivers system, and any patent issued for such claim, shall convey title to the mineral deposits and the right to use so much of the surface and the surface resources, including timber, as are reasonably required for the prospecting and mining operations. Title to the surface of the claim, however, will be reserved to the United States in order to protect the values that are important to the purposes of this act.

My bill provides for the acquisition of lands in fee—but only such lands as are absolutely essential to the purposes of the act—within a belt 1 mile from each

shore of the stream. A strip only 300 feet from either side of the stream, as authorized in S. 1446, is so inadequate as to border on the ridiculous.

Under my bill, scenic easements may be taken for purposes of the act within a belt 2 miles wide from either bank of the river. This compares to the totally inadequate one-fourth mile authorized in S. 1446.

Like S. 1446 my bill encourages the States to act within their own powers to establish and protect Scenic River Areas. But my bill adds one additional provision that is vital: It proposes to set aside the Federal Power Act with respect to any such scenic river that is preserved by State legislative act. Without such provision, a State may try in vain to save a free-flowing stream.

Like S. 1446 my bill neither expresses nor implies any claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws. It would in no wise affect the jurisdiction of the States with respect to fish and wildlife. It expressly denies any intent, purpose or provision to alter, amend, appeal, construe, interpret or modify, or be in conflict with, any interstate compact made by any States which contain any portion of the National Scenic Rivers System.

Finally, my bill contains one other important provision. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct periodic surveys and studies to secure basic ecological data and other information needed for the continuing preservation and management of a National Scenic Rivers System.

When enacted this legislation will be another giant step forward in protecting a portion of our American heritage.

As a part of my remarks, I wish to incorporate the provisions of my National Scenic Rivers Bill, H.R. 14922:

H.R. 14922

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Scenic Rivers Act."

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that some of the free-flowing rivers of the United States possess unique water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values of present and potential benefit to the American people. The Congress also finds that our established national policy of dam and other construction at appropriate sections of the rivers of the United States needs to be complemented by a policy that would preserve other selected rivers or sections thereof in their natural and free-flowing condition, to protect the water quality and shore environment of such rivers and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes. It is the policy of Congress to preserve, reclaim, and make available for the benefit of all of the American people, selected parts of the Nation's diminishing resources of free-flowing rivers. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Scenic Rivers System to be composed of the areas that are designated as "scenic river areas" in this Act, and the additional areas that may be designated in subsequent Acts of Congress. It is not the intent of this Act to require or to authorize acquisition of all lands within the exterior boundaries of scenic river areas but to assure preservation and proper management of the land, water, wildlife, outdoor recreational values, and scenic resources. Areas designated as "scenic river areas" by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be classified and administered in accordance with the provisions of this Act unless the subsequent Acts provide otherwise.

Classes of scenic river areas

(b) A scenic river area eligible to be included in the system is a free-flowing stream, tributary, river, or section thereof and the related adjacent land area that possesses unique water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values. Every scenic river in its free-flowing condition, or upon restoration to this condition, shall be considered eligible for inclusion in the National Scenic Rivers System and shall be classified, designated, and administered as one of the following:

(1) Class I Scenic River Areas—those rivers or sections of rivers that are free of impoundments and inaccessible except by trail, with watersheds or shorelines essentially primitive, and water unpolluted. These would represent vestiges of primitive America.

(2) Class II Scenic River Areas—those rivers or sections of rivers free of impoundments, with shorelines or watersheds still largely primitive, and shorelines largely undeveloped, but accessible in places by roads.

(3) Class III Scenic River Areas—those rivers or sections of rivers which are readily accessible by road, or railroad, with some development along shorelines and which may have undergone some impoundment or diversion in the past.

NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

SEC. 3. (a) The following rivers, or segments thereof, and related, adjacent lands, most of which are public lands, as depicted on maps numbered "NSR–SAL–1000, NSR–CLE–1000, NSR–ROG–1000, NSR–RIO–1000, NSR–ELE–1000, NSR–CAP–1000, NSR–SHE–1000, NSR–GRE–1000, NSR–KLA–1000, NSR–MIS–1000, NSR–SKA–1000, NSR–FLA–1000, NSR–HUD–1000, NSR–WOL–1000, NSR–StC–1000, NSR–SUW–1000," are hereby designated as "scenic river areas":

(1) Salmon, Idaho—the Salmon from town of North Fork downstream to its confluence with the Snake River and the entire Middle Fork.

(2) Clearwater, Middle Fork, Idaho—the Middle Fork from the town of Kooskia upstream to the town of Lowell; the Lochsa River from its junction with the Selway at Lowell forming the Middle Fork, upstream to the Powell Ranger Station; and the Selway River from Lowell upstream to its origin.

(3) Rogue, Oregon—the segment extending from the Applegate River to the Route 101 highway bridge above Gold Beach.

(4) Rio Grande, New Mexico—the segment extending from the Colorado State line downstream to near the town of Pilar, and the lower 4 miles of the Red River.

(5) Eleven Point, Missouri—the segment of the river extending from a point near Greer Spring downstream to State Highway 142.

(6) Cacapon, West Virginia—entire river and its tributary, the Lost River.

(7) Shenandoah, West Virginia—the segment of the river located in the State of West Virginia.

(8) Green, Wyoming—the segment extending from its origin in the Bridger Wilderness Area south to its confluence with Horse Creek.

(9) Klamath, California—the segment extending from the Scott River downstream to near the town of Klamath Falls.

(10) Missouri, Montana—the segment extending from Fort Peck Reservoir upstream to near the town of Fort Benton.

(11) Skagit, Washington—the Skagit River from near the town of Sedro Woolley upstream to the Gorge powerhouse near the town of Newhalem; the Cascade River from its mouth to the junction with its north and south forks and up the South Fork to the boundary of the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area; the Suiattle River from its mouth to the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area boundary at Milk Creek; the Sauk River from its mouth to the junction with Elliott Creek, and the North Fork of the Sauk River from its junction with the South Fork of the Sauk to the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area boundary.

(12) Flathead, Montana—North Fork from the Canadian Border downstream to confluence with Middle Fork; Middle Fork from headwaters to confluence with South Fork; and South Fork from its origin to the Hungry Horse Reservoir.

(13) Hudson, New York—the Hudson River from mouth to source, including tributaries.

(14) Wolf, Wisconsin—the segment reaching from the confluence of the Hunting River downstream to the town of Keshena.

(15) St. Croix, Minnesota and Wisconsin—beginning at the dam near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, and extending upstream to the dam near Gordon, Wisconsin, and its Namekagon tributary.

(16) Suwannee, Georgia and Florida—entire river from its source in the Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia to the gulf and the outlying Ichetucknee Springs, Florida.

Said maps shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. Following further study, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within one year after enactment of this Act, classify these scenic rivers and sections thereof into one or more of the three classes designated in this Act as Class I Scenic River Areas, Class II Scenic River Areas, or Class III Scenic River Areas.

Federal-State planning for additions to system

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture where national forest lands are involved, after consultation with interested Federal agencies, are directed to consult with the Governors and officials of the States in which the rivers listed below are located to ascertain whether a joint Federal-State plan is feasible and desirable in the public interest to conserve segments of these rivers. They shall submit to the President, within three years of the effective date of this Act, their recommendations for inclusion of any or all of them in the National Scenic Rivers System, and the President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate:

(1) Buffalo, Tennessee—the entire river from its beginning in Lawrence County to its confluence with the Duck River.

(2) St. Croix, Minnesota—St. Croix River downstream from the dam near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, to its confluence with the Mississippi River.

(3) Niobrara, Nebraska—the main-stem segment lying between the confluence of Antelope Creek downstream to the headwaters of the proposed Norden Reservoir east of the town of Valentine, and the lower eight miles of its Snake River tributary.

(4) Susquehanna, New York and Pennsylvania—the segment of the Susequehanna River from a dam at Cooperstown, New York, downstream to the town of Pittston, Pennsylvania.

(5) Allegheny, Pennsylvania and New York—the segment extending from the Allegheny Reservoir upstream to its source.

(6) Big Blue, Indiana—the segment extending from its confluence with the Ohio River east of the town of Leavenworth upstream to near the town of Salem.

(7) Little Miami, Ohio—the segment of the Little Miami River in Clark, Greene, Warren, and Clermont Counties from a point in the vicinity of Clifton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of Morrow, Ohio.

(8) Little Beaver, Ohio—the segment of the North and Middle Forks of the Little Beaver River, in Columbiana County, from a point in the vicinity of Negly and Elkton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of East Liverpool, Ohio.

(9) Pine Creek, Pennsylvania—the segment from Ansonia, Pennsylvania, to Waterville, Pennsylvania.

(10) Delaware, Pennsylvania and New York—the segment from Hancock, New York, to Matamoras, Pennsylvania.

(11) Clarion, Pennsylvania—the segment from where it enters the Allegheny River to Ridgway, Pennsylvania.

(12) West Branch Susquehanna, Pennsylvania—the segment of the West Branch Susquehanna from Clearfield, Pennsylvania, to Lock Haven, Pennsylvania.

(13) Little Tennessee, Tennessee—the segment from Chilhowee Dam to its confluence with the Tennessee River near Lenoir City.

(14) Buffalo, Arkansas—the entire river from its source in Newton County to its confluence with the White River.

(15) Colorado, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, Nevada, California—the entire river from its headwaters to its outlet in the Pacific Ocean.

(16) Columbia, Montana, Washington, Idaho and Oregon—the segment of river from the Canadian River to its outlet in the Pacific Ocean.

River basin planning for additions to system

(c) Similar reviews and recommendations for preservation of the following rivers shall be made to the President within ten years of enactment of this Act. Recommendations on one-third of these rivers shall be made within five years of the enactment of this Act; recommendations shall be made on not less than two-thirds of these rivers within seven years after the enactment of this Act, and on the remaining rivers within ten years after the enactment of this Act.

Animas, Colorado.
Ausable, New York.
Big Fork, Minnesota.
Big Hole, Montana.
Black Warrier, Alabama.
Blackfoot, Montana.
Cache la Poudre, Colorado.
Cheat, West Virginia.
Connecticut, New Hempshire.
Cumberland, Tennessee and Kentucky.
Deschutes, Oregon.
Feather, Middle Fork, California.
French Broad, North Carolina and Tennessee.
Gasconade, Missouri.
Gila, New Mexico.
Greenbrier, West Virginia.
Gros Ventre, Wyoming.
Guadalupe, Texas.
Hoh, Washington.
James, Virginia.
Kern, North Fork, California.
Linville, North Carolina.
Little Wabash, Illinois.
Madison, Montana.
Manistee, Michigan.
Methow, Washington.
Mullica, New Jersey.
Namekagon, Wisconsin.
Oklawaha, Florida.
Penobscott, East and West Branches, Maine.
Pere Marquette, Michigan.
Potomac, Maryland, Pennslyvania, West Virginia, and Virginia.
Queets, Washington.
Sacramento, California.
St. Joe, Idaho.
Salt, Arizona.
San Juan, Utah and New Mexico.
Savannah headwaters, Georgia and North Carolina.
Shenandoah, Virginia.
Smith, California.
Snake, North Fork, Idaho.
Tangipahoa, Louisiana.
Teton, Idaho and Wyoming.
Upper Iowa, Iowa.
Wacissa, Florida.
Wapsipinicon, Iowa.
White, North and South Forks, Colorado.
Wind, Wyoming.
Yellowstone, Montana and Wyoming.
Youghiogheny, Maryland and Pennsylvania.

(d) In all planning for the use and development of water and related land resources, consideration shall be given by all Federal agencies involved to potential scenic river areas, and all river basin and project plan reports submitted to the Congress shall discuss any such potentials. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make specific studies and investigation to determine which additional scenic river areas within the United States shall be evaluated in planning reports as potential additions to the scenic rivers system.

Other additions to the system

(e) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the President from time to time their recommendations for inclusion in the National Scenic Rivers System of any other river or segment thereof. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate.

(f) Recommendations made under this section shall be developed in consultation with the States, those Federal agencies which normally participate in the development of recreation plans and comprehensive river basin plans, any commissions established pursuant to interstate compacts the assigned responsibilities of which would be affected, and commissions or other bodies which may be established for the purpose of developing a comprehensive plan for the river basin within which the contemplated scenic river area would be located.

Each such recommendation shall be accompanied by (1) expressions of any views which the Federal agencies and States and interstate commissions consulted pursuant to the foregoing may submit within ninety days after having been notified of the proposed recommendation; (2) a statement setting forth the probable effect of the recommended action on any comprehensive river basin plan that may have been adopted by Congress or that is serving as a guide for coordinating Federal or Federal and State programs in the basin; and (3) in the absence of such plan, a statement indicating the probable effect of the recommended action on alternative beneficial uses of the resources of the basin.

(g) Whenever it is proposed to add a river or segment hereof to the National Scenic Rivers System, and the river or segment runs through non-Federal land, recommendations with respect to its addition and with respect to whether it should be wholly or partly acquired, protected, and managed pursuant to exclusive State authority shall be made to the President by the Governor of each State concerned. Such recommendation to the President shall be accompanied by or based upon a general State plan which assures the effectuation of the purposes of this Act in perpetuity. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the designation of such river or segment thereof as a part of the National Scenic Rivers System and the administration of such area by State authority, together with such draft legislation that he deems appropriate.

Need for land acquisition

(h) Any recommendation for an addition to the National Scenic Rivers System shall indicate the extent to which land will need to be acquired by the State and by the Federal Government, and the extent to which the acquisition of scenic easements or other interests in land may be an adequate substitute for the acquisition of a fee title.

ADMINISTRATION OF SYSTEM

SEC. 4. (a) After classification and designation of the scenic river areas described in section 3 (a) and (b), they shall be administered in a manner agreed upon between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, or as determined by the President.

(b) Scenic river areas designated by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be classified and administered by the Secretary of the Interior, except that when the scenic river area is wholly within, partly within, or closely adjacent to, a national forest such area shall be classified and administered by the Secretary of Agriculture unless it is also partly within, or closely adjacent to, an area administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in which event the scenic river area shall be classified and administered in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, or as directed by the President. The Secretary charged with the administration of a scenic river area or portion thereof designated by this Act or by subsequent Acts may agree with the Governor of the State for State or local governmental agency participation in the administration of the area. The States shall be encouraged to cooperate in the planning and to assume the administration of such scenic river areas where they include State-owned or county-owned lands. Any Federal land located within a scenic river area may, with the consent of the head of the agency having jurisdiction thereof, be transferred to the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary for administration as part of the scenic river area. Any land transferred hereunder to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture for administration as part of a scenic river area in connection with the National Forest System shall become national forest land.

(c) Within the exterior boundaries of a scenic river area or portion thereof under his administration the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands or interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided,* That lands owned by an Indian tribe may be acquired only with the consent of the tribal governing body. In the exercise of his exchange authority the Secretary of the Interior may accept title to any non-Federal property within a scenic river area, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction within the State in which the river or segment thereof flows, except lands within the National Park System, or the National Wildlife Refuge System, which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The properties so exchanged shall be of approximately equal fair market value. If they are not of approximately equal fair market value, the Secretary of the Interior may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. The Secretary of Agriculture, in the exercise of his exchange authority, may utilize authorities and procedures available to him in connection with exchanges of national forest lands. Any such lands acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture within or adjacent to a national forest shall upon acquisition become national forest lands. Money appropriated for Federal or State purposes from the land and water conservation fund shall be available for the acquisition of property for the purposes of this Act. As used in this Act the term "scenic easement" means the right to control the use of land (including the air space above such land) for the purpose of protecting and preserving the scenic view from the river and the shore environment for the purposes of this Act.

(a) Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands by condemnation, for the purpose of including such lands in any scenic river area, if such lands are located within any incorporated city, village, or borough within such area, when such entities shall have in force and applicable to such lands a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(e) Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of Agriculture may exercise any authority to acquire county-owned lands within any scenic river area without the consent of said county as long as the county is following a plan for the management, zoning, and protection of such lands that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(f) Wherever the power of condemnation has been conferred by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands in fee title by condemnation within an area which may not extend more than one mile on either side of the stream, tributary, or river, and only such lands as are essential to the purposes of this Act. Either Secretary may acquire by condemnation for scenic easements, or other interests in land other than fee title, an area which extends no more than two miles from either side of the stream, tributary, or river.

(g) A scenic river area shall be administered for the purposes of water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values contributing to public enjoyment. Lands acquired within each scenic river area shall be classified by the administering Secretary according to the present or desired type of land use to be allowed there: as Class I, Class II, or Class III Scenic River Areas.

(1) Commercial timber harvesting shall not be allowed within Class I Scenic River Areas; commercial timber harvesting shall be permitted within one-half mile of Class II and Class III areas where it is found to be compatible with the maintenance of scenic vistas from the stream and its banks.

(2) No new roads shall be constructed within Class I Scenic River Areas; no new roads paralleling the stream shall be constructed closer than one thousand three hundred and twenty feet of rivers within Class II Scenic River Areas.

(3) Public road access through new road construction shall be allowed only within Class II and Class III Scenic River Areas, as well as landings and other structures related to recreational use of these scenic river areas.

(4) Grazing shall not be allowed within Class I Scenic River Areas; grazing, and improvements necessarily related to it, shall be allowed, subject to regulation by the administering agency, in Class II and Class III Scenic River Areas.

The Secretary of the Interior, in administering such areas, may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas of the National Park System and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for recreation and preservation purposes, and the conservation and management of natural resources, as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture, in administering such areas, shall utilize the statutory authorities relating to the national forests in such manner as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of his Act.

(h) Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture a scenic river area previously administered as Class II or Class III has been sufficiently restored and enhanced in its natural scenic, and recreational qualities, such area may be classified to a higher status Class II to Class I, or Class III to Class II or Class I) and thereafter administered accordingly.

STATE AND LOCAL WILD RIVERS

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is directed to encourage and assist States to consider, in their comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plans and proposals for financial assistance for State and local projects submitted pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, needs and opportunities for establishing scenic rivers. He is further directed, in accordance with the authority contained in the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Organic Act (77 Stat. 49), to provide technical assistance and advice to, and cooperate with, States, political subdivisions, and private interests, including nonprofit organizations, with respect to establishing scenic rivers.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is directed in accordance to the authority vested in him to assist, advise, and cooperate with State and local agencies and private interests with respect to establishing scenic rivers.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no dam or other project shall be constructed, operated, or maintained, or authorized to be constructed, operated, or maintained, (1) in any scenic river area, (2) in any of the scenic river areas subject to review under section 3 (b) and (c), or (3) in any scenic river area established in accordance with State law by a State or political subdivision thereof, by (A) the Federal Power Commission, (B) the Secretary of the Army, (C) the Secretary of the Interior, or (D) the Tennessee Valley Authority, unless the Congress shall, by law enacted after this Act, specifically authorize such dam or other project.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the applicability of the United States mining and mineral leasing laws within the National Scenic Rivers System, except that all prospecting, all mining operations, and all other activities on a mining claim perfected after the date of this Act, either before or after the issuance of patent, and all mining operations and other activities under a mineral lease, license, or permit hereafter issued, shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of national forest lands, may prescribe to effectuate the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That any mining claim affecting lands within the scenic rivers system hereafter perfected under the United States mining laws, and any patent issued for such claim, shall convey title only to the mineral deposits and shall confer upon the holder of the claim only such rights to the use of the surface and surface resources as are reasonably required for carrying on prospecting or mining, subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; and the patent for any such mining claim hereafter perfected shall reserve to the United States all title to the surface of the claim and the products of the surface, subject only to the patentee's rights to use the surface of the claim and the surface resources to the extent reasonably required for carrying on prospecting and mining consistent with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Any patent so issued shall recite these limitations. All such regulations shall provide among other things for safeguards against pollution of the river.

(c) Any portion of a scenic river area that is within the National Wilderness Preservation System, as established by the Act of September 3, 1964 (Public Law 88-577), shall be subject to the provisions of both the Wilderness Act and this Act with respect to the preservation of such scenic river area, and in case of conflict between the provisions of these Acts the more restrictive provisions shall apply.

(d) The head of any Federal or State agency administering a scenic river area shall cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior, and with the appropriate State water pollution control agencies, for the purpose of eliminating or diminishing the pollution of waters within a scenic river area.

(e) Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

(f) Nothing in this Act shall affect the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the States under other provisions of law with respect to fish and wildlife.

(g) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify or be in conflict with any interstate compact made by any States which contain any portion of the National Scenic Rivers System.

(h) A State shall have rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access by such State to the beds of navigable streams, tributaries, or rivers (or segments thereof) which are vested in the State, in case such beds are located in a scenic river area.

(i) Designation of any stream or portion thereof shall not be construed as a reservation of the waters of such streams for purposes other than those specified in this Act, or in quantities greater than necessary to accomplish these purposes.

(j) The jurisdiction of the States over waters of any stream included a scenic river area shall be unaffected by this Act to the extent that such jurisdiction may be exercised without impairing the purposes of this Act or its administration.

SEC. 7. In order to provide basic ecological information needed for management purposes, trends and changes in river resources; and in order to provide scientific and up-to-date information for the preservation and management of the National Scenic Rivers System, a systematic evaluation of scenic river recreational resources will be conducted periodically by the Secretary of the Interior. Such evaluation shall include the gathering and analysis of data on water quality, pollution, the status of fish populations and aquatic organisms, fish habitat, game populations and shore habitats, recreation use, recreation impact, appropriateness of access, management procedures, developments, watershed condiiton and trend, and other data needed to evaluate the resources. The method used shall be sufficiently uniform as to permit comparisons of the same river area from time to time and to be of value in comparing one river area with another. The information gathered for evaluation should be collected with a view to utilizing it in long range management of the various classes of scenic rivers. The evaluation methods should be prepared by trained fishery and wildlife biologists, ecologists, and other appropriately trained scientists.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

MRS. INA BEAUCHAMP HALL, 1966 NORTH DAKOTA MOTHER OF THE YEAR

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, last week, I considered it a great pleasure to escort the 1966 North Dakota Mother of the Year, Mrs. Ina Beauchamp Hall, Parshall, N. Dak., to the Star Spangled Awards Dinner of the American Mothers Committee, Inc.

Mrs. Hall, the mother of nine children, is an associate home extension agent, employed by the Extension Service of North Dakota State University. A check with the Department of Agriculture shows that she is the first home extension agent in the United States to receive a Mother of the Year title.

Another first for Mrs. Hall is the fact that her sister, Mrs. Margaret Breuer, of Emmet, N. Dak., was named North Dakota Mother of the Year in 1956. Never before in my State had sisters been honored with this title.

Mrs. Hall, who lives on the edge of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, has developed, on the reservation, homemaker groups for adult women, as well as 4–H programs currently involving 250 boys and girls.

Despite the responsibilities of rearing nine children, Mrs. Hall has devoted herself unstintingly to community affairs. The Community Development Club of Parshall was organized at a meeting in her home. Believing that old Indian skills and crafts should be preserved, she displayed leadership in establishing a successful fall fair on the reservation in which Indians have the opportunity to exhibit their handiwork. An advocate of improving educational opportunities, she recently established a study hall and library in Parshall for children who find it difficult to study at home.

Mrs. Hall richly deserves the recognition she is receiving as North Dakota Mother of the Year, and I am proud of her.

CATV AND COPYRIGHT REVISION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on the Judiciary has been engaged in a series of executive sessions on H.R. 4347, for the general revision of the copyright law. A pressing issue in the revision is whether and to what extent community antenna television systems should be liable for copyright infringement when they retransmit without permission a broadcast containing copyrighted material.

At the same time, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been engaged in hearings and study of the problems of communications law presented by CATV activities.

Our Copyright Subcommittee has reached agreement on certain amendments to H.R. 4347, to be recommended to the full committee, which would define the status of CATV operations under the copyright law. Because of the importance of the subject and its relationship to matters now under active consideration by the Commerce Committee, the subcommittee has communicated its conclusions to the distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] and has made this communication public. For the convenience and interest of the Members, I am also inserting it in the RECORD, together with a draft of legislative language that would effectuate the subcommittee's proposal.

The letter to Chairman STAGGERS and the draft read as follows:

MAY 5, 1966.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on the Judiciary is engaged in a series of executive sessions on H.R. 4347, a bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code. One of the most important and controversial of the issues posed by the revision is the copyright status of transmissions by community antenna systems.

Under H.R. 4347, as introduced, commercial CATV systems would be fully liable for copyright infringement whenever they retransmit without permission a broadcast containing copyrighted material. After extensive consideration of the arguments made during the hearings and the legal and public policy issues involved, the subcommittee has reached agreement on certain amendments which would substantially change the bill to be recommended to the full committee.

The subcommittee is, of course, aware that your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been engaged in hearings and study of the problems of communications law presented by CATV activities. It has been our purpose, as far as possible, to resolve the copyright issues raised by CATV without trenching upon the area of communications problems. Because of the importance of this question and its relationship to the active consideration now being given by your committee to measures that would define the status of CATV systems under the Communications Act, we have decided to announce our conclusions on this particular question at this time. The following is a broad simplified summary of what will necessarily be a complex statutory provision.

For the purpose of this summary, "CATV" refers to commercial services that intercept off-the-air transmissions of programs originated by others and retransmit them to paying subscribers by wire connections or the like, without altering their content, originating programs themselves, or making special charges for particular programs.

The subcommittee's proposal would divide CATV activities, upon the basis of geographic and other characteristics, into three broad categories or "areas" which we call "white," "black," and "gray." In very general terms, the subcommittee proposes to exempt CATV operations from copyright if they are entirely in the white area; make them fully liable if they are in the black area; and subject them to limited liability in the nature of a "reasonable license fee" if they are in the gray area.

Under the subcommittee's proposal, the white area embraces CATV retransmission solely within the radius of the area served by the primary broadcaster (in effect, its "grade B contour") to fill in gaps or improve bad reception caused by technical interference. Example: A system operating solely within New York City and retransmitting New York City stations only.

The black area embraces retransmission beyond the area served by the primary broadcaster into an area already served by one or more other broadcasters, none of whom is licensed to carry the same program. Example: A system bringing a New York City station's broadcast of a motion picture to Philadelphia subscribers when no Philadelphia station is licensed to broadcast it.

The gray area embraces retransmissions beyond the area served by the primary broadcaster into an area already served by another broadcaster who has a license to carry the same program; or into an area not served by any primary broadcaster.

The subcommittee believes that in the so-called white area where the CATV operation is merely a "fill-in" or "master antenna" service, operating solely within the area served by the primary broadcaster, the impact of the CATV operation is primarily to expand the audience by which the value of the copyright owner's license to the primary broadcaster is measured.

Where, on the other hand, the CATV operation occurs in a black area, i.e., where it extends into an area within which there are broadcasting facilities but the copyright owner has not granted his authorization for any transmission, the unauthorized retransmission by CATV could destroy a market and result in direct, immediate damage. Here the subcommittee would impose full liability for infringement of copyright, including injunctive relief.

Intermediately, in the gray area situation, where the copyright owner has already licensed the use of his work in the area, or there is no broadcaster to license, there is no direct loss of market exclusivity. There is, however, an uncompensated free ride at the owner's expense. Advertisers will not pay for viewers living outside their area, and CATV service in these areas may keep out local broadcasters who would pay. Here, the subcommittee believes that a reasonable license fee best meets the equities.

Beyond this allocation of different rights and remedies for the white, black, and gray areas, the subcommittee's proposal takes into account the arguments of the CATV operators as to the difficulties of obtaining advance clearances and the dangers of unlimited liability for statutory damages in this field. It proposes, with respect to CATV operations in the black area, to impose full liability only if the operator proceeds with the unauthorized retransmission after having received advance notice from the copyright owner. If the owner does not provide advance notice, the retransmission would be treated as if it were in the gray area.

As for CATV operations in the gray area, the subcommittee proposes to withhold the possibility of an injunction or statutory damages, and limit the operator's liability to a "reasonable license fee" to be fixed by the court in the absence of agreement. However, in order to induce negotiations, the proposed amendment would provide the court with discretion to triple the recovery if it finds that the infringer failed to accept a reasonable offer, or to withhold any recovery if it finds that the copyright owner had refused to accept a reasonable offer.

It should be emphasized that the subcommittee's proposal is directed solely to a prospective solution to the community antenna problem under the general revision of the copyright law. It is not intended as the expression of any opinion as to what the present law is under the 1909 statute or as to how the courts should ultimately decide that question.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
Acting Chairman for Copyright Revision, Subcommittee No. 3.

§ . LIMITATIONS ON EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS: SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS.

(a) CERTAIN SECONDARY TRANSMISSION EXEMPTED.—(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (b) and (c), the secondary transmission to the public of a primary transmission embodying a performance

or display of a work is not an infringement of copyright if:

(A) the secondary transmission consists entirely of relaying the primary transmission to the private rooms of a hotel or other public establishment, and no direct charge is made to the occupants of the private rooms to see or hear the secondary transmission; or

(B) the secondary transmission is made solely for the purpose and under the conditions specified by clause (2) of section 109; or

(C) the secondary transmission is made by a common carrier who has no direct or indirect control over the content or selection of the primary transmission or over the particular recipients of the secondary transmission, and whose activities with respect to the secondary transmission consist solely of providing wires, cables, or other communications channels for the use of others.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c), but subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the secondary transmission to the public of a primary transmission embodying a performance or display of a work is not an infringement of copyright if the secondary transmission is made by a governmental body, or other nonprofit organization, without any purpose of direct or indirect commercial advantage, and without any charge to the recipients of the secondary transmission other than assessments necessary to defray the actual and reasonable costs of maintaining and operating the secondary transmission service.

(3) Subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c), the secondary transmission to the public of a primary transmission embodying a performance or display of a work is not an infringement of copyright if the secondary transmission is made for reception solely within the limits of the area normally encompassed by the primary transmission.

(b) CERTAIN SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS FULLY ACTIONABLE.—Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c) and of clauses (2) and (3) of subsection (a), the secondary transmission to the public of a primary transmission embodying a performance or display of a work is actionable as an act of infringement under section 501, and is fully subject to the remedies provided by sections 502 through 506, if:

(1) the content of the particular primary transmission is in any way altered by changes, deletions, or additions during its secondary transmission; or

(2) the secondary transmitter, within one month before or after the particular secondary transmission, originates any transmissions to those members of the public to whom it also makes the secondary transmission, except for no more than one transmission at any one time of weather and news reports; or

(3) the secondary transmitter, within one month before or after the particular secondary transmission, makes any separate, direct charge for any particular transmission it makes to those members of the public to whom it also makes the secondary transmission; or

(4) the secondary transmission is made for reception wholly or partly outside the limits of the area normally encompassed by the primary transmission, and

(A) the secondary transmitter, at least one month before the date of the secondary transmission, has not recorded in the Copyright Office, in accordance with requirements that the Register of Copyrights shall prescribe by regulation, the identity and address of the person who owns the secondary transmission service or has power to exercise primary control over it, together with the name and location of the primary transmitter; or

(B) the secondary transmission is made for reception wholly or partly within the limits of an area normally encompassed by one or more transmitting facilities, other than the primary transmitter, if:

(i) within that area no such facility is authorized to transmit the same performance or display of the work, and

(ii) the copyright owner has given written notice to the secondary transmitter, in accordance with requirements that the Register of Copyrigths shall prescribe by regulation, at least ten days before the primary transmission, that the copyright owner's authorization is necessary for the secondary transmission.

(c) LIMITATIONS ON LIABILITY FOR CERTAIN SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS.—(1) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), in the following cases involving a secondary transmission to the public of a primary transmission embodying a performance or display of a work, liability of the secondary transmitter for infringement under section 501 does not include the remedies provided by sections 502, 503, and 506, and its liability for the remedies provided by sections 504 and 505 is limited as provided by clause (2) of this subsection:

(A) Where the secondary transmission comes within the scope of paragraph (1) of subclause (B) of subsection (b) (4), but the copyright owner has not given notice as provided by paragraph (ii) of that subclause; or

(B) Where the secondary transmission is made for reception wholly or partly outside the limits of the area normally encompassed by the primary transmission, not including an area covered by subclause (B) of subsection (b) (4), and

(i) the secondary transmission is made for reception wholly or partly within the limits of an area normally encompassed by a transmitting facility, other than the primary transmitter, if such facility is authorized to transmit the same performance or display of the work on the date the secondary transmission is made, whether or not such authorized transmission is made on that date; or

(ii) the secondary transmission is made for reception wholly or partly within the limits of an area not normally encompassed by any transmitting facility.

(2) In any case coming within the scope of subclauses (A) or (B) of clause (1) of this subsection, the infringer's liability under section 504 does not include any of the infringer's profits or statutory damages, and the copyright owner's right to recover actual damages is, except as provided in subclauses (A) and (B) of this clause, limited to recovery of a reasonable license fee, as found by the court under the circumstances of the case.

(A) Where the court finds that the infringer has refused or failed to accept an offer of a license, in writing and signed by the copyright owner, in which the license fee stated was reasonable under the circumstances of the case, it may in its discretion increase the recovery under section 504 to a sum of not more than three times the amount of a reasonable license fee, to which may be added a discretionary award of costs and attorney's fees under section 505;

(B) Where the court finds that the copyright owner has refused or failed to accept the written offer, accompanied by a tender, of a license fee that was reasonable under the circumstances of the case, it may in its discretion award costs and attorney's fees under section 504 to the infringer, and may reduce or withhold an award of a reasonable license fee under section 504.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section, the following terms and their variant forms mean the following:

(1) A "primary transmission" is one made by the transmitting facility whose signals are being received and further transmitted by the secondary transmission service, regardless of where or when the performance or display was first transmitted.

(2) A "secondary transmission" is the further transmitting of a primary transmission simultaneously with the primary transmission.

(3) The "area normally encompassed" by a transmission comprises the entire geographic area within the radius that the transmitter's signal is expected to reach effectively under normal conditions, including any parts of the area within that radius that its signal fails to reach effectively because of terrain, structures, or other physical or technical barriers. Where such geographic area has been designated by Federal statute or regulation for other purposes, the Register of Copyrights may, by regulation, make such designation applicable for purposes of this section.

WILL THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MAKE FINAL ITS PERSONAL COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS DIRECTIVE?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, last week the Department of Defense published a revision of its 8-month-old personal commercial affairs directive. This directive sets guidelines for businesses selling or extending credit to servicemen and seeking military assistance in collecting the debt if the serviceman fails to honor his obligation.

The original directive was published last September but was not put into force because Defense Department lawyers felt it was vague and ambiguous. After reading the latest directive, I can only conclude that the Department of Defense lawyers are vague and ambiguous.

Mr. Speaker, before going any further, I want to go on record with a prediction. I congratulate the Department of Defense for the portions of the directive which have been strengthened through revision. However, I predict that the Department of Defense will not adopt in a finalized form all of the provisions of the directive which would hamper the activities of loan sharks and sharp-practice finance companies. And, I sincerely hope that the Department will not accept as final those portions of the directive which contain obvious loopholes.

Perhaps the most glaring loophole in the directive involves the submission of full disclosure forms when a contract involving a serviceman is signed. The directive provides that on-post credit unions and banks fill out these forms at the time of the transaction. However, all other credit extenders are not required to fill out the full disclosure forms at the time of the transaction, but are required to make the full disclosure if the credit extender asks for help from the military in collecting a debt which a serviceman has failed to honor. How can the Department of Defense call this section full disclosure if no disclosure is made at the time of the transaction?

It has come to my attention that not all credit extenders plan to fill in the full disclosure section at the time of the transaction but will be quick to fill out the necessary documents when they want help in collecting the loan. This procedure may be of great benefit to the credit extender but will offer little in the way of assistance to a serviceman.

I strongly urge the Department of Defense to reconsider its stand on this point and require all credit extenders to make full disclosure at the time of the contract signing.

There are some circumstances where this might prove unfair to the credit extenders—such as the business firm which only occasionally handles a military contract. In addition, it might work a hardship on firms who lend to a civilian who later enters the Armed Forces and then falls behind in his obligations. In these cases the Department could provide rules for exception. But to provide an overall out for credit extenders not only creates a loophole, but publicizes it with a virtual flashing neon light.

In addition, the rewrite directive does not provide the Secretary of Defense with the power to declare a firm off limits on a worldwide or nationwide basis, if he feels the offense is serious enough. The original directive did provide this power. Now such a broad-scale, off-limits designation would have to be reached on a locality-by-locality basis, a time-consuming operation that would not provide servicemen throughout the world with adequate protection.

There are other portions of the directive which are not satisfactory, but I will not take the time of this body to go into them, since the Department of Defense has made it clear it is not interested in making it any tougher on loan sharks. If the Department of Defense really cares, why does it not take off-limits action against companies which are abusing the servicemen? Certainly, it does not take a wordy—or perhaps worthless—directive to accomplish this task. The Department of Defense needs to go no further than thousands of legal assistance officers throughout the country to find out which companies are taking advantage of our men in uniform.

Nearly 2 months have passed, Mr. Speaker, since the Department of Defense published a directive which would establish overseas credit unions. At the time the directive was signed, it was suggested that a task force be established to educate overseas commands in the methods of establishing credit unions.

The Department of Defense has dragged its feet in this area and has done little to encourage the formation of such a task force. Despite repeated inquiries by the Banking and Currency Committee, the Department appears to be no closer to the opening of overseas credit unions than it was at the time the directive was signed.

I would further like to bring to the attention of this body that on March 16 of this year I wrote to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara asking that these overseas credit unions be officially designated "Patman Plan Credit Unions," since it was the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the esteemed chairman of the House Banking Committee, who offered the plan which ultimately led to the Department of Defense directive. It was my feeling that by naming these credit unions after this great American, it would be, in some small way, a fitting tribute to his outstanding work on behalf of credit unions. However, the Department has not seen fit to answer my letter although my office did receive a phone call last week stating that they are working on an answer. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that nearly 2 months is an adequate time for the Department of Defense to answer a Congressman's letter.

No one would be happier than I if the Department of Defense would remove from the latest personal commercial affairs directive all of the loopholes that I have mentioned and leave intact those provisions which protect our servicemen. I do not feel that it is too much for the Department of Defense to put the welfare of our servicemen ahead of the welfare of loan sharks.

PATRICK V. McNAMARA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I sadly add my voice today to those who mourn the death of Michigan's senior Senator, Patrick V. McNamara, who announced only recently that he would not seek reelection, and that he was calling an end to a Senate career of 12 years. Death has now robbed him of the opportunity to enjoy the years of retirement that he so richly deserved.

Senator Patrick V. McNamara was a truly great American, a dedicated statesman who fought hard for the principles in which he believed. He was an honest, straightforward man, who spoke to the point, and who had no use for sham and hypocrisy.

He began his career as a pipefitter at the age of 18. By the time he was 21, he was president of a pipefitters and plumber union local. His devotion to the labor movement was one of the guideposts of his life. He was president of Pipefitters' Local 636 in Detroit from 1937 until 1955, and was vice president of the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor from 1939 until 1945.

During World War II he was Rent Control Administrator for the Office of Price Administration for a three-county area, and in 1946–47 he served on the Detroit City Council. In 1949, he was elected to the Detroit Board of Education, where he served until his election as Senator in 1954.

In the Senate, he rose through seniority to become chairman of the Public Works Committee, ranking member of the Special Senate Subcommittee on Aging, and chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Poverty. Through his work on these committees, Senator McNamara used his vision and understanding to enrich the lives of countless Americans for generations to come.

Among a rich legacy of achievements, "Senator Pat" was particularly proud of the Older Americans Act of 1965, which created an Administration on Aging, and the medicare program, for which he battled for many years.

All who knew him will miss Senator McNamara. We will miss his outspoken integrity, his unfailing cheerfulness and his boundless optimism.

I extend to his family my deepest sympathy on their great loss. I know they take comfort in the thought that he lived a long and full life, and that his name will be honored for all time as that of a great and dedicated American.

COMMUNITIES IN ACTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this month the first issue of Communities in Action was published by the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is described as a periodical account of the war on poverty. I bring it to the attention of my colleagues in this House because it appears to me to be a noteworthy effort at telling the story of the war against poverty, including the criticism for and against.

To illustrate the quality of the writing found in this first issue of Communities in Action, as well as its objectivity, I would like to insert in the RECORD two articles. The first, "Sorry, Wrong Number," explains some of the difficulties of communicating with persons in the lower income groups. The second article is entitled "Nobody Wants Welfare." Written by Ralph Mathews, Jr., it tells of the work of Walter Dawkins, a young grassroots organizer of the poor. This article contains what I consider to be a highly significant statement from Mr. Dawkins who discusses what he calls the national mistake of most of the early adult training programs for hard-core unemployed people:

> Right here in the city of Newark at a much earlier stage of the antipoverty program this national mistake was illustrated by the fact that the people who got the money and the facilities to train poor people were always people out of the community, people downtown so to speak.
>
> When the poor communities looked around it was the same downtown people getting the facilities and then saying to the poor, "Come to us, we'll teach you and get you to read." For the poor it was the same old question of those people.

Both articles are extremely worthwhile, and I hope they will be read as widely as possible. In fact, I hope the entire magazine will be read as widely as possible. Frankly, one does not expect interesting, thought provoking, critical

reading to be found in Government publications. Communities in Action is a refreshing change.

Sergent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Russell B. Roberts, editor of Communities in Action, and the rest of the staff have my congratulations and sincere good wishes for many more issues of this excellent new magazine. With unanimous consent, I am inserting the two articles at this point in the RECORD:

"SORRY, WRONG NUMBER"—COMMUNICATION AND THE POOR

The candidate in an election of a community action board knocks on the door. As soon as the door opens she begins her pitch—"you ought to be interested * * * this is something different * * * you have a real interest in being represented * * *." Then, just before the door is slammed in her face, the potential voter she tried to interest waves a welfare department envelope with an election notice enclosed: "Are they going to cut off my check next month if I don't vote for you?"

In a metropolitan neighborhood, a survey shows that 80 percent of the residents don't know where a neighborhood center is located. It has been operating a block or two away for over 6 months.

In a small Midwestern city, a community action agency official shakes his head at a handful of people who turned out for a meeting designed to explain the new war on poverty program. "I don't understand it. Both papers carried an announcement of the meetings." And a block worker replied, "Who reads the paper?"

By and large, when it comes to any kind of mass communication with the people we exist to work with, war on poverty programs get a "sorry, wrong number."

It should not be a surprise, nor should it be a cause for embarrassment or alarm. This situation, recently emerging into sharper focus, really underlines the completely different character of community action. Obviously, one of the reasons that more traditional approaches have failed to be completely effective is this very communication gap. And by now it should be equally obvious that to a startling degree, a meaningful participation of the groups and areas to be served will be measured by our success in closing that gap.

Just as Headstart has triggered a whole new concept of preschool education and Job Corps has revealed a vast potential for skilled people bypassed by traditional education structures, so too, community action must evolve new techniques of communication. The vast available expertise in mass communication or public relations has developed largely as a result of market studies, audience surveys and readership polls. But the people with whom we are concerned have been largely ignored as a market and thus little has been done professionally to research effective communications with them.

In certain areas, some publications, some stations have a segment of this specialized audience. They tend to be selective about the material they use; they are, understandably, as specialized in editorial judgment as in audience.

The burden is on the peddler. The community action agency which wants exposure for its message in such media cannot expect response with a carbon of the same release that goes to the daily paper or the promo the network radio station uses to qualify for its FCC public service record.

Foreign language newspapers—though they will usually do their own translation from English—want specifics. They want stories that have a special interest to their readership. To get their response, we have to know their audience, take the time to get familiar with their interests, learn what they feature. And, in many areas, that's a job which can be tedious and time consuming; but worth the effort.

The same is true for radio stations. Since the resurgence of radio after the TV-induced doldrums of the 1950's, many radio stations have built highly specialized, loyal audiences based on limited but specific programing. Again, standard market data lags behind. To give them the kind of material they find usable requires local study, research, and a substantial rewriting of the standard radio handout.

In the same fashion, the rural weekly, small in circulation, and the farm-oriented radio station, with a low rating, often hold sway over an intensely loyal audience. To a surprising extent, their audiences overlap the ones we're missing.

As a result, the one-release-reaches-all-media mentality has to be abandoned. To do our job well, we have to match message to media in a method as sophisticated, in its own way, as the most highly specialized scientific agency.

Conventional media don't work. The plain fact is that this large part of the American population does not read the papers avidly, follow the news on TV or get predigested opinions from weekly news magazines. Instead, insulated by a whole complex of educational and environmental factors which we are in business to change, their information comes from far more direct and personal sources.

Many of the members of our audience have come to trust the information they get from neighborhood personalities as far more reliable than the press. The friendly neighborhood bartender or familiar laundromat operator frequently have much greater credibility than the most prestigious reporter or knowledgeable commentator.

While the more successful practitioners in the business of mass communications have become habitually dedicated to reaching thousands of people through relatively few outlets, the most successful community action agencies will become adept at reaching fewer people through many more outlets. The adaptation, painful as it may be, must be on our part, not on the part of our audience.

To the degree we can get information about our neighborhood centers and our programs into those channels of communication, we will have participation. It will inevitably be a process of experimentation; it will demand imagination and innovation on the part of community action directors and information specialists. It involves getting closer to the neighborhood, depending far more on the nonprofessionals in this profession and paying a great deal more attention to the laundromat than the library.

Many community action agencies have already developed promising techniques involving such varied operations as periodic meetings with bartenders, gospel singers in flatbed trucks. But, a whole sheaf of new approaches will have to come.

It's up to us to be heard on the telephone poles as well as on television, in the supermarket checkout line as well as on the radio. And simply because no one else has bothered to penetrate this "market" does not absolve—but rather intensifies—our obligation to get there.

OEO has an interest. It can do research, make suggestions and exchange experiences. But it will eventually be the information officer in the local community action agency who will, with colleagues around the country, put together the accepted textbook on new and imaginative ways of getting to the neglected audience. Without an exchange of information—without somebody's routine practice becoming someone else's exciting new idea—our problem will suffer from the same neglect that has left it the stepchild of commercial researchers.

Behind everything we do lies a hidden time bomb. The greater the gap between our communication with the routine audience and that which we create for our new audience, the more Americans might understandably say, "The poor don't care."

The concept of community action has been built on the opposite premise. But if we fail to get the word out to our audience of potential participants as well as the observers whose support we solicit, then we fail. If we fail to close the gap between traditional communication and the people whose problems promoted our existence, then we would but repeat the error of the man who questioned the U.N. because it has so many people in it who speak foreign languages.

Generally, the mass media—press, radio, TV, magazines—has given an unusual amount of attention to war on poverty programs. Most Americans, whose understanding and support we so vitally need in every community, are beginning to know what we are about and can be expected to respond accordingly. But that support has to be matched—just as does the success of the initial communications job—by support and involvement of the people served.

Nobody supports something, even for his own good, if he never heard of it.

"NOBODY WANTS WELFARE"—A PROFILE OF NEWARK'S BLAZER TRAINING PROGRAM

(By Ralph Matthews, Jr.)

Walter C. Dawkins, a young grassroots organizer of the poor, hates public welfare handouts as much as any such conservative. His program to get people off relief into steady jobs should be good news to taxpayers.

Dawkins, 31, is founder-director of Newark's Blazer work training project, an experiment in poverty that takes people directly from the welfare rolls—people previously considered unemployable—and trains them quickly to get jobs that will hold firm despite increased automation.

Blazer is a part of Newark's growing catalog of weapons in the war against poverty and is financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The first 200 students have begun classes. Local sociologists are hopeful Blazer will help people at the bottom of the economic barrel move toward meaningful work and life styles.

The Blazer project is nationally significant for two very compelling reasons:

It has the potential to slash public welfare expenditures;

It is a program conceived, organized, and administered by the poor themselves.

Both premises make it a program to be studied closely by community action agencies throughout the States and territories.

"WILD MAN"

Walter Dawkins, a wiry, energetic young man, is the spirit of Blazer. Critics call him the "wild man of poverty." His champions consider him a metropolitan St. George slaying dragons of apathy which lurk along the trail of the frontlines of the poverty war.

A former schoolteacher and social worker, Dawkins knows firsthand of the denigrating effect of public welfare on people who want to lift themselves into the mainstream of American affluence. He frankly recalls being a welfare baby himself in his hometown of East St. Louis, Ill.

"My mother was a recipient of welfare," he recalled, "as my father died when I was 2 years old." Mrs. Dawkins, a woman of spirit, determined to kick the public assistance pattern as soon as she could. By the time Dawkins entered elementary school he and his brothers were free and clear of it although he was a witness to what welfare did to other families much of his life thereafter.

"My hometown has always been a slum area," he said. "It was compared with Chi-

cago and often called "Little Chicago." I was a part of all the street fights, the gangs, the athletic teams and the successes and failures of the academic system along with all the other guys.

"I lived in the East End, called Polack Town, a section akin to Harlem in New York. Everything went in Polack Town. We lived in a building called 'The Brick,' one long building 2 stories high with 20 families of poor people."

LIKE ZOMBIES

Dawkins remembers with a trace of bitterness that many of his neighbors lived from welfare check to welfare check but seethed with a quiet rage all the while because "nobody wants welfare, not really, it's like being a zombie, you just sit and wait for transfusions in shape of a check in the mail."

The welfare check, Dawkins grew up recognizing, was simply a way of keeping the brakes on people, a form of social control, an emasculation of spirit, a confession of the community's failure to meet its responsibility to the more disadvantaged of its members.

"When we designed the Blazer work training program," he said, "We kept in mind that there is a hard kernel of pride and a need for self-respect in even the most economically deprived people. Blazer is working to reach that spirit in poor people, to break through their surface apathy and help them help themselves get moving."

Prior to the Blazer work program, initiated last fall, Dawkins had operated a volunteer agency (the Blazer Youth Council) that worked to rehabilitate members of Newark's toughest teenage crime gangs.

When his volunteer agency presented the work training project to city and Federal Governments, Dawkins found that while OEO was ready to get the idea launched immediately, he felt the city was dragging its feet on coming up with funds to match the OEO grant.

Rather than wait for redtape to unsnarl, Dawkins with characteristic zest, rallied his friends, associates (including some of those same tough teens from the Blazer Youth Council) and hit the sidewalks of Newark on a fund-raising campaign.

Blazer volunteers went into pool rooms, saloons, set up shop on poverty area street corners, were everywhere in fact. In short order, they raised the necessary money and the Blazer work training project was ready to begin.

"The war on poverty is too crucial to this society's survival for us to wait around," Dawkins said of his crash collection. "We just took our program to the people of Newark and they came up with the money."

COMMON TOUCH

This sense of purpose and urgency that Dawkins inspires confounds a lot of people in Newark used to more conventional approaches. It also has caused several collisions between Dawkins and an assorted host of enemies. But even his most adamant foes grudgingly admit that Walter is a genuine grassroots leader. "Oh, Walter has the common touch all right," a former Blazer Council member has commented. "He is one of the few intellectuals in the country, perhaps, who can completely relate to the poor. He is at home in a gospel church or a teenage rock and roll record hop or a slum tavern, and he can get people to move * * * without them feeling he's ever talking down to them. He can motivate people that traditional social workers can never communicate with * * * the only thing is he is so keen on his work sometimes he leaves others with the feeling he has a patent on poor people and no one else has his expertise."

A friend explains Dawkins' drive this way: "His whole life these last 5 years has been Blazer, first with helping delinquents and now with training folks to get jobs. Most of this time he has worked without money—don't ask me how he kept above water—but now that his dream is reality, he takes a stark view of the world. With him, either you are a friend of Blazer or an enemy. Walter doesn't feel he has time to make subtle distinctions."

For a time a will struggle of classic proportions seemed to be shaping up between an impatient Dawkins and cautious officials of the U.S. Community Corps, Newark's central antipoverty agency. UCC had the responsibility for seeing that Blazer met all administrative procedures required under the Economic Opportunity Act.

One UCC staffer who worked closely with Blazer during its founding, after a set-to with Walter in January, reported wearily: "We have no doubt Dawkins is a brilliant program planner, it is a case of his seeing our view as we are trying to see his. I keep suggesting that he leave the administrative details to us so he will be free to direct the program but he hangs right in there with us." For a time, it seemed even an innocuous item such as hand soap for the lavatories might have touched on a crisis had Dawkins decided liquid soap better met the needs of the poor.

STUDENT UNITY

This was the same week Dawkins had led his new student body through a Blazer assembly meeting which ended with the students voting half of the program's executive committee out of office. It was a wild, exhilarating session which shook local community action leaders into an all-day series of meetings on what to do with Dawkins but ended with the students, all hard-core unemployables, unified, proud, and determined to make Blazer a success. "This was the first time in their lives," Dawkins said afterward, "that many of these people had ever taken a stand or participated in a democratic meeting, and actually saw that their vote could count."

The issue on which Dawkins brought his new students together was fundamental to his concept of motivating the poor. "Some of our council members were middle class, cautious; and the students sensed they would take forever to get the project moving. Remember these students are at a do-or-die point in their lives. If they don't get training for jobs through Blazer they know it's the end of the line for them. They want to make good, it's their last chance. So what happened was they voted out the slowpokes."

These initial, perhaps necessary skirmishes, have lost their steam. The Blazer project is settled in its workshop building in central Newark and the program is moving.

Just how is Blazer structured?

Dawkins explains it this way: "The Blazer Coordinating Council of Youth Development is a nonprofit corporation composed of three distinct bodies: an executive committee which is an advisory group to the trustees and their membership. A trustee board and the third body, the general membership comprised of people from the Newark community at large interested in this city's poor.

"This is the parent body which created a work-training project for a student body of 200 persons from the rolls of city welfare. These students, all adults, are being trained in four basic areas, upholstery, floor polishing and surfacing, automotive repair, and food preparation.

"Each of these four training areas is further subdivided. This means simply that upholstery, for example, has in it furniture upholstery, slipcovers, and drapes. And so on. For each trade.

SURVEYED JOBS

To determine what kinds of vocational training would most quickly provide jobs for Blazer students, the Blazer staff, Dawkins said "went to the Area Redevelopment Corp. in the city of Newark and checked their statistical data on job openings and fields where workers cannot be automated out of jobs * * * in fields of constant need.

Federal and State job protection data was also studied. Dawkins is keenly aware of the implications of automation and feels that in training people for jobs that "will hold up at least into the 1970's, is as far as anyone in vocational education dare go."

The Blazer workers then checked their job data with local industries and the final four-trade curriculum is a result of agreements on jobs are available by both labor experts and employers.

Once Dawkins and his staff knew what the labor market was like they tackled the problem of teaching people who had been able to hold steady jobs in the past or had unfortunate schooling experience if any schooling at all.

His own experience as a community organizer had much earlier led him to conclude that most adult training programs for hard-core unemployed people had failed in the past because of what he calls "a national mistake."

"Right here in the city of Newark," he said, "at a much earlier stage of the antipoverty program this national mistake was illustrated by the fact that the people who got the money and the facilities to train poor people were always people out of the community, people downtown so to speak.

When the poor communities looked around it was the same downtown people getting the facilities and then saying to the poor come to us, we will teach you and get you to read. For the poor it was the same old question of "those people" again.

NATIONAL MISTAKE

The mistake really was in not housing the program right within the community where the poor could participate.

Dawkins is very firm in his insistence that traditional social workers and educators have failed miserably in their missions.

"If you are really going to involve the poor on various levels, the communications barriers must be broken down. We felt and saw that this was a part of what the Government was saying when it launched the war on poverty and traditionally (in education and other social areas) there has been a complete lack of communications. In Newark and elsewhere."

And so Blazer's second concern was a teaching method that would really communicate with poor people, involve and not patronize them at any step of the process.

The answer: assembling a staff of teachers and teacher aids that in the director's words: "were from the poor areas who use the same terminology and had the same broad basic understanding of what poverty really is."

Dawkins' theory that qualified instructors could be found at the grassroots level was quickly borne out as Blazer under guidelines set down as UCC began screening applicants for teaching jobs.

For instance, we found a mechanic who had been on the rolls of the welfare for a year but who had something like 20 years' experience in automobile repair. When the man came to see us as a student he was rescreened by our staff, sent before the personnel committee, and won a job as assistant instructor.

SET AN EXAMPLE

His educational background might be no more than sixth-grade level but he does have 20 years of experience in a specific field. With a capable instructor above him, he has a real chance to help himself get off relief and stay off and set an example for students, poor like himself.

The Blazer Student Council is the dynamic that Dawkins believes will insure success of the program and he rates this as

importantly as curriculum and qualified instructors.

You can't just take in 200 people on welfare and say all of a sudden we're going to make you employable and give you a job. That cannot be the scope. If you begin there you are finished from the start.

The No. 1 thing is to straighten out the students' psychological approach to his problems. That's the purpose of the Blazer Student Council. Through the therapy of meeting with other people he gains a self-inspiration and determination to do for himself, to never go back on the rolls of welfare. When he gets to this point and looks to see how far down he was before beginning classes and participating in the council, the student begins to go through a thought process like this: "Well there ain't no need for me to be on welfare in the first place. I can do a job, and I don't want to be on welfare in the second, and when this is over I'll never go back."

By giving students a say in their destinies through the council, it is Dawkins' theory, self-esteem is raised to the necessary level where "when you place him on a job, his chances of staying are 80-percent greater than if you just train him."

NEXT CRISIS

The Blazer School has been operational 3 months now. The real test of the concept, Dawkins realizes, comes when the first wave of students are placed on jobs.

Will some students fall into past patterns of ineffectiveness? Absenteeism, drinking, and other syndromes of unemployables?

"You can't end it with students once they get jobs," was his answer. "Your program must include a well-thought-out followup. Again the Blazer Council is most important. When a student leaves school his council membership continues. He is expected to come back to membership meetings, to donate money to the matching funds and counsel other students who will follow his same training path.

"This is a vital and healthy relationship. The graduate student, often for the first time in his life, has a measure of progress to be proud of. This pride developed through Blazer keeps him on the job and he returns to show the membership his self-sufficiency. 'Look, I ain't off the job and I ain't back on the rolls of welfare, I'm doing what you really set out to help me do.' "

OPEN DOOR POLICY

To that end the Blazer staff works long hours, after classes counseling students with problems of home and family that would affect the quality of their classwork unless resolved. Dawkins and instructors are quick to note any sign of faltering by any student and an open door policy is in force with all professionals on staff.

"We want every student to feel sure that any time anything bugs him we are here to listen, advise, and act."

As a case in point, Dawkins told of a student, father of a teenage boy, who was obviously troubled.

"He came to me. I didn't go to him. That's one of our fundamentals that students' problems don't go unheard. Once they find out you mean business they bring all kinds of problems, from soup to nuts.

"Anyway this man suspected his boy was on narcotics or getting close to it. So we immediately moved to act. We talked him into night school, but he's got to do something during the day and he should be in the Neighborhood Youth Corps or some local training component which is what we are trying to crash through by tomorrow."

It is this concern for each student, finally, that is the foundation Blazer hopes to build from.

Dawkins, unruffled, as enthusiastic as ever, envisions a time when other communities would want to share the knowledge and approaches now being shaped in Blazer, Newark.

"It is the hope and scope of the Blazer program that it might become a national training academy of the poor. I'd hope that some of the staff members who made this program go, after we give the Government a chance to look at it and see where it works or fails in various areas, would go to other communities to help set up similar programs."

INTERNATIONALIZING OUTER SPACE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the House that the President has taken a very progressive and forward step when he has instructed our Ambassador to the United Nations to approach the rest of the world through the United Nations in trying to establish a barrier against the use of the moon or outer space as a place of contest for the nations of this world. He has asked that these areas be internationalized and we follow in space exploration that principle which has been established already with respect to the use of nuclear weapons.

This is a great step forward by the President, and we in the House should appreciate it, and commend him for it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through May 13, on account of official business.

Mr. GRIFFIN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through May 13, on account of official business.

Mr. RUMSFELD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through May 13, on account of official business.

Mr. HUTCHINSON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 9, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for May 9 through May 16, on account of official business.

Mr. ROBERTS (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOLIFIELD to include extraneous matter with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BERRY.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1308. An act to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 10, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2387. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of determinations relating to deferment of the 1966 annual construction charge payment due the United States from the Okanogan Irrigation District, the repayment contracting entity for the Okanogan project, Washington, pursuant to the provisions of 73 Stat. 584; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2388. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a report of an order entered in the case of a certain alien found admissible to the United States pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2389. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 5, 1966, the following bills were reported on May 6, 1966:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9824. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, as amended, without amendment (Rept. No. 1479). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 13558. A bill to provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, including the examination, licensure, registration of certified public accountants, and for other purposes; with

amendments (Rept. No. 1480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 14205. A bill to declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 13703. A bill to make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 1482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1611. An act to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2263. An act to establish a traffic branch of the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to provide for the appointment to such court of five additional judges; with amendments (Rept. No. 1484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 9, 1966]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 846. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14732, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1485). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9167. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 14810. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, to authorize additional amounts for assistance thereunder, to authorize grants for certain technical studies, and to provide for an expedited program of research, development, and demonstration of new urban transportation systems; without amendment (Rept. No. 1487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITE of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7402. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Chamizal Treaty National Memorial in the city of El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. S. 1160. An act to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2307. An act for the relief of certain civilian employees and former civilian employees of the Bureau of Reclamation at the Columbia Basin project, Washington; with amendments (Rept. No. 1488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1483. A bill for the relief of the John V. Boland Construction Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2914. A bill for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido; with amendments (Rept. No. 1490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11940. A bill for the relief of Fred M. Osteen; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12315. A bill for the relief of Anthony A. Calloway; without amendment (Rept. No. 1492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12884. A bill for the relief of John R. Sylvia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7026. A bill for the relief of Nathan Levine; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11253. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 1495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 14922. A bill to reserve certain public lands for a national scenic rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 14923. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 14924. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 14925. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 14926. A bill to strengthen State and local governments, to provide the States with additional financial resources to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 14927. A bill to amend the act of September 26, 1950, authorizing the Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 14928. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 14929. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 14930. A bill to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 14931. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14932. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to representation elections the results of which have been changed by unfair labor practices; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 14933. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 14934. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for highway safety research and development, certain highway safety programs, a national driver register, and a highway accident research and test facility; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 14935. A bill in relation to rates of toll and disposition of income by the city of East St. Louis, Ill., and the city of Chester, Ill., covering the bridges constructed by said cities across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAY (by request):

H.R. 14936. A bill to authorize the acquisition, transfer, conveyance, and lease of certain property in the District of Columbia for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for other international organizations, and as sites for governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 14937. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny deduction for rent, taxes, or interest incurred for the use or occupancy of an industrial plant financed by tax-exempt obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 14938. A bill to authorize the Department of State through the Agency for International Development to encourage and assist colleges and universities in the establishment, strengthening, and maintenance of programs on foreign development and for their provision of research, education, training, advisory and technical assistance, directly or in cooperation with foreign universities, in connection with programs of assistance to developing nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14939. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 14940. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 14941. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14942. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 14943. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14944. A bill to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 906), as amended, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 14945. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 14946. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 14947. A bill to amend title I of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 14948. A bill to amend the charter of the Disabled American Veterans to provide for an annual audit of its accounts by the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 1138. Joint resolution to establish a commission which shall conduct on the Capitol Grounds a program depicting historical events by means of son et lumière; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.J. Res. 1139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the power of the Supreme Court to declare any provision of law unconstitutional; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 634. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H. Con. Res. 635. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOLE:

H. Con. Res. 636. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MAY:

H. Con. Res. 637. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H. Con. Res. 638. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H. Res. 847. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the proposed transfer of the Army and Air Force Exchange Services from New York City; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

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

469. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the removal of restrictions on the movement of merchandise in highway vehicles on Alaska and British Columbia ferries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

470. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the preservation of Morro Rock as a historical site, natural landmark, and public park; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

471. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the construction of experimental fish protein concentrate plants; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

472. Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Federal center for research into the cause, prevention, control, and treatment of alcoholics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

473. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to the integrated development of the beneficial uses of the waters of the Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 14949. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nguong Thi Tran (formerly Nguyen Thi Nyuong, [redacted] D/3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

386. By the SPEAKER: Petition of International Brotherhood Electrical Workers, San Jose, Calif., relative to situs picketing legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

387. Also, petition of Building and Construction Trades Council, Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to situs picketing legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

Bishop Paul V. Galloway, Arkansas area of the Methodist Church, Little Rock, Ark., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, we ask Thy care for these who are committed to Thee and our Nation.

Give them wisdom, great faith, and creativeness. Bless them, their families, those who work in their offices, and the States from which they come.

Let the light of Thy presence be upon them and within them. Bless our President and Vice President, our Congress and all who give themselves to our Government and institutions. Bless our men and women in the armed services at home and abroad—and all forces of righteousness, reconciliation, and redemption.

Help us to know that Thou art here and that Thy concern is for every person in every land.

On land and sea, and in sky and hearts may Thy name be revered and our people united in purpose and direction.

In Thy love and life we would live and serve now and always. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HARRIS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 5, 1966, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 130) to provide for the designation of the week of May 8–May 14, 1966, as National School Safety Patrol Week.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 437)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Seven months ago, Public Law 89–10, providing massive aid to improve elementary and secondary education, went into effect. At that time we called upon leaders of education in States and local school districts to translate this financial assistance into educational services for the millions of disadvantaged children in our schools: the children who desperately need additional attention if they are to overcome the handicaps of poverty.

I am happy to transmit to you the first report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Their comments on the progress which has been achieved by States and local schools reveal that educators from all levels of government are working together to provide equal educational opportunities for all.

I am particularly encouraged by the major focus of activities identified in the report: to improve language skills in the early years. Nothing could be more fundamental than this work in assisting children who have been denied normal educational opportunities through poverty or neglect.

The commission members have not failed to point out areas in the program that need additional attention. I have pledged that every effort will be made to meet these problems—and I am confident that the Congress will join in these efforts.

We have begun a major campaign to solve a longstanding problem. The first year of this work has proved that we are on the right road, but we still have far to go.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1966.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1308) to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1107, H.R. 13365.

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

DISPOSAL OF METALLURGICAL GRADE CHROMITE FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13365) to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1143), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This measure would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 885,000 short dry tons of metallurgical grade chromite ore now held in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national and supplemental stockpiles except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of metallurgical grade chromite ore is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the ore is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite ore by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The material to be disposed of is excess to stockpile needs. The bill as submitted to the Congress would have permitted the disposal of 2,300,000 short dry tons of metallurgical grade chromite (chromite ore equivalent) which would include ferrochromite. The House of Representatives in considering the measure considered it unwise to authorize the disposal of ferrochromite at this time as such a release would be completely disruptive to the market. The committee concurs with the House in the regard.

The total inventory of metallurgical-grade chromite (chromite ore equivalent) is 6,244,712 short dry tons. The present stockpile objective is 2,970,000 short dry tons. The excess of 3,274,712 short dry tons consists of 985,646 short dry tons in the DPA inventory and 2,300,000 short dry tons covered by H.R. 13365; 885,000 short dry tons of the excess is in ore form, and the balance is in the form of ferrochromium.

Metallurgical grade chromite

Metallurgical grade chromite is an ore consumed in the metallurgical industries, principally for steel products. The ore is hard and lumpy, with a small amount of fines, varying in color from browned-black to black.

The ore is converted to ferrochromium and chromium metal which in turn are used to produce alloy steel and other alloying agents. The addition of chrome to steel imparts qualities of hardness, tensile strength, and resistance to heat and corrosion. Chrome is essential for certain types of stainless and alloy steel, having important uses in the petroleum and chemical industries, and in internal combustion engines and marine equipment.

The United States is dependent upon imports for the supply of this ore. The major sources of supply for the United States are Turkey and Southern Rhodesia.

The average acquisition cost of chromite ores and concentrates was $50.55 per short dry ton. The current market value is about $30 per short dry ton.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the metallurgical grade chromite now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF ACID GRADE FLUORSPAR FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13367) to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1144), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This measure would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 32,000 short tons of acid grade fluorspar in lump form now held in the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in

the national stockpile when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of acid grade fluorspar is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the ore is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal of acid grade fluorspar in lump form by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

As indicated above the acid grade fluorspar in lump form covered by this measure is excess to the stockpile requirements. The bill as submitted to the Congress would have permitted the disposal of 236,773 short dry tons of acid grade fluorspar now held in the national and supplemental stockpiles. Most of the acid grade fluorspar in the stockpile is a concentrate which has been finely ground. The House of Representatives, in considering this measure, became convinced that the domestic fluorspar industry was suffering a severe economic strain. Mere authorization for disposal would tend to further depress the domestic industry. The House report further states that there was industry consensus, however, that the release of acid grade fluorspar in lump form would satisfy the current shortage of this type of fluorspar in the domestic market and would not upset the domestic fluorspar industry. The Senate committee agrees with the views of the House in this regard.

The total inventory of acid grade fluorspar held by General Services Administration now stands at 1,144,090 short dry tons. The present stockpile objective is 540,000 short dry tons, and in addition, 350,000 short dry tons have been credited to the metallurgical grade fluorspar objective. The excess of 254,090 short dry tons consists of 17,317 short dry tons in the Defense Production Act inventory and 236,773 short dry tons covered by H.R. 13367.

Acid grade fluorspar

Acid grade fluorspar is a crystalline or massive granular mineral containing at least 97 percent calcium fluoride. Except for a very limited supply of cryolite and the very low fluorine content in phosphate rock, fluorspar is the only source of fluorine for industrial use. Most of the acid grade fluorspar in the stockpile is a concentrate which has been finely ground.

Although the United States has been the world's largest fluorspar producer, domestic consumption far exceeds output and Mexico (principally), Italy, and Spain are the main foreign sources.

Acid grade fluorspar is used to make hydrofluoric acid. Important products requiring larger quantities of hydrofluoric acid in their production are aviation gasoline and synthetic cryolite. It is also used as a flux in the melting of aluminum and magnesium during alloying and in the refining of scrap aluminum and magnesium.

The average acquisition cost of the stockpile inventories of acid grade fluorspar was $46.69 a short dry ton. The current market price is about $45 a short dry ton.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the acid grade fluorspar now held in the national stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF BISMUTH FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13368) to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1145), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 212,300 pounds of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of bismuth is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national and the supplemental stockpiles is excess to requirements and not because the bismuth is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the disposal proposed is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of bismuth covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of bismuth held by GSA now stands at 3,812,315 pounds. The present stockpile objective is 3,600,000 pounds. The excess of approximately 212,300 pounds is covered by H.R. 13368.

Information on bismuth

Bismuth is a brittle, hard, and easily powdered metal. It is produced as a by-product from the smelting and refining of copper and lead ores. Peru, Mexico, Bolivia, Canada, and the Republic of Korea are the major suppliers of bismuth in ores and concentrates. Several other countries, such as Japan and the United States, are large producers of refined metals from imported raw materials. It is used for low-melting (fusible) alloys such as are found in a number of safety devices as plugs for compressed gas cylinders, automatic sprinkler systems, fire-door releases, electrical fuses, and ammunition solders. The other major use of bismuth is as an ingredient in the manufacture of a wide variety of medicinal compounds.

The average acquisition cost of the stockpile inventories of bismuth was $2.134 per pound. The current market price is approximately $4 per pound.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the bismuth now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF PHLOGOPITE MICA FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13371) to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1146), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately $3,765,000 pounds of phlogopite mica splittings and approximately 205,640 pounds of phlogopite block mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of phlogopite mica is based on a determination that the quantities of this material in the national and the supplemental stockpiles are excess to requirements and not because the phlogopite mica is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantities of phlogopite mica covered by this bill are excess to stockpile requirements. The total inventory of phlogopite mica (block and splittings) held by GSA is 5,288,239 pounds. The present stockpile objective is 1,317,000 pounds. The excess of approximately 3,970,000 pounds is covered by H.R. 13371.

Information on phlogopite mica

Mica is a group name for a number of minerals which have a characteristic structure permitting easy separation into thin tough sheets. Phlogopite mica is softer than muscovite but will withstand higher temperatures. Special uses for phlogopite block mica include insulating material in soldering irons and high-temperature coils, liners in proximity fuses, transformers, and heater elements. Phlogopite mica is obtained from the Malagasy Republic and Canada.

The average acquisition cost of the phlogopite mica planned for disposal was $1.36 per pound for the block and $1.06 per pound for the splittings. The approximate current prices for the block range from $0.50 per pound to $1.90 per pound, duty paid. There are no published prices for splittings.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the phlogopite mica now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF MUSCOVITE MICA FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13373) to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1147), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 6,772,000 pounds of muscovite block mica, approximately 528,000 pounds of muscovite film mica, and approximately 22,666,000 pounds of muscovite mica splittings from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of muscovite mica is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national and supplemental stockpiles is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of muscovite mica covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of muscovite mica (block, film, and splittings) held by GSA is 66,581,281 pounds. The present stockpile objective is 30,200,000 pounds. The excess of 36,381,281 pounds consists of 29,966,000 covered by H.R. 13373 and the remaining excess is from the Defense Production Act inventory.

Information on muscovite mica

Mica is a group name for a number of minerals which have a characteristic structure permitting easy separation into thin, tough sheets. They vary from clear to black. Ruby muscovite has the best dielectric properties. Block mica is the thicker sections ranging from seven-thousandths of an inch upward. Film is split from block to a variety of predetermined thickness ranges. Mica splittings are thin layers of mica with a maximum thickness of twelve ten-thousandths of an inch, split by hand from block mica. There are three principal forms of strategic mica (block, film, and splittings) and a number of qualities and grades.

Mica is used as dielectric supporting elements in electronic tubes, mica capacitors as insulation in motors and other electrical apparatus. Splittings are easily bonded to cloth and glass fabric or build up into plates of any desired thickness or dimensions. Tape and cloth made from mica splittings are used as insulation for field coils and transformers and other electrical coils and devices operating at elevated temperatures.

The principal sources of mica are India and Brazil.

The approximate acquisition price per pound of muscovite block mica in the national and supplemental stockpiles was $2.60; for film, $5.60; for splittings, $1.04. The present market value per pound, depending on quality and grade range from $2 to $9 for block; $1 to $12 for film; and is $1.20 for splittings.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the muscovite mica now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF RHODIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13578) to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1148), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 618 troy ounces of rhodium (Rh content) from the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of rhodium is based on a determination that there is no longer a need to stockpile this material and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The 618 troy ounces of rhodium (Rh content) covered by this bill consists of the entire supply of this material in the stockpile as there is no longer a need to stockpile this material.

Information on rhodium

Rhodium is a metal of the platinum group and is intermediate between platinum and iridium with respect to hardness, toughness, and melting point. It maintains freedom from surface oxidation.

Rhodium has a lower specific electrical resistance than platinum or palladium. Scientific instruments, jewelry, and precision instruments for the measurement of the physical properties of corrosive liquids are plated with this material. Electric contacts plated with rhodium are used for radio and audiofrequency circuits because of freedom from oxidation and low-contact resistance.

U.S. production of rhodium is limited. The primary sources of the material are the Republic of South Africa, Canada, and Soviet Russia.

This bill authorizes the disposal of approximately 618 troy ounces of rhodium now held in the national stockpile. This quantity includes 173 ounces of rhodium in sponge form and about 445 ounces of rhodium alloyed with platinum.

The approximate acquisition cost of the rhodium is about $126.54 per troy ounce. The current market price for rhodium in sponge form is reported at $197 to $200 per troy ounce. The platinum-rhodium alloy is in wire form and has no quoted market price.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the rhodium now held in the national stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF THORIUM FROM THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13579) to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1149), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 3,500,000 pounds (thorium oxide content) of thorium nitrate from the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of thorium is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the supplemental stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of thorium covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of thorium nitrate (oxide content) held by GSA is 3,965,461, pounds. The present stockpile objective is 500,000 pounds. The excess of approximately 3.5 million pounds is covered by H.R. 13579.

Information on thorium

Thorium is used commercially with tungsten or nickel in electrodes in gas-discharge lamps. Some of its compounds are used in

luminous paints and in flashlight powders. It is also compounded with nickel to produce high-temperature alloys. The Atomic Energy Commission is a significant user of thorium in the conversion of fissionable uranium. The chief sources of thorium nitrate are Brazil, India, Africa, and, to some extent, in the United States.

The average acquisition cost of the thorium inventory was $2.08 per pound of thorium nitrate. The current market price is about $1.86 per pound of thorium nitrate.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the thorium now held in the supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF AMOSITE ASBESTOS FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13580) to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1150), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 15,170 short tons of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of amosite asbestos is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national and supplemental stockpiles is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of amosite asbestos covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

Information on amosite asbestos

The total inventory of amosite asbestos held by GSA now stands at 55,170 short tons. The present stockpile objective is 40,000 short tons. The excess of 15,170 short tons is covered by H.R. 13580.

Asbestos is a name applied to a group of naturally fibrous minerals. Amosite asbestos is characterized by long, coarse, resilient fibers, which are difficult to spin. It is more resistant to heat than crocidolite or chrysotile. It varies in color from gray and yellow to dark brown with fiber lengths up to 6 inches. The Republic of South Africa is the only commercial source of amosite asbestos.

Amosite asbestos is used in manufacturing woven insulating felt, heat insulation such as pipe covering and marine insulation board. The long fiber amosite is used principally in the manufacture of thermal insulation.

The average acquisition cost of the amosite asbestos was $245 per short ton. The current market price is about $241 per short ton.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the amosite asbestos now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF RUTHENIUM FROM THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13663) to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1151), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 15,000 troy ounces of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of ruthenium is based on a determination that there is no longer a need to stockpile this material. Consequently express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirements for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The 15,000 troy ounces of ruthenium covered by this bill consists of the entire supply of this material in the supplemental stockpile as there is no longer a need to stockpile this material.

Information on ruthenium

Ruthenium is a gray or silverlike, nonductile metal of the platinum group. It is alloyed with platinum and palladium to produce a hard corrosion-resistant metal. The high melting point, hardness, and brittleness limit the satisfactory working of ruthenium mechanically.

United States production of ruthenium is limited. The primary sources of the material are the Republic of South Africa, Canada, and Russia.

The approximate acquisition cost of the ruthenium in the inventory was about $37.30 per troy ounce. The present market value is $55 to $60 per troy ounce.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the ruthenium now held in the supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF VANADIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13774) to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1152), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 6,450 short tons of vanadium (V content), and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of vanadium is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of vanadium covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of vanadium (V content) held by GSA is 7,865 short tons. The present stockpile objective is 1,400 short tons. The excess of approximately 6,450 short tons is covered by H.R. 13774.

Information on vanadium

Vanadium is a pale gray metal with a silvery luster. It occurs in combination with other minerals or metals, including uranium and phosphate rock. It readily alloys with steel. When added to steel it toughens and strengthens it—forming hard carbides which are retained at high temperatures. Vanadium increases tensile strength without lowering ductility.

The greatest percentage of all vanadium is consumed by the steel industry in the manufacture of high-strength structural steels, tool steels, and wear-resistant cast iron. It is also used in combination with other alloying materials such as nickel and aluminum.

U.S. vanadium ore is mined principally in the Colorado Plateau as a coproduct of uranium. Other sources in the United States are South Dakota, New Mexico, Idaho, and Utah. Foreign sources of supply are Fin-

land, Republic of South Africa, and South-West Africa.

The vanadium for disposal is stockpile quality material in the form of vanadium pentoxide. The approximate acquisition cost of the vanadium pentoxide inventory was $1.18 per pound. The average price received for similar vanadium pentoxide sold by GSA in February of this year was approximately $1.22 per pound.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the vanadium now held in the national stockpile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and to the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] for assuring expeditious Senate action in these stockpile proposals. Their vitally important nature falls squarely within the national interest. These two Members of this body deserve a great deal of credit for giving the measures swift, yet full committee consideration and for seeing that successful action would be achieved today. To both go our thanks for their continuing excellent work in this field.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

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

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

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

U.S. AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

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

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

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, U.S. Army, to be a lieutenant general.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, to be lieutenant general on the retired list.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service and in the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

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

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF THE HONORABLE BERNARD BOUTIN AS ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in public statements today, I have commended the appointment of the Honorable Bernard Boutin as Administrator of the Small Business Administration. President Lyndon B. Johnson announced his selection over the weekend and, as a member of the Senate Committee on Small Business with a vital interest in the stability and health of the smaller businesses of West Virginia and the Nation, I am gratified.

In my statement through West Virginia news media, I declared that I would urge the Senate to act promptly to confirm the appointment of Mr. Boutin, because his organizing ability and leadership talents are needed by the Small Business Administration.

Mr. President, I do urge early action on confirmation of the executive nomination of the gentleman from New Hampshire whom President John F. Kennedy brought into the Federal Government as Administrator of the General Services Administration. In that position, Mr. Boutin performed vigorously and capably.

After a period of return to private enterprise, Mr. Boutin was brought back into Government, President Johnson having appointed him Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, where his performance was of high quality.

In my Public Works Committee and Labor and Public Welfare Committee duties—and in my service as a Senator from West Virginia—I have been privileged to work cooperatively with Bernie Boutin in both his GSA and OEO assignments.

I feel that President Johnson made a wise decision in selecting him to head the vital Small Business Administration.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

REPORT OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the national commander, Civil Air Patrol, Ellington Air Force Base, Tex., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the calendar year 1965, which, with an accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION OF SAN JOSE, CALIF.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Human Relations Commission of the City of San Jose, Calif., relating to the granting of the right of collective bargaining to agricultural farm workers, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 3321. A bill for the relief of Patrick Quisenberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 3322. A bill to declare that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3323. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of certain civilian guards at the U.S. Naval Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3324. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MONTOYA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. TOWER, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 3325. A bill to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in

screw-worm eradication in Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 3326. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a Talented American Senior Corps; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 28, 1947, AS AMENDED

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended. This amendment will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

This proposed legislation is important to the cattle producers throughout the United States. Considerable work has been done to combat this problem, but much more is needed as we look to the future.

Let us review the status of the program as it stands today.

SOUTHEAST SCREW-WORM PROGRAM

In fiscal year 1958, a cooperative program to eradicate the screw-worm from the Southeast was initiated in the States of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. The major screw-worm eradication work was completed during fiscal year 1960 with great economic benefits to that region of the Nation. The primary source of spreading infestations each year to States north of Florida was the overwintering area in southern Florida. This area is surrounded on three sides by water and to the north by a climate which does not allow native screw-worms to survive the winter. The presence of these natural barriers against reinfestation contributed greatly to the success of the Southeastern eradication program.

When major eradication was completed in the Southeastern States it was necessary to protect them from reinfestation. A line of inspection stations was established for this purpose along the Mississippi River to prevent the movement of screw-worm infested animals from the Southwestern States. Maintenance of this protective line required as much as $750,000 annually in Federal funds without cost-sharing by State or local sources for 4 fiscal years—1961–64. The eradication of the screw-worm from the Southwest made it possible to discontinue this inspection line beginning in fiscal year 1965.

SOUTHWEST SCREW-WORM PROGRAM

Cooperative activities were inaugurated in February 1962 as a 3-year trial eradication program to eliminate screw-worm flies in Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico, and concurrently to determine the requirements and the economic feasibility for establishing and maintaining an artificial barrier zone of sterile screw-worm flies along the Mexico-United States border that would prevent screw-worms from Mexico from entering screw-worm-free areas of Texas, New Mexico, and States north and east. This has been accomplished.

Maintenance of this barrier is considered to be a Federal responsibility because program operations must be conducted largely within the Republic of Mexico, with the consent of the Mexican Government. Because screw-worms from Mexico can readily migrate across the international boundary, the northern limits of the barrier zone must extend into southern Texas and New Mexico but the distance depends upon various seasonal and climatic influences. Moreover, the barrier is in the same category as the cattle fever tick buffer quarantine zone along the Rio Grande supported by Federal funds.

The Agricultural Appropriation Act for 1966 made available approximately $2,800,000 for maintenance of a barrier. The major cost-sharing requirement for maintenance of the barrier zone was eliminated from the appropriation language. However, in keeping with congressional intent, the cooperators are required to continue matching the cost of production, irradiation, and release of flies needed to eradicate outbreaks in the freed areas north of the barrier zone.

STATUS OF SCREW-WORM ERADICATION IN ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA

In the fiscal year 1966 agricultural appropriation bill, Congress made available $1 million for the Federal share of full-year costs of a program to eradicate screw-worms in Arizona and California and to extend the screw-worm barrier west to the Pacific Ocean. The Conference Report No. 1186 on the bill stated that as much as $600,000 in matching funds would be provided by State or local sources, making a total of $1,600,000 for this extension of the screw-worm barrier program. The extended program was initiated with supplemental funds of $100,000 provided under the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965. These supplemental funds made it possible to start eradication activities in May 1965 at about the time of heavy screw-worm migrations from Mexico into the United States, thus preventing the usual screw-worm buildup in Arizona during the late spring. This favorable position made it possible to eradicate the native screw-worm population from Arizona and in California in one season. Even though there are areas where the pest can live all winter, not a single screw-worm was reported in Arizona between December 15, 1965, and March 23, 1966. Department scientists have just completed a thorough review of field data and have determined that a period of 11 weeks of freedom from screw-worms is sufficient to prove that the native population has been eradicated. Eradication has been accomplished when, after a period of absence of cases, any new cases which occur must be introduced from outside the eradicated areas.

PROGRAM OF FUTURE OPERATIONS

With the eradication of native screw-worm populations in Arizona and California, the sterile screw-worm fly drop has been concentrated further south in the barrier zone to reduce the heavy native screw-worm populations in northern Mexico south of Arizona and, thereby, further reduce the number of screw-worms that can migrate into Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and other States during the summer of 1966.

For maximum effectiveness the barrier zone from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean must be maintained as one operation. The maintenance of any portion of the barrier zone is dependent upon the proper maintenance of adjacent portions in order to protect all States.

The prospect of a continuing high annual cost to maintain New Mexico, Texas, and States to the north and east free from screw-worms, makes it essential to find means of reducing the cost and, at the same time, prevent the introduction of screw-worms into the United States. An extensive field survey of the situation is being conducted throughout the Republic of Mexico south of the existing artificial barrier zone as far as the Mexican-Guatemala border to determine the problems. Mexico is cooperating in this survey.

This survey is designed to obtain information not presently available relating to first, areas in Mexico favorable to screw-worm breeding; second, natural population densities during different seasons of the year; third, favorable resting areas and dispersal patterns; fourth, varying husbandry practices in different areas of Mexico; and fifth, economic losses in Mexico.

Preliminary results of the survey confirm our earlier opinion that eradication of screw-worms from Mexico is feasible and that an effective barrier can be maintained across the narrow part of Mexico at a fraction of the cost of the present location. After completion of the survey a proposed program, with estimated cost, will be developed for consideration by the two Governments.

The Department does not have authority to cooperate with Mexico in screw-worm eradication. Under Public Law 8, Congress authorized the Department to cooperate with Mexico in the highly successful foot-and-mouth eradication program. The attached proposed amendment would extend this authority to include screw-worm eradication. With such authorization the Department would be authorized to consider a joint program proposal, after which discussions would be held with the Congress.

Mr. President, I request that this bill lie on the desk through Saturday, May 14, for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 3325) to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT TO CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

AMENDMENT NO. 561

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in recent months it has come to my attention that important health, education, and welfare programs are being placed in jeopardy by an effort on the part of certain Federal officials to correct so-called racial imbalance in the States. I hasten to add that the Federal officials are not solely responsible because they are laboring under legislation, the provisions of which are vague and easily misunderstood. For this reason, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an amendment in the nature of an additional title to S. 3296, the administration's proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966. I request unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The purpose of this amendment is to clarify the ambiguities of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This is necessary to avoid further submission of Federal officials to the pressures of outside forces which have compelled them to perform quasi-judicial functions and to allow them to concentrate on their statutory duty.

At the outset, I want to emphasize that this amendment is not intended to change the intent of Congress in enacting title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. On the contrary, it is designed to implement that intent. It is not designed to diminish the decisions of the Federal courts; rather it is designed to rely on those decisions in applying the sanctions of title VI. Nor is it designed to permit unlawful discrimination—it only assists in defining such discrimination.

My amendment would redesignate title VI of S. 3296 as title VII thereof, and redesignate sections 601 and 602 thereof as sections 701 and 702, respectively. Immediately after title V the following new title is inserted: title VI—Civil Rights Act amendment.

This amendment amends title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It would provide in section 606(a) that no funds can be withheld under any Federal program until a constitutional or statutory violation has been committed by the recipient of the benefits of such programs. Furthermore, such violation must be established by substantial evidence.

Subsection (b) provides simply that in making a determination with respect to alleged violations the particular Federal agency must follow the same procedural requirements as in the case of all other administrative adjudications. In the future, the recipient of such benefits must be accorded not only notice of the intention to withhold funds but also the opportunity to be heard and to present evidence in its own behalf.

Subsection (c) provides that in order to support a determination of discrimination it must be shown that there has been an affirmative intent to exclude or the necessary effect of exclusion of individuals from benefits on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

The purpose of this subsection is to negate the application of purely mechanistic and statistical criteria in the determination of discrimination.

Subsection (d) is a protective feature of the rights of potential beneficiaries and prohibits any Federal agency from exercising control over any school, hospital or other institution under the provisions of this title for any purpose other than to provide equal opportunity for access thereto by individuals without regard to race, color, or national origin. Furthermore, this subsection will insure that no class of individuals shall be deprived of the privilege of determining voluntarily whether or not to avail themselves of any benefit provided by any program or activity financed or partially financed by the Federal Government.

Section 601, which is the heart of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, would be left untouched by my amendment. It provides:

> No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The remaining, implementing language of the title, however, brazenly transfers to the Executive the lawmaking power of Congress, and in doing so leaves the definition of discrimination and the application of sanctions to the uncontrolled discretion of agency officials. Congress has meekly surrendered the control of the Federal purse strings to the "equal opportunity officer" of each agency which he may use to effectuate his own notions of sociological progress.

And what has been the result? Not only have many officials predictably taken full advantage of their new power, but indeed some have usurped far more than was given them by the act.

I will mention three examples in North Carolina, only to illustrate how this legislative and judicial power which officials have assumed has resulted in the distortion of the original Federal programs they are charged with administering.

An adult basic education project in Charlotte, under which 1,400 Negroes and 170 whites in a total of 91 classes were being taught to read and write, was threatened with termination by the Office of Economic Opportunity because of alleged de facto segregation and so-called racial imbalance in two classes. This threat, without complaint from any local organization or individual, was made under the provisions of title VI.

In another North Carolina city, a hospital is at this moment under threat of losing Federal funds because nonwhites do not comprise as large a percentage of the patient load as is the percentage of the nonwhite population of the city. There is no allegation of discrimination or segregation in the staffing, in employment, or in the assignment of patients to wards and rooms. The only allegation is that the local populace does not become ill and choose the threatened hospital according to racial quotas.

Finally, there is the example of the Office of Education integration guidelines recently published for the South. There is no pretense in the language of the guidelines that their purpose is to prevent either discrimination or State-supported segregation. The whole thrust is so-called racial balance in pupil and teacher assignment according to percentages.

These mindless threats and fatuous guidelines cannot be remotely reconciled with the language or the legislative history of title VI or with the unlawful conduct—as defined by the courts—that was intended to be condemned. Two brief statements confirm this.

The best authority on congressional intent of any legislative act is the floor manager of the bill, and the floor manager of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was the then assistant majority leader, Vice President HUMPHREY. In developing the legislative history and articulating the intent of the act, the Vice President stated in 1964:

> While the Constitution prohibits segregation, it does not require integration. The busing of children to achieve racial balance would be an act to effect the integration of schools. In fact, if the bill were to compel it, it would be a violation, because it would be handling the matter on the basis of race.
>
> The bill does not attempt to integrate the schools; it does attempt to eliminate segregation in the school systems.

The Vice President meant that the act was designed to eliminate segregation by legal compulsion. His words echoed those of the Federal courts as stated in Briggs against Elliott:

> It is important that we point out exactly what the Supreme Court has decided and what it has not decided * * *. It has not decided that the Federal courts are to take over or regulate the public schools of the States. It has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What is has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains.
>
> Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination.

But in not one of the instances I recounted in North Carolina did the Federal official responsible follow either the mandate of the 1964 act or the mandate of the Federal judiciary, or that of the specific poverty, education or health program he was to administer.

In Charlotte, the poverty program official stated his purpose was to "promote maximum cross-cultural experience," according to his euphemistic, sociological jargon. The education of hundreds of illiterates, 90 percent of them Negro, was to be sacrificed to the overriding imperative of so-called racial balance. His integration program was of more importance than his poverty program. It was not those who administer nor those who voluntarily teach who would have been hurt—only those to whom the ability to read and write would have been denied.

If the incidence of sickness among nonwhites does not increase sufficiently and more Negroes do not come to our hospitals, so that, thereby, funds are cut

off, it is not the hospital trustees nor the staff that will be hurt. It will be the charity patients whom the hospital can no longer afford to treat and many of them are not white. Such tragically insane policies, which completely subvert the purpose of our health-care legislation, cause one to wonder if "all what's nailed down is comin' loose," as the Angel Gabriel said to the Lord in the great play, "Green Pastures."

Such a thought is surely confirmed by the new school desegregation guidelines. In them there is this:

> The racial composition of the professional staff of a school system, and of the schools in the system, must be considered in determining whether the students are subjected to discrimination in education programs.

And one education official, in explaining these obtuse rules, said:

> Race may have to be taken into account in future assignments so as to achieve an integrated balance of staff.

These statements fly blindly in the teeth of every Federal judicial decision concerning equal protection of the laws handed down in the last 20 years—decisions which state unequivocally that race cannot be a constitutionally permissible consideration in the enactment and enforcement of Federal and State laws. To our Office of Education, the Constitution is no longer colorblind. On the contrary, race is the primary consideration in the ground rules of its great drive for so-called racial balance. In ignoring the decisions of the courts, the guidelines equally ignore the intent of title VI. In fact, the sudden emphasis on so-called racial balance among classroom teachers violates the express language of section 604, which States that nothing in the title shall be construed to authorize action by any Federal agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

And, again, who is hurt when a school system fails to achieve a so-called balance satisfactory to Federal officials? Not the school board; not the teacher. The only ones who lose are the students whom the Federal aid to education was designed to help and who have no control whatsoever over assignment policies. Yet the Federal Government would deny to those legally helpless students the equal protection and equal assistance which Federal law provides to all others.

As education bills are brought up in this body, we are admonished time and again that Federal control of schools is not the intention. I have accepted the assurances in good faith. Just last week the Vice President assured us that Federal aid was intended to—and should—strengthen local school systems. I accept this too. But, Mr. President, this is not the current course of Federal aid, for the program has been twisted into a club held over the heads of all southern school officials and used to enforce Washington's notions of acceptable integration progress.

The amendment I introduce today will prohibit such nonsensical interpretations of their own power under title VI as some Federal officials have divined. It will accomplish this by defining section 601 according to the intent of Congress, and the decisions of the Federal courts; if it is adopted, title VI, in the future, will be implemented according to the intention of Congress and not the whim of bureaucrats who are not answerable to the people for their sociological follies.

If my amendment is adopted, every American will be subject to the same guidelines and can ascertain what those guidelines are. No longer will "discrimination" mean something different in 1 year from what it means in the next as is presently the case. No longer can the title be applied in one section of the country and not in another, without the protections of due process, as is presently the case. No longer will free choice be allowed by one department or agency and not by another, as is presently the case.

Mr. President, I ask all Senators to consider this amendment carefully, for I intend to press it. I am confident that fundamental fairness and equal justice require its enactment.

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

The amendment (No. 561) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

On page 35, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new title:

"TITLE VI—CIVIL RIGHTS ACT AMENDMENT

"SEC. 601. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 606. (a) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize the termination of, or the refusal to grant or continue, any Federal financial assistance for any cause other than a violation of a provision of the Constitution, or an affirmative provision of a statute of the United States, which has been established by substantial evidence.

"'(b) No rule, regulation, or order which may result in the termination of, or the failure to grant or continue, any Federal assistance shall be placed in effect unless it has been adopted after proceedings taken in compliance with the requirements of sections 4–10, inclusive, of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003–1009).

"'(c) A determination under this title to the effect that discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin exists, has existed, or in the future may exist, in the administration of any program or activity shall require a showing by substantial evidence that in the administration or operation thereof conditions or requirements are, have been, or may be imposed with affirmative intent to exclude, or with the necessary effect of excluding individuals from participation in the benefits of such program or activity solely upon the ground of race, color, or national origin.

"'(d) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize any Federal department, agency, or officer to issue any rule, regulation, or order for the purpose or with the effect of—

"'(1) controlling or regulating the administration or operation of any school, hospital, or other institution for any purpose other than to provide equal opportunity for access thereto by individuals without regard to race, color, or national origin; or

"'(2) depriving any class of individuals of the privilege of determining voluntarily whether or not to avail themselves of any benefit provided by any program or activity, or of the facilities of any school, hospital, or other institution'."

On page 35, line 17, strike out "TITLE VI", and insert in lieu thereof "TITLE VII".

On page 35, line 19, strike out "SEC. 601", and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 701".

On page 36, line 2, strike out "SEC. 602", and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 702".

AMENDMENT TO S. 985, TRUTH IN PACKAGING

AMENDMENT NO. 562

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, consideration of the so-called truth-in-packaging bill, S. 985, has been prolonged in the Commerce Committee for a number of reasons, but it is now scheduled for further consideration at another executive session slated for tomorrow.

While there is, I believe, unanimity on the part of the committee that a bill is desirable to increase protection of the consumer and to make it more readily possible to judge comparatively between products in the same line through a rationalizing of weights and measures, there has not been unanimity on the question of how best to achieve this goal.

A central question revolves around the desirability of giving a mandate to such agencies as the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration to prepare and enforce certain regulations in this field. The proposal presently before us in a committee print modifies the original bill by incorporating the voluntary standards procedure of the Commerce Department as a means of setting standards, which would then be incorporated in regulations of the agencies.

This, I believe, is likely to fail of the objective intended, since the end result is very much the same except for the interjection of an intermediate step. The amendment I am proposing I offer as a bridge between the very real needs of consumers for an effective bill and the desire of some manufacturers for maintaining the status quo. It puts a greater responsibility on the voluntary standards procedure, which was revised last December and which incorporates provisions for an active consumer role in the process, a role which is pleasing to the President's Committee on Consumer Interests. Under the amendment, the voluntary standards procedure would be the mechanism by which standards are set, but it would also carry an element of compliance through a certification of the adhering industry people, who would be eligible to display a "seal of good packaging practice" as a result.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed amendment may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with an explanation prepared for and already circulated to members of the committee.

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

The amendment (No. 562) was referred to the Committee on Commerce,

and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Beginning with line 12, page 7, strike out all to and including line 7, page 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) Whenever the promulgating authority determines with respect to a particular consumer commodity that the undue proliferation of the weights or quantities in which such commodity is being distributed for retail sale is shown to impair or to be likely to impair the ability of consumers to make comparisons of performance or value including price, the promulgating authority shall publish such determination and the findings upon which it is based in the Federal Register. Unless within sixty days after the publication of such determination as to a particular consumer commodity, a representative group of the producers or distributors of that consumer commodity shall have requested the Secretary of Commerce to develop a voluntary product standard for such commodity under the procedures of development of voluntary product standards established by the Secretary pursuant to section 2 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 272), the promulgating authority may request the Secretary of Commerce to develop such voluntary product standard. The promulgating authority shall through such of its employees as it shall designate participate in the development of the voluntary product standard for the particular consumer commodity.

"(e) Whenever any voluntary product standard has been established and published as to any consumer commodity, the Secretary of Commerce shall transmit to the appropriate promulgating authority (1) a copy of that standard, and (2) one or more lists setting forth the names and addresses of the manufacturers and distributors who have then or thereafter signified in writing their acceptance of that standard. Each manufacturer and distributor who has so signified his acceptance of that standard shall be entitled to display upon labels affixed to, and packages containing, that commodity a seal of good packaging practice which shall be designed by the Bureau of Standards. The introduction or delivery for introduction into commerce, by any person of any consumer commodity bearing a label, or contained in a package, upon which such seal of good packaging practice is displayed shall constitute for the purposes of this Act a violation of this Act if such commodity is not introduced or delivered for introduction into commerce in compliance with the voluntary product standard established for that commodity pursuant to subsection (d)."

The explanation presented by Mr. HARTKE is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF HARTKE AMENDMENT (S. 985)

ANALYSIS

1. Substitutes new section 5 (d) and (e) for section 5 (d), (e), (f), and (g) (committee print pp. 7–11).

2. Retains provision for promulgating authority to make a determination that ability of consumers to make comparisons is impaired by undue proliferation of weights and quantities, publish notice in Federal Register. Addition: Federal Register notice would include statement of basis on which findings are made as well as the notice itself.

3. If industry group does not request Secretary of Commerce for voluntary product standard procedure within 60 days, promulgating authority may do so. In any case, it will participate in development of the standards through its own designated employees.

4. When the voluntary standard has been set, the promulgating authority will receive from the Secretary of Commerce a copy of the standard and lists of those who have given written acceptance of it. These will be entitled to a "seal of good packaging practice" to be designed by the Bureau of Standards, for use on packages and in advertising.

5. The voluntary standards are not made a part of the promulgating authority regulations.

REASONS FOR THE AMENDMENT

1. The section 5 procedures, despite incorporation of the voluntary standards process, do not eliminate objections to the old 3(c) procedure but make them if anything less acceptable. It extends the number of stages through which the process extends, and ends with the same result of mandatory standards.

2. There is an inherent problem in the fixing of mandatory regulations revolving around the possibility of innovation. In order to comply with the regulations once fixed, a company might have to be much delayed in securing approval and thus lose the market advantage of innovation. This has been a major objection from the beginning.

3. Present section 5 procedures open the door to long legal processes which could delay for a great length of time the effective institution of the regulations. The voluntary process is quicker, potentially.

4. Instead of the mandatory "stick" the amendment offers as a compliance inducement a certification "carrot" in subsection (e).

5. The voluntary procedure is highly approved by Esther Peterson's office. Its revision last December has made it what they believe will be a much more effective instrument for consumer protection. Its consumer strength is indicated by these facts:

(i) Initiation of the request may be by "any group of manufacturers, distributors, consumers, users, or testing laboratories" as well as State or Federal agencies.

(ii) The Standard Review Committee, which comes into operation after setting of a standard, under the regulations (Federal Register, Dec. 10, 1965) includes by definition "consumers or users."

(iii) The procedure attains flexibility through a Standing Committee, following standard adoption, "to receive and consider proposals to revise or amend the standard" as changing situations may indicate. Its membership "shall have an equal balance among producers, distributors, users and consumers" together with "other important interests" such as State or Federal agencies.

6. Standards under the Procedures are voluntary, but the addition of the certification provision leads to signature by those who conform, a binding signature whose violation constitutes "a violation of this act." The result is, to a considerable degree, a self-enforcing standard.

MANDATORY PROVISION CAN BE ADDED IF VOLUNTARY PROCEDURE FAILS

1. Legislative oversight is provided (sec. 8) by reports from the Secretary of Commerce to Congress. (While not a part of the prepared amendment, it is suggested that the January report should cover the preceding calendar rather than fiscal year as now stated.)

Fear has been expressed that interminable delay might ensue after the calling of a standard-setting conference, failure for 2 or 3 or more years to do more than meet and fail to agree.

The January 1968, report to Congress should reveal whether this is happening. If so, it is then possible to amend the law to incorporate the deleted mandatory promulgating authority action now in the committee print.

2. There is no question now but that action is essential in the areas of consumer abuse. The affected companies are aware of this, and would prefer to act on their own even under the prod of aroused public opinion and the threat of Federal mandate than to have the standards set by predominantly Federal action. The procedure proposed in the amendment will preserve that freedom, but by indicating (as should be done in the committee report and legislative history) that stronger action will follow the failure of voluntary opportunity, together with the certifying provisions of (e), there will be provided very strong incentives for the success of the voluntary procedure.

SUMMARY

In sum, by adopting the proposed resolution we will effectively stimulate the consumer protection we seek, but will do so while retaining the greatest possible freedom—with the background threat of compulsion if this voluntary opportunity is not fulfilled by the industry people.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK FOR ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 3303, introduced by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and lying at the desk for cosponsors, be permitted to remain at the desk through Wednesday, May 11.

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

SCHOOL MILK BILL HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR THIS WEEK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, most of my Senate colleagues are aware of the fight I have been making daily on the floor of the Senate to save the special milk program for schoolchildren. Every working Senate day since we convened in January I have spoken out on this floor against the administration's proposed 80 percent cutback in the school milk program.

This fight is definitely beginning to produce results. I was gratified when 67 of my fellow Senators joined me in sponsoring a bill to make the school milk program permanent. This legislation also increased Federal funding for the program.

I was heartened the week before last when the House of Representatives decided to appropriate $103 million for the program in the face of the administration's suggestion that funds for the program be cut by 80 percent to $21 million. Although I intend to work for an increase in that figure as a member of the Appropriations Committee's Agriculture Subcommittee this is an excellent beginning.

However, it is only a beginning. Unless my bill to make the school milk program permanent is passed, the present program will expire on June 30, 1967. Of course, it is possible that legislation similar to mine could be introduced in the 90th Congress—next year—considered and passed by both Houses, and signed into law by June 30, 1967. However we all know how difficult it is to expedite action at the start of a new Congress with its multitude of housekeeping chores.

This is why I am especially pleased to be able to report that the Holland Subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee will be holding hearings on this legislation on Thursday and Friday

of this week. As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator HOLLAND has been a valued friend of the school milk program over the years. He has consistently supported amendments that have been introduced in subcommittee to give the program enough funds to meet anticipated growth. Now he has once again shown his strong support for the school milk program by scheduling these hearings despite a very crowded and hectic schedule.

Mr. President, I hope that some of those cosponsoring S. 2921 will see fit to appear in person, or file a statement, in support of the legislation. This would be a great help in insuring speedy Senate action.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2512, THE NOLO CONTENDERE BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee will begin hearings on S. 2512, the nolo contendere bill, on Wednesday, May 11. Additional hearings will be held later in the session. Those wishing to testify on the bill should notify Thomas C. Williams, assistant counsel for the subcommittee.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce that hearings will be held on S. 3296, the administration's Civil Rights Act of 1966, and six other civil rights bills as follows:

S. 2923, providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes.

S. 3170, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States over certain classes of removed cases and to provide injunctive relief in certain cases, and for other purposes.

S. 2846, to protect civil rights by providing that it shall be a Federal offense to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any of his civil rights; by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence; and for other purposes.

S. 2845, to provide for the selection of qualified persons to serve as jurors in each U.S. district court without regard to their race or color.

S. 1654, to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code, to specify the punishment if personal injury or death results from a violation of such sections.

S. 1497, to protect civil rights by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence, and for other purposes.

The hearings are scheduled to begin June 2, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to testify or submit statements pertaining to the bills should communicate with the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach has been invited to be the subcommittee's first witness. Other witnesses who will be invited will include Governors of the 50 States, Members of the Senate, public school officials, representatives of civil rights organizations, representatives of the real estate trade, experts in constitutional law, and other interested persons.

It is the subcommittee's intention to obtain the testimony of the best qualified experts representing a cross section of opinion on these bills. I am confident that, with careful consideration, we can compile a record upon which the Senate can base an intelligent debate.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3169) to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special program for the mentally retarded, mentally ill, and physically handicapped spouses and children of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following concurrent resolutions and resolutions:

Authority of April 27, 1966:

S. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution relative to parity prices for agricultural commodities: Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

Authority of April 28, 1966:

S. Res. 252. Resolution extending birthday greetings to the Honorable Harry S. Truman upon the occasion of his 82d birthday: Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BASS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

Authority of May 3, 1966:

S. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution providing that no Federal agency take any action to discourage parity prices for any agricultural commodity: Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. MORTON.

S. Res. 256. Resolution relating to United States denunciation of the Warsaw Convention: Mr. BASS, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HART, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

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. BURDICK:

Statement by him regarding the artificial water recharge system of Minot, N. Dak.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech delivered at Widen (W. Va.) Arts and Crafts Fair, May 7, 1966.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE IN VIETNAM

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the outstanding and truly excellent medical care being provided Army personnel in Vietnam under the high standards laid down by the Surgeon General, Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton.

The U.S. Army Medical Service in Vietnam has the mission of providing effective medical support to the U.S. Army troops and other U.S. military and civilian personnel in Vietnam.

In accomplishing this mission the U.S. Army is proving that it is one of the finest military medical teams in the world. Complete, close, and continuous medical care and treatment are provided to all supported military and civilian personnel. The members of this dedicated team of highly trained professional and technical personnel are located at all echelons of command from the forward combat areas to the most rearward enclaves, insuring that our most precious commodity, the individual soldier, is provided immediately responsive, effective care and treatment.

The soldier wounded in Vietnam has the benefit of methods and materials far superior to those available a few years ago. The mortality among the wounded reaching a hospital in Vietnam is the lowest in history. In January 1966, it was 2.8 percent, of which the majority occurred within 24 hours of hospitalization. The mortality rate after 24 hours was only 1.2 percent. These splendid data may be attributed to many factors involving planning, logistics, and profes-

sional capabilities. I will mention a few of these factors.

Helicopter evacuation is used for practically all of the casualties for transportation to a hospital. The more seriously wounded usually reach a hospital within 1 to 2 hours after wounding and have been known to reach a hospital in less than an hour. This is exceedingly important in the overall low mortality rate.

Whole blood is available in abundant quantity, not only in hospitals but in division clearing stations and at times even in battalion aid stations. Infusion of blood for the critically wounded continues during helicopter evacuation to a hospital.

There are adequate numbers of fully trained general and surgical specialty surgeons, the great majority of whom are career officers, trained in the programs of the Army Medical Service, and therefore familiar with working within the military framework so that each is familiar with the primary mission of the surgeon in a combat zone and the indicated staging of the surgery of the battle wounded.

At least one, and in some hospitals two and three, well trained anesthesiologists provide anesthesia for the critically injured during surgery, aid in preoperative resuscitation, and participate in the postoperative treatment in the recovery or intensive care units.

Our most significant disease problem in Vietnam today is that of malaria. The incidence of this disease increased last fall concurrent with the buildup in troop strengths in Vietnam. The malaria encountered in Vietnam has demonstrated decreased susceptibility to treatment with synthetic antimalarial drugs. Fortunately, these cases usually respond to further treatment with quinine. As a result of this experience we have embarked on an all-out effort to find new drugs that will be effective in the suppression and treatment of malaria. New regimens are also being tested and a multimillion-dollar research effort is well underway.

United States combat troops in Vietnam are a highly mobile force which operate in and out of very restrictive terrain. Casualties resulting from these operations must be evacuated by a responsive mobile force capable of operating in the same terrain and under the same conditions. The Army Medical Service is meeting this challenge with helicopter air ambulance units in direct support of the combat soldier. Casualty pickups are being made at the place where the injury is incurred and many times while the combat operations are still in progress. The fact that a soldier can be evacuated from the place of injury to a medical treatment facility within minutes not only helps the morale of the fighting man, but has been one of the important factors in reducing the mortality rate to the lowest of any war in history. Approximately 90 percent of all casualties in Vietnam are evacuated by helicopter. Army Medical Service helicopters are averaging over 4,000 patient evacuations per month. Vietnam helicopter evacuations have already surpassed the total helicopter evacuations made during the entire Korean war.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, General Heaton and all his associates are to be highly commended for their splendid work in this field. The Army Medical Service personnel in Vietnam deserve special tribute and commendation for their dedicated service. It is because of their work that General Heaton was able to assure me that "no U.S. Army soldier in Vietnam today lacks required care and treatment."

General Heaton is not only a truly great administrator, he is an outstanding active surgeon and a highly dedicated soldier and American.

All Americans, and particularly our fighting men in Vietnam and their loved ones at home, can be reassured and comforted by the high standards of medical care being provided and by the fact that no avenue of medical support is being overlooked or left unattended.

Mr. President, if I may have one additional minute, I wish to point out that excellent medical support not only exists in Vietnam and the immediate supporting hospitals in the Pacific area, but the more severely wounded are returned to the continental United States and placed in hospitals all over the Pacific side of this country, as well as back here in Walter Reed and other hospitals in the United States, where several hundred of them are now receiving excellent attention.

Let me point out quickly that the Army is not the only one. These exceptional medical services are found in the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines, and they do a splendid job. It does happen that in the war in Vietnam the Army is carrying a greater part of the load because they are the ones in combat and also because to a degree, they are taking care of the men on the immediate battlefields. These things do not just happen. It is with the greatest pride that every American can look at the record and have the finest assurance that if their loved ones are in Vietnam, they are being very well looked after.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield gladly to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I associate myself fully with all the comments which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Miracles are being performed today by the men and women in the Medical Corps of the several U.S. military services, those intrepid people who bind up the wounds of Americans who have fallen in defense of freedom in southeast Asia and around the globe elsewhere.

Speed and skill in medical treatment in all the services have reached new highs. Great new hospitals have been erected here and in the far Pacific. Mobile hospitals are in South Vietnam. Particularly on this occasion, I am glad to join the Senator from Mississippi in paying a full meed of respect to the Army Medical Corps, from the world-renowned Walter Reed Hospital in Washington to its selfless activities across the seas.

I have, as the Senator from Mississippi knows, particular reason to be acquainted with the distinguished soldier who is Surgeon General of the U.S. Army—General Heaton. He is a great American, a great soldier, a great physician, a great surgeon, and a great administrator, who has successfully discharged his responsibility over this farflung, worldwide corps with all its skills in medicine and in surgery by which personnel in the Army are miraculously cared for.

I venture to hope, on this occasion, that the people of the United States, and the men and women in the U.S. Army, may have the benefit of General Heaton's continuing service for many years in the future.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me to make these comments.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I certainly share those views and hopes with the Senator from California.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' RETIREMENT AND ANNUITY FUND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1101, H.R. 11439, be made the pending business at the conclusion of morning business.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11439) to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President there will be no business on the pending legislation, but it will be the pending business tomorrow when those most interested will be on hand to take it up.

WORLD COPPER CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, historically, the mining of copper has been an extremely important element in the economy of the State of Montana, and for much of the West. Therefore, the status of the industry throughout the world is of considerable concern to those of us who represent the Treasure State. In the past several decades, the industry has been plagued by many boom and bust periods. The London market is far too high and I believe that a time has come to attempt to reach some form of international agreement on production and prices. It was with this thought in

mind that I proposed a world conference, on a recent visit to Butte, "the richest hill on earth."

I feel that there is a strong possibility that copper may be pricing itself out of the market because these inflationary prices are stimulating the greater use of substitutes for the red metal.

This situation has developed since Chile raised the price to 62 cents and Zambia increased its price to equal that of the London exchange rate.

Incidentally, according to the New York Times this morning, Peru has joined the parade. These are tremendous increases. This trend can be dangerous. If this continues it will be extremely difficult to maintain a 36-cent-a-pound price in this country while the rest of the world goes way beyond. Incidentally, I want to state that the domestic copper producers—Anaconda, Phelps-Dodge, Kennecott, and the rest—have been most cooperative with the Government in its endeavor to keep the price of copper from going out of sight. Releases of Government stockpile copper help to alleviate the U.S. situation for a time but, unfortunately, our domestic producers cannot increase production to meet demand. Other metals such as aluminum and steel can be produced at higher levels to meet demands but this is not the case in the instance of copper.

Stability in the market is a requirement for continuous production and stable employment. This stability means prosperity to copper-producing areas of my State, as well as in other sections of the country.

This is something that might very well be handled at a world conference to discuss the adoption of an agreement on production designed to avoid "ups and downs" in an industry which can thrive only on a stable production-pricing system. This proposal immediately raises questions of international cartels and violations of antitrust laws but I hope that the experts within the Department of Justice will understand the gravity of the problem and cooperate on this matter.

It would be my suggestion that the administration take the initiative in calling a world conference for this purpose. The stability of one of the major mining industries is at stake and, as always, its effect on the economy, as a whole, will be of the highest significance.

WE SHOULD OFFER DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION TO COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the recent hearings on China conducted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations clearly indicate the need for better communication between the United States and Communist China. The Peking government has for 17 years ruled some 740 million men, women and children—nearly one-fourth of the world's population. The establishment of a workable relationship with the Red Chinese Government is one of the most important problems facing our Nation today.

China will be incapable for many years, if then, of developing weapons necessary to challenge our security. Nonetheless, it is the most powerful nation in Asia and in years to come will have a profound influence upon the kind of world in which our children and grandchildren will be living. There is probably no greater threat to world peace today than the threat posed by the arrogant, hostile Red Chinese dictators who are violently Communist in the Stalin pattern. Time alone will lessen the bitterness they feel toward the nations of the Western world that oppressed China and degraded the Chinese during the 18th, 19th, and around the turn of the 20th century.

The time has come for the United States to recognize the Red Chinese Government. Nations, like individuals, should not ignore the facts of life. Recognition of one nation by another never means approval of the ruling regime of that country. Offering diplomatic recognition and reestablishing our Embassy in Peking would be a step toward world peace and could not possibly bring harm to our country.

Today we must rely on our consul general in Hong Kong and on Great Britain, France, Canada, and other nations that recognize Red China to relay to us information about that government. Hong Kong, incidentally, was taken from China at the end of the opium war which England declared on the Chinese Government because the Chinese tried to prevent the English from profiting by traffic in opium to the injury of the Chinese people. At the same time, there are many vital problems facing mankind that cannot be resolved without direct communication with the Peking regime.

Our allies, including neighbors such as Canada, have recognized Red China and are prospering by trade with that country. In 1964 Chinese trade with non-Communist countries exceeded $2 billion. Very definitely, American producers and manufacturers should be permitted to sell to Red China at world prices for gold whatever the nationals of that nation may wear, eat, drink, or smoke.

Throughout the cold war period that followed World War II, we maintained diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. During the Cuban missile crisis when the late great President John F. Kennedy forced Khrushchev to turn tail and withdraw his offensive missiles from Cuba, the fact that we maintained diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and that there was rapid communication between our President and Khrushchev helped avert a nuclear war.

We should continue to recognize the Government of Taiwan under corrupt warlord Chiang Kai-shek, who took over Taiwan and slaughtered some 17,000 defenseless Formosan men, women, and children. Should the arrogant rulers of Communist China refuse to open diplomatic relations on that account, their scorn would result in a propaganda victory for the United States.

In speaking out for diplomatic recognition of China, let us recognize the facts of international life and speak for that generation of Americans who did not participate in framing our present China policy.

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE ON FARMERS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, in the May issue of Nation's Agriculture appeared a series of questions and answers under the heading, "Our Biggest Business Problem Is the Cost-Price Squeeze on Farmers."

Questions were directed to our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], who serves as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and also on the Joint Congressional Committee on the President's Economic Report.

I ask that these questions and very illuminating answers be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE ON FARMERS

Question. As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and also the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee, what do you think is the major problem facing the Nation's farmers today?

Answer. I believe our farmers face the same problems as all other Americans—the complexities of life in the atomic age, war in Vietnam, inflation at home, and an increasing dependence on a capricious Federal Government. But the greatest problem facing farmers is the continuing cost-price squeeze, which is preventing the agricultural sector from sharing fairly in the national net income and forcing a more dangerous ratio of farm debt to farm assets.

Question. What has been happening to farm prices?

Answer. Generally farm prices have not been moving up in proportion to other prices. This is shown by the parity ratio. In December 1960, parity was 81. Until February of this year, there was only one month when parity equaled this figure; and most of the time it ranged between 74 and 78. It rose to 83 in February of this year and then dropped back to 82 for March. According to the New York Times, the Secretary of Agriculture "expressed pleasure" over this decline and predicted that the average price of all farm products should be 6 to 10 percent lower in the fourth quarter of the year. I do not share this view.

Question. Aren't some farm prices stronger than they have been?

Answer. Yes. Using a ratio based on a 1957–59 average of 100, the index of agricultural prices published by the USDA shows that by March of this year the average for all farm products had risen to 112. This average figure takes into account 81 for food grains, 107 for feed grains, 119 for oil-bearing crops such as soybeans, 123 for meat animals, 108 for dairy products, and 110 for poultry and eggs. But it should be emphasized that the overall increase from 100 to 112 has not kept pace with the increase in prices for nonagricultural items. That is why parity has been so low.

Question. What has been happening to farm costs?

Answer. The index of prices paid by farmers published by the USDA shows that by March of this year (using a ratio based on a 1957–59 average of 100), prices paid by farmers had increased as follows: wages, 127; taxes, 165; interest, 232; seed, 110, and family living items, 110.

Question. Why has interest increased so much?

Answer. This is due in part to increased interest rates. But it is mostly due to the $14.8 billion increase in farm debt over the past 5 years—from $26.2 billion to $41 billion.

Question. Why have farm costs increased?

Answer. A major factor in the increase is inflation. The purchasing power of our dollar has been going down. In 1939, the dollar was worth 100 cents. A little over 5 years ago it was worth 46.6 cents. It is down to nearly 43 cents today. When this happens, wage earners naturally ask for more wages. All of their dollars are worth less, so they need more dollars. And very often wage increases will provide a cushion against future slippage in the dollar. Some labor-management contracts contain an escalation clause under which wages automatically go up as the consumer retail price index goes up and the purchasing power of the dollar goes down. Price increases frequently follow.

Farm land prices have been going up rapidly, and inflation contributes to this. Some people invest in farm land as a hedge against inflation. Others buy farm land for speculation, figuring that inflation will boost the price and they will be able to make a profit, with only capital gains tax to pay. And these inflation-minded groups naturally compete with farmers seeking to consolidate into larger units. More debt, interest, and taxes are sure to follow.

Question. Who is responsible for inflation?

Answer. Let me start out by saying who is not responsible. It isn't the wage earner who asks for more wages. It isn't the retailer who asks for higher prices. It surely isn't the farmer who seeks better prices. These are merely the symptoms.

Inflation is the result of the supply of money (including credit) increasing faster than goods and services are increasing. The foundation for this is laid when a majority of the Members of Congress vote to spend billions and billions of dollars more than your Federal Government takes in, year after year. One can blame the executive branch of the Government for asking for too much spending in relation to our national income, but the responsibility for doing so is squarely on the legislative branch of the Government, which votes the appropriations and the revenue measures.

During the last 5 years, a majority of the Members of Congress have run your Government $31 billion deeper into debt, and this has been accompanied by $51 billion of inflation. Inflation takes more purchasing power away from our people than anything else except the Federal income tax.

Question. Are you in favor of inflation rather than taxes as a means of the Government's taking away the purchasing power of the people?

Answer. There are few Members of Congress who would say they are in favor of inflation. What counts particularly is how they vote on appropriations bills. In other words, it's deeds and not words that count. I not only am opposed to inflation, but my voting record will show that I have voted against some appropriations measures and for reduction of others in an effort to stop deficit spending.

Question. Why are you opposed to inflation?

Answer. Because it is the unfairest way to take purchasing power away from people. It hurts those the most who can least afford to bear it—especially our younger people, who find the costs of higher education going up, the expense of maintaining a young and growing family harder to meet, and the cost of buying a home and going into farming or a business most discouraging; and our older citizens living on fixed pensions, insurance, and savings.

Agriculture, which is a basic industry, is usually damaged more by inflation than any other. I realize that my views are not shared by those who classify themselves as members of the "new economics" school of thought; but I refuse to accept the theory that we have to have inflation in order to prosper.

Question. Are you opposed to increasing expenditures of the Federal Government?

Answer. With our increasing population, we can expect the total of Federal expenditures to increase. I am more concerned about bringing revenue and expenditures into a reasonable balance, so that the foundation for further inflation will not be laid. However, there is no question but what some Federal expenditures are excessive. For example, it has recently been revealed through the efforts of Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, that it cost the taxpayers $11,251 per enrollee in the Job Corps for the year 1965—this in the face of an estimated cost of $4,500 per enrollee at the time the program was being debated in Congress 2 years ago. Many of us voted against the program—even with the $4,500 figure—because we represent parents who are having a difficult time raising $1,500 a year to send children through college.

Question. What can farm organizations do about the cost-price squeeze?

Answer. They can promote more efficient farming practices, research, and improved marketing of farm products. They can, through testimony before the Congress by their representatives and, particularly, through contacts (personally and by letter) by their members with Senators and Congressmen, assist in the very important task of moulding sound farm legislation.

A good many farm organizations, of course, provide cooperative purchasing and marketing activities for their members; and many of these have been highly successful.

Question. What can individual farmers do about the cost-price squeeze?

Answer. Most farmers are doing a good job of farm management now. They must, of course, remain alert to changing conditions and practices. They ought to support a farm organization whose policies they generally agree with, because organized effort is the most effective. However, they should always remember that their Congressmen and Senators are responsible to them and that good letters, setting forth the writer's own views, are effective. If more voters would keep an eye on the voting records of their Congressmen and Senators with respect to deficit spending, we wouldn't be having inflation.

L.B.J. WISE TO HOLD OFF ON TAX HIKE RECOMMENDATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, these who have been critical of the administration for not calling for a big across-the-board tax increase should take a long hard look at the George Shea column in this morning's Wall Street Journal.

Mr. Shea makes an impressive case that inflation may be going through its last gasps.

Of course, the future is always cloudy. None of us can predict with real assurance. But the hard facts of basic commodity prices—especially those that normally lead price performance generally—suggest that those who flatly predict a big inflation are likely to be wrong.

Also, as Shea points out, the bond market has been dropping steadily and is near a record low. The stock market has been falling—some 90 points on the Dow-Jones index since last February.

Heaven knows, this kind of performance is anything but inflationary.

Mr. Shea is especially telling when he writes:

Nor are the downward-pointing signs confined to securities. Some commodities have turned down too. Althought statistics of copper supply and demand still suggest there is a real shortage of the metal, its price in the free London market has fallen from the equivalent of more than 90 cents a pound earlier this year to below 70 cents.

The price of lead last week was reduced here, likewise to adjust to a decline in London. A Government index of so-called sensitive industrial commodities—staples which tend to move up or down earlier than other commodities—is down below 119 percent of the 1957–59 average from a high of 125 percent reached in mid-March. And the Dow-Jones index of commodity future, after touching a high above 140 in January was below 135 last week. The Dow-Jones index of spot prices is still close to the year's high reached in April, but spot prices are normally responsive to current supply-and-demand conditions, whereas futures represent an attempt by traders to read the trends that lie ahead.

Mr. Shea points out that the housing construction industry has been declining for a couple of years—and seems unlikely to recover vigorously in the face of tight money, that in spite of widespread predictions of a bigger auto year than ever, fewer autos were sold in April this year than last.

Sure, the eminence of the economists lined up for a tax increase is impressive. But Senators should not forget that the economic future can rarely be foreseen clearly, and now the indicators are especially mixed.

All of which once again underlines the wisdom of the administration's policy of caution, of hammering where it can to keep prices down—but avoiding what could turn into an economic catastrophe—a big tax increase just as prices are about to level off and the economy is about to slack off anyway.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by George Shea be printed in the RECORD.

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

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

The debate over whether the Federal tax bite should be increased in order to fight inflation makes the business headlines almost daily. Almost no one seems to recognize the possibility that actually a turn toward deflation may already have started, or that the policy question to be determined soon will be what to do if the deflation becomes severe.

True, the debaters do see ultimate deflation as the danger. That is, those who want to raise taxes say, in effect, that the inflationary trend needs to be curbed lest it get so out of hand that severe deflationary measures will have to be taken, leading to a serious recession. The opposite view is that the inflationary trend isn't strong enough to require a tax boost and that a tax boost might bring on a recession right away. But both agree there is a clearly inflationary trend now.

Of course, there are many signs of continuing boom. Wages and numerous prices are still going up, industrial production rises month after month, new orders are at record highs, employment is also a record, and such all-embracing figures as total personal income and gross national production expand

ceaselessly. But the number of signs that point to deflation is surprisingly large.

One such sign is the past year's decline in the bond market, with its accompanying rise in interest charges borrowers must pay. As has been shown in this space previously, such declines in the past have usually been followed by downturns in both the stock market and business. Furthermore, the latest drop in bond prices has pushed interest rates to the highest levels in 40 years or more. Such a severe movement can hardly be disregarded.

There is a tendency to discount its importance because some banking figures seem favorable, notably the trend of loans and of the Nation's money supply. The money supply consists of currency in people's pockets and demand deposits in commercial banks, and except during the first 2 months of this year it's been rising strongly for a good many months. Rising money normally accompanies rising business.

But the rise in money supply reflects rising loans. When banks make such loans they do it by setting up new deposits for borrowers. And the rising loans, by using up the credit resources of the Nation, are the basic cause for the rise in interest rates.

In turn, a growing shortage of credit resources, which naturally is reflected in falling bond prices as well as rising interest rates, is the classic cause for the declines in stock prices and business which usually ensue. There can be shortages of credit just as there can be shortages of men or materials, and if they get severe enough they are just as likely to depress business.

Now a sharp drop in stock prices has duly followed the decline in bonds, even though business is still strong. The behavior of stocks is another of the signs pointing toward possible deflation. In itself it represents deflation of stock values.

Of course, it must be conceded that this decline at present is only about as steep as that of 1965 and is smaller than the one of 1962, neither of which was followed by lower business. However, neither of those declines was preceded by any such deep drop in bond prices as we've seen this time. The current deflation of securities values is more pervasive.

Nor are the downward-pointing signs confined to securities. Some commodities have turned down too. Although statistics of copper supply and demand still suggests there is a real shortage of the metal, its price in the free London market (which affects the open-market price here) has fallen from the equivalent of more than 90 cents a pound earlier this year to below 70 cents.

The price of lead last week was reduced here, likewise to adjust to a decline in London. A Government index of so-called sensitive industrial commodities—staples which tend to move up or down earlier than other commodities—is down below 119 percent of the 1957–59 average from a high of 125 percent reached in mid-March. And the Dow-Jones index of commodity futures, after touching a high above 140 in January, was below 135 last week. The Dow-Jones index of spot prices is still close to the year's high reached in April, but spot prices are normally responsive to current supply-and-demand conditions, whereas futures represent an attempt by traders to read the trends that lie ahead.

Furthermore, not all business trends are upward. The housing construction industry has been producing gradually declining numbers of dwelling units in the past couple of years. The last few months this trend has leveled off rather than continued to drop, but it certainly has shown no tendency to turn up thus far.

The automobile industry is another where trends are in doubt. Earlier this year auto leaders were predicting with no seeming reservations that 1966 would be another year of rising sales of new cars. Now that April has shown lower sales than April 1965, with no special offsetting reasons such as were relied on to explain January and February declines from a year earlier, the industry's prognosticators maintain 1966 is going to be as good as 1965. That in itself is a change to less optimism.

These varying signs of possible weakness in the general economic background may be misleading, as were the stockmarket declines of 1965 and 1962. Let us hope so. But on the other hand they may prove to be forewarnings.

Yet the public attitudes of the economic managers reflect no awareness of these unpleasant possibilities. A similarly short vision has been noticeable at past critical turns in the economic tides, a fact which raises a basic question about the validity of all theories of economic management by central direction. Like the proverbial military generals, economic managers seem to have a tendency to fight the wrong wars at the wrong times.

ADMINISTRATION POLICY AGAINST INFLATION MAKES SENSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there has been widespread partisan criticism of the administration because prices have been rising for the past 2 or 3 months. Some economists and newspaper commentators have denounced the administration for failing in effect to slam on the inflation brakes.

Several times, Mr. President, I have detailed the many actions taken by President Johnson and his administration to stop rising prices.

The most recent evidence that price rises may be beginning to moderate, is not decisive, but it is encouraging. Prices may level off without the rough medicine of a tax increase.

One of the most thoughtful, concise, and competent analyses I have seen of the prospects for price stability has been composed by Prof. J. William Fredrickson, of North Park College in Illinois.

Professor Fredrickson brilliantly summarizes the reasons why runaway inflation is unlikely and why the administration's approach has been about right.

I ask unanimous consent that the Fredrickson article be printed in the RECORD.

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

WILL THERE BE INFLATION? NO

The recent discussion of the state of economy in the popular press has for the most part stressed the danger, if not the probability, of serious inflation. It has been popular to criticize the Council of Economic Advisers for underestimating the degree to expansion in aggregate demand to be expected and to castigate the administration for hesitating to call for an additional tax increase.

In collecting materials relating to this issue from a variety of sources, I have become aware that an alternative conclusion can be drawn from the evidence and that this conclusion can be powerfully supported. This paper is an attempt to state the case for the alternative conclusion in the strongest possible terms.

J. W. FREDRICKSON.

PROPOSITION

Price levels will stabilize and will not continue to advance at unacceptably rapid rates. An inflationary spiral will not get started. The fear of inflation will recede. A further tax increase will not be necessary.

SUPPORT

1. Rises in the wholesale price index and the consumer price indexes orginate in temporary conditions in limited sectors of the economy which are in the process of correction.

2. Other economic indicators point to the existence of soft spots in the economy.

3. The analysis of the current performance of the economy overestimate expansionary forces and underestimate contractionary forces.

4. Administration policy is probably more effective than it is generally believed to be.

EVIDENCE FOR INFLATIONARY PRESSURE

Widespread concern about the present danger of price inflation rests on four pieces of evidence. (1) Unemployment has fallen to 3.7 percent of the labor force. (2) National defense expenditures have shown the influence of the Vietnam war, creeping upward in the fall months and leaping upward by 10 percent in December of last year. The defense buildup is expected to proceed rapidly in the first half of 1966. (3) The wholesale price index rose from 103.3 in July, 108.9 in December and jumped to 112.0 in January. The Consumer Price Index in December was 111.0, up 2.2 over the previous December. (4) Surveys of business plans for investment in plants and equipment in 1966 are running well above last year and exceeding anticipations. A U.S. Government survey in January–February put the figures at 16 percent above last year, and private surveys have yielded even higher figures.

The analysis which concludes that inflation is a threat puts these pieces of evidence into the following pattern. The fall of the unemployment rate tells us that the economy is approaching full employment, which constitutes the limit of its capacity to produce goods and services. (Many economists regard a range between 3 and 4 percent unemployment as the practical benchmark of capacity. The Kennedy council of economic advisers set 4 percent as a provisional target rate—the lowest we can go under present circumstances.) When the full employment capacity limit is reached, additional spending cannot be matched with further increases of output. Competition for scarce commodities, raw materials, and labor will bid up prices and wage rates. This is the classic origin of price inflation.

With the economy at the capacity level, increasing defense expenditures constitute the additional spending which can begin to drive price levels upward. In this situation the sharp increase in the wholesale price index is regarded as the first sign that the process is beginning. The conclusion follows that the economy is on the brink of a more rapid rise in prices and beginning to slip.

The final push would be given by the sharp rise in business investment in plant and equipment projected in the surveys of business intentions. To pile this swollen investment demand on top of Government demand for defense in an economy already at the limit of its capacity will insure the development of an inflationary momentum.

Such is the case for imminent inflation and the basis for calls that taxes be increased immediately.

COMMENTS ON THE EVIDENCE

The four pieces of evidence may not be as signficant as they have been made out to be. At least they bear alternative interpretations which reduce their weight as portents of inflation.

First, no one really knows whether an unemployment rate of 3.7, or 3.5, or 3, really represents the capacity limit of the economy. A few year ago we were told that structural changes in the economy had made it impossible to reduce unemployment below, say, 5

percent; the balance were unemployable. On the other hand we can observe the economies of Western Europe operating at unemployment rates of 2 percent or less. It is worth noting that while the rate for men, 20 years of age and over is about 2.5 percent, the rate for teenagers of both sexes is 12. Unemployment rates are also higher for minority groups, but both minority groups and teenagers have benefited more than proportionally from recent gains in employment. As the labor market tightens these groups will benefit still more. As it stands the labor Department has just said, "No overall labor shortage exists in the U.S. today but there are some imbalances between supply and demand." It should also be remembered that the labor force grows by a million and a quarter a year, so that the capacity limit is a rising limit which yields growing quantities of goods and services even with a constant unemployment rate.

Second, the impact of Vietnam expenditures can easily be exaggerated. Up to November 1965, monthly defense expenditures were scarcely above the figure for December 1964. They went up a half billion in December, about a 10 percent increase. As a percentage of GNP, defense expenditures continued a downward trend prevalent since 1962. For the figure was 7.5 percent of GNP compared with 8.4 in 1964. In the next 2 years it is expected to rise to 7.6. We tend to forget that GNP, is now about twice as large as it was during the Korean war; a similar level of expenditure would put far less pressure on the economy. (During the Korean war period defense expenditures went from nearly 5 percent of GNP to 13½ percent.) Whatever the degree of pressure exerted by rising defense expenditures, there is a school of thought holding that their impact on the economy has already been felt when the increases were announced last fall. If this is the case, the actual outlay of dollars will not have much more effect.

Third, the rise in the price indexes originates in and is concentrated in the farm and food sector of the economy. According to Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, "The largest single factor in this was an inadequate production of pork in the latter half of 1965 and early 1966. The effect has spread into beef, eggs, poultry, and so on." So the price signals have come from a specific condition in one part of the economy, not from general advances all along the line.

The gap in pork production is on the way to being corrected, and the effects of this will be in the leveling out of food prices and possible in some declines. As an indication that this reading of the price indexes is correct, the wholesale price index held steady in the March figures recently released. Preliminary figures suggest that April will also be steady or even down a little.

Fourth, while heavy capital spending does, of course, contribute to the size of a boom, projection of such spending by itself does not guarantee that the spending will occur. George Shea, of the Wall Street Journal, points out that several times in the recent past, actual spending has fallen short of optimistic early year estimates. He argues further that spending for plant and equipment moves with corporate profits after taxes and suggests that the trend toward higher profits is leveling off. The growing scarcity of credit and high interest rates reinforce the conclusion that projections of sharp gains in capital spending are less than ironclad assurances that such spending will occur.

EVIDENCE OF SOFT SPOTS IN THE ECONOMY

So strong has been the emphasis on the evidence for a dangerous inflationary situation, that little stress has been given toward certain other indicators which point in the opposite direction.

In the private sector there are three pieces of evidence which bear watching as an indication of growing slackness in the economy. Housing starts are not rising with the rest of the economy in spite of growing population, and rising interest rates should have some effect in further slowing down residential construction. Seasonally adjusted retail sales have been wavering and have recently been down a little. Consumers have been saving a larger percentage of their disposable income; the ratio has risen from 4.88 in the second quarter of 1965 to 5.63 in the last quarter.

In the public sector the deficit which constitutes the stimulative pressure on the economy has been declining in spite of rising defense expenditures. In December 1965, net receipts were greater than Federal expenditures. For the first 6 months of 1966, rising expenditures will be more than matched by growing revenues. Fiscal 1967 (July 1966–June 1967) is expected to produce a virtual balance in the cash and national income budgets.

These indications of some soft spots in the economy support the notion that scruting of the evidence for inflation suggest: that while the economy is approaching the capacity limit it is not about to explode into uncontrolled inflation.

NEGLECTED POINTS OF ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Discussion of the current state of the economy generally omits mention of two propositions in economic analysis which point to elements of resiliency in the response the economy to increasing aggregate demand: The capacity effect of investment and the tendency of tax receipts to rise with rising GNP.

It is true that high levels of business investment in plant and equipment have a powerful effect through the multiplier on incomes and on the level of aggregate demand. It should also be remembered that the same investment increases the capacity of the economy to produce goods and services. The high and rising levels of capital investment in recent years have resulted in growing increments in the amount of goods and services available to satisfy increasing demand. This means that the next few months will see new capital installations begin to make their contribution to a growing volume of goods and services in response to the pressure of demand.

The tendency of tax receipts to rise with rising GNP is familiar to students of fiscal policy as one of the automatic stabilizers of the economy. With no change in tax rates, the growing volume of goods subject to excise taxes will yield higher revenues, as will higher incomes subject to corporate and personal income taxes. It is estimated variously that between one-fourth and one-third of the dollar increment to GNP will flow to Government in increased tax yields. As has been noted, increasing receipts in the first half of 1966 are expected to outpace the growth of expenditures, including Vietnam. The rise will continue in the second half of 1966, and the increase in total Federal tax receipts for 1966 is in the order of several billions of dollars.

POLICY MEASURES

Discussion of potential inflation and what to do about it has centered on proposals for a further tax increase as a means of reducing the pressure of aggregate demand on prices. Such an emphasis minimizes other policy measures in the modern tool kit of devices for influencing the economy and tends to overlook the delayed impact of policy measures already taken. Action has been taken and is being taken over a wider range of policy alternatives than is generally realized. The impact of some of these measures is only now beginning to have an effect, and some important effects may not show up for some time yet. A review of the policy measures now in operation suggests that current policy may be adequate and that it would be premature to impose additional restraint at this time.

1. Monetary restraint was invoked by the Federal Reserve Board action in December raising the rediscount rate to 4.5 percent, the highest in 36 years. Interest rates are at record highs. Banks are beginning to ration credit. Borrowers are finding it harder to get loans even at higher rates. The money supply is growing at only half of the rate of recent years. (Beryl Sprinkel, of Chicago's Harris Trust & Savings Bank, has shown a remarkable correlation between changes in the rate of growth of money supply and the pace of the economy.)

The results are beginning to show, and not only in the weakness of housing construction. A number of State and local governments have had to postpone or cancel projects because of the high cost of borrowed money. Consumer installment credit extended declined in February for the third month. These may be only the first indications of the gradual impact of monetary restraint; in the 1959–60 experience it was 9 months after the rediscount rate was raised to 4 percent that a general decline in business activity began.

2. Fiscal policy measures currently are aimed at removing the net stimulus from the public sector of the economy by arriving at an approximate balance of the national income accounts budget during 1966. Anticipated increases in expenditure are offset by increases of revenues from three sources: the impact of 1965 budget actions, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, and the normal growth of revenue at high employment.

Scheduled increases in payroll taxes for social security which went into effect on January 1 are expected to yield about $6 billion in additional revenue. This would be partially offset by liberalization of benefits raising transfer payments by $2 billion, leaving a net rise of $4 billion in the amount drained out of the income stream. The 1966 tax adjustment would add another $3.5 billion to Federal revenue. Together with normal growth of revenue at $11.5 billion, the total additional revenue would amount to more than enough to offset the anticipated rise in expenditures of $17.5 billion.

The 1966 Tax Adjustment Act is nicely calculated to produce its maximum effect early in 1966 without a change in the basic tax structure. Reform of the withholding system for individual income taxes, rescheduling of corporate tax payments, and placing self-employed social security payments on a more current basis will reduce disposable income by about $2.5 billion during 1966 when the restraint is most needed. The postponement of the scheduled excise tax cuts for 2 years will restore nearly $1 billion of revenue in the current year. These adjustments will have their maximum effect quickly during the period in 1966 when the influence of defense expenditures will be largest.

Treasury reports on the first quarter indicate that tax collections are running higher than expected and that the budget deficit for the current fiscal year could be reduced by a noticeable amount.

3. The wage-price guideposts have been an important element in the administration's policy mix for promoting stable growth. Although the guideposts have been under fire from both labor and business, an impressive case can be made for the importance and effectiveness of the guideposts. Such a case was made by Senator PROXMIRE on March 14, in which he outlined 10 situations over the past 4 years in which the public suggestion of standards for noninflationary wage and price levels had influenced the outcome. In addition he argues theoretically for the proposition that the guideposts are a policy instrument which can influence price and wage decisions of big labor and big business which

are not reached by monetary-fiscal restraint, but which often set the pace for the rest of the economy.

In the current situation the existence of the wage-price guideposts can help to avoid the launching of an inflationary wage-price spiral based on what may be temporary pressure on certain sectors of the economy. In the future as we learn to live with what is really a new situation—long-term operation of the economy at near capacity—they may become even more important.

4. A new element in economic policy is the effort of the administration to see that every Government action that can have an impact on supply or demand is coordinated into a broad ranging anti-inflationary campaign. The simplest way to support this statement is to list and illustrate the types of action.

(a) Stockpile releases. Aluminum, copper, and a considerable number of other commodities accumulated in strategic stockpiles are being sold to relieve supply shortages.

(b) Sales of surplus agricultural commodities. Corn from Government surplus stocks has been sold at an increasingly rapid rate in recent months. Prices have dropped since mid-February, and this is expected to encourage livestock production which in turn would help bring meat prices down.

(c) Goverment purchases. The General Services Administration has suggested to suppliers that substitutes be used for scarce commodities such as copper and leather. Defense procurement officials are examining their entire purchase list for possible substitutes, particularly food products, and have ordered a 50-percent reduction in pork purchases for consumption of the Armed Forces in the continental United States.

(d) Expenditure restraint. The President has requested that his Cabinet hold expenditures a billion or more below authorized budget levels.

(e) Food distribution programs. The Department of Agriculture is substituting margarine for butter in food distribution programs, thus releasing butter to the commercial markets.

(f) Export quotas. The Commerce Department has imposed export controls on cowhides that will hold exports at 11.5 million hides, 2.5 million less than last year.

In a sense these measures constitute an unprecedented process of Government letting its left hand know what its right hand is doing and getting them to work together in the interests of relieving inflationary pressure. Programs which have operated in the past to support prices are now being used to avoid price increases.

5. Another new element in administration policy is the concerted efforts of high Government officials, led by the President, to influence private decisions by persuasion. Speeches by Cabinet members, private conversations, presidential phone calls, and perhaps most significant, an early April White House dinner for 150 leading businessmen, have carried the anti-inflation message emphasizing the need for restraint in plant expansion. Post dinner responses from those present indicate that a significant number of leading businesses are preparing to reduce their investment in new plant and equipment from the levels originally planned. Since an unexpected large increase in planned capital spending is one of the principal sources of expected inflationary pressure, such a result could be of great help in avoiding the excessive expansion of aggregate demand in 1966.

The case for the proposition that there will be no inflation may be summed up as follows:

1. The evidence of the economic indicators is mixed. Along with signs of weakness in the economy.

2. The signs of developing pressure are concentrated in specific sectors of the economy, and there are indications that they arise from temporary conditions in those sectors.

3. Two frequently overlooked aspects of our high growth economy will provide built-in contrainflationary forces: rising capacity resulting from high levels of investment in recent years and the normal growth of Federal revenues.

4. Administration policy for the control of inflation—the traditional monetary fiscal measures supplemented by guideposts, administrative action, and executive persuasion—is increasingly being recognized as forceful and well aimed.

POSTSCRIPT

There is even a case lurking in the background of this analysis for the proposition that after the period of maximum inflationary pressure subsides in mid-1966 there is a real danger of a slump. George Shea of the Wall Street Journal is sounding this note, and the U.S. News & World Report recently pointed to seven instances of business slumps following within months after the restriction of credit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

WASHINGTON'S OPPORTUNITY IN TODAY'S AFRICA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Graham Hovey, who is a man I have known for a number of years, and who was a highly competent professor at the University of Wisconsin and commentator on the University of Wisconsin radio station in Madison, has had a very distinguished and interesting career. He served on the Minneapolis Tribune and is now on the editorial staff of the New York Times.

This morning the New York Times has published a most interesting, thoughtful, and helpful article written by him on our opportunity in Africa.

Mr. Hovey points out that we are winning in Africa, although it has not made news. Somehow, we always hear the gloomy side. He points out that in African country after country which had been hostile we are ahead, and that the Soviet Union and Red China have been losing ground.

As one African specialist says:

We are winning everywhere * * * we are winning in spite of ourselves * * *.

Less than 10 percent of American foreign aid goes to Africa; this amount was down $100 million this year from 1962 and most of it goes to four or five countries. Africa still accounts for less than 5 percent of America's foreign trade and investment. Of 20 countries getting 92 percent of all American aid in fiscal 1967, only five are in Africa; of eight countries getting 84 percent of American development loan funds, only one—Nigeria—is African. None of the five countries receiving 93 percent of what the administration calls "supporting assistance" is African.

They concede that the European governments should bear more of the burden than the United States in their former colonies. But they say that with no residual colonial interests the United States can encourage essential regional developments cutting across the borders of former British, French, and Belgian colonies.

This kind of opportunity is rare. This seems to be a good time for us to move to try to encourage that kind of regional cooperation and progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful article by Graham Hovey be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

WASHINGTON'S OPPORTUNITY IN TODAY'S AFRICA

(By Graham Hovey)

More by accident than effort, the United States at the moment enjoys its best relations in a long time with nearly every country of Africa north of the Zambesi. The standings of the Soviet Union and Communist China have never been lower.

Will Washington be interested enough and flexible enough to seize this opportunity for constructive actions to assist orderly economic and political development and cooperation?

Or will an administration preoccupied with Vietnam and understandably giving higher priorities to Latin America and an Atlantic alliance in disarray merely mark time in Africa until the next Congo-type explosion?

RECEPTIVE REGIMES

Specialists say the present opportunity in Africa is unusual and cannot last indefinitely. If moderate, pragmatic regimes in key countries, now receptive to discreet American advice and help, cannot demonstrate social and economic advance they will be swept away. And the next round of upheavals is likely to bring in extremist regimes, borrowing tactics and perhaps ideology from Peking.

Military coups in three important countries of Central and West Africa—the Congo (Léopoldville), Ghana and Nigeria—have brought in leaders who seek friendship with their neighbors and cooperation with the West. To the north, the coup in Algeria at least replaced a chronic revolutionary meddler and implacable enemy of the West.

COMMUNIST AGENTS OUSTED

In east Africa, Jomo Kenyatta has driven Oginga Odinga into the political wilderness and booted out some of the Soviet bloc and Chinese agents who furnished resources to the former vice president. Kenya pursues its own brand of African socialism, which allows a major role for private enterprise and investment from abroad.

Next door in Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, whose survival appeared doubtful a year ago, presides over what seems to be the most stable and most democratic government in east Africa, even if Communist China remains the biggest foreign benefactor for his 5-year plan.

"We are winning everywhere," exclaimed an American specialist recently, viewing African events in a cold war context.

"We are winning in spite of ourselves," said his companion, having in mind such facts as these:

Less than 10 percent of American foreign aid goes to Africa; this amount was down $100 million this year from 1962 and most of it goes to four or five countries. Africa still accounts for less than 5 percent of America's foreign trade and investment. Of 20 countries getting 92 percent of all American aid in fiscal 1967, only 5 are in Africa; of 8 countries getting 84 percent of American development loan funds, only 1—Nigeria—is African. None of the five countries receiving 93 percent of what the administration calls supporting assistance is African.

Many Africans view the replacement by a career foreign service officer of the flambouyant but dedicated G. Mennen Williams as Assistant Secretary of State for Africa as merely symbolizing the decline, long ago evi-

dent, of official American interest in their continent.

African specialists want more of many things: American aid, technical and planning assistance, capital investment, imports of African goods, support for commodity agreements, and credits to cushion single-crop economies against violent price fluctuations. Above all, they ask for evidence of a more constant interest in the new Africa's problems.

They concede that the European governments should bear more of the burden than the United States in their former colonies. But they say that with no residual colonial interests the United States can encourage essential regional developments cutting across the borders of former British, French, and Belgian colonies.

With Kwame Nkrumah gone, a chain of friendly states under moderate leaders now stretches around west Africa's hump from Sierra Leone to the Congo. Here may be a unique opportunity for the kind of regional cooperation that alone can make some of these struggling states viable.

A recent First National City Bank study reported a "brighter picture of steady economic development" in Africa and added: "The majority of African leaders recognize the great need for private capital to speed development and are endeavoring to create or preserve an economic climate favorable to investment."

PREMATURE OR WRONG?

Last year for the second time a touring Chou En-lai called African countries ripe for revolution. The revolutions since then were hardly the kind Mr. Chou had in mind, but the question for which the United States will help supply the long-range answer is: Was the Chinese Communist Premier only premature or will events continue to prove him wrong?

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL YEAR

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the University of Kansas has just concluded a week's program celebrating its centennial year.

Time magazine in a recent issue carried an article which truly and factually describes Kansas University, and I quote in part:

What strikes most visitors when they first go to KU is the beauty of the 900-acre, tree-covered campus, atop a hill called Mount Oread, curiously rising out of the prairies around the town of Lawrence. If he tarried longer, the visitor is impressed by the million-volume library, the small classes, the spectacular wildlife diorama that Kansas inherited from the Chicago World's Fair of 1893, the extension courses for prisoners at Leavenworth Penitentiary (favorite subjects: Abnormal psychology and sociology of deviant behavior), the big medical school in Kansas City, Kans.

Over the past 8 years, Kansas had harvested six Rhodes scholarships, almost as many as Princeton or Yale, and 106 Woodrow Wilson scholarships for postgraduate study in the past 10 years. An honors program exempts the top 150 students from classload limits, lets some students carry as many as 28 hours per semester and whiz through college in little over 2 years.

During centennial week, many outstanding citizens from over the Nation visited Kansas University and participated in the program. One of the outstanding speeches was delivered by Dr. J. Mark Hiebert, chairman of the board, Sterling Drug, Inc., and a member of the University of Kansas Council for Progress. The address is entitled, "Public Responsibilities of the Manufacturer of Prescription Medicines."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

The centennial of the University of Kansas falls in a year that may be memorable in the annals of medicine and pharmacy, and of the pharmaceutical manufacturing industry of the United States. It will be known to senior citizens as the year when medicare started. It will also be known as the year when, for the first time, more than 1 billion prescriptions were filled in the pharmacies of America.

This huge number of prescriptions symbolizes the responsibility of the manufacturer in his task of producing efficacious medicines of high quality and safety. These prescription medicines cannot be bought over the counter and can reach the public only through intermediaries—the experts, members of the medical profession. There is no parallel to this situation with any other commodity, in which the industry supplies, the doctor prescribes and the patient consumes, with the doctor figuratively watching over the patient's shoulder to evaluate the effect and the safety of the product.

One billion prescriptions is equivalent to five prescriptions for every man, woman, and child in our country. They add up to more than 8,000 prescriptions for each of the 120,000 registered pharmacists in the United States; and to approximately 50 prescriptions per day, every day of the year for the 53,000 community pharmacies. Think of the impossible situation we would face if, as less than a generation ago, each prescription—either original or refill—had to be individually compounded by the pharmacist.

These prescriptions represent America's biggest bargain for they bring comfort, health and life to itself to untold numbers. The entire billion prescriptions filled in 1966 will cost the American people only one-sixth the estimated cost of landing the first American on the moon.

Moreover, the cost of the billion prescriptions will be a prime investment. They will substantially reduce the economic loss due to illness. They will reduce to a fraction the cost of hospital care and of illness by reason of the speedier recoveries they make possible. In this connection, it may be useful to recall the testimony before a congressional committee given in 1959 by Dr. James A. Shannon, Director of the National Institutes of Health:

"The cost of some of these modern drugs is high, but it can be looked on in another way—that is, if you use these very potent drugs properly. Today I would guess $3 worth of penicillin can be substituted effectively for 2 or 3 weeks in the hospital with lobar pneumonia, with an incidence of empyema in about 10 percent, and with a death rate of no less than 5 in the healthy young adult. No pneumonias are cured with $3 or $4 worth of penicillin," Dr. Shannon observed.

The ability to fill 1 billion prescriptions in a single year reflects progress in science, advances in medicine, discoveries by pharmaceutical manufacturers, sophisticated production technology and the availability and the professional skills of the Nation's pharmacists. Almost 95 percent of the prescriptions today are produced in their entirety by pharmaceutical manufacturers. Clearly, a billion prescriptions could not be filled if an overwhelming number of them required compounding by the pharmacist.

An interesting fact about these prescriptions is that they will include, for the most part, the 587 new single chemical entities introduced in the period 1941–63, of which the United States firms originated 321, or 61 percent of the total. There has been a falling off in the introduction of new chemical entities since the new drug amendments of 1962 were enacted by the Congress. It is to be hoped that this is only a temporary condition.

There is much more to the billion prescriptions than quantitative statement. All of us have heard recitals of the diseases overcome in our time by men of science, medicine and pharmacy, working individually or associated with industry or with nonprofit institutions. Today's newborn child will happily miss most of the illnesses to which we were exposed. Some of them are cataloged by Sir Derrick Dunlop, the distinguished physician who heads the Safety of Drugs Committee of the United Kingdom. In the Harrington lecture, he said: "The advent of the sulphonamides heralded the therapeutic explosion in the 1930's. Since then the mortality from gastro-intestinal infections, the chief cause of infantile deaths, has fallen by over 80 percent and that from pulmonary infections by nearly 70 percent, while the mortality from tuberculosis, meningococcal infections, mastoiditis, and venereal disease all show similar or greater declines.

"Diphtheria, from which as late as 1940 there were 2,500 fatal cases in England and Wales alone, has disappeared," Sir Derrick continued. "Typhoid, typhus, tetanus, cholera, plague, yellow fever, rabies, smallpox, measles, whooping cough, and polio can be prevented; many tropical diseases such as malaria (once the world's most prevalent disease, afflicting an estimated 800 million population) have been controlled; and the lives of patients suffering from diabetes and pernicious anemia can be preserved and considerable relief given to sufferers from hypertension, arthritis, asthma, and many nervous and mental disorders.

"The list is far from comprehensive," Sir Derrick said, "and makes inadequate mention of the relief from suffering which the purely symptomatic use of modern drugs confer. Doubtless the all-round improvement in social conditions has contributed to these remarkable results, which since 1930 have added 10 years to our average expectation of life; but in this country (United Kingdom) the use of modern drugs, including bacteriological products, has been a more potent factor."

This from Sir Derrick Dunlop. Here is another view of the benefits of medical progress. It is presented in a study by Arthur D. Little, Inc., on the social and economic benefits of the pharmaceutical industry in the United States.

The report estimated that 4,400,000 people of working age were alive in 1961 who would not have been if 1935 death rates had continued. This means that in 1961 61 people out of every 1,000 in the civilian labor force would have been dead if the mortality rate of 1935 had not been reduced. The Little report noted also that "there are more than 2 million working age survivors (in 1961) who, if the 1935 death rates had continued, would have been a victim of just four diseases—tuberculosis, syphilis, influenza, and pneumonia."

The therapeutic explosion of our time has provided still other benefits. For example, two-thirds of the patients being admitted to mental hospitals today are discharged in the first year, a marked improvement over the experience of only a few years ago. And Kansas is in the forefront of progress in the treatment of mental illness. Today, through the use of modern drugs and psychiatric care, 75 to 85 patients out of every 100 admitted to mental hospitals in this State will be discharged within a year. This is even better than the national average.

It would be less than frank for me, a native Kansan and one-time student at the University of Kansas, to leave you with the misimpression that all is perfect in the wonderfully exciting and personally satisfying world of pharmaceutical discovery and manufacture. We confess to human fallibility; we have made errors—and I hope we succeed in omitting to make the same errors again. But I think we have a right to responsible perspective in the evaluation of our industry's achievements.

Please do not misunderstand. There is always room for improvement—in our industry and everywhere else. Criticism can be most helpful in guiding such improvement, but we ask, at the same time, for a fair and balanced appraisal of the values supplied by the health professions and the health industries. Presenting the American pharmaceutical industry as in a distortion mirror gives, at the very least, aid and comfort to our competitors abroad and to this extent lessens our ability to contribute to U.S. foreign exchange. Based on my travels overseas, it seems to me that continued attack on the American pharmaceutical industry is producing a decline in the opinion in which the American people are held by peoples and their leaders in other lands.

We appreciate that the pharmaceutical industry of today is quite different from that of a generation ago. We used to have botanicals, galenicals, infusions, extracts, mixtures, and pills. Modern drugs are highly potent. They can be, and often are, lifesaving; but, by comparison with the medicaments of yesteryear, the margin between therapeutic dose and toxic dose is substantially narrowed. In the discharge of his responsibilities, the manufacturer of pharmaceutical products must never forget this.

Responsibility of the manufacturer, the subject of this paper, is a theme I have thought about as medical student, physician and business executive. During this period—which coincides, roughly, with what is often referred to as the golden age of medicine—the responsibilities of the manufacturer of pharmaceuticals have multiplied.

I have already referred to our fundamental responsibility for quality, efficacy, and safety, within the limits of practical possibility in the light of current technology. I should add that the judgment of efficacy cannot be left solely to the experience of a handful—even of specialists. Rather, it should represent the collective judgment and experience of the medical profession.

As to the manufacturer, he has a major function of creating through research more and more lifesaving and health-preserving medicaments, and ever larger assortments of products in order to increase the choices available to the physician and thereby to serve the individual requirements of specific patients.

He should bring to the attention of the physician all new developments that may favorably affect the health of his patients.

It is equally his responsibility to alert the physician to undesirable and unanticipated side effects, contraindications, new indications when permitted by law to do so, dosages and the like.

If product error occurs, he must notify the medical profession immediately; and, if safety is at stake, he must withdraw the product at once.

It is our responsibility as an industry to adapt our policies and practices to the higher standards made possible by science and technology, and to regulation by Government. This is the 60th year—the diamond anniversary—of the enactment in 1906 of the Pure Food and Drug Act. It was the first law of its kind in our country and represented the public's response to the quackery of the times. The subsequent enactments by Congress—the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act of 1938, the Durham-Humphrey law and the new drug amendments of 1962, among others, reflected the public's increasing concern arising from the higher potency of modern medicines.

If the pharmaceutical manufacturer is not to be overburdened by statutes and regulation, he must practice self-discipline in his day-to-day operations.

Looking broadly at the national health picture, it seems to me that the total responsibility for the health of our population is shared by many—by government, the professions, the sciences, industry, the universities, the hospitals, all the health agencies public and private. In the exercise of this responsibility by all who share it, distrust must give way to faith, suspicion to confidence, prejudice to objectivity.

Turning to safety, government, industry, the professions and the public are properly concerned about the reduction of risk. I have already referred to the built-in safety of prescription preparations by virtue of their being prescribed for patients by expert intermediaries—the physicians.

There is, to be sure, an element of risk in every type of product. There is risk in every action of people. There is risk in life itself, from the moment of birth onward through the entire life span. It is urgent that risk be minimized to the greatest extent possible; but it is no more possible to attain zero risk than to find the end of infinity.

In fact, safety consists in the judicious balancing of benefits and risks. This judicious balancing happily resulted in the eradication of that cruel crippler, polio. Dr. Leonard W. Larsen, president of the American Cancer Society and past president of the American Medical Association, recently disclosed that early batches of polio vaccine were found to contain a virus that produced cancer in hamsters—a virus which has since been removed. But he reminded the American people that "in removing greatly dreaded plagues from the list of lethal diseases, we had to take chances that sulfa drugs and antibiotics would not subject patients to deadly allergies and other diseases."

Safety has other dimensions of critical importance. Safety requires the courage to say "yes" to a new drug as well as the judgment to say "no." The "yes" answer is urgent when it can mean safety from imminent probable death.

Individual safety is also the responsibility of the individual. Safety should be built into the automobile; but it is still the man behind the wheel, urging forward some two tons of metal and glass, that determines ultimate safety on the highway. There is no known way of eliminating personal carelessness by legislation. This requires education, continual education, of the users of many kinds of useful products having a risk quotient. Medicaments on the markets are acceptably safe when used as directed on the label or by the physician. Danger develops in one's own home when useful products—be they medicines, kerosene, powerful detergents, insecticides, whisky, even common salt—are misused or abused. Danger develops when these products—any and all of them—are placed where children of tender years can get at them.

As to the evaluation of medicines for efficacy and safety, the computer is not the final and perfect answer, useful though it is. What the physician feels and perceives at the bedside of his patient may not fit into the square, or oblong or round hole of the punch card; but his observations are often a surer guide to the usefulness of a particular medicament for a particular patient. In the interest of the patient—that individual so unique that there is not another entirely like him in the whole wide world—we must be careful lest the sicentific pendulum swing too far in the direction of mechanistic technology.

The United States has an enormous pool of talent—in Government and in industry, in the professions and in the sciences. Can the Government, without abdicating its statutory responsibility, avail itself of the skills of experts outside of Government to contribute to the appraisal of the therapeutic efficacy and safety of new entities on their way to becoming medicaments? Might not the outside experts have some advisory role? If a useful way could be found, the public interest, I believe, would be well served.

We have come two-thirds the way along the lane of the 20th century. In that period, life expectancy has increased by 75 percent, from 40 years in 1900 to slightly more than 70 years today. What can we look to by way of further extension of life expectancy during the final third of the century? The answer lies in what all of us—you and I, the lawmakers and administrators, the scientists and the members of the healing professions, and the public—do with the knowledge we have, with the talents and energies that reside in us, to increase knowledge and to apply it courageously and intelligently, to the art, the science and the joy of living.

I presume on the hospitality of Sir Derrick Dunlop's paper to close with this quotation from it, with which I heartily associate myself:

"Operating under the profit system, the pharmaceutical industry has made enormous contributions to our society. Indeed, nearly all the valuable new drugs of the last 30 years—penicillin and streptomycin are notable exceptions—have been discovered in the manufacturers' laboratories. Since the October revolution in 1917 the State-owned industry in the U.S.S.R. has not produced a single new drug of therapeutic importance. We must therefore be careful not to kill the goose which has laid so many golden therapeutic eggs by excessive bureaucratic restrictions—still less by nationalization."

Thank you for the privilege of permitting me to participate in the pharmacy colloquium during the university's centennial observance, and thank you for listening.

THE HEINEMAN SUCCESS STORY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there are few industries in this country that have had a rockier or tougher road than the railroads. When a railroad is able to show a profit, it is rare good news; and when one shows an increasing profit, it is even more welcome news.

But when a road that has been a money loser is able to show sharply increasing profits, it should be clear that there is something like business genius at work.

This is the fortunate fate of the railroad that has more miles of track in my State of Wisconsin than any other—the Chicago and North Western.

The Chicago and North Western has enjoyed the leadership in the past 10 years of Mr. Ben Heineman. Heineman was born in Wausau, Wis. His hard and successful work have made Wausau and Wisconsin proud and grateful.

In 10 years as a top officer of the Chicago and North Western he has not only brought the railroad clearly into the black, with a healthy profit of more than $16 million, but he has greatly improved the prospects for this railroad in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on Ben Heineman's remarkable job with the North Western Railway, which appeared in the March 21, 1966, issue of Railway Age be printed in the RECORD.

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

C. & N.W.'s SPECTACULAR COMEBACK: THE HEINEMAN'S DECADE-LONG STEWARDSHIP OF THE CHICAGO & NORTH WESTERN HAS SEEN THE ROAD MOVE FROM RED INK TO LARGE SPLASHES OF VERY SOLID BLACK INK

Chicago & North Western and Chairman Ben W. Heineman complete a memorable decade together April 1.

And what a decade it has been. Investors no longer cringe when they think of the C. & N.W. shares in their portfolios. In the 10-year period, the road has gone from a very red $5.5-million loss in 1956 to a solid $16 million net in 1965.

Further, the turnaround in results is only part of the good news coming out of the new North Western nowadays. The road's employees, shippers, commuters and shareholders also have rising expectations from such assets as—

C. & N.W.'s plant and car fleet. It has respectability such as it has not had for years.

Mergers in the making.

C. & N.W.'s commuter service. Record revenues and earnings in 1965 from the road's suburban operations at Chicago promise to get even better. Trends so far in 1966 indicate growing rush-hour and non-rush-hour traffic.

Diversification: Prospects for increased earnings from C. & N.W.'s entry into chemical manufacturing are very bright.

Ben W. Heineman himself. There are those who insist he is C. & N.W.'s single best asset.

Ten years at C. & N.W.'s have not abated one whit Heineman's conviction that the rail industry future "is unlimited and will eclipse the great railroading years of the 19th century." Perhaps more pertinent to what happened at C. & N.W., Heineman has a passion for dispassionate analysis and a taste for action based upon such analysis.

C. & N.W.'s drive to hold and reduce rates and to work out economically attractive rate-service-equipment combinations that make competition and gain tonnage over the long haul reflect that kind of managerial insight. C. & N.W. hunted for ways to reduce rates when many carriers were unsure of the approach needed to deal with shrinking profit margins.

GRIM NEWS AT C. & N.W. IN 1956

When the curtain went up on the new North Western 10 years ago, only the leading men in the cast (and possibly the shippers, among such onlookers as employees, shareholders, financial experts, other railroad men, and the public) felt a comeback was even possible.

C. & N.W. news in early 1956 was enough to discourage even determined optimists. Aside from the loss of $26 million in passenger operations the year before, the road lost $8 million overall the first quarter of 1956 and $11 million by midyear. C. & N.W.'s previous management, while making good moves—retiring uneconomic branch lines, reducing employment, dieselizing, buying substantial numbers of new cars, probing merger possibilities with Milwaukee, ordering bilevel commuter equipment and installing welded rail—had not been able to halt C. & N.W.'s downward slide.

C. & N.W. sought rate increases in the early fifties as an offset to ballooning costs, especially labor costs. None of it seemed to have had much effect on overall results. "Everything we did seemed to turn up two other things that desperately needed action," recalls a C. & N.W. veteran. "We were being bled at a thousand places by people and practices that were hard to get at."

SAVING PENCIL STUBS

The old switchman's tag for C. & N.W. (the Cheap & Nothing Wasted) was actually quite inaccurate. While saving string and pencil stubs was an art in many lonely Iowa and Wisconsin stations (a magazine carried a story in the early fifties about an agent at a one-man station who had saved two drawersful of pencil stubs from his work of 42 years), there was internal and external waste. It is now apparent there was outside waste because of missed opportunity as the road tried to pry apart the narrowing gap between revenues and expenses by seeking rate increases. Shippers weren't buying and the competition kept capturing vital chunks of C. & N.W.'s tonnage.

On the inside, C. & N.W. was a road that gloried in having the world's largest freight yard at Proviso (a yard that some experts figured was 50 percent waste space), and an LCL house that could house 700 cars at a time—for traffic that C. & N.W. handled at a substantial loss. Serious problems were getting more acute with every wage increase. C. & N.W. was already burdened with the highest ratio of wages to revenue in the industry. There were, for example, more than 500 crossing flagmen on the payroll. There were hundreds of one-man stations scattered over the C. & N.W. system that could not be economically justified.

The C. & N.W. annual report for 1955 is an interesting document. It noted that the board of directors had requested that the president call in outside accountants to audit the company's financial statements for 1955. "This was a forward step because no such audit had ever before been undertaken," the report told C. & N.W. shareholders. In the same statement appears what must be one of the most curious phrases ever to appear in a railroad report: "the board recognizes what is known in railroad circles as deferred maintenance."

GOOD NEWS IN A FOOTNOTE

That same annual report carried the best news beleaguered C. & N.W. shareholders had gotten in years. In a footnote at the bottom of page 2 appeared the information that, on March 2, 1956, Ben W. Heineman was elected chairman and chief executive officer and that Clyde J. Fitzpatrick (then operating vice president of Illinois Central) had been elected president of C. & N.W.—effective April 1, 1956.

On that April Fools' Day in 1956 began a decade of C. & N.W. that was to see the road achieve a dramatic comeback, make Heineman a leading industry figure (he first appeared in the industry in 1950, as attorney for a group of Chicago Great Western stockholders) and make C. & N.W. one of the most publicized railroads in the country.

C. & N.W. MADE GOOD COPY

The struggle to straighten out the wobbly C. & N.W. of 1956 was chronicled in most major newspapers and financial journals—many times over. Even literary journals like the Saturday Review, Atlantic and Harper's have treated their audiences to highly entertaining (if somewhat simplified) accounts of the Heineman-Fitzpatrick struggle to right the listing C. & N.W.

Most of the stories, however, focused upon the merger maneuvering of Heineman (now recognized as one of the most astute industry strategists to come along in years), the rebuilding and success of the road's commuter service at Chicago, and on the 1962 Telegraphers' strike, when Heineman stood eyeball to eyeball with Telegrapher Chief George E. Leighty and refused to back down from his principles. It was a moment when Democrat Heineman, with his taste for books, avantgarde art and all, made even the flintiest of the industry's conservative chieftains sit up and take notice.

One of the funniest (and sincerest) tributes ever given to Heineman came after the strike, in the Chicago Traffic Club bar. A portly, extremely Republican railroad vice president told his guests that Heineman handled the strike "just as well as if he'd been a Republican."

But, by and large, stories about C. & N.W. dealt with relatively minor aspects of the road's reformation. The business and financial press generally made much of the merger moves and the up-and-down progress of C. & N.W.'s financial performance and share prices. The newspapers focused primarily on the unusual news coming out of C. & N.W.'s commuter operations, merger talk and on the attractive human-interest angles that can be developed from such a complex, articulate man as Heineman.

SHIPPERS KNOW REAL STORY

Of the various audiences that have read about and watched C. & N.W. during the last decade, probably only C. & N.W.'s men and the road's shippers are aware of C. & N.W.'s larger and more important accomplishments in the last 10 years. They are the ones who know about the rate reductions, the new equipment, the improved schedules and services, the new power, the industrial parks, the new port facilities, the upgraded plant and the aggressive marketing that marked the new management's quest for internal efficiency and external effectiveness as a competitor.

Selected 10-year operating and financial data for Chicago & North Western

	1965	1964	1963	1962 [1]	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
Operating revenues.....thousands of dollars..	227,589	220,811	218,923	196,961	218,117	207,282	213,350	215,127	218,483	225,787
Operating expenses.....do....	181,152	182,075	179,093	169,218	176,849	178,580	182,887	178,234	186,670	198,211
Net railway operating income or (loss).....do....	15,516	12,400	11,318	(630)	10,746	(1,263)	3,124	8,861	5,470	131
Other income.....do....	7,453	5,684	7,035	8,861	2,582	2,832	2,445	2,258	1,937	1,919
Income available for fixed charges.....do....	28,073	18,084	18,353	8,231	13,328	1,569	5,569	11,119	7,407	2,050
Fixed charges.....do....	9,004	6,923	6,791	6,997	7,213	5,710	5,420	5,260	4,784	4,540
Contingent interest.....do....	3,005	3,038	3,038	3,038	3,039	3,039	3,039	3,039	3,039	3,039
Net income or (loss).....do....	16,064	8,123	8,524	(1,804)	3,076	(7,180)	(2,890)	2,820	(416)	(5,529)
Average number employees during year.....	14,423	15,252	15,883	16,075	16,505	17,311	18,229	18,449	20,933	24,795
Diesel locomotives.....units..	729	729	734	744	747	759	693	701	700	710
Freight train cars.....	43,423	42,065	41,737	41,838	43,426	44,308	40,581	41,239	40,712	42,346
Passenger train cars.....	279	296	413	447	471	633	802	853	957	1,085
Capital expenditures.....thousands of dollars..	47,418	30,075	23,321	15,936	21,313	26,883	25,382	25,704	21,240	32,356
Long-term debt including current maturities.....do....	295,769	225,795	224,173	225,896	235,497	242,364	217,853	220,734	212,380	219,976
Miles of road operated.....	10,362	10,432	10,462	10,547	10,702	9,521	9,284	9,309	9,297	9,362

[1] Data for 1962 reflect effects of 30-day telegraphers' strike.

A security analyst sums it up this way: "The merger news is all talk and hope, the commuter business, when all is said and done, is still only 6 percent of C. & N.W.'s business. But the road's shippers and freight tonnage are where the real turnaround at C. & N.W. was accomplished. That's where the road's real strength has been a-building. Where else do you think Heineman got the money, leverage, and credit to go bidding for Rock Island? Or to buy a $90 million chemical corporation when he decided on some contracyclical diversification for C. & N.W.?"

ACTION AT THE TOP

Contact with shipper requirements and competitive realities was quick once C. & N.W.'s new managers took over 10 years ago.

There was a lull for a few weeks after Heineman and Fitzpatrick moved into adjoining offices in C. & N.W.'s executive suite. Then the astonishing activity at the top began. It was to continue unabated for 10 years. It is still going strong and, if anything, is stepping up as the road continues to hack at internal inefficiency and improve its competitive position against trucks and barges operating in C. & N.W. land.

For weeks Heineman, with his quick, incisive intelligence, and Fitzpatrick, the practical, hard-boiled operating chief of IC whom Heineman had chosen to be C. & N.W.'s president, were everywhere on the railroad—evaluating men, plant, machines, operations, equipment, and organization.

A C. & N.W. trainmaster wrote to a journalist friend during that period: "The new chairman has an uncanny knack of asking questions that make you feel uneasy. Mr. Fitz doesn't say much, but he scribbles lots of notes." So began what has proved to be one of the most memorable collaborations in the history of railroad renovation.

MEETING PROBLEMS, HEAD ON

Little more than a month after they moved in at C. & N.W., Heineman and Fitzpatrick began making the tough decisions that were to become mileposts on C. & N.W.'s comeback journey. The quick, resourceful response to the road's problems illustrates both the magnitude of C. & N.W.'s trouble and the tough, analytical framework within which the road's new management energetically set out to restore some luster to what was once one of the bluest of blue-chip railroads in the United States.

On May 10, barely 6 weeks after the new management took over, C. &. N.W. retired 116 steam engines and announced that all freight and passenger service was dieselized through more efficient scheduling of the road's 710 diesel locomotives. A few days later, reorganization of the road's operating department swept away the posts of four district superintendents and placed operations on a divisional rather than a departmental basis. (In later years, after C. & N.W. pared down to competitive weight by reducing employment from 27,000 employees in 1955 to about 14,500 in 1965, it was not often noticed that the road had made even sharper cuts in supervisory and middle-managment ranks than it had among contract workers.)

In quick succession, decisions were made to expand track rehabilitation, bridge and roadbed programs; to install new accounting and reporting procedures; to reorganize the road's industrial development department and purchasing department; to shut down a third of giant Proviso yard (and release about 74 acres for eventual industrial development); to build a $6 million freight-car shop at Clinton, Iowa (to replace 14 obsolete facilities) and to bring in highly qualified new men wherever there were not men suitable for promotion.

PLUGGING THE LEAKS

With passenger operations resulting in a $26 million deficit in 1955, and with an $11 million overall C. & N.W. deficit in mid-1956, Heineman recalls, "We put tourniquets on everything in sight." Associates say that during those first few tense months there was some concern lest there not be enough cash to meet payrolls in the 3d quarter.

On October 25, 1956, 7 months after C. & N.W's new management took the railroad in hand, the railroad made the first of a series of moves to plug the cash leaks caused by passenger trains. In an unprecedented move, it petitioned the Wisconsin Public Service Commission for permission to take off 21 trains, pleading the loss of $2 million annually. In return it offered to buy new equipment to improve other trains. It was the first big move against passenger losses and was to be characteristic of dramatic C. & N.W. action that reduced that reduced passenger losses from $23.4 million in 1956 to $1.6 million in 1965.

HITTING A LOW

The road's working capital declined from a meager $2.1 million at the end of 1955 to $47,417 at the end of 1956. The $5.5 million deficit at the end of 1956 forced the new management to suspend payment on C. & N.W.'s second mortgage bonds and on sinking fund requirements that were payable only if earned. Cash brought in by sale of scrap and real estate made it seem that C. & N.W. was staying alive by cannibalization of its own assets.

Hope stirred early in 1957. When the year began there were a lot of new faces on the C. & N.W. The average age of the road's executive officers was 48.6 years, compared with 55.3 years at the start of 1956. The railroad pushed industrial development of 6,200 acres near Peoria, Ill., announced a $5 million program to automate crossings, discontinued its free LCL pickup and delivery service (which was losing $1.5 million annually), bought a quarry to insure a supply of reliable ballast for its stepped-up roadway programs, bought the Litchfield & Madison for $8 million, hired outside research experts to survey C. & N.W.'s real estate, began expanding TOFC service, created a motor carrier division to handle its expanding TOFC traffic and pushed programs in South Dakota and Minnesota for central agencies to replace the network of inefficient small stations that were draining C. & N.W.'s resources. The central agency setup was later applied to the road's extensive network of stations in Iowa, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and other States and, ultimately, it led to the telegraphers' strike of 1962.

GETTING TO THE CORNER

At the end of 1957, one could hardly say that C. & N.W. had turned the corner. But the road was getting into the corner's neighborhood. The $5.5 million loss of 1956 was virtually eliminated, even though operating revenues dropped more than $7 million. And, during that first full year of plugging up C. & N.W.'s cash leaks, the new management began to focus on the railroad's outside problem—the competition.

Said Heineman, 18 months after becoming chairman of C. & N.W.: "We have the unalterable conviction that the industry as a whole has been suffering from persistent erosion of its proportion of total intercity freight. While there are many contributing causes for the gains recorded by competing modes of transportation, not the least of these are the many railroad rates fixed at unrealistically high levels without regard to competition." The statement was a tipoff to C. & N.W.'s competitive strategy from then on.

SEEK OUTSIDE HELP

C. & N.W. began going to the outside for help when it needed answers to real estate, market, and passenger problems. The road has, over the years, spent thousands of dollars buying the services of professional researchers and consultants to get to the heart of problems in iron-ore movements, industrial park location, commuter data of all kinds, diversification, and other problems where C. & N.W. felt it best to get advice from independent specialists.

Says a spokesman, "It's dangerous to have fixed notions in some areas when you're about to commit substantial effort and capital. We at C. & N.W. don't merchandise to please ourselves. That's why we so often call in outside research firms. They're more hardheaded and are less apt to get emotionally involved."

In 1958, the railroad cut 24 hours from its Chicago-west coast schedules (via its UP and SP connections). It dismantled its 21-acre freight house at Proviso, began systemwide training of sales personnel, and continued to attack internal inefficiency by pushing central agency systems. C. & N.W. secured approval from the Illinois Commerce Commission for a package of proposals on its commuter operations that were to result in a completely modernized service. The road also substantially boosted plant upgrading, equipment acquisitions, and car-repair programs.

Of equal significance in 1958, however, were reduced rates C. & N.W. installed on intrastate shipments of corn, oats, and soybeans in Minnesota—and its application for rate reductions on interstate shipments of corn, sorghums, and soybeans to Chicago, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Sioux City, Omaha, Kansas City, St. Louis, and Peoria markets. Multiple-car rates on pulpwood were announced. Freight train schedules were again tightened. C. & N.W. pressed tax claims against the United States. They were to prove important in the road's rehabilitation.

The railroad established a foreign trade department (in response to the St. Lawrence Seaway) and published a foreign trade handbook to inform C. & N.W. men and Midwestern shippers on the terminology and techniques of foreign trade for proper use of the seaway.

Orders were placed for an additional 36 doubledecker commuter cars (costing $5.6 million). C. & N.W. announced a $9 million rehabilitation program for 8,000 freight cars, the beginning of a series of massive programs and equipment acquisitions that were to result in reduction of C. & N.W.'s per diem deficit from $6.5 million in 1955 to $764,000 in 1964.

THE BETS LOOKED BAD

For a road that zigzagged above and below the breakeven point all the way into the early sixties (the $1.8 million loss in 1962, the last deficit year, was attributed to the telegraphers' strike that year), C. & N.W. pushed some muscular capital spending programs from the very beginning. Programs stayed in the $21 to $26 million range (except for the strike year) until an upturn in revenues enabled C. & N.W. to spend $30 million in 1964, more than $50 million in 1965 and announce a record $66 million in capital improvements for 1966.

In retrospect the capital spending moves before the upturn look inspired, but at the time they looked like bad bets to many in the industry, the financial community, and to the investing public. When Heineman and Fitzpatrick took over at C. & N.W., the road's common stock was selling at around $27 and the preferred around $37. By mid-1962, fading of confidence by the investing public could be seen in the abandonment of C. & N.W. by the investment trusts and other institutional buyers. C. & N.W. common was selling for $8.75 a share.

C. & N.W. SHAPES UP

If misgivings existed in C. & N.W.'s stark, ultramodern executive offices, they did not reflect in either the direction or tempo of the road's internal or external action. C. & N.W. accelerated consolidation and elimination of facilities, getting rid of unnecessary tracks

around terminals, tearing up unneeded tracks in small towns, and passing tracks too short to hold modern era trains. Stations were closed by the hundreds, reducing maintenance substantially. Stations on lines where passenger service was eliminated were torn down and the land turned to other uses. Management appropriated money ("Even when it hurt," recalls one C. & N.W. officer) for mechanization of track work—$11 million worth of machines—and stepped up programs wherever programs could quickly pay for themselves.

Chairman Heineman's conviction that "price moves merchandise" was the ruling axiom in C. & N.W.'s external moves as the fifties closed. C. & N.W. began making competition with incentive rates on butter, reduced rates on iron ore, livestock, lumber, coal, corn, and many other commodities. The moves held—and in some cases substantially increased—tonnages of C. & N.W.'s 10 largest revenue producing commodities. Pressure was constantly applied to reduction of passenger losses. Passenger train miles were reduced from 8.6 million in 1955 to 1.2 million by 1965.

INTERNAL OPTIMISM HIGH

Expansion of the road's commuter operations (as the C. & N.W. probed the possibilities for profit from this unlikely direction) came right after the start of 1960 when the road announced a $29,554 profit on 1959 commuter operations. The road converted 45 locomotives for push-pull operation, and ordered 116 more bilevel coaches for such operations, giving it a fleet of 200 modern, double-deck coaches.

The road reduced grain rates on points west of the Missouri River, again expanded its industrial development department, scrapped whole fleets of obsolete suburban and passenger cars, reduced rates on iron ore to offset competition from foreign ores, agreed to buy 1,500-mile Minneapolis & St. Louis for $20.9 million, handled the first bulk cargo (inedible tallow) through Navy Pier at Chicago and kept pressure on regulatory agencies for reduction of losing passenger trains.

In mid-1960, testifying before the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, Heineman cited what must have been a substantial factor in C. & N.W.'s decline in the post-World War II years: In the 13 years from 1947 through 1959, cumulative losses from passenger train operations on C. & N.W. totaled $287 million.

Later in 1960, Heineman, in a speech, deplored the lack of coordination in planning metropolitan transportation that forces commuter operations to compete with public funds. He offered to sell C. & N.W. suburban facilities rather than enter such competition. It was an offer he was to make even after the service became profitable. Just a few weeks ago, just after it was announced that C. & N.W.'s commuter trains produced a $1.38 million net in 1965, Heineman told a Boston audience he would sell C. & N.W.'s commuter operation "lock, stock, and barrel" rather than compete with public money.

MORE IN EARLY SIXTIES

Computers, microwave, massive car-rebuilding programs, additions to the commuter fleet as passengers increased, reduced rates and a systematic upgrading of suburban stations and construction of a $1-million TOFC terminal at Proviso were highlights of progress internally and externally at C. & N.W. up to mid-1963, when Heineman and C. & N.W. made headlines everywhere by deciding to fight moves by Union Pacific for control of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific. C. & N.W. filed application for control of Rock Island, made a counter-offer to Rock Island's shareholders, and began what is proving to be the noisiest, most complicated fight for control of a railroad that the industry has seen in many years.

The road cleared up interest arrearages on its bonds. It reinstated preferred dividends as Christmas of 1963 neared. Profits of $203,000 for 1963's commuter operations were included in C. & N.W.'s net income of $8.5 million from railroad operations that year.

MORE MERGER ACTION

As 1964 got underway, C. & N.W. announced more unit coal trains, sold lakefront land in Milwaukee and spent $1.3 million dredging and constructing a facility at Escanaba, Mich., enabling deep-draft vessels to load there.

In mid-1964, Heineman's outspoken convictions about the need for consolidation of midwestern rail systems (based upon plans formulated by industry experts during the depression era) began to show up in C. & N.W. moves to consolidate with neighboring railroads. C. & N.W. and Chicago Great Western announced they were negotiating terms for merger. By September 1, both C. & N.W. and CGW boards approved the merger terms that had been worked out. Exactly 2 weeks later C. & N.W. and Milwaukee announced agreement on plans to merge. The C. & N.W.–CGW merger plan was recently approved by an ICC examiner (Railway Age Mar. 14, p. 7).

At year's end, C. & N.W.'s board declared a $3 dividend on common stock to be made quarterly in 1965 on 1964 earnings (which came to $23 million, including special credits from sale of real estate and refunds of State and Federal taxes amounting to $15 million). The road posted a $706,000 profit on its commuter operations at the end of 1964.

LAST YEAR, DIVERSIFICATION

C. & N.W.'s gains could be gaged early last year when it announced $45 million in capital improvements (this was later increased to more than $50 million). C. & N.W. bought abandoned Chicago North Shore & Milwaukee right-of-way in Kenosha and in Illinois, and continued its attack on competition and internal inefficiency. Last March, C. & N.W. and Milwaukee approved merger terms. Rates on corn in the Midwest to export markets via the St. Lawrence Seaway were cut.

On June 14, C. & N.W. announced it had agreed to buy the Velsicol Chemical Corp. for $90 million, and was endeavoring (successfully, as it turned out) to buy 230,000 shares of Michigan Chemical Corp. (a Velsicol subsidiary) at $33 per share so that it could file a consolidated return.

By late last year, C. & N.W. was back in the thick of the contest for control of Rock Island when the Interstate Commerce Commission approved its application for authority to make its existing exchange offer available to Rock Island shareholders who hold Union Pacific certificates of deposit. By late last year, too, C. & N.W. saw a substantial group of other midwestern railroads—including Milwaukee, Santa Fe, Missouri Pacific, Frisco, and other roads—also opposing Union Pacific control of Rock Island.

CHANGE IS RELATIVE

By 1966, C. & N.W. was shaping up—fast. The road's shares are now bought avidly by investors convinced that C. & N.W. and its remarkable chairman are on the way to bigger, better, and more profitable years ahead. The road's internal reworking is hardly over. As one veteran observer puts it, "A railroad takes a long time to go downhill, and it takes just as long to build it up again." But the road is handling its trains economically and building capability at an accelerating clip.

Early last January, C. & N.W.'s $66 million capital improvement program, largest in the company's history, caused a stir. The program, noted Heineman, "will enable us to accelerate our program of tailoring our services to the needs of our customers, and also help increase our overall operating efficiency, thereby enhancing our ability to maintain or reduce our present level of freight rates."

NOW, FASTER PROGRESS

Massive equipment purchases and equipment rebuilding programs from 1962 to the present have had a dramatic impact upon C. & N.W.'s once-ancient car fleet.

The road has placed orders for two RCA Spectra computers and for an IBM 360. Additional hotbox detectors are being added to C. & N.W.'s main lines. A $6 million elevator capable of holding 5 million bushels of grain at Superior, Wis., will be completed this spring and leased to Continental Grain.

C. & N.W. is leasing, in a single order, more than 2,000 radio units and equipping all locomotive cabs, cabooses, and 170 way stations with two-way radio. As part of the program (aimed at developing greater efficiencies in operations over the road as well as in yards), head-end brakemen will also have portable walkie-talkies to use when they must be down from the cab.

WHAT'S AHEAD?

One commodity that is not in short supply at C. & N.W. these days is know-how. Larry S. Provo, C. & N.W.'s vice president, finance, notes that while progress is still needed in many areas of C. & N.W.'s operations, "We nonetheless have already made operations sensitive to management control and competition. That makes progress more possible.

"If we did not have a thing to do in the next 10 years but consolidate with CGW and Milwaukee, that would be a great accomplishment in itself.

"We expect good results from our diversification. Chemicals have a much greater growth factor than railroads. A growth of 15 percent per year is not unusual in the chemical industry.

"Above all, more accurate decisions are ahead. It has been difficult to arrive at decisions because the industry is so large and complicated. We used to have 25 percent facts and 75 percent judgment enter into decisions. We hope to see that reversed one of these days. We've already come a long way. We're honing down the decision-making process here at C. & N.W."

NEED FREEDOM TO REACT

Heineman, a man who has done much to make the long-range approach more common, thinks prospects are bright for railroads generally and C. & N.W. particularly—if there is no business downturn, if concerted industry action unfreezes the rate apparatus.

"When business slows down, whether in the shirt business or any other business," he says, "there is a natural tendency to cut prices. Our trucker and barge friends are all able to make 'instant bargains' to haul bulk commodities. The railroads cannot unless they get legislative relief. If, when a downturn comes, railroads do suffer—as they may—it will be because of the rigidity of the price structure upon us but not upon our competition."

NOT ALL ROSES

Another C. & N.W. officer, noting that he feels C. & N.W. is still a marginal property, admits the past 10 years were not without errors of commission and omission. "Sure, we've made our share of bad moves—and some of them were beauts. No one can ever say definitely what value we missed by not making certain moves we could have made. We are painfully aware of the cost to C. & N.W. of moves we did make that we shouldn't have made. We made some costly mistakes, for example, with reduced fares on through passenger trains. We'd have done better to raise the fares.

"But, the important thing is that we react to facts—and we make a determined effort to

get the facts. We've done a lot. We've got a lot to do. You can't say we're passive about events here at C. & N.W. We're moving."

A TASTE OF SUCCESS

C. & N.W., having written a dazzling comeback story, begins 1966 with vitality, ideas and momentum. Its management is young and has had an exhilarating whiff of success. That's a magic mixture.

RAILROADS MUST AGREE ON WHAT IT IS THEY DO WELL

Ben W. Heineman has been described as a professional problem-solver. He had problems enough to solve at C. & N.W. the past 10 years. Many railroad men—and all C. & N.W. shareholders—think he handled them brilliantly.

He caused a stir among railroad men in the Midwest late last year when he made a problem-solver's stab at prescribing for maladies that afflict the industry. He called for railroads to "analyze clearly the problems and opportunity of the industry" and to have the "toughness of mind and basic courage to make clear to the public, to the Government, and to our coworkers what such analysis discloses to us."

Heineman said competition forces the industry to be price conscious: "Some railroads still believe rate reduction to meet truck competition is unwise because in reducing rates to meet 10 percent of competition they also reduce rates on 90 percent of a given commodity. The hope is that by doing nothing, the competition will go away. Competition doesn't go away. It increases."

The rail industry, says Heineman, has carried a great deal of "fat." Stripping it off "will permit us to absorb cost increases in labor and materials for longer than our competition is able to absorb them.

"We must agree on what we do well. Then we must cut the fat to permit us to do it at the lowest possible price. Then we will be able to rebuild our volume on a sound basis and again be adding employees—on a sound basis."

Heineman wants agreement on "the important objectives of the industry. * * * This great industry must come as closely as possible to having a unified voice and objective. If we are granted the wisdom to arrive at a consensus, a genuine consensus, as to what the course of this industry should be, and are granted in addition the courage not to be diverted from this, but to stay with it despite all conceivable challenges and obstacles—we'll be a great industry for a long time to come."

Asked what such an industry consensus ought to include. Heineman reiterated his previously expressed strong feeling that the industry ought to make clear to Government, public and to itself that trucks and barges do not carry passengers at a loss and neither can railroads if they are to perform basic functions to the country's benefit.

But, importantly, Heineman thinks the industry ought to achieve—

Agreement, generally, that price is the essence of competition, and that the industry must have the right to reduce rates.

Agreement on car ownership—as to who is obliged to own what kind of cars and in what quantity.

Agreement on a central system, perhaps a separate, jointly owned computer company, with basic responsibility (and authority) for equipment distribution.

Agreement on a unified approach to changing work rules in the industry.

Some kind of internal consensus on mergers "would be helpful. It would be difficult but not impossible to achieve."

Achieving agreement in these areas would, he thinks, enable railroads to solicit the support of shippers, labor, and the public and to present to Congress a program which all strongly support. "If the approach is forceful and united enough, shippers and the administration will support it."

Obstacles to such a consensus are—

The difficulty of getting railroad presidents together. "And even if you do get them together, you're not likely to get much done because the homework will not have been done."

The strong individualism prevailing among industry chiefs. "Responsible, as they should be, for their companies, they tend to look pretty closely at short-range difficulties rather than at long-range benefits."

Heineman sees strong staff work as a way around some of the obstacles. "Agreement might be possible if staff work was done well. There should be at least a year of preparation by first-rate people putting problems in focus. Meetings would be a waste of time without such preparation.

"Above all, there has to be desire and motivation before such a consensus can be achieved. Objectives on a national, unified basis are necessary to get the fat out of operations and to put a fine edge to our competitive capability.

"But before we can even make a beginning an industry group has to sit down and examine the feasibility—and value—of such a consensus."

EDUCATION AS AN INSTRUMENT OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations will soon make its recommendations, and the Senate will consider the continuation of our foreign aid program. One of the most important elements of foreign aid, and perhaps the element of most lasting significance, is assistance to education.

On April 16, former Senator William Benton addressed the American Academy of Political and Social Science on the subject of "Education as an Instrument of American Foreign Policy." This address is another example of Senator Benton's consistently wise counsel, and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

EDUCATION AS AN INSTRUMENT OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By William Benton)

Back in the late summer of 1945—just before V–J Day—I was summoned to the service of the State Department; summoned in the fine old sense of commanded. I was to be an assistant secretary. This was in the days when there were only four assistant secretaries authorized by Congress and we had considerable standing in the city.

During my early weeks in the Department, I attended a lecture given by one of our distinguished Foreign Service career officers—later U.S. ambassador to several countries. He told us that the most significant act in international relations is the crossing of the border of one nation, without permission, by the troops of another nation.

More recently, another distinguished career officer—several times an ambassador—was asked by a Senate committee to describe the qualifications of an ideal American emissary. The single most important qualification, he replied, is the ambassador's professional judgment on when to threaten the use of force.

Here are two examples of a classical view of diplomacy. Today, however, the diplomat worried about threatening the use of force would be well advised if he headed for the telephone; the hot line isn't there to be ignored. New conditions have forced a new diplomacy.

To what extent is the new diplomacy taking over? To what extent is it clearly recognized? These seem suitable questions to raise with this academy.

When I joined the postwar State Department, I was to be in charge of the new diplomacy. This included the war-spawned activities of the OIAA, the OWI, the OSS, and other vibrant overseas agencies. It encompassed all of the Department's informational activities, domestic as well as international, including what became the Voice of America. I was also in charge of American participation in UNESCO and, indeed, of all the Department's so-called cultural activities, including the exchange of professors and students. Further—believe it or not—I was responsible for nothing less than the reeducation of Germany and Japan. Although I did not know it on the day of my command, I and my new diplomacy were not welcomed by the classical practitioners, those of whom it has sometimes been said, they are honest men sent abroad to lie for their country.

An early impulse was to call upon my old friend from the Midway, Harold Lasswell. As most of you know, Harold is a kind of one-man academy of political and social science. He knows practically everything about everything. Beardsley Ruml once called him the best educated man in America, and by this Beardsley meant the best educated man he had ever educated in his days dispensing largesse for the general education board. At my request and for the special benefit of Congress, Dr. Lasswell abandoned his famous polysyllables and condensed the factors involved in international relations into four five-letter words. The first word was "force"—the use or the threat of armed might. The second was "deals"—meaning diplomatic arrangements. The third was "goods"—meaning economic dispositions. The fourth was the relatively new diplomacy—"words"—the open covenants openly arrived at—meaning, more precisely, propaganda, or, to use less propagandistic words, meaning information and culture in all their forms. That fourth was the great newly recognized field—my special area—important everywhere in the world but made especially important in some areas by the rise of educated electorates. Dr. Lasswell was its prophet; he was and is to the best of my knowledge the leading theoretician of international propaganda. He gently reminded me that one of the principal functions of "words" in international relations was to "economize on the use of force." Force remained the fundamental.

The title assigned me for my speech today, "Education as an Instrument of Foreign Policy," suggests that a fifth five-letter word should now be added to Harold Lasswell's quartet. The new word is "teach."

This in no way minimizes force, deals, and goods as instruments to be manipulated in the pursuit of foreign goals. Perhaps it only emphasizes that words—particularly those words and images that can fairly be called educational—will play proportionately a greater role. However, I am less sanguine of their impact than I was 20 years ago. I am less hopeful of quick progress through the new diplomacy.

Many of us then were confident, and somewhat in a hurry to prove it, that Understanding with a capital "U" could prove an answer to many of mankind's ills. We persuaded ourselves to the belief that as there were fewer misunderstandings in the world there would be fewer tensions to be relaxed and fewer relations to be improved. This seemed a recognizable goal within a realizable future.

I startled the State Department by arguing that the United States should welcome at least 50,000 foreign students a year.

There were 10,000 here then, in 1946. I wrote an article in the Ladies' Home Journal entitled "Our Best Weapon—Exchange Students." One sentence in that article was based on my observations in a prewar visit to Shanghai. It read, "It is said that 40 percent of the leading civil servants in China have studied at American universities." Three years later the Communists had seized China's mainland. Today there are 90,000 foreign students here in the United States. It's wonderful; and I still argue that exchange students are a potent weapon. Should I still argue they are our best?

Has UNESCO, which has sought Understanding with a capital "U," actually contributed to peace, or even understanding? The UNESCO General Conference in November of 1964 set up a special round table to meet at the next Conference in November of this year to discuss how UNESCO has and can contribute to peace. This is in tribute to UNESCO's charter and in commemoration of its 20th anniversary.

In the 20 years UNESCO's program has undergone a swing of roughly 180° in orientation. We who pioneered UNESCO at the London Conference in 1945, where we wrote the charter, were anxious first to help repair war-devastated schools, universities, and libraries. (To that end I personally gave $75,000 of the 1945 printing of Encyclopaedia Britannica.) Our longer range perspective was focused on the more developed countries. Like the old Institute of Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations, UNESCO proposed to concentrate largely on the advanced countries. It would construct "the defenses of peace in the minds of men" where, traditionally, wars began. The big wars didn't begin in the underdeveloped countries.

Not foreseen by us in London was the trend that today puts more than 90 percent the UNESCO's program into helping the relatively underdeveloped countries. Can our projected UNESCO round table on peace demonstrate that this encourages peace? I hope so. But the viewpoint must be very long range. Surely it will be easy to demonstrate that the UNESCO program embraces education as an instrument of foreign policy. Yes, the word "teach" is now paramount in UNESCO. But the "defenses of peace"—those to be constructed remain on the horizon. Education holds no quick promise of peace or even of understanding.

Still, the promise is there—even if it does not warrant an immediate or massive educational crusade. One formidable obstacle to any such crusade, very easy to understand, confronts us in the literacy figures. Seven hundred million adults—4 out of every 10 of the world's population—can neither read nor write. The number is increasing. Does this then warrant a vast worldwide campaign? Unfortunately, we are not yet ready. We don't know how to make it stick. When we do, I shall favor it. Promising starts have been made. UNESCO is sponsoring a spatter of experiments. What we learn from them we hope to expand, ultimately on a world basis. The so-called new techniques are being applied in some areas. But where choices must now be made at the adult level—and they must—I feel that first priority must go to the education of people who are being trained for jobs. Thus, it is now better to take the illiterate factory worker and teach him to read and write so that he may become a foreman than it is to stretch our present goals to the masses of illiterate peasants. Two years ago Minister of Education Torres Bodet told me that 50 percent of all Mexican children drop out of school after the first grade. But even if they didn't in many communities there are no books. Torres Bodet's goal was 50 books for every community schoolhouse. In Brazil, in most of the 50,000 primary schools, largely taught by teachers with only an elementary school education, there are few if any books. These two illustrations from these two relatively advanced countries show the complexity of the literacy problem.

How then shall the United States pursue the promise? Last autumn President Johnson signaled the wave of the future for U.S. policy, and doubtless stimulated the suggested title of my speech today, in his speech at the Smithsonian Institution. This former Texas schoolteacher had already earned himself a secure place in the history of American education by sponsoring the great congressional acts of 1965 which will raise to $10 billion a year the total Federal money going into domestic education. In the Smithsonian speech he preempted center stage in world education. The President said:

"The men who founded our country knew that once a nation commits itself to the increase and diffusion of knowledge the real revolution begins. It can never be stopped.

"We know today that certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth: that ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace; that the conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms; and that the knowledge of our citizens is the treasure which grows only when it is shared."

President Johnson concluded his speech with his outline of a program of five points.

Rene Maheu, Director General of UNESCO even before these points had been cabled to me as the U.S. member of UNESCO's Executive Board which was then meeting in Paris, read them point-by-point to the Board as a statement of historic importance. Here is the President's projected five-point U.S. policy:

First, to assist the education effort of the developing nations and the developing regions.

Second, to help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it.

Third, to advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands.

Fourth, to increase the free flow of books and ideas and art, and works of science and imagination.

Fifth, to assemble meetings of men and women from every discipline and every culture to ponder the common problem of mankind.

Shortly after his Smithsonian speech, President Johnson hammered home his theme in a speech to the bankers. He startled them by coolly suggesting that education is more important than money. Rene Maheu also read this to the UNESCO Board.

The President then set up his task force to prepare the recommendations for Congress. Was its Chairman the head of the Office of Education? Not at all. Was he the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare? No. He was the Secretary of State.

In February, the President implemented the findings of the task force by calling upon the Congress to establish a Center for Educational Cooperation. Is this a center for encouraging cooperation among the 50 States as Dr. Conant has recommended? No, it is not, even though such a center is manifestly needed. The President informed the Congress, "Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes * * * it must be at the heart of our international relations." The eyes of the Center are thus to be fixed in large measure outside our own borders.

(The President's new initiatives in international education also anticipate a "Council on International Education"; the creation of a corps of education officers in the U.S. Foreign Service; further stimulation of exchanges with students and teachers of other lands; direct support of countries struggling to improve their educational standards, including the development of new techniques for basic education and assistance in the teaching of English; and finally, building new bridges of international understanding through conferences and through the increased flow of books and audiovisual materials.)

The President's February message—which will shortly come before Congress for action, and will deserve your support—further suggested the establishment of what he called "binational educational foundations." When the President greeted Madam Gandhi, he proposed creation of the first such Foundation, an Indian-American Foundation, "to promote progress in all fields of learning in India." This was no airy gesture. The President proposes to put behind the new foundation $300 million in blocked rupees accruing from sales of food to India under Public Law 480.

We Americans are by no means alone in sensing these new directions. For example, every year the Soviet Union produces 100 million books in English, French, German, and Spanish—with major emphasis on English.

(There are 41,000 teachers of English in the Soviet Union and the Russians seem reasonably resigned to the fact that English and not Russian has become the world language of science, and that English, not Russian, is becoming the auxiliary language of nation after nation. If anyone wonders why the Britannica bought the Merriam-Webster dictionary, I can assure you it was not merely to help our subscribers understand the polysyllabic articles you and Lasswell write for the Britannica—and our salesmen do indeed expect to sell a dictionary with every set. But it was also to promote English throughout the world—and of course to profit thereby.)

These 100 million Soviet books are not limited to Marxist-Leninist propaganda. Many are texts by Soviet authors in physics, chemistry, geology, biology, medicine and engineering. These are made available to students at low cost—at most nominal cost compared with the prices of American texts in the same fields. India and Brazil are notable areas for distribution of such English-language texts. Recently I heard a report about a startling example of Soviet enterprise. An American professor, appointed by an Egyptian university to teach a course in American civilization, found that the books he assigned his classes weren't available in Cairo in American editions. But, according to the report, Soviet manufactured English-language books about America were plentiful.

Such a direct attack is not the only way the Soviet Union applies this aspect of the new diplomacy to foreign policy. Ten years ago I wrote an article for the New York Times magazine entitled "The Cold War of the Classrooms." This article was based on the first of my five trips to the Soviet Union. Last month I published a book titled "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," based on the latest of these trips. Ten years ago and again today I have described the gauntlet the Soviets have flung at us in education. This, in my view, may prove to be their great challenge. It has been made by them most openly—and avowedly—and I would add most honestly—as a proposed test of the worth of our two social systems. "Follow our educational model," the Soviets cry to the underdeveloped nations, "and you, too, can pull yourselves up by your bootstraps."

In my judgment the Soviets have one undeniable advantage over us in education: they appear to have greater faith in it than we do, and they work harder at it. Their conception of the aim of education is of course wholly different: they aim at service to the state, while we hope to aim at the development of the individual to his highest potential powers. They have not yet achieved our degree of universality, particularly at the secondary school level. But

the measure of their concentration—both in the party and government and by the individual—is breathtaking. The vocabulary standard for a Russian fourth-grade youngster is twice that of an American. Pupils entering 10th grade, having had 9 years of mathematics, tackle calculus while ours are still floundering with solid geometry or trigonometry. The Soviet budget for education—which equals its budget for defense—represents 15 percent of gross national product, compared with our 5 percent.

Let me give you an example of the grim Soviet devotion to education. Last September the periodical Sovetskaya Kultura complained that only 7 percent of the time on Soviet TV is devoted to entertainment. The author, one Victor Slavkin, says, "Of course I don't count such things as animated cartoons in a program on health education as entertainment." He concludes with a protest, "The viewer should not be considered a patient who wishes some medicine, nor a schoolboy to be seated at a desk."

Russia's present plans for television call for setting aside one entire network for education, extending from Leningrad to Vladivostok. This is not intended as a means of so-called "enriching" of primary and secondary school courses—which, in effect, is what most of our daytime ETV programs turn out to be. The new Soviet ETV network is to concentrate on advanced education in evening or prime hours. It will be integrated with correspondence techniques and the students will get periodic time off from their jobs to attend the universities. It will be devoted to training in medicine, engineering, and other advanced disciplines. The head of Soviet TV explained to me, "We have plenty of teachers and we thus don't need TV's help in the 10-year schools. We need more engineers even though we are now graduating three times as many as you are. Further, we shall command the help and leadership of our top scholars and academicians in developing our TV courses. We shall give diplomas with the same standing as those of our universities and research institutions."

Does such Soviet dedication to education have any implications for our foreign policy? What do you think? Doesn't this question apply particularly to the potentialities of the new techniques of education? Here at home as well as in President Johnson's proposed program outside our borders, I see high hope in the use of radio and television, in programed self-instruction, in films and filmstrips, and language laboratories. Everyone admits that there is no perfect substitute for a good teacher. But where are there enough good teachers? Our country has pioneered in the development of the new techniques, and Prof. Wilbur Schramm of Stanford, is now pioneering through UNESCO in the study of their application in the developing countries. But the application both at home and abroad promises to be painfully slow.

Recently my friend Prime Minister Harold Wilson sent Lord Goodman to me armed with the recent British white paper which proposes a TV channel dedicated to a new "University of the Air." The projected courses are to rival in quality those at the British universities. Isn't it a certainty that such courses will be exported? Should they not even be exported to the United States? Indeed, perhaps the greatest hope for us in the United States—in our efforts to use the great new medium of TV for "the public interest, convenience, and necessity"—and most notably for education—perhaps our greatest hope lies in the lessons to be jammed down our throats from the use of TV by the British, the Italians, and the Japanese who are now in the forefront—yes, and also the Russians. Can't an assembly of scholars like this one dare to hope that our American people won't tolerate great progress in the use of TV for education abroad in contrast to continued neglect and apathy at home?

Prof. C. E. Beeby, for 20 years Minister of Education in New Zealand, later Assistant Deputy Director of UNESCO, still later Chairman of UNESCO's Executive Board, and now at Harvard, has written:

"In the period between the two wars we had discovered that education could be a force in social change, but except in totalitarian countries, the change of which we spoke was a staid and stately process that bore little resemblance to the kaleidoscopic events in Africa and Asia over the past decade."

The evolving countries have told us the "staid and stately" pace in education just won't do in these times even if we are prepared to tolerate it at home. James Reston recently wrote:

"Wherever (Washington officials) look in the developing world they find much the same situation—the gap widening between the rich industrial nations of the northern climes and the poor industrial nations of the southern; vast corrective programs dealing with the effects of poverty and illiteracy, but scarcely touching the causes, and everywhere in these poor lands human fertility outrunning human ingenuity."

India's current 5-year plan uses the following words:

"Education is the most important single factor in achieving rapid economic development and technological progress and in creating a social order founded on the values of freedom, social justice, and equal opportunity."

President Johnson has used the phrase "the gospel of development."

Even those nations today which turn their backs on the gospel are eager for development. Education is the key. It is also the only solid basis, as India insists, for freedom, social justice, and equal opportunity. Who then in this scientific group can deny that it thus must be a central concern in the development of our foreign policy?

Unhappily, almost by definition the gospel of development—the so-called revolution of rising expectations—will be accompanied by conflict and dissension. But there will be little hope of resolving the conflicts, and of achieving peace in our century, unless the world makes heroic efforts in education—sustained, imaginative, and ever-greater efforts.

Thus education is destined to become a characteristic form of America's involvement in world affairs. I agree this is an optimistic view of the future. I give it to you political scientists whose work is often permeated by pessimism under the guise of realism. I leave you as you adjourn your important conference with this optimistic view. Can we call my view other than optimistic since education is indeed an end in itself? It is the very essence of the American dream. It is now as well a means to many ends. Some of these will increasingly guide the conduct of our foreign policy. For this, I am thankful.

PATRICK V. McNAMARA

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, if one's greatness is measured by his character and integrity and by the courage of his convictions, then truly Pat McNamara was a great man.

A man of very humble beginnings, he began his life working with his hands and, although he later held one of the highest offices of this Nation, he never forgot his early associations with men and women of labor. He never succumbed to the temptations of power and the vanity of prestige. He was concerned with the plight of the elderly, the ill, the uneducated, and the youth of our Nation. He was truly a friend of the forgotten underdog.

If one's greatness is measured by the warmth of his heart and the milk of human kindness which flows through his veins, then truly Pat McNamara was a great man. Although he was a man of huge physical proportions, he responded to the cries of a little infant and was concerned with the plight of helpless animals. He was truly a compassionate person.

Pat McNamara was truly one of the finest men I have met along life's pathway. In his passing, our Nation has suffered a great loss, but because of his presence in this world, our Nation today is a greater and much better place. Our Nation will miss him and I will miss him.

INFLATIONARY TRENDS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, indicative of the increasing concern throughout our Nation over inflationary trends are the comments expressed in an editorial which appeared in the Friday, April 22, edition of the Pratt, Kans., Tribune.

This thoughtful piece, entitled "From All Points of the Compass," emphasizes the paradoxical effect on our economy of vast Federal defense and welfare programs. I would commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

FROM ALL POINTS OF THE COMPASS

Inflation news is coming in from all the points of the compass nowadays.

For instance, says a Herald Tribune News Service dispatch, wholesale prices took a big jump in February, according to the Department of Labor. It was the biggest for any February in all of 16 years. And it "lifted the closely watched price inflation barometer 4.1 percent above its year-ago level."

Government spokesmen, the report goes on, express the hope that the wholesale price index may soon stop its upward surge. Just about everyone will concur in that. But, as past history has proven, this may turn out to be whistling in the dark, and the forces which are now shouldering prices and costs upward may prove irresistible.

The ordinary citizen, worriedly watching further degradation of the dollar can only hope for the best. Each of those dollars buys a little less each month. And there can be small doubt that this will continue so long as we attempt to fight a major war, declared or undeclared, and with it carry on welfare programs of unprecedented scope and cost. It cannot be too often repeated that in this way we create new classes of poor at a time when a major governmental purpose is to combat and eliminate poverty.

A SOUND VIEW

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the "sound view of Vietnam," held by Secretary Freeman has been lauded by the Denver Post.

The Post quotes Freeman as saying that "agriculture is the key to lasting victory in Vietnam," and the paper adds:

More and more, this is being accepted as truth. Military effort, by itself, is not enough. Only a sweeping modernization of the Vietnamese economy—particularly in the

rural areas—will achieve the lasting victory we seek.

Because we are concerned about the "second front," and because this editorial on the subject is most informative, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

FREEMAN HAS SOUND VIEW OF VIETNAM

Orville Freeman's view of the problem in South Vietnam differs little from that held by other members of President Johnson's Cabinet. Nevertheless, having recently toured rural areas of South Vietnam as an expert observer, the Agriculture Secretary gives an impression of persuasive credibility.

He believes, in the words he used in addressing the National Farmers Union convention in Denver, that "agriculture is the key to lasting victory in Vietnam."

More and more, this is being accepted as truth. Military effort, by itself, is not enough. Young peasant volunteers must be organized in a concerted program aimed at opening up what Freeman calls a "second front" in the long Vietnamese war.

The military fight for territory has made some progress. But only a sweeping modernization of the Vietnamese economy—particularly in the rural areas—will achieve the lasting victory we seek.

President Johnson expressed this view in the Declaration of Honolulu, which followed his conference in Hawaii with leaders of the South Vietnamese Government. Johnson's Agriculture Secretary gave the Declaration full support in his Denver speech last week.

Rural uplift is not new. But the effort needs to be so much greater than we have hitherto been willing to hazard that it amounts—at the very least—to a major shift of emphasis in the Asian war.

The reason for the difficulty is that ongoing programs are hard to maintain in the face of hit-and-run terrorism by the Vietcong. Secretary Freeman said the 1,500 village chiefs killed in South Vietnam during the last few years are equivalent "in the United States to assassinating 60,000 American mayors and county commissioners."

Obviously it is difficult to bring progress. Few villagers want to volunteer for the firing squad.

Nevertheless, this is what must happen. Progress and modernization must be made so attractive that the South Vietnamese people are willing to take the gamble because they are convinced the Vietcong represent only bloodshed and repression.

The $275 million aid package now before Congress, plus expanded aid to be sought in the next fiscal year, is the first installment in the sweeping program aimed at escalating rural progress in the war-torn country.

We believe, as does Secretary Freeman, that this will be money well spent. Military effort alone will not get the job done; a combined effort has a good chance of bringing peace to southeast Asia.

Perhaps the program envisioned by Secretary Freeman—improved agricultural technology, education, land reform and an upgrading of rural life generally—will someday produce a pattern of peaceful development which can spread from South Vietnam to other underdeveloped nations. That would be a marvelous bonus, indeed, because the killer in other countries—the specter of famine—poses a threat which is far more deadly in its implications than the Vietcong.

PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS FOR MICRONESIA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it was with a deep sense of personal interest and satisfaction that I note that the Department of the Interior and the Peace Corps have announced plans to recruit, train, and assign as many as 750 Peace Corps volunteers to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—Micronesia.

On March 21 of this year—more than a month and a half ago—I urged the Secretary of the Interior to seek the services of Peace Corps volunteers for Micronesia which the Interior Department administers. In my letter to Secretary Udall, I stated that it was "not only proper but a matter of priority that the Micronesians receive urgent assistance from the Peace Corps." Specifically I referred to the need for improving education, medical and health services, economic development, and other activities.

Secretary Udall responded to me at that time by saying that "your proposal is indeed intriguing and we shall want to study it very carefully."

It was my concern over the failure of the Interior Department to utilize Peace Corps volunteers long before now which prompted me to write to Secretary Udall. For it has been evident for some time that the Interior Department has not come to grips with the many problems of this far flung and underdeveloped area of the western Pacific.

I am very pleased, therefore, that the Interior Department now agrees with my proposal to use Peace Corps volunteers in the Trust Territory. I am doubly happy that both the Interior Department and the Peace Corps are moving with unusual swiftness to carry out my proposal.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks the texts of my letter of March 21 to Secretary Udall and his acknowledgment to me; a fact sheet issued by the Peace Corps titled, "Peace Corps and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—Micronesia;" and a news article from the Washington Post of May 7, 1966, titled, "Pacific Islands Showplace Is Peace Corps Aim."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1).

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is a matter of deep pride to the people of Hawaii that the training of the Peace Corps volunteers for Micronesia will take place in Hawaii. Hundreds of Peace Corps volunteers have been trained for service in various Asian countries at the Hilo campus of the University of Hawaii and at the Peace Corps camp in Waipo Valley operated by the university, both located on the big island of Hawaii. The experience already gained by the Peace Corps staffs in Hawaii will be of great value in training the prospective volunteers for the trust territory.

The Peace Corps volunteers will give the Micronesians the kind of practical assistance they need and have asked for—in education, community development, public health and public works. The volunteers will thereby help the trust territory people build the social, economic and political basis for self-government.

As the Micronesians progress, they will be better able to decide the type of political status they wish for themselves. Looking toward this eventuality, I introduced in the Senate, on August 18, 1965, a resolution which would open the way for the trust territory to be included in the State of Hawaii if the people of Hawaii and the trust territory are in favor of such inclusion.

The assignment of Peace Corps volunteers to the trust territory will go a long way toward preparing the Micronesians to decide their future status. I am, therefore, very pleased and enthusiastic over this development.

EXHIBIT 1

MARCH 21, 1966.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In line with my general concern for the status of the people of Micronesia, I am writing to recommend strongly the use of Peace Corps volunteers in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

There is a clear and current need in the Trust Territory for the type of services which the Peace Corps can render. As High Commissioner M. W. Goding said in addressing the opening session of the first congress of Micronesia on July 12, 1965, at Saipan: "There is a tremendous job that remains to be done. Many of the problems we face might be described as being typical of any growing but undeveloped economy. One of the most challenging problems and one that will require bold and imaginative approach lies in improving living conditions, in supplying adequate medical services and educational opportunities for people in the more remote and thinly populated islands of the Territory."

Commissioner Goding thus noted that while some progress has been made, a great deal of work lies ahead in improving education, medical and health services, economic development, and other fields. Volunteers of the Peace Corps have been notably successful in helping people help themselves in these activities in underdeveloped areas elsewhere. They can render invaluable services to Micronesians if assigned there.

Since the well-being of the Trust Territory people is a responsibility of the United States, and more particularly of your Department, it would seem to me not only proper but also a matter of priority that the Micronesians receive urgent assistance from the Peace Corps.

If there are legal, technical, or other reasons why Peace Corps volunteers cannot be assigned to the Trust Territory, I wish to be fully advised on this matter and would appreciate information as to what steps can be taken to overcome such obstacles.

May I hear from you at your earliest convenience.

With warm personal regards and aloha, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HIRAM L. FONG.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1966.

Hon. HIRAM L. FONG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FONG: I am acknowledging your letter of March 21, in which you propose the use of Peace Corps volunteers to assist the Micronesian people.

Your proposal is indeed intriguing and we shall want to study it very carefully. We shall be writing you further on this subject at the earliest possible time.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

PEACE CORPS AND THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (MICRONESIA)

WHAT IS IT?

The trust territory consists of 2,141 islands spread over 3 million square miles of the Western Pacific. Taken from Japan in World War II, the islands were placed under a United Nations trusteeship in 1947. Their administration was assigned by mandate to the United States, which in a string of bloody battles, had driven the Japanese out of them.

WHAT IS MICRONESIA?

This is the name given to those Pacific island occupied by the Micronesian peoples, seafaring first cousins to the Malays. Greater Micronesia includes the Gilbert Islands, which are under British administration. Otherwise, Micronesia and the trust territory are the same—embracing the Marianas, Marshall, and Caroline Archipelagos. Guam, the largest of the Marianas, is not included in the trust territory since it became an American possession in 1898, when it was ceded to the United States by Spain.

WHO ARE THE MICRONESIANS?

They include most of the 88,000 inhabitants of the 97 populated islands of the trust territory. (Two of these islands, Nukuoro and Kapingamarangi, are homes for another people, the Polynesians.)

They speak nine separate Micronesian languages with dialectical variations. They came to Micronesia in prehistoric times, probably sailing their great oceangoing outrigger canoes from lands lying to the east. They were already settled in the Marianas when Ferdinand Magellan discovered them for the West in 1521.

WHERE IS MICRONESIA?

Mili, the westernmost of the Marshalls, is less than 100 miles east of the international date line. More than 3,000 miles farther east, Tobi in the western Carolines lies off the northern tip of New Guinea. Almost 2,000 miles northwest of Tobi, the remote and uninhabited Farallon de Pajaros juts its rocky peak out of the ocean less than 700 miles from Japan.

In all the huge expanse of water included in Micronesia (larger than the land area of the United States), only 687 square miles are above sea level.

WHAT ARE THE PRINCIPAL ISLANDS?

Saipan and Tinian in the Marianas became the sites of B–29 bases in World War II from which Japan was regularly bombed. The *Enola Gay* took off from Tinian on the fateful day when it dropped to atom bomb on Hiroshima. Bikini, in the Marshalls, was the site of America's first H-bomb explosion.

In preparation for World War II, the Japanese constructed major fortifications on Yap and Truk in the Carolines. The American assault against the Japanese brought the names of other islands to the attention of the world—Eniwetok, Kwajalein, Ulithi, the Palaus.

WHY IS THE PEACE CORPS GOING TO THE TRUST TERRITORY?

The Micronesians asked for Peace Corps volunteers—for teachers, engineers, surveyors, health experts, agricultural extensionists, draftsmen and persons who know how to organize and run cooperatives. And that is what the Peace Corps plans to send.

WHEN WILL VOLUNTEERS GO TO MICRONESIA?

Two waves of volunteers are now planned. The first, to arrive by October 1966, will begin programs in elementary education and community development, public health, and public works. The second, to begin in January 1967, will concentrate on secondary education, cooperative and credit union development, agriculture, public administration, communications and transportation. These two waves will involve as many as 750 volunteers. Others will follow later.

WHERE WILL THEY TRAIN?

The prospective volunteers will take their training at the Hilo campus of the University of Hawaii and at the Peace Corps camp in Waipio Valley operated by the university. Their training conditions will simulate as far as possible their later working conditions.

WILL THE PEACE CORPS PLAY A SPECIAL ROLE IN THE TRUST TERRITORY?

In his May 5, 1966, letter to Peace Corps Director Jack Vaughn, President Johnson said: "I will be asking the Congress to approve the Department of the Interior's omnibus legislation which seeks to improve the capital budget of the territory and to raise the level of the Interior Department's continuing effort in the territory. However, I see the Peace Corps role as a very special kind of effort being separate and apart from the daily tasks of civil administration."

This "special kind of effort" will lie at the heart of a fresh attempt to fulfill America's responsibilities in the trust territory. It will seek to improve the conditions of life for the people of Micronesia.

Finally, it will help build the material and spiritual circumstances in which the people of the trust territory can intelligently and successfully—and in the not-too-distant future—chose their own form of government.

[From the Washington Post]

PACIFIC ISLANDS SHOWPLACE IS PEACE CORPS AIM

(By Bryce Nelson)

Several hundred Peace Corps volunteers will be sent to the U.S.-administered Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in an effort to make them "a showplace for the world," the administration announced yesterday.

Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, declared that the United States already had done much for the trust territory but that "We have to do better than we have done, very frankly."

U.S. administration of the 90,000 people, who live in the 2,141 Micronesian islands scattered across 3 million square miles of the Pacific Ocean, has been under increasing criticism in recent years, both domestically and at the United Nations. The United States was given trusteeship over the area in 1947 by the U.N. after defeating the island's former trustees, the Japanese, in World War II.

COMPLAINTS FILED

Last spring, health officials in the islands sent a petition of grievances to the U.N. Trusteeship Council.

The Council responded by asking the World Health Organization to send an investigating mission to the area last fall. The report, which listed shortages in health facilities and personnel in Micronesia, will probably be discussed by the Trusteeship Council in late June.

Goldberg conceded yesterday that there had been some criticism at the United Nations and added, "We as Americans have to have always our tradition of decent respect for the opinions of mankind, and we are manifesting that respect by the attention we are paying to the subject."

Goldberg said yesterday that the commitment of Peace Corps volunteers to Micronesia symbolized the U.S. "determination to discharge our full responsibility as trustees."

In the 19 years of the U.S. trusteeship, there has never been an election to determine the wishes of the Micronesians as to the status of their islands. In a letter sent to Peace Corps Director Jack Hood Vaughn and dated May 5, President Johnson declared, "Ultimately the people of Micronesia must decide what their future status will be."

NO ELECTION TIMETABLE

Goldberg said yesterday that there had been no timetable set for elections but that the administration hoped to "achieve this as rapidly as possible."

The Peace Corps action was announced at a three-man press conference at the State Department by Goldberg, Vaughn, and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, whose Department is charged with administering the territories.

To supplement the Peace Corps effort, Udall announced that his Department was sending legislation to Congress to substantially increase the amount of money the Interior Department spends to aid the trust territory. Udall pointed out that the current annual budget was $17 million and that the annual expenditure was only about $7 million until 2 years ago. Udall said that his Department currently had 300 employees in the trust territory.

Vaughn said the number of volunteers to be sent to Micronesia was as yet undetermined but that he thought that several hundred would be sent in October. The second group of volunteers will be sent next January. Peace Corps officials indicated that the total number would probably be about 700.

REENLISTMENT ALLOWED

To help gain volunteers for Micronesia, the Peace Corps will allow current volunteers to reenlist to work in a different project for the first time. Volunteers have sometimes been allowed to reenlist to work in the country to which they were originally assigned, but they have never been allowed to change countries prior to this time.

The project also will mark the first assignment of Peace Corps volunteers to territory administered by the United States.

The Peace Corps begins a crash recruiting program Monday at approximately 62 colleges in order to obtain volunteers before the students begin their final examinations and leave for their summer vacations.

The Peace Corps has already prepared its recruiting pamphlet for the Micronesian project. It is entitled "The Peace Corps Goes to Paradise" and begins: "Tropical islands. Enchanted evenings. Swaying palms and sun-kissed maidens."

But the brochure also is quick to point out the "problems in Paradise": "Understaffed schools. Bad roads. Insufficient medical facilities. Inadequate water and sanitary facilities. An island territory that has to import seafood."

THE GROWING SHORTAGE OF TRAINED PERSONNEL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the most serious problems confronting our country in the field of health is the growing shortage of trained personnel. The Congress has already taken steps to meet this need by passing legislation such as the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the Nurse Training Act, and the Vocational Education Act. Presently before the Congress is the Health Manpower Act designed to provide more medical technologists, biomedical engineers, dental hygienists, and other college-trained specialists.

Although these Federal programs are making a valuable contribution, there is a great need for complementary local action. I am, therefore, particularly pleased to note an outstanding example of such initiative in my own State directed at a solution to the critical shortage of trained nurses. Knowledge of this local effort came to me in the form of an editorial in the Journal of the Arkansas Medical Society, condensed and reprinted in the Arkansas Gazette.

The editorial, written by Dr. Alfred Kahn, Jr., describes a plan originally conceived by Mrs. Mildred Armour, head of the Arkansas Baptist School of Nursing, and later adapted in the form of a proposal of the Pulaski County Medical Society.

Because this article shows the productive imagination which can be generated when local groups address themselves to the responsibilities and needs of their communities and professions, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

DOCTOR DEFINES AND EXPLAINS NURSE SHORTAGE, SUGGESTS POSSIBLE SOLUTION

(NOTE.—Dr. Alfred Kahn, Jr., of Little Rock wrote the accompanying editorial in the Journal of the Arkansas Medical Society. It has been edited to make it somewhat shorter. In Little Rock, the scarcity of nurses is such that St. Vincent Infirmary has had to close a 27-bed ward, an unprecedented action.)

(By Dr. Alfred Kahn, Jr.)

Despite the fact that there have been signs for a long time that hospitals were short of personnel to carry out patient care, the full impact has not reached the public and the physicians in this area until the crisis was on us. This is often the case in other walks of life and, in fact, the critical nature of the situation often is of value in that it prompts strenuous and concerted activity to remedy the situation.

The so-called nursing shortage probably should be redefined. What is meant by this is the lack of trained personnel to do bedside care of the patient. The reasons for this fall into two categories: The acute problem and the long-range problem.

Unfortunately, most of the discussions about the lack of bedside personnel have had to do with the acute shortage. This so-called acute shortage simply means that there are barely enough registered nurses in this area to keep the hospitals in what one might term "a state of compensation."

Basically, the cause is the critical lack of nurses. However, superimposed on this are some acute problems, which have caused the nurses to leave the hospitals.

SALARY FOREMOST OF ALL PROBLEMS

Foremost among these problems is that of salary. After 3 years of nursing training, many nurses can get more money by going to a Veterans' Administration hospital or into a physician's office than they can obtain by working in a hospital. In a world of free economy it has always been the policy that the worker has a right to try and obtain the best salary which he can get. And yet $350 per month, after 3 years of training, is better than many young college women get with a degree and after 4 years of training. This is no attempt to say that $350 is the right amount to start nurses at.

One of the major complaints of nurses is that they would like to have weekends off; many nurses do not want to work night or split shifts; all of these things are reasonable but they add to the problem of staffing the hospital. There are other irritating seemingly minor problems, which have entered into the overall acute picture and turned nurses away from the hospital. These include frequent change of assignments, association with less trained personnel in the care of the patients, etc. In other words, the short-range problem is one of "making do" with barely enough nurses.

SEMANTICS ADDS TO THE SITUATION

A long-range problem of the so-called nursing situation has to do with semantics as much as anything else. Twenty-five or 30 years ago the standard worker on the floor of the hospital was the so-called trained nurse. This individual had 3 years of training and, during her training years, she worked on the floors of the hospital in a manner similar to a graduate trained nurse. As time has gone by, the trained nurses have understandably tried to raise the standards of their group. This has resulted in an attempt to have their graduate nurses, in as many instances as possible, have a college degree. The result of this is that these individuals are equipped to do administrative work as well as to perform nursing functions. Now rather than just a graduate trained nurse, what we have is a medical administrator with a degree.

UPGRADING POLICY BOTH GOOD AND BAD

This upgrading policy has resulted in two things: A lack of nurses to perform the functions which they formerly did, and a highly trained individual capable of doing administrative work and who might prefer to do it to bedside care.

In the long range it would be better if these highly trained folks were replaced in the hospital by a new category, technically trained to take care of patients and not so interested in administration.

This is not intended to reflect on the desire of the current nurse program to upgrade themselves and who are in a certain sense changing their hospital function. On the other hand, the long range program should take cognizance of this change and immediately have an explosive expansion in the schools which train young women to take care of patients at the bedside.

POSSIBLE PLAN TO SOLVE CRISIS

The Pulaski County Medical Society has felt the nursing shortage acutely and, as a result, has had some exploratory meetings with interested parties. At one of these meetings, J. A. Gilbreath (Arkansas Baptist Medical Center administrator) suggested the following plan, which is an adaptation of one proposed some months ago by Mrs. Mildred Armour (head of Arkansas Baptist School of Nursing).

The plan is aimed at conserving teaching personnel. It was suggested that since most paramedical personnel have the same basic didactic needs, that a formula be worked out whereby there is a year's course in anatomy, physiology, chemistry, etc., which would be identical for nurses, technicians, etc. At the end of the first year, if any of these individuals desire to stop their training, they would be qualified as a 1-year nurse technician.

Some individuals might want to take 2 years' training.

It is important to point out that if this individual is in the nurse training plan, she would be performing bedside nursing in moderate amounts; this is a necessary aspect of the program for both the hospital and the individual. Lastly, some individuals would want to take 3 years' training and receive a designation equivalent to a graduate nurse technician or some other appropriate designation.

For this plan to work in a satisfactory manner, there would have to be some means of licensing these officials on a statewide basis if not on a national basis. Thus, the trainee could obtain employment at the proper level of competence in any hospital throughout the State and, if this plan were used nationally, the trainee could be employed in other States at an equal stage of training.

This plan need not to be in conflict with the so-called registered nurse training program but would be an additional training program [for] specialists in bedside care with emphasis on practical nursing rather than on college-type education as advocated by the existing registered nurse associations for their members.

CHANGING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on the last day of April, the distinguished American and, I am proud to say, fellow Kansan, Alf Landon, spoke before the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters on the momentous changes taking place in policies and decisions of governments around the globe and their interacting impacts—with special emphasis directed to the impact of and the impact on our Nation's international position.

Because Governor Landon's comments are both thoughtful and timely, I ask unanimous consent that his recent address be printed at this point in the RECORD so that all of us might have the benefit of his observations in the vital and tension-ridden areas of international relations which necessarily dominates so many of our considerations these days.

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

CHANGING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(By Alf M. Landon, Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters, Pittsburg, Kans., Apr. 30, 1966)

I am going to attempt briefly to clarify the impact on the United States of our international position on momentous changes taking place in policies and decisions by governments throughout the world—a world that has been made smaller due to modern transportation and communication—also a world growing bigger as nations develop in Africa-Asia and the great countries to the south of us. There are more undeveloped natural resources and land in that great area than in the rest of the world put together.

Just as the printing press brought about revolutionary changes in economic and political life in the Old World in the Middle Ages—so is the radio today—with its transistor—revolutionizing economic and political life for the illiterate peoples of the modern world from pole to pole.

It is interesting that the first grab made in all attempts to gain control of a government by force today is the radio station as the center of communications—instead of the transportation center. The radio station is the only means of reaching the people of a country involved to convey the political objectives, ideals, and motives of the leaders of the new crowd.

It is also interesting to note that radio in those countries has not changed the style of presentation by the speakers—like it has in America. In our country, it has eliminated the old-fashioned type of oratory. The limitations of radio and television time compel the speaker to put his thinking down in a manuscript so that he says in much less time what he is talking about than did the stump speaker up to the event of the radio.

Of course, there still remains the question of getting to the point that he's trying to convey. I remember the old story of two men listening to a candidate speaking from the back of a wagon on a street corner. Finally, one said to his neighbor, "What's he talking about?" The other fellow answered, "He don't say yet."

The great blackout through the failure of electric power over a wide area in the Northeast probably would have been our country's greatest domestic tragedy if it had not been for radio stations maintained by auxiliary power and radio transistors.

The confusion and uncertainty existing in Washington and throughout our great and beloved country—because of conflicting statements by the Johnson administration on its Vietnam policies—is being currently

noted and vigorously protested by leaders of President Johnson's own party—in and out of the Congress—and the situation is coming to a head.

I am only going to mention Vietnam as it relates to the world in the area of our foreign policies.

We have our President saying our objective is remaking that little unhappy country in our own image.

We have his Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, saying at the last meeting of NATO in France, and before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that we are in South Vietnam in extension of our containment of communism policy for America's and the free world's interest and in commitment of our obligations as a member of SEATO—Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

We have our President asking for aid and assistance from other signatures to that treaty.

Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Korea, and Thailand have responded in varying degrees. Therefore, all these governments will of course have a right to expect to be consulted regarding any negotiations that include Hanoi and the Vietcong.

Now Premier Ky has called—at our prodding and encouragement—two conventions to draft the first constitution in all South Vietnam's history preliminary to the first general election in all its history on August 15.

We have President Johnson's glowing description of the Vietnamese Government and Great Society that is going to emerge—with our aid—from that election—which is to be a free expression of the Vietnamese people's will.

I do not believe the situation in South Vietnam is stable enough to sustain that overly optimistic statement.

The President is reported to be warning administration circles to be prepared for the possibility that a new civilian facade of that government might not continue the war for South Vietnamese nationalism.

With the Vietcong completely occupying most of South Vietnam and able to arouse the rest—with the pressure the military juntas army and the organized Buddhists can and will use at the polls on election day in the areas they control—how can there be any semblance of a free election—or a fair election?

Then the big question is whether the Vietcong will be a part of any civilian government. If they are—that means sooner or later a Communist take-over of that government. Secretary Rusk said in February before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "To suggest that they (the Vietcong) represent the aspirations of the Vietnamese people is absurd."

Yet—Arthur Goldberg—America's Ambassador to the United Nations—when asked 3 weeks ago if the Vietcong were to be included in the planning for the first constitutional South Vietnamese Government—answered. "That is an academic question."

Secretary of Defense McNamara—2 weeks ago before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—said—in answer to Senator GORE—that he did not object to the Vietcong taking off their uinforms and voting in their pajamas.

It should be remembered that 24 hours or so after Senator ROBERT KENNEDY'S statement in February in favor of settling the Vietnamese war by a coalition government that included the Vietcong—Mr. Moyer, the President's press secretary, said there was no broad difference between Mr. Johnson and Senator KENNEDY. Both agreed that any coalition government would have to be ratified by a general election.

At that time, Vice President HUMPHREY rightly compared letting the Vietcong in the South Vietnamese Government to letting a fox in the chicken coop. There would be no chickens left. Or to an arsonist in the fire department.

If that coalition government including the Vietcong occurs, neither the containment policy nor the objectives of the Great Society itself will be attained.

Momentous decisions are building inside and outside of South Vietnam that can well be a turning point in all Asia. The key question is political. That is the participation of the Vietcong in the new government.

Little Vietnam—a country of only 15 or so million population—has no strategic military or economic value—no natural resources—compared with Indonesia. The most important event in all Asia since the Chinese nuclear bomb in October 1964, is the recent nationalistic revolt against Communist domination in Indonesia. That country—with the fifth largest population in the world—stretching out for 3,000 miles—with immense natural resources—is the strategic key to southeast Asia.

It is obvious that the answers to questions raised on our South Vietnam policy are not simple. It is obvious they are complex and many peoples are involved.

There is a growing urgent call for an "agonizing reappraisal of our Vietnam policies."

I believe that is too narrow a focus. I do believe there is urgent need for a realistic reappraisal of our present foreign policy and international relations, where crucial decisions are building up the world over in the light of the changing foreign policies of our allies and friends who are joined with us in the common defense of freedom and democratic processes of government from domination by communistic tyranny.

Let us now look briefly and objectively at recent major developments with momentous implications announced in the foreign policies of two of our closest allies.

First there is France. I do not share Secretary of State Rusk's optimism on President de Gaulle's dismissal of NATO forces from France—even though all the other NATO governments are sticking together so far.

Secretary Rusk recently said: "Fourteen nations, comprising 450 million people possessing massive military power, will not be paralyzed by the attitude of France."

Pulling out the American airfields and backup military bases and supply depots in France creates a crucial military logistic problem. Our main supply lines for our 250,000 American soldiers now stationed in West Germany cross France from French ports.

Even though all the other government members of NATO are willing to make their countries available—at the best we would have jerrybuilt logistic supply lines to West Germany that for sure would be vulnerable in time of war or threats of war.

Political decisions involved are equally important. According to the AP account of its interview with the French Foreign Minister, he "stressed that France intends to remain a part of the North Atlantic Treaty signed in 1949. France is divorcing itself only from the military organization which was set up after the treaty went into force and was not specifically mentioned in the pact. The United States does not draw this distinction between the treaty and the military organization, saying that a linking of the two is essential."

Now, let us take a good look at the changes Prime Minister Wilson has announced in England's foreign policy in his recent white paper. I quote from Joseph C. Harsch, long head of the Christian Science Monitor's London bureau and now on its Washington staff:

"Britain has clearly opted out of the world salvation business. There is not one word, one whiff, one faint smell of ideological Armageddon in the whole of the white paper.

"It would be difficult to draft two more different views of the world and responsibility to it than the one in the British white paper and the other in the recent pronouncements of President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk in Washington.

"The Johnson-Rusk papers assume a world locked in grim ideological conflict. Mr. Wilson's white paper assumes a reasonably stable world in which the most important part, Europe, is for the moment quiet and relatively safe. The rest, Asia and Africa, is unsettled, but not of major concern.

"Washington and London are on divergent paths."

Analyzing the changing world around us, U Thant—Secretary General of the United Nations—said a few weeks ago:

"One lesson we can draw from the Vietnamese crisis, and for that matter from developments in many parts of the world today, is the fact that nationalism is still the most potent force in the life of a people. Whether you assess the situation in Vietnam or Syria or Ghana or Indonesia or elsewhere, I think historians may draw one conclusion: That nationalism, more than any political belief or political ideology or political conviction, is the most potent force in the life of a people.

"This applies equally to Africa or to Latin America or even to Europe. I think it is misleading to think primarily in terms of political ideologies in the context of the newly emerging nations."

So we find President de Gaulle, Prime Minister Wilson, and Secretary General of the United Nations U Thant—agreeing that nationalism is the basic motivating foreign policy of all the governments in the world—while American foreign policy is still based on past concepts.

The nationalistic trend in the world is not a question of whether we like to see that or not. There isn't anything we can do about it. It simply is a drastic change in international relations the world over. Whether it is good or bad—we must adjust our foreign policies to it.

Nationalism is forcing a complete reversal in the Soviet's foreign policy based on control and domination of international relations for all the Communist bloc. More and more, the erstwhile Russian colonies are asserting their independence of the Soviet in both domestic and foreign policies. Therefore, the Soviet is forced to modify its international relations—as it has been forced to swing toward the individual incentive profit motives of capitalism by the failure of the Marxian-Lenin theories to work in that field also.

China—after its break away from Russia—struck out on its world conquering plans based on the old Marxian-Lenin theory of "decadent democracies and capitalistic principles." It accused Russia of being a traitor to the original Communist theories of conquering the world by force.

Despite the fact that China has met with one disastrous defeat after another in the rising tide of nationalism in Africa and Asia—despite the failure in its attempt to dominate those countries through subversion, murder and assassination, which reached a climax in Indonesia—and despite the fact that it is today practically isolated from the rest of the world—China shows no signs of changing its foreign plans of world conquest.

The United States has ignored this development of vigorous—enthusiastic nationalistic trend all over the world.

Our international objective throughout our entire history has never been one of conquest and domination—like that of Russia and China. Rather, it has been to raise the standards of living—to spread the democratic processes by education—by technical training—by the greatest economic aid program the world has ever known.

As a matter of fact, this new nationalism is a horse of a different color from the old dynastic political and military ambitions and

colonial policies that infected the old world for many centuries.

This new nationalism is not threatening the world's peace—except as Russia and China attempt to use it to foster their Marxian-Lenin theories of world conquest.

Russia has found those theories will not work any better in foreign policies than they have in domestic policies. Chinese leaders must be revaluating their position in the world today.

Infiltrating the Vietcong in the South Vietnamese Government is the only place where they can get at least a color of victory in world affairs.

Therefore, the adjustment in our international relations does not require the drastic reversal in our policies that it demands for Russia and China. The only adjustment we need is to recognize its existence—that it is not the threat to world peace—unless China or Russia use it for their purpose of world domination. So far, it has worked the opposite to wreck that goal.

Isn't it high time that we Americans realized we are isolating ourselves from countries whose agreement and support on international positions and policies we need?

I believe all three of our last Presidents have missed opportunities for influencing the establishment of a stable and therefore peaceful world. General Eisenhower with his "brinkmanship"; Mr. Kennedy with his "grand design"; and President Johnson with his negative rejection in October 1964, of China's proposal for a meeting of the five nuclear powers preliminary to a meeting of all the world governments for discussing abolition of nuclear weapons. France and Russia accepted. England did not, although that reversed all the previous political and personal positions of Prime Minister Wilson.

We must not allow differences with France and England to grow. We must seek to mobilize the unity of the free world—even though that requires a readjustment on our part of differing views of responsibility for a reasonably stable world.

The NATO countries need us. We need them—including France. To let existing divisions in NATO grow unresolved is to court disaster for all. This is no time for mutual polemics or satirical comments between France and America—two of the key countries in the economic and peaceful life of the world.

The latest case in illustration of the need to readjust our international relations is the resignation last Tuesday of nine representatives of the great countries to the south of us on the Alliance for Progress panel. They resigned in protest against U.S. domination.

They need the United States of America. America needs them. They are close to home on this hemisphere.

However, America's military power must be maintained second to none. It is extremely useful and necessary in maintaining a balance of power still essential to preventing world war three.

That does not mean that the world's peace can be kept only by military force. It does mean that it is a great help in stabilizing situations.

I am increasingly concerned about America's position in the major developments that are taking place in a fermenting world—in which we seem to be getting every day closer to some irreversible position—and the fragmentation of the free nations bloc—as we have come seriously close in Vietnam.

I believe that the world's problems can be kept manageable for peace by sound pragmatic policies that are based neither on overreliance on military power—nor the millennium claimed for the United Nations—nor the illusions of free elections in the midst of terror.

Big spending in foreign aid programs is not a substitute for equity in a foreign policy.

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN WILL NOT SEEK REELECTION

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened by the news that my good friend and esteemed colleague, Congressman LEO O'BRIEN, of Albany, N.Y., will not seek reelection this year.

Hawaii has had many great friends. History will some day record that LEO O'BRIEN was one of our greatest friends.

When Congressman O'BRIEN leaves Congress at the close of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, he will have completed nearly 14 years of faithful service to the people of New York's 29th Congressional District, to the people of the State of New York, and to his Nation. He will be remembered for all his good works by many countless thousands of people, and he will be forever remembered by the people of Hawaii as the stalwart defender and advocate of Hawaii's bid for statehood.

LEO O'BRIEN had the distinction of serving as the floor manager of the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills.

Therefore, Mr. President, may I, in behalf of the people of Hawaii, say mahalo to LEO O'BRIEN, and to wish him the very best in the years to come.

LEO O'BRIEN is truly one of the finest men I have ever met along life's pathway.

Mr. President, recently John Hall, a young man who covers Hawaiian matters in Washington for the United Press International, described his day with LEO O'BRIEN. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hall's article, as published in the Honolulu Advertiser, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THIS TIME "THE IRISHMAN" MEANS IT

(By John Hall)

WASHINGTON.—"It's sort of a cry-wolf proposition," LEO O'BRIEN said, with that straightforward permanently creased Irish smile. "I've said I'm going to quit so often that nobody pays any attention. But I mean it this time."

The newspapermen had started calling him that morning after the story of his retirement broke in Albany.

Now it was 2 p.m. The buzzer on his office phone was still ringing regularly.

"Hello Dick * * * Yes, it's true * * * the thing is that one of my grandchildren grew a foot while I was away last time. They're always out skiing or something on weekends when I'm home. I want to be there to see them grow inch by inch.

"Annoyance," the moonfaced Irishman said thoughtfully, as he hung up the phone and straightened a stack of papers on his desk in the Rayburn Building. "Annoyance was what got me into the statehood fight. In 1955, Clair Engle was chairman of the Interior Committee and Clair took the statehood bills away from my subcommittee. He wouldn't let me hold hearings—did it himself. The bill went to the floor and got recommitted overwhelmingly.

"The following year, Clair handed me that tired old rubber ball that had been bouncing futilely down here for 40 years. You know, the theory always had been that Hawaii should be admitted first because it was more prosperous. But I decided to take that cart and—hold on a second.

"Hi, Tom * * * pretty good. Yeah, that word veteran gets me. I quit the newspaper business because they were calling me a veteran reporter. Now they're calling me a veteran Congressman."

"Now, let me see * * *. So I decided to put that cart before the horse and make it run * * *. Make Alaska the needle and Hawaii the thread. Hawaii was terribly annoyed * * * but we got the Alaska bill on the floor and, after 6 days of debate, it passed. Of course, Hawaii couldn't be turned down then. And the next year, in 1959, Hawaii was admitted.

"Everybody was afraid of any implication of communism in Hawaii. Of course, it wasn't true. But we just couldn't get the bill through, so we did it backward and it worked.

"I came down here in 1952. Did you know I was scooped on my own election? I had to stay on as a reporter at the statehouse. I was running because I was the only one who knew anything about the bills that were pending. I was elected on April Fool's Day. On election night, my editor messaged 'Opposition reporting you elected.'

"Anyway, I came down here and they tossed me on Interior. If there is one committee remote from my district, it was that one. But I figured there were a lot of ambitious, western guys on there and I would move fast. I did, and in 6 years I was second ranking member and chairman of the Territories and Insular Affairs Committee."

The phone was buzzing again.

"Charlie, how are you? * * * Yeah, I want to go soak up some friendship * * *. Well, I enjoy the rumors and it might be smart to get someone from upstate to run. But this has no connection whatsoever, although I don't know a better way of being with your family than being Lieutenant Governor. It's the best form of social security. But 32 years with a title, then to go back to 'Hey, you * * *' I don't know * * * this even sounds phony to me, as a former reporter, but I just want to be with my family. Maybe I'll do a little writing, some TV work if anyone wants me. Thanks, Charlie * * * bye.

"Well, anyway, I'm proud of the part I had in the statehood bills. But you know, dealing with individuals is just as important a part of being a congressman. One night the doorbell rang and a fellow asked for my help. He'd been accused of deserting the Army—the poor fellow couldn't read or write. His bedridden, domineering mother had told him he had been discharged. He didn't have a friend. I went down to his court-martial and they gave him 6 years at hard labor, just because I was there. I finally got it commuted to time served and the poor fellow is back with his family."

FACTS (UNPLEASANT) ON FARM PRICES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with parity dropping another two points in April we confront a situation where parity prices for farmers are down to 80 percent and still the attacks on American agriculture continue to be made by this administration in an effort to blame our farmers and ranchers for the fast burning fires of inflation which are destroying the purchasing power of our American dollar.

However, the facts and figures available from the various agencies of our Government indicate with complete clarity that American agriculture is actually the victim rather than the villain of the inflation which the reckless spending programs of this Johnson administration have stimulated.

In this connection, a significant and factual editorial from one of the great

newspapers published in the heartland of America's agricultural area provides some thoughtful reading. I commend it to the Congress and the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., entitled "Facts on Farm Prices" be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

FACTS ON FARM PRICES

The Farm Journal for May points out some facts and figures which should be informative to city folk as well as farmers. They were gleaned from reports of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

For example:

The prices farmers received for all products in 1965 were 8.93 percent below the prices of 1947–49.

Consumers in 1966 are spending 18.2 percent of their disposable income for food, as compared to 20 percent 5 years ago.

Food prices in retail markets are 17.1 percent higher than in 1947–49, but costs added after the food items leave the farm have increased by 41 percent.

In the period from 1947 to 1949 to 1965, weekly wage rates to labor have gone up 107 percent, and prices of things farmers buy have increased by 28.3 percent.

All of which leads to some wonderment as to why the President should blame food prices for inflation, and makes enigmatic the Secretary of Agriculture's recent expression of pleasure that "farm prices in certain key items have moderated" from "cyclical highs which have accounted for most of the consumer food increases."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAIL PROJECT—S. 2721

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, just last week I was honored with the opportunity of addressing the student body at George Washington University on the occasion of its annual Law Day ceremonies. In my opening remarks I noted the general theme of Law Day for this year, "Respect the Law—It Respects You," and pointed out that in recent years it has become increasingly apparent "that the law is a respecter of persons—that the law as administered in this country often operates to favor the rich litigant over the poor litigant," and that "this favoritism tends to be a built-in factor of our legal system of any adversary system in fact."

Therefore, in pursuance of this thought today, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to the fact that in recent years the spotlight of inequitable treatment of the poor in our legal system has been focused upon the inequities and injustices inherent in our present financial bail system. Indeed, the system's many critics have long decried the anachronism whereby the primary and often sole criteria for an accused's pretrial release is the price of a bond or a bond premium, when it has been evident for some time that factors other than financial consideration may give greater assurance of the accused's return for trial and allow the poor and rich man alike to obtain his pretrial release based upon conditions justly imposed by law without a price tag.

Since 1961, through the efforts of many lawyers, judges, and public officials throughout the country, research and demonstration projects have been set up at least in 50 major cities in our Nation to test the theory that strong community ties provide a good and safe assurance of a defendant's return for trial, and that therefore he can be released on bail without requiring a traditional financial bond.

As a result of an extensive study of the bail system in the District of Columbia in 1962 by the junior bar section of the District of Columbia Bar Association jointly with the Judicial Conference for the District of Columbia Circuit, a bail project was established to conduct such a demonstration in the District of Columbia.

This project, funded by a Ford Foundation grant to Georgetown University, has been in actual operation in the courts of the District of Columbia since January of 1964, and through periodic reports since then it has demonstrated beyond question the reliability of the community tie factor as a reasonable alternative to the traditional financial bond system in assuring that qualified defendants will return for trial.

Most recent statistics indicate that the District of Columbia bail project has recommended the release on personal bond to the courts of over 2,290 persons charged with felonies and misdemeanors, and that the courts have accepted approximately 85 percent of these recommendations, allowing almost 2,000 persons to be released without the necessity of having to pay a price for their pretrial freedom.

In the careful recording of the program's operational statistics, the District of Columbia bail project reports that 56 persons, or approximately 2.9 percent have failed to make required court appearances after release on personal bond. However, it is interesting to note that 44 such defaulters have been returned to custody, 38 of whom were rearrested in the Washington, D.C., area. There has been extensive coverage of this project's activities both in the local and national press media and it appears that it has been overwhelmingly accepted in the District of Columbia.

Congress has already recognized the need for reform of this unfair monetary bail system and has incorporated the substantive aspects of bail reform measures tested by the District of Columbia bail project and more than 50 other similar type projects throughout the country, in legislation now pending final enactment.

Last September, the Senate passed and sent to the House the Bail Reform Act, S. 1357, which in essence requires all Federal courts, including the court of general sessions for the District of Columbia, to give greater priority to personal recognizance releases and other types of conditional releases short of the traditional financial bond releases.

Just a few days ago, this bill was approved by the House Judiciary Committee and it appears that final passage will not be long delayed.

It should be noted, however, that S. 1357 indicates broadly to the Federal courts the basic guidelines for determining an individual's qualifications for personal recognizance or other nonfinancial conditional releases. It requires the judicial officer in making such a bail determination to take into account from available information: the nature and circumstances of the offense charged, the weight of the evidence against the accused, the accused's family ties, employment, financial resources, character and mental condition, the length of his residence in the community, record of convictions, and his record of appearances for court proceedings or flight to avoid prosecution or failure to appear at court appearances.

Unquestionably this legislation will be a great step forward in assuring the American people of equal justice under law by providing much of the needed improvement in the administration of criminal justice in our courts and thereby eliminate a major part of the area of favoritism which I spoke of at George Washington University.

What is now apparent, however, is that the Bail Reform Act will require certain machinery to properly effectuate the legislative reform goals intended. In short, in order for the courts to make rational determinations with the guidelines set forth in S. 1357, it will be necessary to obtain quickly and efficiently all the necessary background information concerning the accused. It would be folly to suggest that the already overworked and understaffed judges of our Federal courts, especially in the District of Columbia and more specifically in the court of general sessions, now have the time and facilities available to them to investigate adequately the accused's family background and history and all the other information required to properly implement the dictates of the Bail Reform Act.

Mr. President, what is needed is already in active use today in our Federal City in the form of the District of Columbia bail project. For, in addition to this project's great work in testing and establishing the reliability of the community tie and nonfinancial condition thesis, it has also demonstrated more than adequately that the very machinery used by the project in its experiment can be and is the necessary adjunct to the Bail Reform Act.

In May of 1965, the Judicial Conference for the District of Columbia Circuit, which was greatly responsible for initiating this fine project, went on record as urging Congress to enact legislation to provide a proper vehicle to effectuate the experimentally tested procedures on a permanent basis. A bill, S. 2721, which incorporates such a proposal has already been introduced in the Senate and is now being considered by the District of Columbia Committee. This bill provides for the establishment of a bail agency in the District of Columbia, and if enacted into law, the courts of this city would have the necessary arm outside the adversary system to gather and verify factual data concerning defendants for the purpose of

making proper bail determinations. Hearings have already been held on S. 2721 and it is my understanding that these hearings produced no opposition to it.

Recently President Lyndon B. Johnson in a special message to Congress urged the speedy enactment of this legislation. Therefore, I add my voice to those of the many other persons who have gone on record favoring the enactment of this legislation.

Recently it has been announced in the Washington newspapers that the District of Columbia bail projects grant will expire in September 1966, and it is already cutting back on its much needed services in the courts. Unless Congress acts to establish a permanent bail agency which will assume the very worthwhile functions already begun by this project, I believe that much of the bail reform intended by S. 1357 will not be carried out in the District of Columbia.

In the past few months, I made two special trips to the District of Columbia jail for the purpose of personally inspecting its much publicized overcrowded facilities. These visits made it perfectly clear to me that there is a pressing need to alleviate these overcrowded conditions and the most immediate remedy certainly has to be to effectuate the release of more people awaiting trial who are now languishing in that jail for long periods of time because they cannot afford bail or bond premiums.

Accordingly, I must urge that the Senate District Committee consider S. 2721 as a matter of priority, that it be approved by the committee as soon as possible, and passed by the Senate at the earliest possible date.

THE ULTIMATE BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, this is No. 743,096,481, formerly known as the junior Senator from Missouri, rising to the floor. Before I begin my remarks I want to compliment my good friend and colleague, No. 2,675,030,666, formerly known as the senior Senator from Rhode Island, for those excellent remarks just made. I also want to point out to Senator No. 6,438,772,194 that he is in error. I have recently spoken to my constituents, Nos. 714,346; 348,642; 743,821; and 348,643, and they have assured me on this point.

Mr. President, before I create another man from Mars scare, I want to clarify my last statement. Recently, we have been warned that a Federal Data Center is being planned, into which all information about our individual citizens will be fed. Our citizens will lose the little individualism they now have, and they will become merely a number which can be fed into this computer. One scientist, Dr. Orville G. Brim, Jr., head of the Russell Sage Foundation, has called this central agency that would pool all the public and private records on our citizens a Government dossier bank. Dr. Brim commented that:

> There is no doubt that we can run the society better with this information, but doing this would well be in conflict with all our fears of having privacy.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure intends to study this so-called Federal Data Center very carefully. Somewhere along the line toward Government efficiency we must cease pushing our citizens into the computer.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article on this subject which appeared in the recent May 16, 1966, issue of U.S. News & World Report.

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

[From the U.S. News & World Report, May 16, 1966]

A GOVERNMENT WATCH ON 200 MILLION AMERICANS?

Your life story may be on file with the Government before long, subject to official scrutiny at the push of a button. That's the trend.

It can lead to a data bank in Washington, storing up facts on everybody's records on schooling, jobs, taxes, arrests, other information.

Alarms are being sounded about the growing interest of the Government in private lives of its citizens.

A record of every important fact about every individual in the Nation, from the cradle to the grave, is gradually being built by Government.

Now there is talk of a Federal data center into which all or part of this information could be fed.

Here in one place could be a dossier bank on each of the Nation's nearly 200 million people. That bank would grow with the population and the growing volume of data on each individual.

Press a button and out could come the life story of any person, to be used for purposes of the Government.

Here could be tax records, records of any brushes with the law from traffic violations to indiscretions in youth or old age, school records, records of any personal transactions involving the Government.

Possibilities of abuse are described as extensive.

Even now, there are reports that income tax information—supposedly inviolate—is used at times to bring pressure on men in public office or businessmen who may not cooperate with men in high office.

It is promised that a data center for Government will be hedged about by assurances against abuse.

It is recalled, however, that Government promises often prove not to be permanently binding.

When the social security program was enacted 30 years ago, there was assurance that the social security number of an individual would be used only to identify his account.

Today the social security number is on most tax returns. Banks and businesses use people's social security numbers when reporting interest and dividend payments to the Internal Revenue Service. That number has become a universal identification number around which the lifetime record of every individual can be built.

Plans taking shape for the 1970 census suggest an interest in obtaining much more information about individuals, including possibly, their religious affiliations. The promise is made that this information would be kept inviolate.

However, some officials feel that the temptation would be to feed census information, coded to a person's social security number, into the Federal data center.

The trend in all government—local, State, Federal—is to centralize information on individuals.

Fingerprint files of the FBI now total more than 167 million. A nationwide system of crime reporting is being built around communication circuits and electronic computers.

Into the FBI, too, flows information about many individuals in a wide cross section of society. Much of this information is in "raw" form—unevaluated.

This question is asked: Could information of this type, much of it gossip, find its way into a central computer mechanism of the Government?

The Federal Government itself is moving its police power into wider and wider fields.

The number of FBI agents is to be increased, if President Johnson has his way, to step up enforcement of civil rights laws. Businessmen are finding Government more and more directly involved in policing their labor relations and their hiring practices.

Reports multiply involving more and more individuals.

All can be fed into the vast complex of computers that Government is building and now is thinking of centralizing.

WHY SOME ARE ALARMED

The potentials of this whole developing trend are alarming to a growing number of individuals who are aware of what is happening. This alarm grows from the possibility of abuse in a period when the Government shows what has been described as an expanding tendency to use its power against individuals.

Some in business recall how FBI agents swept into steel company offices in 1962 demanding records without a search warrant. President Kennedy, the night before, had used TV to attack this industry's announced price increase.

Other businessmen are aware of instances in which the Internal Revenue Service used the most modern techniques for "bugging" private conferences.

Information gathered in these and many other ways, say those who are concerned, might be fed into a computer system to build a dossier bank on individuals.

The growing use of computers by the Government brings this warning from Dr. Roger Revelle, director of Harvard's Center for Population Studies: "What happens to the citizen when his identity and every detail of his life are coded and classified in the Government's computing system? * * * Not only does it become impossible to cheat even in a piddling sort of way on your income tax, it becomes impossible to do almost anything without the Government knowing about it, and knowledge is liable to lead inevitably to control."

Dr. Orville G. Brim, Jr., head of the Russell Sage Foundation in New York, has dubbed a central agency that would pool all the public records on each citizen a "Government dossier bank."

Dr. Brim makes this comment: "There is no doubt that we can run the society better with this information, but doing this could well be in conflict with all our fears of having privacy invaded."

Dr. Brim would have the Government separate the identity of individuals from the mass of statistics it collects. "We must protect the individual against the chance of raiding parties by unscrupulous politicians," he says.

A New York sociologist puts the potential danger this way: "To the extent that knowledge is power, he who has access to dossiers has power."

TASK FORCE AT WORK

Proposals for a Federal data center have been made to the U.S. Budget Bureau by two private study groups. The idea now is being

considered by a top-level task force appointed by President Johnson.

Initially, the proposed data center would pull together in one place all the statistics collected by more than 20 Federal agencies. Among the major departments: Treasury, Agriculture, Labor, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Federal Reserve Board.

A survey shows that these agencies have 100 million punch cards and 30,000 computer tapes crammed with information about people and business.

A data center, it is argued, would bring more efficient recordkeeping for the Nation. At present there is said to be much overlapping and waste in collection of statistics and reports.

Material fed into computers at the data center would be available within Government and to business, research groups, and State and local agencies.

Precautions would be taken in the data center so that Federal officials would not make available any confidential material, according to officials.

HELP FOR PHYSICIANS

Also under consideration within Government is an idea for a medical data bank. This would set up on computer tapes the medical histories of all Americans. At the push of a button, a doctor could get the complete file on a patient—his illnesses, operations, shots taken, and the like.

This comment on a medical data bank was made by a doctor who knows about proposals to set one up:

"It would be a great thing. Computers do not forget the way patients often do. Material being fed into a data bank could help us spot an epidemic almost as soon as it got started."

But, again, dangers are cited of possible misuse of a medical data bank. As one doctor put it—

"Let's assume an individual had a nervous breakdown years ago, with subsequent complete recovery. Or even that the person contracted a social disease in his youth.

"Is this medical record to pop out of a computer at the touch of a button, say, by that person's employer? What might such medical information mean to an unscrupulous politician out to 'get' an opponent? Rigid safeguards would be needed to protect information in any medical bank."

Government officials say the idea of a medical data bank is still in the dream stage. However, one agency in Government already is sounding out computer manufacturers for cost estimates on equipment that would be needed.

OUT-OF-DATE DATA?

A major concern that is voiced about any data center is that it might contain out-of-date or questionable information that could prove harmful. As an example, a law professor is quoted recently as saying:

"I have filled out hundreds of detailed questionnaires on former students. My verdict on the emotional adjustment of a student I saw only in class may affect him for the rest of his life. It's damned unfair."

From a computer manufacturer's representative: "People change, yet there is the real possibility that records in a central file wouldn't be updated. Thus a bureaucrat passing on an application for a license, say, could turn down the applicant on the basis of something that happened years before, but which has no validity now."

A business executive worried about the trend toward central files tide to computers comments: "It is not going too far to see emerging the outlines of an all-knowing, all-seeing Government—Big Brother. Will college admission officials or employers eventually be going to a Government bureaucrat for clearance on young people under consideration?"

At bottom, the big worry is not the use of computers by Government. It's recognized that recordkeeping in today's complex world has reached the point where information can only be efficiently handled by high-speed computers.

SAFER ON TAPE?

"No one wants to wreck the machines that bring progress," says a Columbia University professor. He adds: "Information stored on a computer tape could be safer than material now in a file drawer.

"Codes can be devised so that computers will divulge information only to qualified recipients. Even among agencies of the Government there could be 'blocks' put into the computer system to prevent swapping of information—such as is now done to prevent Census Bureau material from getting into the hands of the Internal Revenue Service."

Still, growing numbers of people are concerned that safeguards on a central file could break down, that people in places of power would be able to get around restrictions. The most intimate details of people's lives might then be used for purposes much different from those intended.

Privacy of the citizen is seen as a protection against abuse of power. And a growing number of people see proposed data banks as posing a potential threat to that privacy.

Computers make it possible to set up central files on nearly 200 million Americans of the present and the added millions of the future. A Federal data center, now being proposed, would be built around the computer.

Washington today spends almost $2 billion each year in operating computers and adding to its battery of nearly 2,500 computers.

Capacity to record, store, compare, and analyze bits of information is practically unlimited.

To show the speed involved: In 20 seconds a man with a pencil can add two 12-digit numbers.

A man with an adding machine can do 10 such sums in 20 seconds. A pioneer computer pushed that up to 100,000.

Latest computers will do 160 million such computations in 20 seconds.

It's the potential for keeping track of every move of every individual through a Government computer center that is causing warnings to be sounded.

One phase of the growing trend toward policing by Washington of all Americans is emphasized by a Senator. EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, put it this way:

"I must report to you that the right of privacy—the right to go into your home without the fear that someone is secretly watching your every move, the right to talk freely with your attorney, your banker, or your wife without the fear of a hidden recorder or transmitter—this right is today being dangerously and recklessly ignored and violated."

The Senator revealed: "Our investigations of Big Brother tactics by Federal agencies have turned up some really incredible things.

"For example, the fact that the Post Office was turning over first-class mail to the Internal Revenue Service, which, in turn, opened the letters.

"The Internal Revenue Service runs a snooping school where the agent's graduation present is a set of lock picks. This school is still in full operation.

"A retired officer of the Federal Narcotics Bureau told us that all of his agents wiretap, regardless of State and Federal law.

"One year ago the IRS told us they did not have 'bugs' in conference rooms where attorneys meet with clients. Then, after my investigations, they admitted they had a few. * * * After we did some more investigating, they admitted that in 22 cities they had bugged conference rooms and, in 10 cities, conference rooms with see-through mirrors that permit agents to spy on taxpayers.

"We found * * * one private company which had sold nearly $100,000 worth of snooping equipment to 10 Federal agencies. Most of these Federal agencies had absolutely nothing to do with national defense or national security."

If the Government does set up a central file or dossier bank of personal data on people, there will be a huge store of information at hand to feed into it.

It will only be necessary to comb the records already gathered by public agencies—Federal, State, and local—and assemble these records in one place. Most people probably would be surprised to know how much information is on file about them. For example:

Census data: Every census gathers more detailed data than the preceding one. In 1960, controversy developed over questions about incomes and other personal data. Even more information will be sought in 1970.

Taxes: In files of the Internal Revenue Service there are the most minute details of people's private affairs. Nobody has any secrets from the tax collector.

Social security: In these files are data on 160 million people, living and dead.

Bank accounts: Federal agencies supervise banks and have access to records of deposits and other data.

Fingerprints: The FBI has more than 167 million sets of fingerprints.

Armed Forces: Detailed records, showing all manner of information on the millions who have served in the military, are in the official files.

Security: Extensive files are gathered on people who apply for any of the 3 million Federal jobs requiring security clearance.

Police: Millions of Americans are in the files of the police for various reasons, including offenses or indiscretions of long ago.

Schools: Courses, grades, I.Q.-test scores, personality profiles, teachers' evaluations—all this is only a portion of the records kept on those who go through school.

Drivers: The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads has a master file, on computer tapes, of all drivers whose licenses have been suspended or revoked because of involvement in a fatal accident or drunken driving.

That's just a sample of the data now kept on people. More detailed information is being compiled all the time. With computers and central files, it would be the work of a split second to tap this store of data on almost any person in the country.

FRANCIS BELLAMY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Francis Bellamy, clergyman and editor, led a full and varied life of 76 years: a Baptist minister for 12 years, serving successively as pastor of three churches; staff member and contributor to the Youth's Companion and to various other publications for another 12 years; advertising editor with Everybody's Magazine for 11 years; and advertising account executive for a final 6 years before his retirement. This was a life of service and achievement, marked by concern for social welfare, for the education of youth, and for political responsibility. Francis Bellamy's talent for concise statement, and his heartfelt passion for his native land, fused once in that noble and powerful statement for which his name is remembered today, the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. This statement, as Bellamy composed it for the national public schools celebration of Columbus

Day in 1892, sponsored by Youth's Companion, read:

I pledge allegiance to my flag—and to the Republic for which it stands—one Nation indivisible—with liberty and justice for all.

Today we have altered the phrase, "my flag," to "the flag of the United States of America," and we have added the words "under God." Otherwise, the pledge remains as Bellamy wrote it, and this pledge, and the spirit of loyalty which it inspires and expresses, stands today as a lasting memorial to the great soul and penetrating mind of Francis Bellamy. It is fitting that this Nation, to which he wrote so fine a tribute, should rejoice upon the anniversary of his birth on May 18, 1855. I therefore wholeheartedly concur in the movement to declare May 18, 1966, Francis Bellamy Day.

MORE CHANGES, MORE CHANCES—A SPEECH OFF THE BEATEN TRACK

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, occasionally among the thousands of speeches heard in Washington each year, there is one so off the beaten track that it surprises, delights and cheers us. Such a speech was one given recently at the Magazine Publishers Association by Edward Weeks, the editor who made the Atlantic Monthly important reading for all of us over many years.

It concerns first the art of tombsmanship, a subject not recently discussed on the Senate floor but close to Mr. Weeks' heart because of his recent retirement. I defy any one to read it without smiling. A hearty laugh will follow when one reads his account of "naked diplomacy" during the Teddy Roosevelt administration and his description of one man at one desk in the State Department in 1937 "trying to cope with the riptide of Russian aggression."

Editor Weeks gives us an idea to brood over when he quotes Sir Oliver Franks on the danger of a diplomat being away from Washington at the moment that this country "wakes up and finds itself in agreement." He gives examples of the part magazines play in bringing the Nation's readers to "that instant of crystallization" of sentiment. He shows us some of the ways "our national confusion" gets resolved. He closes with a sentence about the United States which I believe any Member of the Senate—any official in a democracy—will cherish:

Gentlemen, if there is a more fearless and independent body of readers anywhere in the world, I would not know where to find it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD. I commend it to Senators. It is quite evident that our friend of the Atlantic Monthly—even in his "entombment"—maintains the knack of slipping a solid gold nugget into what seems only enchanting froth.

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

MORE CHANGES, MORE CHANCES

(By Edward Weeks)

Mr. Stein, honored guests, fellow publishers, and editors, I trust you all noticed how sympathetically Mr. Stein lowered his voice when he came to my retirement. In no country in the world is the art of tombsmanship, the act of public embalming, so beautifully displayed as in the United States. It is true that the Soviet Union for a number of years spectacularly embalmed two of its national heroes, Lenin and Stalin, and when they found that Stalin's record would not wash they had him removed in the dead of night, and narrowed their display to one.

But in America every leader in his profession, every business executive, even an editor, as he passes the cutoff point of 65, is entombed, with a burst of fireworks. For an interval he is feted at receptions; he is given a Paul Revere bowl; his portrait is unveiled, there are banquets at which things are said about him which he may believe but his wife never—and then, like Stalin, he quietly sinks into the shadows. Not the Egyptians, not the Russians, not the Chinese will ever rival us at tombsmanship—and part of the artistry is that it is all wrapped up and over within a month.

Speaking of entombment may I divert your attention for a moment to the State Department. My friend, the former Ambassador William Phillips, is today one of the oldest living graduates of State; he began in 1903 as a private secretary to Ambassador Rufus Choate in London and his next post took him to Peking under our Minister, Mr. Rockhill. In his book, "Ventures in Diplomacy" Bill Phillips writes that when he began his duties in Washington 60 years ago the entire personnel of State numbered 167 persons and the diplomatic mail was delivered by an ancient Negro messenger who placed the envelopes in wire baskets hanging on the outside of the office doors, the baskets being marked, "Secret" and "Confidential." Teddy Roosevelt was then President and as Phillips played good tennis and liked to walk he was soon a member of what was called the "Tennis Cabinet." In the intimacy of the White House he heard T.R. tell of a tramp he had just taken with M. Jusserand, the French Ambassador. When they reached Rock Creek the President proposed that they swim across: he stripped, plunged in and was soon on the other bank. Whereupon the Ambassador followed suit but when he sputtered out of the water, like Teddy in the buff, it was seen that he had forgotten to remove his brown kid gloves. That happened 60 years ago in the days of what we might call, "naked diplomacy."

In 1937 when another Roosevelt was President we were seeking to persuade the Soviet Union to repay us for the American investments which had been confiscated during the revolution and our policy was based on a blend of martinis and soothing sirup which it was thought would make the Russians amenable. Indeed, the faith in F.D.R.'s influence over Stalin was such that the Russian division of the State Department was reduced to a single room containing two desks: at one desk sat the man who was in charge of our affairs with Poland; at the other sat George F. Kennan, a well-qualified but solitary diplomat who did not believe in the efficacy of soothing sirup. It seems hardly credible that less than 30 years ago we had one man at one desk trying to cope with the riptide of Russian aggression.

Today, although I am sure there are times when President Johnson must wish he could tell General de Gaulle to go jump in the Potomac, our Executive can no longer indulge in that form of "naked diplomacy". Nor does our State Department, now having a personnel of 15,000 in Washington, delegate the Russian problems to one man at one desk. I have used those two vignettes to illustrate how great a change has overtaken us since Pearl Harbor; never in history has a nation been obliged to accept such untested responsibilities as we have taken on in the past two decades.

In this world of urgency and peril, of belligerency and caution, of generosity as spontaneous as the Marshall plan, and of destruction as cynical as the defoliation in Vietnam, the magazine editor, like the members of Congress, must deal in futures, must live with crises which admit no quick solution, and must everlastingly seek for explanations his people will understand. To this task we must bring both vigilance and humility. And on Monday mornings which I find the most exhilarating in the week we bring something else: the realization that the more changes that occur the more chances we have of strengthening our American destiny.

A few years ago on the occasion of Walter Lippmann's 70th birthday the corps of journalists tendered him a luncheon at the National Press Club. It was not an entombment for everyone realizes that Walter is not replaceable. His response on this occasion is worth recalling:

"Last summer while walking in the woods and on the mountains where I live I found myself daydreaming about how I would answer, about how I would explain and justify, the business of being opinionated and of airing opinions reguarly several times a week.

"Is it not absurd, I heard the critics saying, that anyone should think he knows enough to write so much about so many things? You write about foreign policy. Do you see the cables which pour into the State Department every day from all parts of the world? Do you attend the staff meetings of the Secretary of State and his advisers? Are you a member of the National Security Council, and what about all those other countries which you write about? Do you have the run of 10 Downing Street, and how do you listen in on the deliberations of the Presidium of the Kremlin? Why don't you admit that you are an outsider and that you are therefore by definition an ignorramus? How then do you presume to interpret, much less to criticize and to disagree with, the policy of your own Government, and for that matter of any other government?"

And he closed with words so honest and so searching that they brought a rising acclaim:

"If the country is to be governed with the consent of the governed, then the governed must arrive at opinions about what their governors want them to consent to."

We editors are always straining to reach the moment of crystallization, when readers will look up from our pages and say, "Yes, that is exactly what I think. That writer has added the whole thing up correctly." I remember hearing Sir Oliver Franks, when he was the British Ambassador in Washington, comment on the differences between the British and American democracy. He said, "One of the first things a diplomat in your country learns is not to be away from Washington for too long. You people have your own singular way of making up your minds. Things drift along in a seemingly aimless fashion in Congress and your commentators and editorial writers at many points of difference, and then all of a sudden one bright morning the country wakes up and finds itself in agreement. A consensus has been arrived at and the design accepted as if it came down from on high. A diplomat should not be away from your Capital when that moment occurs."

The magazine editor plays a powerful part in bringing readers to this instant of crystallization: it is his unique opportunity to provide the summation of a point of view. Each of us works this out in his own way. In the spring of 1940, in my third year as editor of the Atlantic, I heard that Nehru, president of the Nationalist Party in India, had been jailed by the British and I assumed that since he had time on his hands he might do a little writing for us. So I invited him

to do an article on the India which he saw emerging when the war was over. Only the British would have passed on such a request to a political prisoner, and only the British would have released to me the firmly reasoned, impassioned declaration of Indian independence which Nehru wrote. Even today Nehru's words have a bite as you can tell from this brief quotation:

"The tragedy is that Britain should have encouraged, and should continue to encourage, disruptive and reactionary tendencies in India in order to preserve her imperial interests. She will not preserve them, for they are destined to go, but they will go in hostility and conflict if no better way is found. The day when India could submit to external impositions is past."

The only thing wrong about this article was my timing; for it appeared in print less than a month before Dunkirk and when people had time to reflect they were so concerned with the future of Britain that they had small thought for the future of India. The Daily Worker was the only American periodical to notice Nehru's declaration of independence and they reprinted it in full without asking permission. Yet had I published this very same article at the war's end in 1945, it would have come far closer to the moment of truth.

But at the war's end there were two of my rivals who were unerring in their timing. When Harold Ross sent John Hersey to Hiroshima to do an anniversary article on that terrible cataclysm and then devoted an entire issue of the New Yorker to this shocking, pitiable story, he touched the American conscience to the quick. And when in July of 1947 Hamilton Fish Armstrong, the editor of Foreign Affairs, persuaded Mr. X, the nom de plume of George F. Kennan, to define "The Sources of Soviet Conduct"—and how they might be contained by the free world, that article paved the way for an agreement on "the containment policy," which has endured to this day.

The more changes, the more chances there are for an editor to resolve our national confusion. That is what John Fischer of Harper's did with the penetrating article, "The Illusion of American Omnipotence" by D. W. Brogan. It is what Max Ascoli did in the Reporter with his two unsparing articles on the China lobby. It is what James Shepley of Life did with his article, "How Dulles Averted War," which held some surprising confidences of John Foster Dulles, then the Secretary of State, and incidentally coined the word "brinkmanship." It showed us what Dulles' policy was good for—and where it was dangerous.

There is a bit of the missionary in every American and in our zeal to defend the free world we sometimes forget that our right arm, our power to defend, can only be as strong as our heart is strong here at home. Let me call to your minds the more striking magazine articles which have warned us of how vulnerable we are. People will long remember those irrefutable papers which foretold, in the New Yorker, the destruction of our balance of nature by the pesticides, the series on "Silent Spring" which Rachel Carson wrote as she was dying of cancer. People are still talking about the issue of Scientific American which Gerry Piel published last fall depicting so vividly the plight and the hope of our great cities just at the moment when we were setting up a Department of Urban Affairs. Every magazine has been engaged in the struggle for civil rights. I take a partisan pride in the articles on "The South and the Southerner" which Ralph McGill, at my urging, wrote for the Atlantic; I listened when James Baldwin describes "The Fire Next Time"; and I took a vicarious pride in that penetrating symposium on "The White Problem" which John Johnson put together in "Ebony" in August of 1965.

Some of our troubles like that of Watts in Los Angeles are too intricate and too stubborn for any immediate solution and in such cases we keep the pressure steadily applied. This is what Gardner Cowles has done so effectively in Look. That trenchant article, "Three Who Died," was the work of a three-man Look team, and it is the best summation of why those convulsive Negro riots occurred. It is like Mike Cowles' editorial philosophy that you do not let matters stand after one such survey; he believes that the steady and continued exploration of a dangerous subject will provide the cumulative understanding we need. There are others who share Mike's conviction: think of Barbara Ward and of how steadfastly she has appealed for aid other than weaponry for the more vulnerable new nations. Think of James Bryant Conant and how patiently and with what illumination his articles have helped to raise the standards in our public schools.

I said earlier that editors face their responsibility with vigilance and humility. It is a humbling business to try to scan the future. "The future," says Walter Lippmann, "is not predetermined in any book that any man has written. The future is what man will make it; and about the present, in which the future is being prepared, we know something, but not everything, and not nearly enough." In our struggle for truth I think you will agree that we are aided by the most conscientious and responsive body of readers this Nation has ever known. For 43 years I have been studying the reading habits of Americans. I remember how complacent we were in the golden twenties, how little concerned with what was going on in Europe. I remember how self-centered and resentful we were in the depths of the depression. I remember how slow we were to rouse ourselves against Hitler's terrible threat in the late thirties.

History has a way of sending us telegrams. Some of these telegrams are a shock, but we read them and take them to heart; others seem so shocking that we throw them away unheeded. History sent us two portentous telegrams in the 1930's. One was from John Maynard Keynes, and when we had had time to study it and to understand what he meant by deficit financing, we found the answer to unemployment and a defense against the alternating booms and depressions which had wracked this Nation for 150 years. The second telegram which was even more shocking and which we did not heed came to us from Hitler in the form of "Mein Kampf." The first translations of "Mein Kampf" reached us in 1933 but not until years later, not until 1939 did we read the complete text and realize that he really meant what he said.

Editors and readers alike, we have become a very different people since 1946. Our electorate listens to the televised news in the early morning and again before supper. It follows the newspapers closely, not just the sports page, the murders, and the comics. Since 1946 our electorate has shown an insatiable demand for history, for the best thinking on foreign affairs, and for fearless, unsparing explanation of what we must do about civil rights, conservation, the use of drugs, the pollution of air and water, the ratlike corruption that always gnaws at the American fabric. Gentlemen, if there is a more fearless and independent body of readers anywhere in the world, I would not know where to find it.

PROPOSED TREATY ON OUTER SPACE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun carried a cogent editorial this morning in support of President Johnson's proposal of a treaty governing the use of outer space.

The President has rightly seized the initiative by proposing the development of such a treaty now, rather than waiting until after the expected problems arise.

I do not believe that anyone would benefit from proliferating our earthbound conflicts into outer space. On the other hand, the advantages of cooperation in space exploration are significant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Baltimore's Sun's editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

SPACE TREATY

President Johnson's appeal for a treaty to prevent space explorations from posing "serious political conflicts" is historic and welcome. He is quite right in saying that now, on the eve of actual ventures to the moon and beyond, is the proper time to establish rules for the conduct of nations in space. We hope he is correct when he says "the time is ripe" for agreement on those rules.

Only the United States and Russia have the capacity for space voyage at the moment, but that will not always be. It is to the advantage of both nations, and to the advantage of all the others who will follow in developing the necessary technology, to outlaw war and narrow national exploitation in space. Much of the modern bloody history of western man stems from the colonial conflict that followed the discovery of the "new world." Those conflicts were not prevented by the two great powers of another day dividing up the spoils between them. The knowledge and possible riches of the planets are tempting, and the best time to agree that those riches belong to all is now, prudentially in advance.

The strategic implications of national control of the moon, the planets and space are still murky—but still ominous. The President rightly asks agreement on the proposition that no weapons of mass destruction be stationed by any nation on celestial bodies. If the major powers could agree to that now, it would be a further step toward stability, as logical and promising as the partial test ban treaty.

For scientists the benefits of space cooperation are obvious. Presently there is much duplication of effort and priorities of a nonscientific nature often are imposed on programs because of political pressures.

For the taxpayer, too, there would be benefits from cooperation. The space program is enormously expensive and will continue to be, but it could be much less expensive if there were no military-political necessity to conduct so much of it on a crash basis.

PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, Dr. W. E. Davis, a Baptist minister from Newport, Ark., is—like many of us—concerned about the rapid proliferation of pornography in America today.

Dr. Davis, founder and director of the Clean Literature Crusade expresses his concern in the following words:

America's moral stream is being polluted daily by the filthy-fingered pornographers who fling their filth and vend their vice from every newsstand in America. Yet, when one dares to protest their moral pollution he is accused of censorship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article entitled "Clean

Literature Crusade Launched by W. E. Davis," printed in the RECORD.

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

CLEAN LITERATURE CRUSADE LAUNCHED BY W. E. DAVIS, NEWPORT MINISTER

(By W. E. Davis)

America's moral stream is being polluted daily by the filthy-fingered pornographers who fling their filth and vend their vice from every newsstand in America. Yet, when one dares to protest this moral pollution he is accused of censorship.

Cutting out from society the cancerous growth of pornography is not censorship. Cleaning out the Augean stables of America is not censorship. On the contrary, this is cleansing America, this is protecting the American people and the American home as much as fighting on the battlefields of the Nation for the security of our coastlines.

America has a moral consciousness which needs to be aroused and activated. Sir, at this very moment, an enemy, as potentially pernacious as bombs from Peking, rockets from Moscow, or missiles from Havana, is spreading its poison through the body of our United States. This foe is all the more deadly because it is not even recognized as a threat to the ultimate safety of our country.

Yet the sad and oft-repeated lesson of history teaches us that in vain does a bronze shield defend the heart of a country if the innermost core of the nation's heart is eaten away by the dry rot of immorality.

So it is in our cherished country today. The purveyors of pornography and vendors of vice pose as deadly a threat to our national survival as the most dangerous weapon in the armory of communism.

A house of sand will become a sturdy structure in comparison to the fragility of our civilization if the mortar of moral fiber is withdrawn from between the stone blocks of our National Temple.

Entire civilizations have been built or destroyed by the effects of books. The reading of a good, clean book, such as the Bible, will have a beneficient effect upon society. At the same time, the reading of a bad, dirty book, such as "Mein Kampf," will have a baneful effect upon society.

Yes, we as Americans, are living in a time of tremendous moral crisis. This moral crisis is evident in many phases of American life, but perhaps there is no areas wherein it is better illustrated than in the field of literature.

For example, the latrine literature advanced by the National Council of Churches advocating a "new morality"—found wide acceptance in the religious world. The pursual of this pornographic propaganda has produced the theological theory—"God is dead."

Likewise, in our schools and colleges, boys and girls have drunk the drippings from depraved minds until today demonstrations desecrate the "land of the free and the home of the brave."

Literature, it seems to me, has an obligation to uplift, not to degrade. This is especially true of the material presented to young minds in their formative stages. In the minds of the generation which will one day lead our Nation, we have an obligation, a moral obligation, if you please, to inculcate an appreciation for the best our society has to offer, not a morbid interest in its more sordid aspects.

To a great extent, a literate nation is what it reads. Our reading material directs our thoughts. Our thoughts, in turn, direct our actions. Our actions congeal to form our habits. Our habits mold our very characters.

Arnold Toynbee is reported to have said, that of the 21 civilizations which have arisen and vanished, 19 fell from internal decay.

So, my interest, sir, is not censorship, just a concern about the moral foundation of America. It is a sad commentary upon the lofty profession of journalism when any individual will editorially erode the moral foundations of our "Great Society."

May I conclude by saying—"Extremism in the defense of decency is no vice. Moderation in respect to morality is no virtue."

THREAT TO PROJECT MOHOLE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the immediate and unfavorable reaction which resulted from the action of the House Appropriations Committee last week in disapproving funds for Project Mohole. Specifically, I refer to two editorials from responsible newspapers expressing concern over the future of the project. One editorial appeared in the Honolulu advertiser last Saturday; the other in the Washington Post this morning. Both make a strong case for continuing this scientific project as a matter of national interest.

As one who has long supported Project Mohole, I take the view that the project should be continued—that its potential for providing mankind with new and needed scientific information about the earth's structure outweighs the costs involved.

I quote from the Honolulu Advertiser's editorial:

It is possible to sympathize with the Representatives in their enormous task of trying to squeeze waste out of a $14 billion money bill for 23 Federal agencies. We wish them luck so long as the cutting and pruning are judiciously exercised and those projects tossed on the scrap heap are truly expendable. That is good Government.

But we are budgeting billions for space exploration. It is deemed in the national interest to do so and to land a man on the moon by 1970. It makes no sense, therefore, to eliminate the one project afoot that may tell us what matter we will find out there and how to cope with it.

A kill in funds now would kill the entire program—"As if we had never started," said Dr. George P. Woollard, head of the Institute of Geophysics here at the university and spearhead of the Mohole project—$30 million would be down the drain.

It seems at this moment when the spending of Federal funds is being examined so critically, we may find that we cannot afford not to go ahead with Mohole.

If what the scientists say is true about its value to the space program, we shall have to come back to it eventually—behind the Russians?—at a time when the cost could be billions, not millions.

I commend the Honolulu Advertiser for stating the case for restoring funds for Project Mohole so clearly and cogently.

The Washington Post editorial also advances convincing arguments against abandoning the project. I ask unanimous consent to have the Post editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 9, 1966]

PROJECT MOHOLE STYMIED

Project Mohole, an ambitious but uncertain scientific attempt to pierce the earth's crust, has become a victim of the war-spurred congressional economy drive. The House Appropriations Committee has denied it funds for fiscal 1967. Even though there is reason for concern about Mohole on both cost and management counts, a complete cutoff of money risks the loss of the funds already invested.

The ambitious plan to drill through the earth's crust 30,000 feet under the Pacific Ocean off Hawaii has caught the imagination of world scientists. It is exciting to speculate about what might be learned from samplings taken so deep in the earth. Moreover, if the huge unanchored drilling platform planned for Mohole actually works and if the drilling process itself works, they may be of great assistance to the oil industry as its offshore exploration moves to deeper waters.

But there are three reasons for doubt about Mohole. First, the prospective cost has risen sharply. Estimates now are about $80 million and some authorities foresee a total of as much as $130 million—substantially more than envisaged even last September when the administration's scientific advisers gave their final approval. Second, there is a feeling within Congress that the project has been mismanaged by the National Science Foundation, which was not originally constituted as an operational agency. Third, Mohole's principal champion, Representation ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, died in February, and there seemingly is no one else with the same interest in pushing appropriations for it. Thus critics and skeptics have an open field.

Yet it would be a pity to abandon this effort to learn more about the environment of the planet on which we live—especially when there is still so much attention to the mysteries of outer space. Complete withdrawal from the Mohole project would mean writing off an investment of some $50 million. Perhaps the requested new appropriation of $19.6 million is excessive; but cannot enough be provided to keep the project on a standby basis so that it may be resumed at a more favorable time? Surely the scientific community and the White House ought to urge reinstatement of enough funds to keep Project Mohole cranking in low gear.

COMMUTER TRAIN CUTBACK IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I make no comment on the legal aspects of the New Jersey Public Utility Commission's decision in the Erie-Lackawanna case. But its practical effect is clear. Railroad commuter service in our metropolitan New Jersey-New York region is about to be reduced still further.

By now everyone should know that you cannot help ailing railroads by lopping off a few—or many—trains. Invariably the effect is to accelerate the downhill slide by driving the ever-shrinking band of patrons to other, more convenient, more dependable means of transportation.

Commuter passenger service will survive only if the commuter can be attracted back to the trains. But to do this will require providing frequent, reliable, on-time, comfortable trains and safe, clean, attractive terminals.

This, in turn, will require, as I long have urged, the development of a unified, balanced transportation system to serve the whole region, not just a few parts of it. And it now seems clear that we can no longer avoid the conclusion that such a coordinated system can be provided only by a competent, bistate or tristate agency.

A LESSON IN COURAGE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is a real pleasure to pick up a paper and

read a sports column like the one written by Merrell Whittlesey in the Thursday, April 21 edition of the Evening Star.

Under the heading, "Orioles' Bat Boy Gives Lesson in Courage," Merrell Whittlesey has written the story of Jay Mazzone, 12-year-old son of a Maryland State trooper who is bat boy for the visiting clubs at Memorial Stadium in Baltimore.

When he was only 2, Jay was nearly burned to death. Now he has hooks for hands, and skin has been grafted over much of his body. These handicaps do not get in his way, however, and he asks no favors. He performs his duties as bat boy with energy and efficiency, and has gained the admiration of all visiting players.

Merrell Whittlesey is to be commended for bringing the story of Jay Mazzone to the public's attention as an example of great courage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 21, 1966]

ORIOLES' BAT BOY GIVES LESSON IN COURAGE

(By Merrell Whittlesey)

Visiting ballplayers in Baltimore's Memorial Stadium have a gentle, sober reminder this season that base hits, errors, and earned runs are not the most important things in life.

The bat boy for the visiting clubs is Jay Mazzone, 12-year-old son of a Maryland State trooper who was burned close to death when he was 2½ years old. Jay has hooks for hands—his were burned off above the wrists in a fire in his back yard—and has skin grafted over much of his body.

But this spry youngster carries his cross with distinction. The ball players eye him with sympathetic interest when they first spot him, but both Yankees and Senators took him to their hearts. They flip his cap, pat him on the back, and watch him with admiration.

Jay is not looking for sympathy. He cares for the bats with the hooks he uses for hands in a professional manner. He doesn't need any reminders. Jay is on top of every play, in batting practice and during the ball game.

He takes off his school clothes and dons his baseball uniform, with the No. 1 on the back, without any help. For the first two games of the Yankee series last week, his dad was there to tie his shoes. But his father was on duty during the third game and Bobby Richardson, the Yankee second baseman, observed the youngster tying his shoes with the hooks and offered to help.

But Jay said no thank you, sir, and tied them himself. But he said last night before the Senators' game that Mr. Richardson and Bobby Murcer, the young Yankee shortstop, were extra nice to him, and he remembered them and Mr. Crosetti, the coach.

Frank gave Jay a half-dozen new balls and a ball autographed with all the Yankee names. The youngster was very appreciative.

The players appear reluctant to ask Jay about his accident, but he is not backward to those who overcome their hesitance.

He and his brother were playing in the backyard of their home in Pleasantville, N.J., where their father at the time was a city policeman. They were near a trash pile which had kerosene cans on it, played with the can, and the kerosene spilled over Jay's snowsuit.

Then he was too close to the fire. A spark ignited the suit and he went up in flames. For a month it was touch and go as to whether he would live. Skin was grafted from the few unburned parts of his body, his dad gave skin from his legs, back and stomach, and Jay pulled through.

Jay's family moved to Baltimore 4 years ago when his father was named to the Maryland State Police force and last year a friend of his father wrote to the Orioles and Jay was invited to try out for bat boy. He served one series for the Tigers and one for the Orioles. This year he was told the visiting clubs were his own.

Jay is a sixth grade student at Sinclair Lane school, where he asks no favors.

He plays on an organized football team and uses foam rubber padding for hands. He is a right fielder on a baseball team and uses a special glove with a hook apparatus. He swims, plays table tennis and knows how to use a rifle.

In the basketball season he is a ball boy for the Baltimore Bullets.

Jay said that Coach George Susce and Bobby Saverine were particularly attentive to him among the Senators, but all of the players seemed nice, although he had them on two losing nights.

"He hustles every minute," Gil Hodges said last night, with admiration. "Look at the bats, every one in place. If there is a loose ball, he grabs it in his hook and tosses it to somebody.

"I was watching him during our first game and in an idle moment he grabbed a bat and was pounding on a resin bag, handling the bat just as though he had hands."

Jay has a locker in a corner of the visiting clubhouse. He changes clothes without help. Earlier he brought a candy bar from the clubhouse to the bench, peeled off the paper with his hooks, and held it in the cold steel frames as he ate it.

The ballplayers watch him quietly and his courage makes baseball seem awfully unimportant.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS RETIREMENT AND ANNUITY FUND

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate Calendar No. 1101, H.R. 11439.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 11439) to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes, which has been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Effective", to strike out "the first day of the third month which begins after the date of enactment of this amendment" and insert "December 1, 1965,"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "such effective date" and insert "December 30, 1965,"; in line 9, after the word "month", to strike out "latest published on the date of enactment of this amendment," and insert "of July 1965"; and on page 5, after line 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect December 1, 1965.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS: SYMBOL AND SUBSTANCE

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, President Johnson's visit to Mexico last month demonstrated once again the strong bonds between the United States and Latin America, the enormous good will and affection for the United States that can be found to the south.

It also demonstrated that even in the midst of crisis in Vietnam and difficulties in Europe, the President of the United States does not forget that to the south are lands of 230 million people, with whose future we are and must be intimately concerned.

And most important, the President used this occasion to remind all the people of the Americas—North and South—that the United States stands unequivocally for democracy and for social justice; that—

> We will not be deterred by those who tenaciously or selfishly cling to special privileges from the past, and and we will not be deterred by those who say that to risk change is to risk communism;

that the alliance is nothing less than a "social revolution."

These are welcome words, beyond question a commitment to the ideals of the Alliance which must help to still the doubts of any, in Latin America and the United States, who question the depth and duration of those ideals.

What the President has done, however, is no signal for others of us, in the government and elsewhere, to relax our own efforts. Rather, it is a challenge to all of us to move forward, beyond the principles he has so clearly enunciated; to help turn his words into action; to apply these principles to the complex and difficult problems that are the face of reality in Latin America.

For the greatest danger confronting the Alliance for Progress is that its great exhortations to economic progress, to social justice and democracy, may become, in the press of day-to-day demands, no more than words. The charter is no precious talisman, to be taken from its case and exhibited periodically; it must be *used*. Its ideals must pervade every aspect of our policy. It must govern not only the necessarily infrequent acts of Presidents—but the daily actions of every member and part of the U.S. Government with responsibility in Latin America.

It is to the detailed working out of the President's policy—the great efforts and hard choices ahead—that I address myself today; to discuss some of the areas in which we must concentrate our atten-

tion, the areas on which the President touched so eloquently in Mexico City.

But before discussing specific problems, there is one element of our policy that must be clear—one constant thread running through all our days:

That we associate ourselves with the aspirations of the Latin American people for a better life—for justice between men and nations—for the dignity of freedom and self-sufficiency. These demands are in part material; above all, they are demands of the spirit.

But we must realize that the demands of the spirit—the demands for justice and a sense of participation in the life of one's country—are the essential precondition to material progress. The dispossessed and the landless will not strive and sacrifice to improve land they do not own, in whose proceeds they do not share. Parents will not sacrifice to insure education for their children, the children themselves will not study, if the schools to which they go end in the third grade, and if they are considered unfit for admission to higher grades. Individual entrepreneurs will not flourish in a closed society, a society which reserves all wealth and power and privilege for the same classes, the same families, which have held that wealth and power for the last 300 years.

We will understand the demands of justice—and help to meet them—only by a renewed consciousness and dedication to our own heritage, to the dreams of liberty and justice which have sustained this Nation since our birth in revolution less than two centuries ago.

Without this spirit, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, all our efforts will be useless.

With this spirit, no matter what the obstacles, any material poverty can be overcome.

I. THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

THE CHARTER

Five years ago this spring, President Kennedy called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress, "a vast cooperative effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose, to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work and land, health, and schools—techo, trabajo y tierra, salud y escuela. And he proposed "a vast new 10-year plan for the Americas—a plan to transform the 1960's into a historic decade for democratic progress."

That proposal was accepted by all the Latin American nations—except Cuba. In August of 1961, at Punta del Este in Uruguay, 20 nations signed the charter of an Alliance established on the basic principle that free men working through the institution of representative democracy can best satisfy the common aspirations of man. The charter pledged efforts at development—setting a target of at least 2.5 percent per year growth in income per person. But it was far more than a promise of economic development. In addition it pledged—

A more equitable distribution of national incomes, raising more rapidly the income and standard of living of the needier sectors of the population;

Diversification of national economic structures, to reduce dependence on a limited number of primary products;

Acceleration of industrialization, particularly of capital goods, to increase productivity; storage, transport, and marketing;

Comprehensive agrarian reform, with a view to replacing latifundia and dwarf holdings by an equitable system of land tenure so that, with credit, technical assistance, and improved marketing, the land will become for the man who works it the basis of his economic stability, the foundation of his increasing welfare, and the guarantee of his freedom and dignity;

The elimination of illiteracy and a sixth grade education for all school-age children;

Improved health, including new water supply and sewage services for 70 percent of the urban and 50 percent of the rural population;

Expanded housing and public services for urban and rural population centers;

Stable price levels, but always bearing in mind the necessity of maintaining an adequate rate of economic growth; and

Cooperative programs designed to prevent the harmful effects of excessive fluctuations in foreign exchange earnings derived from exports.

And the United States pledged at least a billion dollars a year of assistance of all kinds, to help make these changes possible.

THE ROOTS

This Alliance for Progress was a response to the demands of the 1960's; its roots run deeper and further in time. In the past, the United States had acted as "protector" of hemispheric stability—intervening militarily in Latin American nations 21 times just in the period 1898 to 1924. And too often our great strength was used, not to advance the freedom and aspirations of the Latin American people, but in the name of stability, to protect our short-range economic interests.

Military intervention ended with the Good Neighbor policy; the last marines left the Caribbean in the 1930's, and relations improved through inter-American cooperation in World War II.

But in the years following World War II our attention, energies, and resources were largely concentrated on the great and urgent task of rebuilding Europe and working for the containment of, and then a just and stable peace with, Soviet power. Latin America was neglected and ignored. In the 15 years after the war, we provided $30 billion to Europe; $15 billion to Asia; but only $2.5 billion to our own hemisphere, to help the declining economies of an entire underdeveloped continent. We were content to accept, and even support, whatever governments were in power, asking only that they did not disturb the surface calm of the hemisphere. We gave medals to dictators; praised backward regimes; and became steadily identified with institutions and men who held their lands in poverty and fear.

In the late 1950's the failures of this policy, or lack of policy, erupted into anti-Americanism and the growth of communism. Our Vice President was mobbed and stoned in Caracas. Communist revolution—caused less by Castro and his band in the Sierra Maestra, than by the bloody and corrupt tyranny of Batista which we supported to the moment of its collapse—took power in Cuba; and his defiance of the United States received the secret admiration of many who hated communism, but rejoiced to see the discomfort of the huge and seemingly callous giant to the north.

Thus were we awakened from what Roberto Campos called the perilous lull. Latin American leaders seized the opportunity to press for change: President Kubitschek proposed a great Operation Pan America; revolutionary statesmen like Romulo Betancourt in Venezuela and Eduardo Frei in Chile received new strength in their own countries, and new recognition from the United States. In August of 1958 we had agreed to the creation of the Inter-American Development Bank and, in the Act of Bogotá, committed ourselves to take some tentative steps toward social reform. Now, in 1960, Congress authorized $500 million for a Social Progress Trust Fund to be administered by the new Bank.

And the stage was set for the great adventure—the Alliance for Progress—an Alliance whose goal was nothing less than to lift an entire continent into the modern age; receiving not only the blessings of its technology and the abundance of its economy; but above all, seeking human dignity and personal freedom, living in the ideal that all men deserve an equal chance to share in the blessings of this world.

This was the difference between the Alliance and all our previous relationships with Latin America. President Kennedy saw that what was important was not the statistics of economic development, but the human and spiritual reality behind them. It would matter little that a nation's economy grew by some millions of dollars, if those dollars were not used to improve the lot of the dispossessed and hungry poor. No material improvement would bring dignity to the lives of men unless other men treated them with the respect and dignity that are the due of citizens in a just and democratic state. And there could be no lasting peace in the Americas unless relations between all the American nations were founded in deep and genuine respect, for the hopes and rights and future of the people in every part of the hemisphere.

As President Kennedy saw, the Alliance was not and could not be a program of U.S. assistance, but a cooperative effort among all the nations of the Americas. It embraced not simply economic progress, but social justice, political freedom, and democratic government. It was an attack not just on poverty, but on the oppression and exploitation of man by man which had too long been the ruling pattern in the hemisphere.

This was a pledge of revolutionary change, for Latin America as well as for the United States. But the need for change was not universally accepted, either in Latin America, or in the United States; nor, despite President Johnson's efforts, is it universally accepted today.

There are still those who believe that stability can be maintained, and communism defeated, by force of arms; that those who have waited three centuries for justice can wait another so that old privileges may be preserved; that the economic machinery of the 20th century can be developed and managed by social structures which were outmoded in the 18th.

But there can be no preservation of the status quo in Latin America. The central question before us is not whether we can prevent change, but, as President Kennedy put it, whether "man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by free men, working within a framework of democratic institutions."

To appreciate the force of that question, and the meaning of the choices ahead, it is first necessary to look at what is in Latin America; at its geography and resources, the legacy of the past and the stirring currents of the future.

II. BACKGROUND FOR CHANGE

I returned from Latin America with impressions and emotions as varied as the peoples and places of that vast continent.

For it is varied; each nation has its own institutions, its own history, its own dream of the future. Income standards, education, numbers and composition of population, the quality of life and living—all vary greatly within and between nations.

Still they share many characteristics in common. And foremost among these is the feeling of admiration, respect, and deep affection which their people arouse in the visitor. In the words of the Mexican economist Victor Urquidi:

> These people have endured three centuries of colonial rule, a hundred years of civil war, invasion and various forms of organized bloodshed, a good deal of exploitation by domestic landowners and foreign investors, the effects of the world economic depression of the thirties, and, more recently, the hot and cold wars of the great world powers—and, throughout it all, an almost intolerable amount of corruption and repression.

Even today, they cling to life with a precarious hold; it is as if they were not of the land, but only on it. Life is short, the works of man seem impermanent; it is for some as if Pizarro came only an instant before. Governments sometimes seem to come and go almost at random, and the dynamics of change may seem entirely arbitrary: a civilian government may infringe on army privileges; or the navy may come into conflict with the army, or two branches of the army with each other; or a popularly elected President may go mad, or the army remove another for alcoholism.

Political labels, to the eye of a North American, are confusing, and make uninformed judgments dangerous. Latin Americans themselves are sometimes bedeviled by the overlap and contradictions between parties or factions. There is a "right" of the past, of the old landed oligarchy, and a "right" of the present, of business and commerce. There are popular forces of reaction, for example Peronism; there are popular forces of democratic progress; and there are popular forces of Marxist socialism or communism.

The divisions and antagonisms may be as great between the two kinds of right-wing forces as they are between left and right. There are similar antagonisms between the popular forces; and the former dictators Odria in Peru and Peron in Argentina got the votes of the poor slum dwellers through government programs for their benefit, though neither one was either democratic or progressive, and each repressed even mildly Socialist parties of the left. And many political factions, in this many-faceted politics, have their own military allies—too often ready to seek by force a predominance not conferred by the electorate.

Inflation—the cruelest of taxes on the tenant farmer and the unorganized worker—is in some countries endemic, and the savings of millions may be almost wiped out in a year. Yet even such harrowing uncertainty does not touch millions of Latin Americans who live entirely outside the money economy.

HAZARDS OF GEOGRAPHY

The continent has not been physically conquered. The distances between places are immense: 745 miles from Guayaquil in Ecuador to Lima, Peru; then 1,600 miles more down the west coast to Santiago; to Buenos Aires another 706 miles; to Rio de Janeiro, 1,200 more; and from there to Caracas another 2,810.

And between many of these places lies almost nothing—nothing but mountains and deserts and vast plains or jungles. Chile is 2,630 miles long; just over 8 million people live there, nearly 3 million in and around the single city of Santiago. It is as if the population of New York City were strung out from Goose Bay, in Labrador, to Key West, with the Rocky Mountains less than 100 miles from the Atlantic. Capital cities, which may hold one-third or even one-half of their countries' populations, often sit like islands in midocean, cut off by a hostile Nature from contact with each other or with the world outside.

This is true between countries. Peru and Chile are neighbors; they are separated by a great desert on which no men live. Between Chile and Argentina rises the great cordillera of the Andes; between the cities of Brazil and those of Venezuela or Peru are the unexplored jungles of the Amazon. But isolation and insularity are the rule even within nations. Peru, for example, is a seacoast nation, with an advancing export economy based on marine products. It is also a mountain nation, a place of scattered inaccessible villages where peasants have never heard of the United States—where even the word "Peru" has no meaning. And it is a nation of Amazon jungle beyond the mountains, a jungle which is no closer to the thoughts of Lima than to the thoughts of Washington or Indianapolis.

As Walter Lippmann has incisively pointed out, this geography has severely limited progress in the past, and still does today. Economic integration is handicapped because it is cheaper to ship goods from Europe than across the Andes. The Indians of the altiplano, the high plain of Peru, live almost as if the conquistadores had never left, or even come, in part because from their village it may take weeks of lonely journey to reach the capital, Lima. Millions of peasants are apathetic because their miserable poverty is the only way of life they have ever seen. The aimlessness of much of Latin American politics must result from the severe limits the land places on the possibilities of action upon which a meaningful political life must focus. And the extent to which Latin American governing classes have lacked concern for the welfare of their people probably results in part from the fact that people and places of misery have seldom seemed like parts of the same country in which the more fortunate lived.

THE LEGACY OF THE PAST

The people of Latin America struggle with more than the hazards of geography. They live also with the inheritance of history—as Teodoro Moscoso has written, a history of conquerors,

> who sought above all the gold and the many other riches of the new world. * * * They established in their new world, * * * the authoritarian rule of the elite which was the mode of government at home. * * * Indians in the Western countries and Negroes on the shores of the Caribbean and the Atlantic were serving as workhorses on plantations and rocky farms while the landlords enjoyed the finer things in life. * * * They produced bananas, sugar, wheat, meat, metals, and other food and raw materials that industrializing nations in Europe and North America were eager to buy. In short, economically they were very much like the African and Asian possessions of the European powers.

There are many legacies of this colonial period. One is the basic economy of much of Latin America—dependence on single commodity exports, relative lack of industry, absence of a mass market, prevalence of government monopolies. A new group of entrepreneurs, often the most progressive and liberal members of their communities, and a similar group of public servants, typified by Raul Prebisch of Argentina and UNCTAD, Hector Hurtado of Venezuela, Carlos Sanz de Santamaria of Colombia and the CIAP, Roberto Campos of Brazil, and many others, have worked to reform this system; its prevalence in spite of their efforts attests to the strength of the past.

But the past lives, more importantly, throughout the social structure: in education systems designed for a social elite; in concentrated land ownership; in constitutions which in some areas may effectively disenfranchise 80 percent of the electorate; in a feudal disdain for productive investment and for the hard work that is the lot of the majority.

POVERTY

The final legacy of this pattern of development is poverty and degradation and want, the statistics of which have become almost a litany.

Income per person is often less than $100 yearly; the average for all of Brazil is at most $300 and may well be less; 60 percent of the people of El Salvador have incomes of less than $55 a year.

Ignorance is standard in nearly all the countries; in Colombia, for example, only 60 percent of all children enter the first grade—and 90 percent of these have dropped out by the fourth grade. Fifty percent of all Latin Americans are illiterate.

Disease and malnutrition are almost everywhere; half of all the people buried in Latin America never reached their fourth year.

To travel in Latin America, to see the terrible reality of human misery, is to feel these statistics with stunning force.

In Recife, there are people who live in shacks by the water in which they dump their refuse and garbage; the crabs which feed on that garbage are the staple of their diet.

In fields nearby, men cut cane in the broiling sun from dawn to dusk, 6 days a week—and take home $1.50 for their week's labor; children under 16 make half as much; the minimum wage of 60 cents a day is not enforced. In some of their villages, and in others which we visited, 7 out of 10 children die before their first birthday—and there are primary schools for only one-quarter of those who do survive. In other villages nearby, a new factory has contaminated the water supply—and the mortality rate for children and adults is catastrophic.

In Peru, outside Cuzco, we met men working their landlord's fields for 45 cents a day, a good wage in an area where others must work 3 days with no pay beyond the right to cultivate a small mountainside plot for themselves. They had never heard of President Kennedy or President Johnson; they had never heard of the United States; they did not know the name of the President of Peru; and they spoke no Spanish, only the Quechua tongue of their Indian ancestors. In one village, I was introduced as the President of Peru—because, according to our Peace Corps guides, the mayor said he had dreamed, shortly before, that the President of Peru was coming to his village.

And everywhere, in and around every major city, were the slums—incredible masses of tin or tarpaper or mud huts, one room to each, with what seemed like dozens of children coming out of every doorway. Called barriadas in Lima, poblaciones callampas in Santiago, villas miserias in Buenos Aires, favelas in Rio de Janeiro, and ranchitos in Caracas, all are the same—vast numbers of peasants who have come to the cities in search of a better life, but find no work, no schools, no housing, no sanitary facilities, no doctors—and all too little hope.

And in Peru, Brazil, and in other countries of Latin America are the Indians not only cut off from the outside world but frequently their own political structures, desperately crying out for the help that will bring them into the 20th century.

These are some of the obstacles which confront the people of Latin America. Yet they have endured. They have sustained a faith in democracy and the value of the individual. They have, as the world saw last month in Mexico, kept a great fund of friendship and admiration for the people of the United States. They have produced some of the finest artists and poets of our time. And they have preserved a spirit of spontaneous gayety and humor, even in the midst of adversity, that is a lesson to all of us elsewhere in the world.

But we should not be surprised. For greatness is also part of the legacy of Latin America.

It is a legacy of civilizations—Mayan and Aztec and Inca—built before the white man came, whose buildings and treasures still thrill the eye.

It is a legacy of the proud and audacious men who came to conquer a continent—not with great armies, but with bands of a few hundred.

It is a legacy of men like Fra Bartolomeo de las Casas, who began a crusade for the welfare of the Indians in the 16th Century.

It is the legacy of Hidalgo and O'Higgins and San Martin and Bolivar—the liberators who caught the fire of our own revolution and sought liberty and equality for all men in the Western Hemisphere.

NEW WINDS BLOWING

These legacies, this spirit, are alive today, perhaps more than ever before. Everywhere we traveled, the ideals of independence and freedom and justice are a moving, active force. Everywhere, it is this legacy which is thrusting forward, the future seen plainly on the faces of the people.

Latin America is poor. But Venezuela's gross income is already on a par with Southern European levels of a few years ago, and is rising every year.

Latin America is short of trained people. But in Brazil and Chile and Peru, the "new men," economists and engineers and administrators, are stretching their considerable talents in the cause of progress.

Latin American politics have too often been restricted to upper class involvement. But in Chile and Venezuela and Peru, we saw democratic parties speaking for the majority of the people and acting in response to their interests; and in every country men and parties are dedicated to new progress—and to ancient ideals of justice.

For Latin America is on the move. Every legacy of the past, every state of rest, is under assault by the forces of change.

We saw change in the barrios of Caracas, where Peace Corps-type projects of community organizations and self-help are being carried on by an Accion force made up primarily of Venezuelans.

We saw change in the countryside of Chile, where agricultural workers are organizing unions to better their wages and working conditions, and ultimately to secure land for themselves.

We saw change in Sao Paolo, where new industries and new prosperity have built a boom city as contemporary as anything in the United States.

We saw change in remote villages in Peru, where students are working with poor peasants to build schools and housing and public facilities.

And we heard of change everywhere—from Bolivia, where 400,000 people have come down off the high plain, following a new road into the jungle to clear and cultivate new lands; from Minas Gerais in Brazil, where other thousands are following the new roads to Brasilia; from the mouth of the Orinoco in Venezuela, where a new Pittsburgh is rising.

This is the progress that is beginning in Latin America; but still for most Latin Americans there has been little progress, little fulfillment. The old dreams of freedom and justice, independence and democracy, have received a new form and new life in the charter of the Alliance; but the obstacles to progress have not been overcome.

To achieve the ideals of the Alliance, the aims which President Johnson expressed so well last month, there must be, as he said, a social revolution.

For there cannot be steady jobs and housing and economic security; there cannot be schools for all the children; and there can be no democracy, or justice, or individual dignity without revolutionary changes in the economic, social, and political systems of every Latin American nation.

And these changes the people of Latin America are determined to have. The coal miners in Concepción, laboring 5 miles under the sea for $1.50 a day—the mothers in Andean villages where schoolteachers tell the children that their parents' tongue is the speech of animals—the canecutters and laborers watching their children die—the priests who see the teachings of their church violated by the lords of the land—these people are the engines of change in Latin America.

These people will not accept this kind of existence for the next generation. We would not; they will not. There will be changes.

So a revolution is coming—a revolution which will be peaceful if we are wise enough; compassionate if we care enough; successful if we are fortunate enough—but a revolution which is coming whether we will it or not. We can affect its character; we cannot alter its inevitability.

But to say this is only the beginning; the question is now how the revolution is to be made and guided.

At the heart of the revolution, underlying all hope for economic progress and social justice, are two great and resistant problems—education and land reform. Both education and land reform are needed for economic growth. No amount of capital, no purely economic measures, can bring progress unless each nation has the trained and skilled people to do the work of modernization and change. Nor can any industrial economy be built on a failing, inadequate and obsolete system of agricultural production.

But these are far more than economic measures. No matter how rich or powerful a nation may grow, children condemned to ignorance, families enslaved to land they cannot hope to own, are denied the dignity—the fulfillment of talent and hope—which is the purpose of economic progress. Progress without justice is false progress—and a false hope. Thus education and land reform must be at the heart of our concern for change in Latin America; and among

the highest priorities of Latin American Governments themselves.

III. LAND REFORM

THE NEED

Unproductive agriculture is probably the major factor in Latin American poverty. As a continent, Latin America does not feed itself. Sorely needed foreign exchange is spent to import food—$140 million for 8 million Chileans alone. Insufficient nutrition saps the strength and productivity of many of the hemisphere's workers.

Over half the continent is engaged primarily in farming (in contrast to the United States where farmers are less than one-fifteenth of the labor force). Much of the labor of the subsistence farmers of Latin America is relatively wasteful; often they cannot feed themselves decently, let alone produce surpluses. By contrast, agriculture has provided the greater part of increases in our own productivity and wealth; agricultural productivity has risen 6 percent yearly, as against about 2 to 3 percent in manufacturing.

The lack of productive employment on the land reverberates throughout Latin America. Children drop out of school because of their poverty. Manufacturing languishes because there is no mass market. The cities receive great new influxes of people who apparently feel that poverty in the city is at any rate more exciting than poverty in the countryside.

In short, no solution to Latin problems is possible without great progress in agriculture.

This was recognized by the charter of the Alliance, which called for comprehensive agrarian reform; by President Kennedy, who placed it at the head of his efforts for the Alliance; and again by President Johnson in Mexico City. And it is recognized throughout the nations of Latin America, where land reform is in the forefront of public attention.

But still the Inter-American Bank tells us that the fundamental pattern of the agrarian structure has not changed in the past few years; food output per person is just where it was 5 years ago.

Toward this vital goal of the Alliance, we must make greater progress.

LAND REFORM: THE ELEMENTS OF A PROGRAM

True land reform requires much effort, of many different kinds.

First, land must be redistributed. Many Latin American farmers are really laborers who own no land at all; they have neither the incentive nor the means to increase production. Of those who do own land, the great majority farm less than 10 acres, which are likely to be of poor quality. Throughout Latin America, it is estimated that more than 70 percent of the landowners control less than 4 percent of the land. Ninety percent of all land is controlled by less than 10 percent of the landholders; and there are nations in which less than 1 percent of all landholders control nearly 70 percent of the land.

Thus, one family in Peru owned over 300,000 hectares, or 741,000 acres—an area nearly as great as the State of Rhode Island.

The smallest plots, the dwarf holdings, can build up no capital—for fertilizer, for machinery, for better seeds; their poor and unschooled owners are largely ignorant of better farming methods. But neither have the great latifundia often been more productive per acre than the smaller holdings. Most owners are absent. Their workers are uneducated and underpaid, with little incentive. The very size of the estates has allowed their owners to become wealthy without substantial capital investment to increase productivity. In Peru, for example, haciendas of over 2,500 hectares are one-tenth of 1 percent of all farms, and hold 60 percent of all the acreage; yet they cultivate less than 5 percent of their land—as against smaller farms which cultivate half or two-thirds of their area.

For these reasons the charter of the Alliance called for the replacement of latifundia and dwarf holdings by an equitable system of land tenure; it recognized that redistribution of land, to create adequate family-size farms and cooperatives, must be the basis of a productive and efficient agriculture.

It was recognized also that redistribution of land is essential for the dignity and freedom of the man who lives on it. Like the framers of our own Constitution, the framers of the Alliance believed that an independent, propertied yeomanry would be the surest foundation of democracy and political stability. And surely we in the United States—a nation built on private property—will understand the importance of assuring the widest possible opportunity for the ownership of private property in other nations.

Land redistribution is a complex and difficult task. Efficient use of land must be rewarded and inefficient use penalized; complicated formulae may have to be devised to take account of such factors as whether land is irrigated. The method of compensation for land which is taken for redistribution will usually present serious difficulties. And the lack of a basic system of recording land titles, or even determining who actually owns land, can delay distribution for years.

Moreover, redistribution may well result, in the short run, in lowered agricultural productivity, and lowered food shipments to the cities—creating additional hardships for city dwellers and additional obstacles, such as inflation, to economic development. Further, many of the farmers of the hemisphere are unprepared for independent ownership; and it would be tragic if we were now to repeat the history of land reform in Mexico, where much land distributed in the 1920's was sold off to large holders within 20 years.

Yet for all the problems, all the difficulties, land must be redistributed. Over the long run, it is an essential step toward a productive agriculture. But it is much more. Land reform is the essence of human dignity and democracy in Latin America. To give land to the man who works it is to give him, for the first time, a degree of security—something more than subsistence living—a place to stand for his rights as a citizen, a share and a stake in the society around him. As our own Daniel Webster said in 1820:

> The freest government, if it could exist, would not be long acceptable, if the tendency of the laws was to create a rapid accumulation of property in few hands, and to render the great mass of the population dependent and penniless. * * * Universal suffrage, for example, could not long exist in a community where there was great inequality of property.

The question then becomes, what else we must do to make redistribution work. What are the additional needs of an agrarian reform program?

Fences, seed, fertilizer, machinery, livestock—these are as important to farm output as the land itself. But Latin American smallholders have neither these things nor, as a rule, access to agricultural credit with which to buy them. Farmers must be instructed in the use of their land and tools; but there are no land-grant colleges, no extension agents or advisers, to help the new farmer to make his land more productive.

And when he produces more, the farmer will have to send it to market. But agricultural marketing is also in a rudimentary state; only the relatively few cash-crop plantations have convenient and direct access to markets, and there is much to be done by way of standardizing grades and prices and quality, and creating a structure of middlemen between farmers and consumers which can assure a fair price to the farmer, not taking all the profit for themselves; all these are essential to a modern agricultural market.

To make a real land reform—to build an agricultural system which will feed these nations and support their farmers—will therefore require the creation of a new institutional structure. Agricultural credit, training for farmers, extension services, new networks for transportation and distribution—all these are difficult to build; but all must be created.

Next, the geography of Latin America must be overcome. For there is simply not enough acreage under cultivation. In Peru, for example, there is under cultivation about one-half of an acre per person. President Belaunde has set an average of three-quarters of an acre per person as a target. But even this is far from the U.S. average of over 2 acres per person under cultivation. Given the low productivity of land in Latin America, Peru would need to more than quadruple its present acreage under cultivation in order to match our food output per person.

Increases of anywhere near this magnitude will require a great colonization effort east of the Andean Mountains—in that part of Peru, three-fifths of its territory, which is part of the Amazon Basin. And this in turn will require efforts of many different kinds. Roads are the first priority; but schools and housing and other facilities will also have to be built for any new settlers. More basically, we do not yet know how to raise many crops in the Amazon Basin; temperature and rainfall levels have so far prevented systematic colonization. Thus major efforts at research in tropi-

cal agriculture are necessary; and even after new techniques are developed, it will be necessary to instruct tens of thousands of farmers in their use.

In summary, then, "land reform" must be far more than an attractive slogan. Real improvement in Latin American agriculture, and in the lives of those who till the soil, requires decades of effort—economic, educational, and social.

It requires a commitment and it requires action—and that action must come now.

LAND REFORM: POLITICAL

But these efforts are only part of what is required. Land reform requires a great political effort; for it is, at the root, a political question: of the will and determination to reform the basic social and political system of a nation.

Land is the principal form of wealth in Latin America; its possessors, while by no means all-powerful, still are highly influential everywhere, and naturally resistant to reform. Large-scale land redistribution necessarily implies major changes in the internal political balance of many Latin American countries—away from oligarchy and privilege, toward more popular government.

Improvements in the educational system, also vital to comprehensive land reform, would also work great changes in the political balance. Representation of any area in the Brazilian Congress, for example, is based on total population. But illiterates are ineligible to vote; and in some areas, dominated by large landowners, up to 80 percent of the people are illiterate. This illiteracy gives to the established groups in these areas great leverage in the Congress; there is a vested interest against educational improvement.

Establishment of agricultural credit institutions for farmers may threaten local rural moneylenders—or established urban banking interests. Channeling higher education resources into agricultural service and improvement would mean denying to middle- and upper-class students some of their present monopoly on university study, and limiting their opportunity to take liberal arts and law courses.

All these changes, the essential components of a serious land reform program, raise basic social and political issues. Nearly all will be as difficult to resolve as basic issues within our own country, now and in the past—States rights, slavery, tariffs, economic reform. All require the creation of new institutions and patterns of behavior. All will give rise to basic divisions in the countries affected—at the root, the question, "Who governs?"

Thus there is no such thing as "pure" economic development in Latin America. Development depends on change—on new balances of wealth and power between men, on new justice in the courts of the market. Economic development requires hard political decisions; it therefore depends on political leadership, political development, political change. A better life for the people of Latin America can only come out of progress toward a better, more democratic political and social structure.

WHAT WE CAN DO

There are two ways in which the United States can help to accelerate comprehensive land reform in Latin America.

First, we can help with material assistance, in money and technology—for the training, schools, personnel, equipment, and roads which, as I have described, are necessary.

Agriculture, like any other industry, requires investment. All but a few Latin American nations are desperately short of investment capital; this we can help to supply.

We can help with technical assistance. In Venezuela, for example, 1 year's work by agricultural technicians taught farmers to increase their corn yields from 1,000 to 2,300 kilograms per hectare; they expect to reach 4,000 kilograms per hectare. But this experiment required a ratio of 1 technician to 30 farmers; to duplicate it throughout the hemisphere would require a million agricultural technicians.

Clearly, we do not have this many trained people. But we do have far greater resources than we now are using.

Our agriculture has been built, not by government, but through the work of the land-grant colleges, the State extension services, the voluntary associations such as the Grange and the 4–H clubs and the Farm Bureau and the Farmers Union. We have made a first step toward using these State and local skills in a partnership between Chile and California and other similar partnerships of the Alliance.

But this is only a beginning. We could directly involve these institutions and individuals in the work of development—for example, by subcontracting our agricultural development program in a specific country to a single State or group of States. Through their own extension services, and the volunteer groups, they could supply managers for our AID funds. Without creating great new bureaucracies, we could secure the service—the energy and devotion and skills—of tens of thousands of Americans on less than a career basis.

In the long run, of course, all these jobs should be done by Latin American technicians; and we should help to train as many as are required. But Americans can help, on a short-term basis—and, given the opportunity, I believe they will.

Second, we can help Latin Americans meet the political challenges of land reform—above all, by clearly identifying and associating ourselves with the forces of reform and social justice. In nearly every Latin American nation elections are fought on the basis of the Alliance and its ideals; the great partnership that is the Alliance gives substantial weight to the opinions and feelings of other men and governments in the hemisphere. Strong association of the United States with land reform will everywhere help its supporters, and make others more reluctant to oppose it.

The basic work of reform, of course, is and must be for the people and governments of each Latin American nation. There are limits to the role the United States can play; I will discuss those limits later. But we can help; and we certainly can help by not extending our material and moral support to those who actively oppose necessary political, economic, and social change, including the comprehensive land reform which is at the heart of development efforts.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is an unusual and welcome speech. The Senator from New York has not only set forth appropriate goals but he is also spelling out in detail many hard, tough facts, unapproved but highly relevant to an understanding of South America.

I am particularly delighted at the Senator's linking of land reform and education.

I ask the Senator if it is not true, that to achieve effective land reform it is very important that the kind of education which is necessary for farmers to be productive be made available to Latin Americans? Would not the county agent system, which has been so enormously successful in this country—and the agricultural extension courses be immensely helpful to a successful program of land distribution among farmers? Is it not true that if farmers get land and do not have the ability, education, and training to enable them to utilize modern agriculture techniques, there not only could be an inability to produce but political reactions against the resultant rise of food prices?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct. I think that that is the heart of it.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin. If we concentrate only on redistribution of land and do not take other steps, so that when land is redistributed and a farmworker takes over some land and does not know how to till the soil, or use any of the more modern techniques to make his land productive, I think we are going to be in greater difficulty.

There is going to be an adverse reaction in the country and particularly in cities where a large portion of the population lives because food prices are going to go up. There is going to be an adverse reaction in the countryside because people are not going to get the benefits they expected.

The promise to them is not going to be fulfilled unless we take the other steps. At the same time we have land redistribution we must take the steps to make sure that those people who work with the land know how to use it and deal with it: We must make sure they are educated enough to use modern techniques that must be made available to them. An example of this would be how to use fertilizer.

The present Presiding Officer [Mr. HARRIS] and I traveled in the same area in Brazil last fall, and there we saw individuals working land 12 hours a day, 6 days a week, for $1.50 a week, with no possibility of educating their children or owning the land in the future, and without the kinds of agriculture training they

need to become useful citizens, or for their families to become useful citizens.

In my judgment, and I am sure in the judgment of the present Presiding Officer, as I have talked to him, this situation is going to be catastrophic, not only for that country but for the entire hemisphere.

As we concentrate on the problems of Vietnam and other problems that appear to be more explosive at the moment, I hope that we do not ignore this part of the world which is going to be so meaningful, not just for the Senator from Wisconsin and myself, but those who take over in this country, after we leave.

If the people in these countries feel that they have no future, that the land does not belong to them, that the society does not belong to them, and they cannot obtain a reasonable opportunity for their children in the future, in free institutions, they will move in different directions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am somewhat surprised, and I do not question the Senator's assertions, but I am surprised to find on page 11 the following statement:

> This is the progress that is beginning in Latin America; but still for most Latin Americans there has been little progress, little fulfillment.

I had thought that statistics which I have seen for 1963, 1964, 1965, and a projection for 1966, indicated an increase in productivity in Latin America that has exceeded the goal set by the Alliance for Progress—not by much, but by a little, and that the per capita increase has also been somewhat better than had been expected.

Has this income been so badly distributed that most Latin Americans have been left out?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is one of the problems. Statistics are only numbers—they do not measure improvement in the lives of the poor. Also some countries have done much better than other countries.

If one were to look at the overall average he might be somewhat encouraged, since a good number of improvements have been made. But the population has grown so rapidly in many of these countries that the output per individual has not increased over the last 5 years.

I am going to talk about the expanding population within Latin America and some things that I believe need to be done about it.

With all of the effort we have made in the problems of Latin America, we have not gotten our heads above water because of the fact that many of these programs have not been so successful as they might have been; second, that the benefits have not been distributed properly; and third, the explosive population growth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I welcome the reference of the Senator both in his text and in his off-the-cuff remarks indicating a revolution is coming and the indications of that revolution. We have seen the terrible implications of revolution in Cuba. We realize what a threat that kind of bloody Communist revolution is to this country and to citizens in Wisconsin, New York, and other States. If the revolution is not orderly, if it is not in the democratic direction, it is very likely to be in the other direction. The other direction could constitute a real threat to our security.

I also appreciate the Senator's realistic emphasis on the obstacles which we face; that this is not a situation where we can simply say we are for land reform and support some kind of government program or appropriation which would distribute land. The New York Senator stresses the point that it will require new institutions and new patterns of behavior, and change will require new struggle.

Unless we realize that there are going to be setbacks, and a lot of division in this country, as well as in South America over this kind of program, and a lot of dispute here about whether or not we can proceed in this kind of necessarily revolutionary way, I think we will not achieve what we wish to achieve.

I believe it is important that we recognize that it is going to be a long, tough, hard road. There will be setbacks and discouragement certainly for a while. We can expect to be at times in conflict with the government in authority in some Latin American nation over these objectives.

Unless we realize that, and are prepared for it, we may not have the heart to continue to help. This will take years, decades of patient, painstaking, costly, dangerous work for this country; but the the alternative to this peaceful revolution may be a Cuban revolution on a continental basis, or a Vietnam military action against Communist subversion costing billions of dollars and many lives.

I believe it is most helpful that the Senator referred to what happened in Mexico. There was land redistribution, but in a few years the land was repurchased by large estates. Unless land reform is accompanied by a well-integrated program of agricultural training, transportation improvement, agriculture credit, and a number of other things that take time and patience, we will not help the Latin Americans to overcome the enormous obstacles that their countries face.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I say to the Senator from Wisconsin that as we realize the tremendous problems in Latin America, certainly Mr. Castro and those who are associated and identified with him also realize them. But for them, these problems create a potential for unrest and division.

In a broadcast from Havana in the last few weeks, a dozen countries were named in which Castro and communism are going to make a major effort, through violence, to overthrow the existing governmental structure.

We have a moral responsibility—and some people may take issue with this—because of our gross national product of approximately $700 billion and because of the level of affluence that exists in this country.

Half the people of Latin America die before the age of 4 because they do not have enough to eat, because of lack of decent water, because of no doctors. I do not think we can live in isolation from these problems that exist elsewhere in the world. We have that responsibility.

Beyond that, we have a problem of self-interest. We are spending now at least a billion dollars a month in Vietnam to kill people and to fight a war. What we are talking about here is funds for the whole of Latin America, to help them to help themselves. What we are talking about here, at this juncture, is the expenditure of money equivalent to that spent in 3 or 4 weeks in Vietnam, to help the people of Latin America to help themselves.

From the standpoint of our moral responsibility and our self-interest, we should head off what is likely to occur in the countries of Latin America during the next few years. This can be accomplished by taking the steps to which I have referred.

In traveling through Latin America, one is impressed by the fact that something can be done. It is not a situation in which one becomes discouraged. There are problems and difficulties, but something can be done. The leadership and direction of the United States and the interest of this country in the countries of Latin America are required in order to attain these goals. We cannot become interested in Latin America only at the time another Castro arises. If the Latin-American countries can only attract our interest, our concern, our leadership, and our direction by having another Castro, then it will be too late.

We learned our lesson during the 1950's. Castro's rise was not caused just by negligence on the part of this country. What brought about Mr. Castro and communism in Cuba was our support of Batista; and Batista, not Castro, was the major cause of communism in Latin America. The question is whether or not we learned the lesson of the fifties, so that we can apply it to the sixties. Are we learning the lesson of southeast Asia, so that we can apply it to Latin America?

This is the time we should take steps to head off difficulties 5 years from now. If we do not, we will not be able to head off these difficulties. If we say we do not have an emergency in Latin America and therefore we are not going to pay attention to that area and are not going to take the necessary steps, then we are going to pay for it in spades, in my judgment, for many years in the future.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

IV. EDUCATION

THE NEED

Education is the second major problem embracing both progress and justice. And it is of primary importance to Latin America—as to every nation.

Education is not only important to understanding the world and each other—it is the key to the future, the foundation of progress in the modern world. No nation, not one, has entered the ranks of modern economic society without trained and educated people to run the factories, manage institutions, guide the government, draw plans. Without them all the money and loans are worthless.

Education is the key to progress of another kind: like land reform, it is a

passport to citizenship. As Horace Mann put it:

> A human being is not, in any proper sense, a human being until he is educated.

Men without education are condemned to lives as outsiders—outside political life, outside the 20th century, foreigners in their own land. Men who are illiterate cannot read newspapers, or instruction manuals, or even the road signs by which we guide our footsteps. Even for those who can read, further education is the key to social and economic mobility and freedom; there can be no career open to the talents without the education which develops talent.

But education, the key to progress, is sadly lacking in Latin America. There are not nearly enough trained and educated people to run the machinery of modern society. And the illiteracy of 50 percent of all Latin Americans inhibits progress of all kinds—economic, social, and political.

Popular education, in the sense in which we understand it in the United States, is only beginning in most countries. The Latin American nations have made great efforts to build schools and add teachers in the last 5 years, increasing enrollment in primary schools by 6 percent yearly, and secondary enrollment by more than 10 percent a year.

But statistics of improvement can be misleading. The school-age population is also mushrooming—so that, in some countries, there are more illiterates now than there were 5 years ago. In rural Peru many primary schools do not go beyond the first grade; in none of the five countries we visited were there schools available for all children above even the third grade. And dropouts, due in large part to poverty, illness, and lack of facilities, make the top of the education pyramid narrow indeed. Of 1,400 Brazilian children, for example, 1,000 enter the first grade, and 396 the second. Of these, 169 finish the fourth grade; 20 complete high school; 7 enter some form of higher education institution—and perhaps 1 of the original 1,000 who entered the first grade will finally graduate from the university. That is 1 out of 1,400 Brazilian children. Even in Argentina, where 10 percent of the college-age population are enrolled in universities, only 4.9 percent of those who do enter the university leave it as graduates.

Quality standards also are often low. In Peru less than one-third of elementary school teachers have any professional training—and 15 percent themselves are only elementary-school graduates. Even in the universities throughout the hemisphere, professors can teach only part time, and must hold outside jobs to live. In Buenos Aires, at the best medical school in Latin America, 1 microscope and 1 cadaver must be shared by 40 students.

And the educational resources available are not sufficiently directed toward the task of development. Fully 20 percent of university students study law; an equal number study medicine; more pursue a classical liberal-arts curriculum. Less than one-twentieth of the students are preparing for work in the critical field of agriculture, and too few prepare for work as engineers or teachers. Secondary schooling is academic, directed at university entrance—though only a small fraction of those who attend secondary schools ever enter college—and does not provide the skilled and semitechnical manpower which is needed in the factories and workshops of the continent.

The production of the educational system, in sum, is a very small group of professionals at the top; all too few middle-level workers, without vocational training; a great mass of the semieducated and semiliterate; and tens of millions, adults and children, without any education whatever.

PROGRAMS FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Improving educational levels is by its nature a gradual process; there is no short cut. To teach more children, we need more teachers; to get more teachers, we need more college and high school graduates; to have more graduates, we need to teach more children.

The United States can help this process with money and with people. Already, Peace Corps volunteers teach thousands of children, and help many local communities to build schools. Many of our universities aid universities in Latin America; some have established branch campuses there, to advance the exchange of faculty, of students, and of ideas. U.S.-donated food feeds hundreds of thousands of students, and U.S. assistance has built thousands of new schoolrooms throughout the hemisphere. All these efforts can and should be intensified, especially efforts to build educational institutions, as by aid to departments of education. I welcome President Johnson's new emphasis on education in our international development programs.

There is a type of educational assistance which we have not yet made available to Latin America; I urge that efforts to make it available go forward with all possible speed. In the last few years, our universities and industry have developed dozens of new educational techniques—teaching machines, educational television, programed instruction. No one contends that these machines are all there is to education; but they can make a major contribution to learning where teachers are in short supply and poorly trained. We should now investigate the applicability of our new techniques to education in Latin America, especially at the primary level. And we should help Latin Americans acquire and use whatever, out of our educational inventory, will be of help to them.

I would point out that not all these resources will be found in universities. One of Latin America's greatest needs, for example, is for subprofessional medical personnel, to work in the remote rural areas. The greatest body of such personnel that we have developed are the medical corpsmen of the armed services. I suggest that we now explore ways in which the trained technicians and experience which have been developed in the military can be made available to Latin America, so that they may develop medical technicians competent to meet the most pressing needs of people in areas without doctors. But our money or teachers or techniques or administrators can do only the smallest part of the necessary job.

We can help make school available to more people. But more schools will not themselves erase the poverty which largely causes the overwhelming dropout rates. Keeping more children in school, therefore, requires major improvements in the lot of the poor: comprehensive land reform in the countryside, and increased employment in the cities. Without such economic progress and social reform, great new investments in education will largely be wasted; all must go forward together.

Moreover, the aid we offer will not be used unless Latin Americans themselves make hard political decisions—decisions to open education to a far wider proportion of their people, and not reserve it as a privilege of the more fortunate few. In some countries, such as Brazil, for example, secondary schooling is mostly private, and universities are supported by the States. Thus, those who can afford to pay for high school are given free higher education; but most of those who cannot pay for secondary schooling do not get even that. For this policy to be reversed—the state to pay for high school and possibly a different policy to govern fees for university study—is a political decision for democracy, which is a Latin American responsibility.

Above all, improving education requires decisions by those now receiving an education to contribute their time and work to the education of their countrymen. This elite—the university students—are the key to better general education, as they are to every other hope for progress in their society. But this is another problem.

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

"Problem" because it is just that. Part of the problem is politics. The University of Caracas has for some years been the center and command post of Communist terrorism in Venezuela; other universities elsewhere are also centers of extremist politics. We need only note what has been happening at the University of Mexico City. Fidel Castro was not the first Latin American revolutionary to come out of student politics—nor will he be the last. One Latin American president told me that the students were his second most serious source of difficulty. And one of the most disturbing moments of my 3 weeks in Latin America was when a group of Communist students burned the American flag.

Not all student activists are extremist or irresponsible. Many Latin American students have in the past given their lives for independence and freedom. Many others have come to lead their nations toward reform and progress, such as Presidents Betancourt and Belaunde and Frei. There are activists today, building schools and roads and clinics and houses, the first generation of Latin American students to soil their hands and bend their backs. There are Peruvian students working in the slums of Lima and in the Andean villages. Some Chilean students are the backbone of the Peace Corps-type programs in their own country. And I saw Venezuelan

students working in community-action programs in the barrios of Caracas.

But those who are radical and not active are far more numerous than those who are active—whether extremist or constructive. And in this combination of extreme speech and little action is great danger for their countries, and for the United States.

The primary danger is that the real problems of Latin America, which depend greatly for their solution on these very students, will go unsolved.

A second danger is that extreme speech will contribute to further political and social instability.

And a third danger is that the social problems aggravated by inaction will be blamed upon the United States.

I saw this happen again and again in my travel last fall. Students in Peru blamed the United States for the military coup in Brazil. Students in Venezuela blamed the United States for the weakness of the OAS. Students in Chile blamed the United States for their border quarrel with Argentina. And students everywhere blamed the United States for poverty and stagnation in their own countries. Repeatedly, I had to state the simple fact that what the United States did would mean far less to their countries than what they themselves could do.

What are the roots of extremism among the sons of a class which has been privileged for 300 years?

Partly, it is simple nationalism. For most of their history, the upper classes of Latin America have neglected their own nations, preferring to enjoy the benefits of a cosmopolitan European culture. But the post-World War II period has seen a resurgence of national feeling all over the globe and the birth of dozens of new nations from the former colonies of the great powers. It is not so easy, now, to be without a nation in which to take pride. The Latin American countries are weak and poor and not "modern." They suffer badly, in the eyes of their young men, by comparison with the United States.

To demand sweeping change is to be "modern"; to be anti-United States is not only "modern," but brave; to be Marxist is to be at once anti-United States and intellectual.

A second reason is the obvious demand of justice. No man is insensitive, and young people are particularly sensitive, to justice: to the demands of the landless and the sick and the untaught. The manifestoes of leftwing students in Latin America, in fact, are often less advanced in many respects than the platform of the Democratic Party in the United States, or than the Conservative Party in England. It is often a measure not of themselves but of their societies that these students are cast in the role of extremists.

But more than anything else, I think, these students are what they are out of the desire "not only to equal or resemble, but to excel"; the desire which John Adams said "next to self-preservation will forever be the great spring of human actions." The students I saw seem to have sensed that their societies, as presently constituted, have not enough room for achievement; that they have inadequate opportunity to establish themselves on the great stage of public affairs, to dare and to achieve for their countries and for their posterity.

STUDENTS: WHAT WE CAN DO

There is much we can do to help the students of Latin America, and to help ourselves with these students.

First, we should extend all possible help to the improvement of their education generally: through financial assistance, to improve their university facilities and faculties; through help for the creation of entirely new universities; through assistance for secondary schools to aid their preparation for college.

Second, we should devote greater thought and effort to conveying to these students the truth about the United States. Partly this is a matter of learning how to talk to them. We tell them, for example, that we have a "capitalist" economy, and that they would do well to follow our example. But this does not mean to them what it means to us; to them, "capitalism" stands for the rapacious and irresponsible colonial economy of their history, and 9 out of 10 of them say they are opposed to it. We should find a better way of describing our own society—one which more accurately conveys to them what the facts are here. And we should be clear in our own minds about what our society represents, what we personally believe about our society, and what it stands for. I think John Buchan, Lord Tweedsmuir in his autobiography gave an impressive definition of "democracy."

He said:

> Democracy, the essential thing as distinguished from this or that democratic governments—was primarily an attitude of mind, a spiritual testament, and not an economic structure or a political machine. The testament involved certain basic beliefs—that the personality was sacrosanct, which was the meaning of liberty; that policy should be settled by free discussion; that normally a minority should be ready to yield to a majority, which in turn should respect a minority's sacred things. It seemed to me that democracy had been in the past too narrowly defined and had been identified illogically with some particular economic or political system such as laissez-faire or British parliamentarism. I could imagine a democracy which economically was largely socialist and which had not our constitutional pattern.

But words or messages will work no magic changes among Latin American students. I know that, ever since the onset of the cold war, we have been urged to develop a concise, exciting American manifesto—a platform which would compete with the simple rousing calls of the Communists. But what matters about this country cannot be put into slogans; it is a process, a way of doing things and dealing with people, a way of life. There are two major ways of telling others what this country is really about; to bring people here, or to send Americans abroad.

We should, therefore, expand our programs to send students and teachers of all kinds to Latin America and to bring Latin American students to the United States. This is more, I would add, than a matter of opening places in universities here.

Too often, students who do come here have little contact with the substance of our life. There are thousands of Latin American students in New York City alone. But programs to help them understand us—to meet not just with other students, but with government officials, and labor and business and community leaders, and ordinary citizens outside New York City—these programs are too often scattered and fragmentary, or even nonexistent. And the same situation holds true all across the country. I urge that we give increased support and encouragement to such programs; not in a spirit of salesmanship or propaganda, but in an honest effort to help these students see our own blemishes along with our assets, and the ways in which we are dealing with our problems. They will appreciate our candor. And I have confidence that the overall picture they receive can only be a positive one.

One concrete step we can and should take is the establishment of centers of study and meeting for Latin American students in the United States. Where any one should be located is less important than that it is established.

Third, we should give to the youth of Latin America a full chance to participate in the building of their continent. That chance is available to some; but the students of Argentina, for example, have no organized opportunity to serve in Peace Corps type work, though many have expressed a desire to do so. I therefore propose that consideration be given to urging more Latin American nations to form their own peace corps—a step which Brazil has just taken and a form of which has been taken in Peru, Chile, and Venezuela. But I believe we should go further. We should consider also the formation of a multinational hemispheric peace corps in which Americans from both North and South could join for work in their own or other American countries, as well as in the United States. The Peace Corps has shown that young people can make a difference—to individuals, to communities, to whole nations. It has given to thousands of young Americans an opportunity for direct action in support of their ideals; and a hemispheric peace corps can and should do the same for Americans south of the Rio Grande. I would hope that our own Peace Corps would become clearly aligned with it; the two corps should work together.

The benefits of such participation would be as great for us as for them. It could add to the efforts of our Peace Corps, and to the work of such groups as the International Volunteer Service and the Papal Volunteers, thousands of eager workers, thoroughly knowledgeable about Latin America. If our young people joined in this effort they could give to their Latin American compatriots a far improved knowledge of the United States. And such a corps might one day become the nucleus of a true hemispheric community.

Fourth, we should permit all those—students, professors, writers and others—who wish to come to this country to do

so, regardless of whether their political or economic views are in agreement with our own. Too often, we have even denied entry to distinguished Latin American scholars, working with U.S. universities, because of their supposed political views. But the theory of our Constitution, as we hope will be the theory of other constitutions, is that, as Justice Holmes said:

> The best test of truth is the power of thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the marketplace.

We need not fear the presence of dissenting voices, whether of our own citizens or of Latin Americans or others. And our willingness to listen—and to let even our critics see our strengths and our weaknesses—will, not only be a clear demonstration of our own basic faith in our veracity and our ideals, but will in my judgment, make a distinct impression on the students and young intellectuals of Latin America.

Fifth, let us preserve always a sense of perspective and balance in our judgments. There is, on the extreme left, a highly disciplined, highly motivated minority. But even these students are not necessarily Communists, and we should neither unduly bemoan their victories nor trumpet their defeats. When I was in Indonesia in 1962, the mass of students were, if anything, more vocal in their anti-Americanism and Marxism than the students I saw in Latin America. Yet the same Indonesian student organizations, perhaps many of the same individual students, led anti-Chinese and anti-Communist demonstrations in 1965 and 1966—and helped oust the China-oriented Foreign Minister and install the Nationalist-neutralist army in power.

The students had not suddenly become pro-American or even anti-Communist; but they saw foreign-supported communism as a threat to their national independence, and reacted as strongly as they would have if the United States had tried to dominate their country.

Among those students who are bitterly critical of the United States, even among those who call themselves Communists we should not abandon our efforts. During my Latin American tour, I spoke to the students of the University of Santiago. The only students opposed to my speaking were not the orthodox Communists, but the militant Chinese-oriented group; they threw eggs and tried to shout me down for 25 minutes. Other students, standing up for my right to be heard, threw these extremists bodily out of the hall. Many of the students who remained, indeed many of those who threw out the Communists, were highly critical of the United States. But they would fight to listen to a representative of the United States speak and answer their questions and defend his country against their accusations.

The next night, at Concepción, a hundred extremists, better organized, were able to prevent me from speaking. But they did so at the cost of alienating most of the rest of the students, and exposing the weakness of their position. At a meeting before my appearance, I told the extremist students I would admit that the United States had made mistakes; challenged them to debate their case before their fellow students and asked whether they would admit their wing of the Communist Party had ever made a mistake. Their answer was "no" to the debate and "yes" to the question—they said their mistake was not making a revolution in Chile. These replies had a profound effect on the other students present.

Let me add one final point. We should not become discouraged because of these incidents. That is exactly what the Communists wish to accomplish. They realize that rudeness, disorder, violence receives considerable publicity in the United States. They are also aware that people in the United States become disturbed and concerned and wonder whether our efforts of friendship are worthwhile.

Let me say I believe our efforts are productive. In Concepción tens of thousands of people poured out into the streets in a demonstration of friendship. They know about the United States—and they represent the feeling of the people for this country. Less than 100 students out of 1,000 caused the disturbance that evening. And before the night was out they were involved with anti-Communists in a pitched battle which raged for several hours. I would not regard the students of Latin America as "lost" to their countries or to the hemisphere as a whole.

We just cannot permit a well-disciplined, articulate vocal minority to intimidate or discourage us. If we stand up and demonstrate that we are prepared to meet them face to face, that we will not be intimidated, that we will talk with them; that we will exchange views with them; that we will debate them; yes, even that we know some students who believe in freedom of speech who if they wish it will fight them—we shall be successful; not immediately perhaps, but, given the wisdom of our other policies, slowly and inexorably.

These students are the future leaders of their countries. They do have a great reservoir of patriotism and idealism, and a basic belief in the importance of the individual. They are worth listening to, and worth talking to with patience and candor; they are worth, in fact, all the time and effort we can spare. It is easier to talk to government officials, or to businessmen, or to other North Americans; and too often, only one or two members of an entire Embassy staff ever talk with students. I urge instead that all members of our embassies, as well as the many U.S. officials and citizens who travel in Latin America, try to achieve some personal contact, some dialogue with individual students and student groups.

UNIVERSITIES AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES

It should be apparent that the universities of the United States have a great contribution to make—to Latin American education, agriculture, and public administration; to the Alliance for Progress; and thus to the national interest of the United States. But revelations of recent months, even days, show that the sincerity and prestige of our universities have been seriously compromised by arrangements with agencies of the U.S. Government.

The first of these was a study named "Camelot." The Department of the Army commissioned this study from a group at American University. The Army, with intelligent foresight, was attempting to find out what social, economic, and political factors might influence the growth or decline of insurgent movements. But the Army was not the proper agency to do the study; and the study itself, designed by the university, seems to have been so clumsily drawn as to antagonize any self-respecting Latin American. One does not, for example, ask a Latin American political leader—for that matter, any political leader—how he feels about his parents. The study was to have been conducted in secret; when the news inevitably leaked, U.S. university studies throughout Latin America came under hostile suspicion as tools of the Pentagon.

The embarrassment of Camelot has now been compounded by the revelation that a Michigan State University mission in Vietnam was a cover for the CIA, and that the respected Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology was set up in part with CIA funds. Surely, every U.S. university mission, all over the world, will now be suspect—impairing, to some unknown degree, their ability to function as scholars and teachers.

It was for just this reason that the center at Massachusetts Institute of Technology has announced that it has severed its connection with the CIA; not because it felt that its academic integrity was compromised, but because of the suspicion and distrust that was unavoidable abroad.

In large part, we in the Congress must bear responsibility for this situation. Camelot was undertaken by the Army because far more research funds are available to the Army than are appropriated to the Department of State, or AID, or other nonmilitary institutions. The same shortage of research funds to nonmilitary agencies was also the reason why CIA funds were given to Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I support the new policy which gives to the State Department, and to the Ambassador in each country, control over U.S. Government-sponsored research abroad. But the problem of universities becoming identified with undercover and military agencies will continue so long as those agencies have the great preponderance of foreign research appropriations. The Department of State, and the Agency for International Development, should therefore seek major increases in their research budgets, with corresponding reductions in such budgets for the military and the intelligence agencies.

And we should now take such administrative steps as are required to insure that intelligence agencies do not use our universities as covers or tools. Unless we now take unequivocal action, the universities will not be of great further use to the CIA in any case; we must try to salvage their reputation for serious academic work.

For the truest test, the surest message, of our nature and our principles will be found in what we do. We will not build respect for our academic institutions, or traditions of university independence, by using them for intelligence work. And exchange programs or even shared work in projects in slums and villages will be ineffective, in the long run, unless we maintain our commitment to progress, justice, and freedom—in Latin America and at home—to the ideals of the Alliance and to our own tradition. More than anyone else, the students of Latin America will be watching.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. I may want to make a comment later on as to the other aspects of the Senator's excellent address, but I should like to comment briefly now, and ask a question or two about this subject.

Let me say that while the Senate as an institution may from time to time engage in discussion dealing with foreign relations matters which are already in a crisis stage, I believe that the Senate rises to its highest responsibility in the field of foreign relations, under its constitutional directive, to advise and consent in this area and to assist in the making of policy, before the subject reaches the crisis stage.

I feel that Latin America is of the greatest importance to the future of the United States and to the peace and security of the world. The Senator from New York, not only through his interest in this area of the world during the time he served in the administration of President Kennedy, and through his recent tour of South America, but also through this first of his two addresses on the floor of the Senate on this subject, will help very much to focus the attention of the people of this country on the importance of Latin America to them.

It could be summed up—and this is what the people in this country need more and more to know—there, as elsewhere in the world, in five or six words; namely, "desperate, downtrodden people will rise." If the history of our country, or of the world, teaches anything, it is just that.

I believe that the Senator has very well stated what must be the prime base of our policy, what is, fortunately the case under the Alliance for Progress, that simple, economic aid without real revolution—political, economic, and social revolution—will come to naught, and that the things we do must all be focused in that direction.

To me, that is the heart of what the Senator has stated to this moment in his excellent address. Those are things which the people of this country must understand, that we must take an interest in Latin America, that it is not only an affront to our conscience that the people down there are so downtrodden and desperate, but also our own enlightened self-interest is involved. Unless we appeal to those deprived people, they will rise up in revolution until they shake the foundations of our own peace and security. I stated at the beginning that the Senator has brought these points home in his speech. It is something we need to understand.

I am particularly taken by the Senator's comments about the students in South America, the force that they are, and the explanation he has given as to their general attitude and feeling—which worry some of us perhaps more than it should. But I believe that we must do as the Senator suggests, take a greater interest in them.

I believe that idealism has become the pragmatism of our day. I believe that there exists in the minds of the students in Latin America the same kind of feeling, the same kind of desire to be of assistance to other people which existed in this country when President Kennedy came forward with the Peace Corps idea.

I believe that one of the major benefits which perhaps will come from the address of the Senator from New York is the idea of a multinational, hemispheric Peace Corps.

I therefore wish to ask the Senator—I know that he talked about it as he visited the student groups in South America—what sort of reaction he received from students to the idea that they themselves might be an instrument for greater justice in their own countries and surrounding countries?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma. Let me first comment on the remarks he made at the beginning, the way he summarized what I believe to be the basic problem that we have to deal with in Latin America, and what will govern our relationships there.

I say that even if we appropriate $2 billion, $3 billion, or $4 billion, unless we have this idealism, unless we accept the fact that people will advance their lives, and we identify with that, the money will be wasted. Anyone who feels that because Latin America lacks the financial help from the United States it does not progress, in my judgment, makes a major mistake. That is not what the problem is basically. The basic problem is that what we have to do—here in the United States, all of us, especially the Federal Government which has that particular responsibility—is to realize that there is a revolution now going on down there, and we must identify ourselves with that revolution.

Let me say that I was impressed with the friendliness of the people of Latin America toward the United States. We have preached to them the dignity of the individual, the fact that we want to help them lead their own lives and to determine their own destinies. We have told them about our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution.

However, that does not mean very much to a father who cannot get a job, to a father who must work on a farm for 12 hours a day, 6 days a week, for only $1.50, or a man who sees half his children die before they reach the age of 1. Look over Latin America as a whole, and we see that half the burials that take place there are in coffins less than 4 feet long, because those who died were under the age of 4.

We must recognize these facts, and identify ourselves with them. We must put ourselves in their shoes. We would not accept such conditions in this country. The Senator from Oklahoma would not accept them. I would not accept them—neither would anyone else in this country, no matter how many persons came to us and preached about free institutions and democracy and how awful communism is.

We can say that communism does terrible things, that there are no free institutions under communism. But how can it be any worse there, where men and women and their children are mostly illiterate, and they cannot vote in an election, because there are no schools and there is no way to receive an education? But we go down there and tell them about the dangers of communism, that they must be for democracy because communism is so dangerous.

What does that mean to them? It would not mean anything to the Senator from Oklahoma. It would not mean anything to me. I see the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in the Chamber—the chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee, who knows more about this subject than any of us—and I know it would not mean anything to him, or to anyone else in this country who has any feeling for his family, let alone his country.

That is what we are facing. We have come to a crossroad. We must either move down and give some attention to this problem and realize that this is the kind of society we want to be identified and associated with, that this is the kind of leadership we plan to give the rest of the world, or we must move back and decide that we will stay in the United States and not be concerned about the rest of the world, nor give it leadership.

We should make that decision, one way or the other. We cannot go half way. Therefore, I know that what the Senator from Oklahoma has stated is absolutely correct, that we must identify ourselves and relate ourselves to the fact that a revolution in Latin America is coming, and will come, either with free institutions, or with extremism on the left or right—which will eventually end in extremism of the left which, in my judgment, will be communism.

As I said earlier, I think we have the responsibility because it is morally right to do so. As was said at one time, we cannot save the few who are rich if we are not willing to help the many who are poor. Unless we do not take that kind of step, we are headed for catastrophe.

Mr. HARRIS. I was wondering if the Senator would comment on the challenges he issued, about which I read in the Spanish language newspapers, with regard to the students in Latin America.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think the answer is that they have a great interest in doing something. Just as in the 1950's here in the United States, there was a need for a vehicle for idealism so that is true now in Latin America.

In time of war, people are asked to go out and fight and, if necessary, die for their country, whether it be a democracy or some other kind of government. Then they come back from the war and into the community. If they have an education, they are able to get a good job, earn a good living, and try to provide a better life for their children.

I think it is the idealism that they feel for their fellow citizens that exists there. President Kennedy pointed it out in 1961. That same feeling exists in Latin America today, and what they really need is a proper vehicle to use that idealism.

In Brazil we heard complaints that in the United States we emphasize the concept of financial gain. As I went out to the villages, saw students working there from the United States, but I very rarely saw students from local colleges. I said, "If you feel so strongly about it, why are you not out there working for the people?" The fact is that they must have a vehicle that is organized, such as VISTA is organized, and as other vehicles are organized to help people. In the last week, I have learned that in that country they have organized a peace corps, which I think will be very effective.

So it was very plain to me, and I was was struck by the fact that, so far as the student is concerned, it is idealism that motivates him; he wants a better society for the people in Latin America. If there were some vehicle established for him to express that idealism, he would be better equipped to help the people.

Anyone who has gone to a university, who has any conscience at all, has a feeling for those who have not had that opportunity and a feeling that he wants to make some contribution.

I had the convictions while in Latin America that if we helped them to fulfill their expressions, with their talent, energy, and experience the people there would gain, as well as the people in other countries, and the people of the world.

Mr. HARRIS. I also wanted to comment on the Senator's statement with regard to land reform. I agree that, while it is true that as a result of land redistribution, there is the probability that in many areas production in agriculture will go down initially, the primary benefit of land reform and redistribution will be a change in the political balance, because unless one now has political influence in the government, he is not going to get much change in education, for example, and that person is not going to have much influence in the government as long as he is only a serf in a feudalistic system.

I think it is imperative that we understand that land reform, as indicated in the Senator's speech—which I am sure will receive wide report and I am confident will be read by people in South America—is one of the central ideas of the Alliance for Progress, and key part of that program.

When I was in Argentina, I read a good deal of what happened to the Senator in Concepcion, and at other meetings of that type, particularly one other meeting at Santiago. I read and heard about what took place while I was in Argentina, and also later when I was in Chile, after the Senator was there. The upshot was that these things were a plus for us, a boost for our image, because it indicated to the people that we favor open debate and that the minority critics were fearful of open discussion. It also indicated that the Senator stood for free and open debate, and that most of the people there did not countenance the activity carried on by a minority there.

I talked with some students in Santiago and I found they were totally ignorant of the fact that we were pushing for land reform. Of course, it was being advocated by President Frei, they said, but they almost refused to believe that we were pushing it.

They said, "Oh, you say you're for land reform, but when these measures get before the Parliament here, the landed people, who have great access to the press, will say it is the first step toward communism and your people will finally oppose it."

Can the Senator tell us authoritatively that we cannot have substantial progress in the Alliance for Progress unless there is progress in one of its basic tenets, which is land reform, and that this is and will be the strong position of our Government?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not think there is any question that we believe, that that is what we stand for. I think it has been indicated quite clearly by the U.S. Ambassador to Chile. I think, however, it is important that we keep that in the forefront of our minds, that we do not lose track of the fact that land reform is a central part of the Alliance for Progress. What is of some concern, may I say to the Senator from Oklahoma, is that the Alliance for Progress may become just an aid program, a bilateral arrangement between the United States and a particular country to aid and assist that country. That was not the basis of the Alliance for Progress concept. It was to be a joint effort on behalf of the United States and Latin American countries, working together.

Second, it was not to be merely an aid program for financial assistance, but was to be part of a social reform, of which land reform was to be an important part. I think it is important that we keep pumping hard at that concept and that we do not emphasize how much money we provide; that it does not become a foreign aid program only; that we do not get merely to a bilateral aid program between the United States and countries of Latin America.

The Alliance for Progress, the relationship of the United States and the Latin American countries, in my judgment, requires a soul and heart. The land reform proposal provides that. Our interest is to improve the lives of the people in Latin America, and not just the economic, social, and political ruling classes.

Mr. HARRIS. May I say one last thing? I do not want to keep the Senator from New York too long. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations, I was particularly interested in the Senator's statement with regard to universities and their connection with intelligence agencies.

I think the Senator is quite right. There must not be any connection between intelligence agencies and social and behavioral science research in foreign countries by American universities. I think further that such research, while it can be helpful to us and the host country in the formation of policy, ought to be "civilianized," either through the State Department or AID, as the Senator suggested.

I would like to have the comment of the Senator. Perhaps it should be some new apparatus in the Government. Since Defense, which now largely finances this kind of research, has funds available for this kind of research, such new apparatus might use beginning funds from other agencies for this type of research. Thereby we might civilianize this type of activity, which we need to do, because we already have too much of a militaristic image in Latin America.

I think that programs such as Camelot or Simpatico aggravate that situation and make it worse.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator. I thought about where it could be placed, and I thought about the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which has had much experience in research.

There is a difficulty, and I do not have a closed mind—perhaps the Senator's committee could go into it further—but the fact is that they had so obviously little experience in other countries, it might be difficult for them to do it. I came back and suggested that it be handled in some way through the State Department. There might be a better way to deal with the problem. I was not able to resolve it in my own mind. Perhaps if the Senator from Oklahoma holds hearings he could look into the matter to see if there is a better way.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. There might be a better way to deal with it than I have suggested.

Mr. HARRIS. As a part of that last question, I note what the Senator has said on page 17 of the text which I have, which says:

> But we can help; and we certainly can help by not extending our material and moral support to those who actively oppose necessary political, economic and social change, including the comprehensive land reform which is at the heart of development efforts.

It has been my concern—and I use the conversation I had with students in Santiago as an example—that while we do believe in these basic principles of change, we are not getting that fact across to the people themselves. I believe that there have to be more dramatic ways of bringing that fact to the attention of the average person with whom we must identify in Latin America.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the Senator mean by that statement which I just read, even though it might be a little difficult in certain cases, perhaps we might withhold aid from an administration or perhaps types of aid from an administration which did not believe in the types of programs which the Alliance for Progress puts us on record as favoring?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what I am suggesting to the Senator, and to the Senate.

First, I think the entire idea of the Alliance for Progress and the aid aspects of that program is to improve the lives of people there.

Therefore, if the financial assistance that is to come from the United States is going to achieve that purpose, the heart of the effort must be land reform plus education. If they have not established a system within a country to bring about necessary land reform or to improve education, the money, in my judgment, is going to be lost. It is not a question of cutting off the funds. The point is that kind of waste was not the purpose of the Alliance for Progress or of the assistance program. I think it is fraud to give assistance or funds when the money is going to be wasted or go to a few wealthy and powerful individuals in the country. I believe that is a grave mistake and identifies and associates the United States with the wrong group in Latin America.

It would be self-defeating and a waste of money and cause us immeasurable harm.

I wish to say one other thing to the Senator before he takes his seat. In his opening statement he talked about the idea that we frequently respond to crises in the United States. I would like to have the comments of the Senator from Oklahoma, who was in Latin America at the same time that I was, about how important it is that we can make a difference in Latin America.

Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. HARRIS. I certainly do agree. I would say that when I talked with the distinguished Senator from New York after he came back from Latin America and told him that I came back rather depressed, he said that he was not so depressed, but was optimistic. Then he said, in explanation, that he felt there were things we could do, and therefore, that he was optimistic, although depressed by some of the facts.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. I could not agree more. There are things that we can do and must do, which the Senator is bringing to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Would the Senator agree that the things we can do, we can and must do now?

The Senator and I might stand up in the Senate 2 or 3 years from now and it might be too late to do some of these things.

Mr. HARRIS. I agree with the Senator. We must not wait, otherwise we are going to go from crisis to crisis, from the Dominican Republic to Vietnam. We are called upon now to do things in a preventive way.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. We can see in our policies, perhaps in Vietnam or other areas, that if we had taken steps maybe a decade, or 3, 4, or 5 years prior to the present time, the situation would be quite different than it is.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am suggesting that there are steps that can be taken dealing with the problems of Latin America.

I think that the foremost reason to do it, in my judgment, is that we have a responsibility to help because of the kind of country we are. Second, not looking at it from that point of view, I hear the word "pragmatic" used so frequently nowadays—we are looking at it for our own self-interest. The time is now. What we might do now, from a monetary view, would save 10 times as much financially.

If we had dealt with Cuba and Batista in the fifties we would not have to worry about Castro. What made communism in Cuba was the policy of the United States during the fifties. It was not the fact that we had some support for Castro when he came from the mountains, but the relationship which we had with Batista at that time.

Now we can take steps to head off crises in the future. That is why I thought the point that the Senator made was so excellent.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the Senator for his statement and for yielding to me. Also, since I quite agree with his thesis, just stated, I commend him for what I believe to be a landmark and monumental speech in this field.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from New York that in my opinion this is the most important speech that has been made on Latin American problems in this body and in this country since President Kennedy initiated the Alliance for Progress program and made his last speech, in which he gave an accounting of what the Alliance for Progress was doing and what he hoped for it.

I think this speech updates the Alliance for Progress program in a clear statement of its objectives.

The Senator from New York has said the things about the Alliance for Progress and its objectives that have needed saying since the last great address of President Kennedy on the subject to which I referred.

I hope that this statement of the Senator from New York will be caught by the media of information in this country. It is a very basic statement, if we are to have the proper understanding of the Alliance for Progress and if we are to have the reexamination of the program that I believe is so sorely needed.

When the Senator from New York points out that the great danger is that the Alliance for Progress will be looked upon as just another aid program, he goes to the heart of the present problem that confronts the future of the Alliance for Progress. The reason for this situation, and the blame for it, rests in part on our country, but at least in an equal part—and I am afraid more than an equal part—on our neighbors in Latin America.

In some of our recent international conferences with Latin American officials, a tendency has developed on the part of many Latin American leaders to make a false assumption which stems from the time when President Kennedy was still a member of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs. In that subcommittee the seeds of the Alliance for Progress were sown, before Senator John F. Kennedy went to the White House as President. Many of the Latin American leaders forget what the purpose of the Alliance was. It was not designed primarily as a so-called dollar aid program. Yet, in listening to many Latin American leaders in conferences these days, one cannot escape the conclusion that many of them think that that is the primary purpose of the program.

The Senator from New York has pointed out ably in his speech today, as did President Kennedy—as we tried also to do at the time of the Bogotá Conference, which was the forerunner of the action that was taken in the Senate committee, and as we subsequently tried to point out at the time of the Conference at Punta del Este—that the Alliance for Progress is designed to be of assistance to the democratic leaders in Latin America, as they are developed, to bring about the necessary social, economic, and political reform that must be achieved in many of those countries if the danger of communism is to be met.

This is basic to an understanding of our foreign relations with Latin America. That is why it is very gratifying to hear the Senator from New York say what I have heard this afternoon, statements that I have felt for a long time needed to be said. They need to be said over and over again.

Our problem is to help people. Our problem is to use our largess to the extent that we provide dollar aid. However, of even more value to Latin America, we should provide for the exportation of our techniques, of the information that we can supply them, of the skills that can come from the people in our country. If we export the skills of people in our country by way of exchanges with Latin America, we can do more for Latin America than any number of American dollars.

I have become concerned from my discussions with many Latin American officials recently because they apparently think the American dollar is the answer. The American dollar, improperly used, can cause much more trouble than help.

What we must do is to accomplish what President Kennedy envisioned. When President Kennedy was a Member of the Senate and was a member of the subcommittee of which I am the chairman, we talked time and time again about this matter. We have to export to Latin America something more precious and worth much more than just American dollars. We have to export techniques, and an understanding of our economic system.

I do not mean to make a speech, but the Senator from New York is responsible

for these remarks. He has stimulated them. I have tried to live with this problem. There was a need for someone to say what the Senator from New York has said this afternoon.

We must consider what we can do, in addition to aiding them with money and sending to them the information, the skills, and the techniques that will help them to develop their own free society. We cannot export a free society to them. We make the mistake, in our foreign affairs, to try to export our free society. It cannot be done. Freedom has to grow in their own soil, in their own culture, among their own people.

I am glad that the Senator from New York stressed in his discussion this afternoon the point that the Alliance for Progress must not become a program of mere dollar aid. I am glad the Senator from New York said some other things in his speech that needed to be said.

I hope our Latin American friends will take note. I hope that when they take note, they will realize what a very good friend of theirs has said.

One of the difficulties of speaking in the Senate is that a Senator's comments might be interpreted as not a complete endorsement of something that is occurring in a Latin American country; then the Senator is considered unfriendly to that country.

The fact is that those of us who are trying to make the Alliance for Progress work as it was originally envisioned by President Kennedy are friends of Latin America. I say to the people of Latin America that in my judgment they do not have a better friend in the Senate than the Senator from New York.

The Senator from New York spoke of the educational problems in Latin America and the reactions of the students there. We must say to those students, as the Senator from New York has said, that they have to do more than they are doing in their countries in order to bring about the implementation of the ideals about which they talked to Senator KENNEDY when he was in Latin America and engaged in open and frank discussions with them.

There should be not only American young men and women in a Peace Corps in Latin America. There should be an American and Latin American Peace Corps, including students from all Latin American countries. With this kind of combined Peace Corps, the day will be hastened when the changes will be achieved about which the Senator from New York has spoken. I am glad that the Senator from New York spent as much time as he did on the need to meet the educational crisis in Latin America.

I say dogmatically—because it is a dogmatism that cannot be successfully challenged—that there is no hope for the development in Latin America of what we consider economic and political freedom for the mass of the people of Latin America because of the rate of illiteracy that presently prevails. Economically and politically free people cannot be developed out of ignorance. They have to be educated at least to the level of literacy.

This brings me to the International Education Act of President Johnson. I enthusiastically support this act so far as its objectives are concerned. The Senator from New York is a member of my subcommittee, as is the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is in the Chamber. Our subcommittee will conduct extensive hearings in connection with this act. We shall do everything we can to help the President implement it into legislative form. It may need some revisions.

The Senator from New York made some suggestions this afternoon in regard to the bill. What we do in American universities and colleges in preparing to be of help educationally in Latin America is only a small part of the job. It is important. It provides for the training of personnel. We must provide facilities to which they can send students to be trained in the programs so that they can go back to Latin America and help. That is very important.

The President has in mind, and has said so very clearly, that he, too, recognizes, however, that the other part of the coin is the development of an educational program at the mass level in each of the Latin American countries.

I happen to think—maybe out of bias—that that is far more important than the program at the level of our colleges and universities in the United States. But I want them to go forward together.

We are not doing as much under the bill as I think we can and should do in connection with the mass educational programs.

In each one of the Latin American countries I think that the literacy program ought to go forward along with the program in the United States. I hope that when we get into our hearings we can be helpful to the President in making a record that will support and strengthen the bill so that it will not be limited, as it is limited now for the most part, to the so-called U.S. domestic aspect of international education program.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. In my speech I mentioned the possibility of furnishing in Latin America, to lower grades particularly, some of the advanced techniques we have been developing and which we have discussed so thoroughly and completely before our committee. It was based on the hearings, in which we discussed the effort that had to be made among disadvantaged people in the United States, that I raised the question as to whether some of the techniques and information which was being developed in the United States could be correlated and made available in Latin America.

Mr. MORSE. I know that the Senator in his speech pointed out some of the techniques involved in the entire subject of literacy courses that could be conducted by television and, to some extent, even by radio or by visual aid. I think that we should try to do that. I do not think that we should wait to attack the literacy problem in Latin America until we develop the U.S. domestic aspect of the President's international education program, although I am all for that.

The Senator mentioned universities and intelligence agencies in a section of his speech. It so happens that last week, at Wayne State University, I spoke at an institute sponsored by four universities. But those who came to the institute came from all over the United States. The president of the institute is Prof. John Gange of the University of Oregon. It is a large group of political scientists.

I was asked to lecture on the very subject matter that the Senator from New York has covered in this part of his speech dealing with universities and intelligence agencies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the lecture that I gave at Wayne University on the night of May 5, in which lecture I discussed the subject that the Senator from New York has raised in his speech.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. I said in the first paragraph of the lecture:

> It has been suggested that I talk to this meeting on the subject of the gap between academic research and foreign policy. But at the risk of being topical and taking a short-term view, I would rather talk about a factor in this relationship which worries me much more. It is the extent to which academic research and opinions about foreign policy are polluted by Government sponsorship.

I discussed Camelot in the lecture. I discussed the situation that had developed at MIT, and in that respect I pointed out that in the late fifties our subcommittee—and President Kennedy was then a Senator from Massachusetts on my subcommittee—$150,000 had been appropriated by the Senate for the subcommittee to make a study of United States-Latin American relations growing out of unfavorable incidents in Latin America.

Similarly the full committee had undertaken a study of the foreign aid program, using the same system of contracting to many academic individuals and institutes.

The first proposal of the Senate was that there be an investigation of our Latin American policy in 1958. I asked that it be changed to a study instead of an investigation. I then moved in the committee that the $150,000, or most of it, be used to enter into contracts with universities, research foundations, and centers of recognized authorities on Latin America to have them prepare for us a series of monographs that would be helpful to use to set forth the findings of fact and the recommendations as to what Congress and the administration should do in regard to possible changes in foreign policy.

The then Senator Kennedy from Massachusetts seconded my motion and made a strong supporting speech urging its adoption. The Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously adopted the procedural recommendations.

It was out of those studies and recommendations—as President Kennedy told me on several occasions that he took them to the White House when he went there—that he went to work and formulated the great Kennedy Alliance for Progress program.

One of those studies for the full Committee on Foreign Aid was prepared by MIT. I want to say on the floor of the Senate today that it was a good study. It was prepared by men at MIT who were competent to prepare it. But as I pointed out in my lecture the other night at Wayne University, we did not know that the division of MIT that conducted the study came into creation under a CIA grant. We do not know today how many more of the studies on foreign aid and Latin America were done by academic or private agencies subsidized by CIA, AID, and the Defense Department.

I do not think, at least when the contracts are let as we let that contract, that such an obvious fact should be kept from us.

I pointed out in the lecture that as a result of what has really developed now, not only in the academic world but also outside of the academic world, we should let the reader beware, let the public beware, let Congress beware, and let all of us beware of these studies that are recommended out of the universities unless we know where the funds come from to finance the center or the professor making the study.

I do not think that Congress should continue to support the CIA, and I said in my lecture, the Defense Department and also the State Department, in financing, undisclosed to the people and to the country, these so-called academic research studies because they make them suspect, and they are bound to be suspect.

The Senator from New York said that he would give some thought as to how this type of work should be done, and I am all for that. The Senator suggested the State Department—and that may be most appropriate—in reply to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], stating also that he had given some thought to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That should be studied further. But I think there is another suggestion, to which I have been giving a considerable amount of thought, that needs to be considered. I am not so sure that we should not set up a national foundation of international research study somewhat in the format of a National Science Foundation, and we have a whole series of Federal foundations.

I am not so sure, in order to guarantee their independence, to guarantee their objectivity, to free them from any suspicion that they may be connected with the CIA or the Defense Department or the State Department, and therefore their point of view may not be completely objective, but that we ought to have an independent foundation to conduct what should be independent studies. But I have reached no final conclusion about it. I am happy that the Senator from New York spoke out on this matter, because he knows, as I know, that the academic world is greatly disturbed. I wish he could have seen the reaction I received from outstanding scholars in this country following my lecture the other night, when they came up and said they were sure I had no idea of the great controversy going on within the academic world today because of the views held by many about these federally financed research studies, whether by the American University in this city, or Michigan State University, or Massachusetts Institute of Technology—which, as the Senator mentioned, has now discontinued its past relationships with CIA because of the criticism it was arousing. They said, "If you knew how we really feel, you will know how welcome your remarks were here tonight. The Federal Government ought to follow a procedural course of action that will take America's universities out of the realm of the suspect."

And they are suspect today. We have a right, now, when we receive a report from any American university relating in any way to the American military or the American foreign policy, to ask the simple questions, "Who finances your center or program? What were your instructions? What review was your report subject to?"

As an old academic man myself, I commend the Senator from New York on what he has said on that subject, because I am sure he will find that that part of his speech will exercise a terrific impact on American academic life.

One further word. I wish to say that at the beginning, it was never contemplated that the Alliance for Progress program should be a military aid program. The military aspects of our aid to Latin America were never intended, in the first place, to be encompassed in the Alliance for Progress program. I think that is very important, and I stress it again today.

Yes, a certain amount of military aid will be needed. But we have too many leaders in some Latin American countries who seem to think the greatest weapon we can send them for meeting the challenge of communism is military aid. It is my opinion that the military aid we have sent them has, in many instances, played into the hands of the Communist threat in Latin America, rather than tending to subdue it.

Whatever the views of others may be, I only wish to say, as I close, what I said at the beginning: the Senator has made a speech this afternoon which updates the Alliance for Progress. It is a most appropriate speech to be read in connection with the last speech on the subject made by President Kennedy, and I hope all Members of Congress and officials in the State Department, the Pentagon, and the CIA, as well as the leaders of the Latin American countries, will read the Senator's speech, contemplate it, and comprehend it; and then see what can be done to carry out the great idealism it expresses.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] spoke of idealism as being pragmatic. I know of nothing that is more pragmatic than an ideal put to work. That is all the Senator has asked for in his speech. We have some great ideals in this country in the field of foreign policy. However, of late we seem to have given them an opiate; they are not alive, not vigorous. They are asleep. I hope the Senator's speech will serve to awaken some of them, because that is what I interpret its purpose to be.

EXHIBIT 1

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, INTERNATIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION, WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY, DETROIT, MICH., MAY 5, 1966

It has been suggested that I talk to this meeting on the subject of the gap between academic research and foreign policy. But at the risk of being topical and taking a short-term view, I would rather talk about a factor in this relationship which worries me much more. It is the extent to which academic research and opinions about foreign policy are polluted by Government sponsorship.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has recently concluded a series of hearings on the Vietnam war and China policy in an unprecedented effort to ventilate ideas and opinions that will go beyond official policy on these subjects. It was especially true in the case of China that we relied heavily upon academicians, since the absence of trade, cultural, tourist, and political relations narrowly confines the extent of public knowledge and expertise about mainland China.

No State Department or other Government witnesses appeared, primarily because they declined to appear in public session. But even so, it soon became evident that much of the institutional work on Chinese and Asian affairs is sponsored or subsidized to some degree or other by the foreign policy agencies of the Federal Government. The Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department and its foreign aid agency, and the Department of Defense spend tens of millions each year for academic research. Beyond that, we have encountered the problem of professors who appreciate—as do you—that expert knowledge of foreign policy requires a familiarity that often must be obtained by working for a foreign policy agency if not full time, then at least as a consultant.

The influence of present or potential contracts, and of present or potential "consultantships" is one of the problems that will grow as academicians are brought into foreign policy formulation. It will grow for the Congress and the public, too, as we seek judgments of international affairs that will be unencumbered by association with the agency that devised the policy under review.

PROBLEM OF INDEPENDENT FOREIGN POLICY OPINIONS

I would like to take you to a few examples of the difficulty this relationship poses for some of us in the Senate. The Foreign Relations Committee has a special responsibility, in my opinion, not only to consider the evidence and testimony presented to us by the Department of State, but to consider also the shortcomings in a given policy. In the latter 1950's, we undertook one review of the foreign aid program by contracting with several universities and private consulting agencies to survey various aspects of foreign aid. The Latin American Subcommittee, of which I am chairman and was then, did the same for Latin American policy.

The role of private enterprise in aid, aid activities of other free nations, and of the Communist bloc, the objectives of U.S. economic assistance, and our military assistance program were among the subject matter surveyed in the foreign aid study. Commodity problems in Latin America, problems of Latin American economic development, and Soviet

bloc activities in Latin America were among the topics surveyed by contract for my subcommittee.

We know now, but did not know then, that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies, which received one of these contracts, had been founded a few years before primarily through a CIA grant. The MIT Center did the survey of the economic objectives of foreign aid. I was reminded of this study just a few days ago, when the CIA man in charge of the Michigan State project was quoted as saying "there is nothing sinister in using foreign aid as a CIA cover nor in using universities as CIA covers." We still do not know how many other of our contractors received financial support from CIA, DOD, or other Federal agencies in the foreign policy field.

This week, MIT announced that it would drop its CIA contracts. According to its director, Max Millikan, its contracts related to research on Communism and China. The amount of cash represented by current CIA contracts for the MIT Center is classified.

I may say that if we on the committee were gullible then, we are not so gullible now. During the China hearings, it became the practice to ask each witness the extent of his personal relations with Government agencies, and the extent to which his institution was subsidized by Government agencies. As Senator FULBRIGHT put it to one: "I am trying to find out how independent a witness you are."

This particular witness was both a university faculty member and a leading analyst for a Washington institute financed almost entirely by the Defense Department. Indeed, one man who has been in and out of the Defense Department, the academic world, and private institutes, explains that the relationship is so incestuous that it scarcely matters which payroll he is on.

MICHIGAN STATE AND VIETNAM

By far the most dramatic of these episodes has been the Michigan State adventure in South Vietnam. I will not go into the facts of that project, which are now widely known. But it is a matter of increasing concern that the Michigan State administrators seem to view the role of their Center for International Programs not as an educational program but as an operations arm of national foreign policy agencies. The coordinator of the MSU Vietnam project, Stanley Sheinbaum, who caused the facts of that project to be published, draws a conclusion from them that must be considered, whether his discription of what transpired is questioned or not. He states:

"The Michigan State professors performed at all levels. They advised on fingerprinting techniques, on bookkeeping, on governmental budgeting and on the very writing of South Vietnam's constitution. One was even instrumental in the choice of the President of South Vietnam. But in all this they never questioned U.S. foreign policy which had placed them there and which, thereby, they were supporting.

"The following article on MSU's involvement in Vietnam is merely a case study of two critical failures in American education and intellectual life today. The first and more obvious is the diversion of the university away from its functions and duties of scholarship and teaching. The second has to do with the failure of the academic intellectual to serve as critic, conscience, ombudsman. Especially in foreign policy, which henceforth will bear heavily on our very way of life at home, is this failure serious.

"For this failure has left us in a state of drift. We lack historical perspective. We have been conditioned by our social science training not to ask the normative question; we possess neither the inclination nor the means with which to question and judge our foreign policy. We have only the capacity to be experts and technicians to serve that policy. This is the tragedy of the Michigan State professors; we were all automatic cold warriors.

"On every campus from Harvard to Michigan State, the story is the same. The social science professor, trained (not educated) to avoid the bigger problems, is off campus expertising for his Government or industry client whose assumptions he readily adopts. Where is the source of serious intellectual criticism that would help us avoid future Vietnams? Serious ideological controversy is dead and with it the perspective for judgment."

I hope that Mr. Sheinbaum is wrong in saying that controversy is dead. The teach-in movement last year on many campuses—which I encouraged and in which I participated on several campuses including the University of Oregon—encourages me to think it is not dead. The teach-in a year ago at Rutgers was reported in the campus newspaper with an outpouring of enthusiasm, not so much for what was said as for the all-night faculty-student intellectual free-for-all which led one student to say of it: "This was the first time I felt that I knew what a real university is."

But there is a price for independence. In the period of 1959, 1960, and 1961, the University of Oregon and Oregon State University both received foreign aid contracts in Asian countries. It was given to the University of Oregon to advise on economic planning by South Korea, and to Oregon State to advise on agricultural education techniques in Thailand. Both groups were highly critical of the performance of the local government, and of AID for extending aid, anyway. "Political reasons" were overriding. The contracts were not renewed, for AID does not care to employ persistent critics any more than anyone else does. But it was the findings of these two schools with which I have close ties that prompted me to begin looking into aspects of foreign aid that I had not previously considered.

Perhaps my personal reaction was the only result of these contracts at the time. But I am only now beginning to feel that the whole question of employing academicians for this job deserves rethinking. How many university groups sacrifice their contracts for these intellectual conclusions and how many become the action arm for the program in order to sustain the contract?

ACADEMIC RESEARCH ABROAD

Another example that aroused many of us on the Foreign Relations Committee last year was the Camelot episode. It was not until local repercussions in Chile had come to the attention of the American Ambassador that we knew American University was under contract to the Department of the Army to study social conditions in Chile that might lead to unstable political conditions. In layman's language, the purpose of Project Camelot and others like it is to survey a country to get a line on its potential for revolution, and how it can be headed off or countered. Last summer we were given to understand that between 40 and 50 of these studies in foreign countries were being financed by the military agencies.

Camelot was canceled, and an agreement was entered into between the State and Defense Departments that henceforth the studies would proceed only upon the approval of the State Department.

But the Special Operations Research Office at American University continues for this purpose. Its Director described its purpose as: "the relationships with the peoples of the developing countries and deals with problems of aiding in the orderly process of social change and national development which is of concern to the U.S. Military Establishment."

For studying the "orderly process of social change and national development which is of concern to the U.S. Military Establishment" the Army budgeted $2,463,000 to the Special Operations Research Office in fiscal year 1966. In both Vietnam and the Dominican Republic the orderly process of social change and national development has required large numbers of U.S. troops, for it is the Military Establishment's idea of what is orderly that is coming to dominate American foreign policy in the undeveloped parts of the world.

And for this the academic world is being drawn in not to advise but to implement. The entire Defense Department budget for research on behavioral and social sciences came to nearly $23 million in fiscal year 1966. The CIA budget is classified. But these sums cannot help but raise the question of the independence of the results they produce.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

It is into this picture that the administration has brought its proposal for a new International Education Act, and to discuss this aspect of academic research and foreign policy I shall put on my hat as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, to which the bill was referred.

Its short title is: "To provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research."

The purpose of the bill is to provide Federal assistance to institutions of higher education to strengthen their international studies programs at the graduate level. The bill carries no specific amount for this purpose, but we are told that about $10 million a year is expected to be spent under it.

The objective is laudatory. But will the results be laudatory? That is the question we are going into in our subcommittee when we take up this bill. Does it mean that another $10 million will be added to the existing funds for Defense and CIA research? Does putting the Office of Education in charge of allocating the money mean the centers so financed will remain reasonably pure in their research activities? Or does the permission contained in the bill to "utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government" mean that the graduate centers so aided will merely become another front for the CIA and the DOD?

There are some of us who feel that aid to education through the Office of Education, as distinct from a grant or contract for a specific purpose from the Defense Department, AID, or CIA, may be sufficiently divorced from special purposes and sufficiently free from ties to a particular policy to be worthwhile. But the bill will have to be much more carefully drafted than it is now if that result from it is to be achieved.

These remarks admittedly have dwelt on the dangers of directly subsidized academic work in foreign policy. They have not gone into the virtues of such subsidies, and I think there may be some in that public knowledge in these fields is advanced. I hope I have not left you with the idea that I have no confidence at all in the intellectual freedom of the academic world, for I continue to regard it as one of the central and stalwart elements in the checks and balances of our free society.

What I would like to emphasize above all is the problem of public knowledge of the source of these Federal funds, and the purpose for which they were advanced. It is the acceptance of published findings and opinions by a people—and a Congress—unaware of their financial backing that I feel constitutes the danger to foreign policy formulation. And it is an emphasis and preoccupation with operations rather than scholarship and teaching that constitutes

the danger to our educational institutions from extensive governmental support.

Acknowledgment of sources, however, raises questions beyond those of financial support. Last week, Senator FULBRIGHT called to public attention the leading article in the Nation's most respected foreign policy publication, the Foreign Affairs Quarterly, which argued that the Vietcong should not be included in any negotiations in Vietnam because it is a Communist front for Hanoi. The author was described by Foreign Affairs as a "student of Asia." I wonder how many of you here who are students of Asia, as I am, could publish in Foreign Affairs on that basis. But this particular student of Asia, George Carver, Jr., is also a leading Vietnam expert of the Central Intelligence Agency, a part of his qualifications that was not mentioned by Foreign Affairs.

In his letter to the Central Intelligence Agency, Senator FULBRIGHT raised on behalf of the committee the following issues as to the role of Agency employees in engaging in activities designed to influence foreign policy attitudes in the United States: "Was Mr. Carver encouraged by the Agency to write this article? Did the author use information available to him only by reason of his employment? Did the Agency approve the article? Would the Agency have approved the article if it had been critical of administration policy? Would their employee have been free to write a critical article for publication; and why was his official connection with the Government not made public? How many other Agency employees have written articles in their field of interest for publication in the United States without attribution? How is this kind of activity related to the role of the Agency as an information gathering institution?"

The CIA's explanation was that Foreign Affairs requested the article. But it had nothing to say about the implication that the public was exposed to a vital argument of American policy without knowing who was really responsible for it.

What is coming out of all this is a growing attitude of "Let the reader beware." Let the public beware, let the Congress beware, that anything it reads these days is reasonably free from the intellectual baggage of direct self-interest.

These are some of the doubts that I must express to you on the subject of academic research and foreign policy. I have not resolved them at all, and in fact, have probably not thought them through, from the standpoint of foreign policy formulation.

From the standpoint of higher education, I do believe that the desire of educational institutions to become operating arms of foreign policy is leading to bad practices and bad results. That may be foreign policy, but it is not education.

I would like to see the academic community survey this subject itself. I would like to hear the pros and cons of the criticisms I have made. I would like to feel that there is some recognition within the academic social sciences of the dangers involved in Federal financing, and that perhaps some self-policing is in order.

The "credibility gap" between Government and governed is already wider than is safe for our free institutions. More than any others, the academic community should be on guard against this gap because the efficacy of intellectual freedom requires not only a speaker but a listener. The audience of the academic community consists of the student and the public. To the extent that either audience becomes cynical and unbelieving, academic research will lose its impact on the formulation of foreign policy.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Oregon. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, he has had much experience in such matters, and I particularly appreciate his remarks concerning the history of that subcommittee, and the service thereon of Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, which ultimately led to the Alliance for Progress program, and how, as a result of the interest thus created in his mind, much progress later resulted. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MONTOYA. I commend the Senator from New York, not only for what he has said today, but also for having taken the time to visit in Latin America during the recess and talk with students, men on the street, and people in government there, thus creating a good impression for the United States, and helping persuade the people of Latin America to believe that we, as a people, are interested in Latin America.

I have hurriedly read the speech just delivered by the Senator from New York, and I must say in all candor that it is a great speech. It contains many suggestions which, if adopted, will constitute guidelines for a proper blueprint for dealing with Latin America in the future.

Lately, because we have been busy with the Vietnam war, we have not done enough to create and keep open lines of communication between our country and Latin America. And somehow, we have been led to believe that the Yankee dollar is an adequate means of communication. I think history has proved that the Yankee dollar is no such thing. We need people-to-people communication.

Many reforms are needed in Latin America to improve its standards of living. For instance, let us take the case of Mexico. Mexico has made great strides, but it tackled the problems of education and the problems of distribution of land on a parallel basis; and thus Mexico has been able to upgrade the living standard of these people, and they have progressed.

Mexico, furthermore, knows how to deal with the Communist problem, and has dealt with it successfully, in spite of the fact that recently there was an uprising at the University of Mexico.

I say to the Senator from New York that as a results of my visits to Latin America, I have concluded that something which is very important to creating a good image for the United States there is the image of our President. I recall the image that President Roosevelt created in Latin America. That image was transferred to the people of the United States. Then I recall the declaration of President Kennedy on the Alliance for Progress. The people of Latin America revered him, and still do. That reverence has been a carryover from his declaration.

I am anxious, as I know the Senator from New York is anxious, that our country do something affirmatively other than passing out dollars through the Alliance for Progress. Many things need to be done in education, in agrarian reform, in agricultural research, and in communication. I think the Senator will agree with me that in traveling through Latin America, if one visits the bookstores, one can find many books that have been placed there, at a very minimal cost, by the agents of Peking or Moscow. The United States has made very few books available to those bookstores, or even the libraries in Latin America. We do have a publishing house in Mexico City, but I do not believe that we are publishing enough books, nor making them available at low cost throughout Latin America, so that people there may learn about our country, and may understand that our motive is to improve the lot of our neighbors, and not to enrich ourselves through the process.

I commend the Senator from New York for his splendid statement and the great contribution he has made in this particular field.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his remarks, and also for pointing out a very important matter which deals with the field of communications and our ability to talk and work with the peoples of Latin America.

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

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I regret very much that I was called from the Chamber at a time when the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] was completing his remarks and I did not get back until he had concluded.

I should like to express my complete endorsement of the carefully documented survey the Senator from New York has made of the situation in Latin America. The Senator's keen powers of analysis are evident throughout this survey, which was based upon his trip through Latin America last fall during which he talked with a great number of individuals in places of leadership in Latin America.

I share his views as to the necessity for a massive program of land reform and education, if the objectives of the Alliance for Progress are to be achieved.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that there is no real justification for further military aid to the nations of Latin America, but that there is a great need for further economic, social, and technical aid.

The Senator from New York, I understand, will complete his remarks tomorrow, at which time he will discuss the programs of economic assistance. For the moment, I should like to reiterate the point which I have already made in the Committee on Foreign Relations with respect to the utter inadequacy of the foreign aid bill which it is now considering. I hope to be in the Chamber tomorrow when the Senator from New York makes his comments as to the need for additional economic aid.

To my way of thinking, the American people have got themselves in to a cul de

sac with respect to foreign aid. Our neighbors overseas have no domestic constituencies. It is not popular in Pennsylvania, in Alaska, in Florida, or in Maine, to advocate taking taxpayers' dollars and spending them for social and economic purposes overseas. Yet the rich nations are getting richer every year, and the poor nations are getting poorer every year. In terms of, first, a sense of compassion and, second, in terms of a sense of enlightened self-interest, I am strongly of the view that the richest nation the world has ever known is acting in a niggardly, uncompassionate, and unenlightened way in cutting down, year after year, the amount that it is spending on foreign aid, not only in gross terms, but also in terms of a percentage of the gross national product.

I am utterly unable to understand why the Congress in general, and the Senate in particular, and the President—influenced no doubt by the political difficulties of passing through Congress an adequate authorization or an adequate appropriation for foreign aid—should have been unwilling to respond to this moral, to this social, to this economic challenge—and, indeed, I say again, to this challenge of self-interest.

For the time will come, if we constantly cut down on our commitments toward land reform, toward education, toward economic improvement of the underdeveloped countries—and I speak not only of Latin America, but also of the countries of Asia and Africa—when the United States will have precious few friends left in the world. In fact, if I may say so, for a variety of reasons we are well on our way to that unfortunate situation right now.

In my judgment, what is needed more than anything else is an intensification of the education of the American people and of Congress to the vital necessity for expanding the extent of our contributions to the underdeveloped countries of the world—contributions of an economic and social nature.

I share to the highest degree the views of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who believes that to the maximum extent feasible foreign assistance should be multilateral, that is, it should be extended through international institutions, and not bilateral in terms of agreements between ourselves and particular countries.

Nevertheless, as a pragmatic matter, it must be clear that we have been quite unable to persuade the other relatively well-to-do nations of the world to bear their share of the burden.

I wish that it were otherwise. I would hope that we would be able to make our contribution through IDA, through the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, through the Inter-American Bank, and through the newly established Asian Bank.

As Senator FULBRIGHT has well said, "You never see signs on walls saying 'World Bank go home'."

For that reason I share his views on the desirability of making as much of our aid as possible multilateral. But in some way, in some manner, this aid must go to those countries before it is too late, and they become places where there are heard curses not loud but deep, while the most opulent, affluent, and compassionate nation the world has ever known turns its back on its obligations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LOCATION OF 200-BILLION-ELECTRON-VOLT ACCELERATOR

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, for two decades the United States has led the world in the science of nuclear energy. We have pioneered in the peaceful uses of the atom. We have taken the lead in urging the world to adopt international measures against the spread and use of nuclear weapons.

We are now getting ready to build a 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator, the world's biggest atom smasher. It will be a vital tool for our understanding of nuclear matter. It will help keep the United States ahead in the nuclear science race.

We are going to build it. The question is where?

During the past year we have trusted the Atomic Energy Commission with the job of answering this question.

When the Commission asked for site proposals last year, communities all over the Nation responded with suggestions for 200 sites in 46 States.

Mr. President, never before in the history of Federal construction programs has the Government had so many offers, so many sites to choose from.

But Mr. President, something has gone wrong. What began as a search for the best site has turned out to be a miserable deception.

The National Academy of Sciences has interfered and the good faith of all those who submitted site proposals has been violated.

From my State there were four proposals for sites in Kansas City, Joplin, St. Louis, and Flat River. The first three were among the final 85 reviewed by the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Academy of Sciences. While all four were rejected, let no one misunderstand me. Of course, I was disappointed. Of course, I thought the proposals from my State were outstanding and deserved to be among the final six. Many Missourians made a tremendous effort to win this accelerator, and share the concern I am expressing today. But the deception I am talking about affects the whole Nation. It affects the future of our high energy research program. It affects our success in the nuclear energy race.

Mr. President, I am bringing this whole matter before the Senate today because I think the American people have a right to know what happened. They should know the facts and Congress should know the facts.

Before the end of this session the Atomic Energy Commission is going to be asking Congress to approve a site for the new accelerator. And they are going to ask us to authorize construction costs totaling $375 million. I think it would be a great tragedy, a great setback in our nuclear programs if the Commission proceeds to choose from a list of sites which fail to meet the basic physical requirements which the Commission itself set forth last year.

When the Commission asked for proposals, they issued official criteria on which these proposals should be based. These criteria were submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and are printed in the committee's hearings. These criteria were given to all the communities where proposals were being drawn up. These criteria were given to the press and have appeared in whole or in part in papers and magazines all across the country. I have a copy right here in my hand and I am going to put it in the RECORD where everybody can see it once again.

Mr. President, every proposal submitted to the Commission was based on these criteria. Organizations and local governments spent hundreds of hours and thousands of dollars measuring themselves against these criteria.

Every proposal was submitted in the belief that the best man will win. But thanks to interference by the National Academy of Sciences, the best man has about as much chance of winning as the North Pole has of melting before tomorrow morning.

What a shame it is that the Atomic Energy Committee turned the site evaluation over to the National Academy of Sciences. For no sooner had the National Academy taken over, than it adopted an entirely new criterion for judging the sites. The Academy admits this on page 7 of its 44-page report. And, as if this were not enough, the Academy report firmly states they "assigned paramount importance to this new criterion."

This is an alarming development. By refusing to stick to the original AEC criteria, by changing horses in the middle of the stream, the Academy has picked six seriously inadequate sites. They have recommended to the AEC six sites—Ann Arbor, Brookhaven, Chicago, Denver, Madison, and Sacramento—of which not a single one satisfies more than five of the eight major AEC criteria. Three of the six recommended sites fail to meet half of the eight major criteria.

If you ask the National Academy why they did this they will tell you they are "assured that the sites have suitable physical properties." This is the way the report puts it.

But when you sit down and read this report you find plenty of evidence that they were not sure—not sure about the sites they are choosing, not sure whether the sites live up to the basic requirements of the accelerator.

On the matter of electric power, the AEC set forth clear and vital requirements. This instrument will take tremendous amounts of electrical power. The proposed power supply, for instance, must have at least 10 times the capacity needed by the accelerator. Yet the Academy states "a detailed study would be needed" to determine if they could ever get adequate power at the Denver and Madison sites. At present the power supply at both sites is hopelessly inadequate.

The Academy is willing to take a costly gamble on two sites which fail to meet

minimum standards. Yet the Academy rejected many other sites with plenty of electric power to offer.

What made the Academy think it could ignore a vital factor like power?

When the Atomic Energy Commission first asked for proposals they stressed the importance of proximity to a major airport having frequent service to major U.S. cities. That is actually one of the criteria.

But what did the National Academy come up with?

They came up with Sacramento, Calif., which does not have a major airport and is 2½ hours driving time from the San Francisco airport. They came up with Madison, Wis., which the report actually admits "offers only limited direct airline service to major cities except for Chicago."

And, as if that were not enough, they came up with Brookhaven which is 1½ hours from a major airport.

Now, the Atomic Energy Commission has told us all along that there will be teams of scientists flying to and from the site each day. The report itself even states that most of the research at the accelerator will be carried out by visiting scientists.

But for some reason, the Academy insists on recommending three sites which are painfully hard to get to—sites which will increase travel time and cause the waste of thousands of valuable man-hours through delay and gross inconvenience.

Mr. President, anyone who reads the Academy's report will see immediately that the Academy had very little concern about construction costs. In fact, on page 3 of the report they state:

> It has not been the purpose of this committee to estimate the costs of construction and operation at various sites.

Well, now, I wish the Academy would tell us who is looking at the construction costs? Who is trying to find a site where the American taxpayer will not be burdened by unnecessary expenses?

At Ann Arbor the report states:

> The bedrock is reported to vary from 200 to 300 feet. * * * Deep foundations such as piles will be required for support of the magnet ring and in critical experimental areas.

At Brookhaven, we find the proposed site is located on a "glacial outwash plain, underlain primarily by sands and gravels to the depth of nearly 200 feet." At Denver we find the report stating:

> The terrain is rolling and considerable excavation will be required.

At Sacramento, there is little, if any, excavation material above bedrock and thus the excavation for the instrument would require blasting. The report admits that in the case of Sacremento "the principal drawback in the site is the shortage of soil materials in the vicinity that could be used for shielding."

The original criteria set forth by the Atomic Energy Commission did not include climate. But in November, the Commission submitted to the National Academy a revised criteria list. This new list did specifically include climate.

The Commission and the Academy agreed: below-freezing weather could "increase costs and decrease efficiency in the experimental areas during the severe part of the winter."

In fact, Mr. President severe weather would mean a loss in operating costs of $1 million per week based on the $60 million annual operating budget.

Yet, in spite of this warning, which site did the Academy pick?

They picked Denver and Madison which both have more than 160 days a year with below-freezing weather. On top of that, Denver has an average of some 59 inches of snowfall every year—snowfall which brings traffic in the area to a complete standstill.

Mr. President, it does not take a construction engineer to realize that at these sites there will be added cost for the American taxpayer.

The Academy said it was not very concerned with construction costs.

Why did not the Atomic Energy Commission reprimand the Academy for this attitude? After all, the Atomic Energy Commission had given its word to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. They had given their word to the Congress. And they had given their word to hundreds of Americans drawing up site proposals.

Mr. President, I submit that unless this whole massive deception, this violation of good faith, is corrected immediately the American taxpayer is going to be asked to pay millions of extra dollars for construction, with the possibility of delay in getting the accelerator built, and extreme inconvenience for thousands of scientists and technicians who will use the accelerator when it is completed.

Mr. President, the more I read the National Academy report and the more I review what has been said by the Atomic Energy Commission, the more alarmed I become.

What we expected the Academy to do was to select a site that is physically ideal for the construction of the accelerator.

But the Academy refused. They refused to recognize that the American people expect economy from their Government.

And instead, they substituted a subjective criterion which holds about as much water as a fisherman's net.

The Academy says that it placed "paramount important to the considerations that affect the recruiting of personnel."

Fantastic as it seems, the Academy actually believes that unless they build this accelerator in one of these six sites, they will not be able to attract the scientists and engineers needed for construction and operation.

Can anyone imagine that a scientist would refuse to work at the most important research installation in his field just because it is not at Denver, Madison, Sacramento, Chicago, Ann Arbor, or Brookhaven?

The Academy says, "Oh, but Senator, the scientists would like to live in Denver and they already live near the other sites. If we put it where there are no high energy physicists, or if we put it where there is no fabulous recreation attraction, these men and women will not come."

What if we find some who like water skiing instead of snow skiing, or quail hunting instead of duck hunting?

They might as well tell me our scientists have suddenly gone soft, that they are no longer the great Americans you and I know them to be.

It was the Atomic Energy Commission that built the Los Alamos weapons research laboratory. Did they have any trouble attracting scientists to go out there?

It was the Atomic Energy Commission which built the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee. Do they now propose moving Oak Ridge up to Denver or Brookhaven or Madison or Sacramento because the scientists prefer not to move to Oak Ridge?

Mr. President, I submit that scientists will go to the Arctic, the equator, or anywhere on earth if it is necessary to pursue their research. Yet today, no one is asking our high energy physicists to go anywhere like the Arctic or the equator. All we are asking is that they go to a site where the acelerator will be the least burden to the American taxpayer and a site which will provide the maximum benefit for the whole Nation.

Mr. President, this is not the only speech I will make on this subject. I can promise the Senate that I will attempt to bring to the public's attention all of the facts on this matter. The Congress and the public must know. They have a right to know.

When all the questions and facts are laid before this body, I hope the Atomic Energy Commission will reject the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences.

And do not let the AEC tell us they are bound to accept the recommendations of the National Academy. They are bound only to be accountable to the people. They are bound to follow the directions of the President and the Congress. The sooner they understand that, the better off they will be.

I think it is in the national interest that the AEC make a complete review of all the proposed sites, not just the six that the National Academy selected. Without such a review I am convinced that great damage will be done to our nuclear research program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the document entitled "Considerations Involved in Siting a Major New Accelerator."

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

CONSIDERATIONS INVOLVED IN SITING A MAJOR NEW ACCELERATOR [1]

1. GENERAL

A national laboratory having as its principal research instrument a 200- to 300-billion-electron-volt accelerator will have a staff of approximately 2,000 people. The resident staff will include professional scientists and engineers who will be responsible for the

[1] Submitted by Commissioner G. F. Tape to Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States, on Apr. 1, 1965. Also appeared in AEC press release dated Apr. 28, 1965.

design, construction, and operation of the accelerator and its associated facilities, and research scientists whose principal function will be carrying out the long term research program in collaboration with visiting scientists, particularly from university users groups. The site must be so located that management can mobilize and maintain the necessary specialized staff, both resident and nonresident, to accomplish effectively the goals of the research project.

It is difficult to establish priorities or weights among the various technical, economic, and social criteria that can be described. Some items, of course, are absolutely essential such as acreage requirements, the availability of adequate power, the proximity of adequate transportation, etc. On the other hand, other items such as foundation requirements of deep piles versus shallow piles, one-pass versus recirculating water systems, tunneling versus cutting and filling for shielding the magnet ring, etc., cannot be categorized absolutely and are subject to some compromise in order to maximize the potential of each site.

In other words, there will be trade-offs between the technical and other factors in order that overall efficiencies and economies can be obtained.

2. LAND

(a) Sufficient acreage, in the continental United States, should be available to meet both initial and long range expansion requirements (depending upon shape and topography, 3,000 acres is tentatively estimated as minimum for a 200-Bev. proton accelerator).

(b) The land should be owned or be reasonably available to the Federal Government.

(c) The terrain and substructure should have load-bearing capacity adequate to insure stable foundations for both the accelerator and the other associated facilities.

(d) The site should be reasonably level to minimize expensive excavations.

(e) Sites with serious seismic activity, faults or loose joints in bedrock are to be avoided; however, it is unlikely that many sites will be eliminated solely on this basis.

3. UTILITIES

(a) The ready availability of electric power at the site sufficient for a demand load of several hundred megawatts is required.

(b) The ready availability at the site of an adequate supply of cool, clean water is desirable. Since closed recirculating water systems can be used and may be preferable technically, it is unlikely that many sites will be eliminated solely on this basis.

(c) The economics of power and water acquisition and especially subsequent operational costs will be a factor.

4. ENVIRONMENT

(a) Proximity to a major airport having frequent service to major U.S. cities is necessary to provide easy access and minimum travel time for university users and other visiting research personnel.

(b) Adequate surface transportation facilities are necessary for movement of goods and transport of personnel.

(c) Proximity to a commercial industrial center which includes adequate coverage of special needs in electronics, electrical and precision mechanical equipment will ease problems of recruiting technical support and in obtaining specialized supplies.

(d) Proximity to other broadly based research and development activities will provide opportunities for desirable interaction of scientific and engineering personnel.

(e) Sufficient housing and community facilities must be available to accommodate the permanent operating and research staff of several thousand people and the transient staff of several hundred.

(f) Proximity to a cultural center that includes a large university will provide intellectual and cultural opportunities attractive for staff and families.

(g) Regional wage and cost variations as well as labor surplus areas are factors.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the document setting forth eight major considerations, entitled "200-Billion-Electron-Volt Accelerator Laboratory Siting Factors."

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

THE 200-BILLION-ELECTRON-VOLT ACCELERATOR LABORATORY SITING FACTORS

The evaluation factors for siting the 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator as originally submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are recast and further highlighted in this document in order that the Commission be able to make a final selection.

The principal objective in the factors governing the choice of a site is the contribution to the capability and effectiveness of the Nation's research in elementary particle physics. The site must be so located that management can mobilize and maintain the necessary specialized staff, both resident and nonresident to accomplish the research goals.

The siting factors have been categorized as follows:

I. Land suitability.
II. Utility availability.
III. Construction cost.
IV. Operation cost.
V. Transportation.
VI. Colleges and universities.
VII. Communities.
VIII. Other considerations.

I. LAND SUITABILITY

(A) Sufficient acreage, in the continental United States, should be available to meet both initial and long-range expansion requirements. Depending upon shape and topography, 3,000 acres is estimated as minimum for a 200-billion-electron-volt proton accelerator. Availability of additional land contiguous to the site described should be considered.

(B) The land configuration and dimensions should be capable of accommodating the accelerator and associated facilities. One and one-quarter miles is taken as the least linear dimensions with acceptable topography.

(C) The land should be owned by or be reasonably available to the Federal Government. Cost of the non-Federal land should be considered.

(D) Compatibility of present use of the land and of the existing capital improvements with an accelerator laboratory should be considered.

(E) The site should be reasonably level to minimize expensive excavations. The maximum elevation differential should be no more than 100 feet.

(F) The surface and subsurface soils should have load-bearing capacity adequate to insure stable foundations for both the accelerator and the associated facilities.

II. UTILITY AVAILABILITY

(A) Distance of power from site and the ready availability of electric power at the site must be sufficient for a demand load of 200 megawatts initially and increasing gradually to 300 megawatts.

(B) Impact on the electrical distribution system as it affects the availability of electrical power in the quantities necessary for efficient operation of the accelerator laboratory should be considered.

(C) The need for reliability of electrical power requires that the power source be an interconnected system.

(D) The ready availability at the site of cool, clean water should be considered. The initial minimum usage rate is estimated to be 2,000 gallons per minute, assuming the use of a recirculating system. Eventually the water requirements will be 4,000 gallons per minute.

(E) Natural hazards, including seismic, hurricane, tornado, snow, rain, temperature, winds and dust affects construction costs. Natural hazards bear upon construction costs by way of affecting problems of stability as well as insulation and covering construction costs.

III. CONSTRUCTION COST

(A) The effect upon construction costs due to existing facilities such as buildings, utilities, and roads should be considered. The utility of existing site facilities should be gaged in relation to the new laboratory to assess construction cost savings.

(B) Soil movement and load-bearing capacity affects accelerator associated construction costs. The requirements of accelerator stability must be accounted for in addition to the conventional construction requirements.

(C) Elevation differential affects construction cost. The elements involved are the relative costs of cutting and filling, as well as the effects of elevation differentials on earth stability which in turn affects construction cost.

(D) Tunneling cost advantage over cutting and filling, if any, should be conisdered.

(E) Cost to cope with elevation of water table should be considered. The variation of level and variation with time of the water table affects earth stability and is to be associated with drainage construction costs.

(F) Cost to bring electric power to the site should be considered.

(G) Cost to bring water to the site should be considered.

(H) Regional wage and cost variations as estimated by construction cost type indices should be considered.

(I) Depth of bedrock as it affects the stability of the accelerator and the associated facilities should be considered.

(J) Depth and variation in level of the water table as it affects earth stability in the vicinity of the accelerator should be considered.

(K) Seismic activity as it affects the strength and movement of soils should be considered.

IV. OPERATIONAL COST

(A) Electric power cost taking into account regional variations is an important consideration.

(B) Water cost taking into account regional variations should be considered.

(C) Existing and planned technological capabilities and facilities on the site area contribute to reducing operational costs. Include existing machine shops, electronic shops, maintenance and service shops, etc.

(D) Existing and planned technological capabilities and facilities in the vicinity of the site area contribute to reducing operational costs. Proximity to a commercial and industrial center with a well developed research and development base affects operational cost.

(E) Natural hazards affect operational costs. Include seismic disturbances, tornadoes and hurricanes as they affect operating costs.

(F) Climatic operational costs. Include heating, air-conditioning, water cooling, snow removal, etc., as they affect operational costs.

(G) Soil movement and load-bearing capacity relative to operational cost should be considered. Costs to realine experimental

facilities associated with preventative maintenance programs and emergencies, can be large.

(H) Regional wage variations and labor relations affect operational cost.

V. TRANSPORTATION

(A) Proximity to a major airport having or planning to have frequent service to major U.S. cities is desirable to provide easy access and minimum travel time for university users and other visiting research personnel.

(B) Availability of adequate surface transportation facilities for the movement of goods and transport of personnel should be considered.

VI. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

(A) Proximity to colleges and universities should be considered.

(B) Strength of graduate and undergraduate programs in the physical sciences and the liberal arts available to the staff and their families is an important factor.

(C) Potential scientific and engineering interaction between the universities and the accelerator laboratory, and the relative merits of the impact of local university elementary particle physicists and engineers upon the work of the accelerator laboratory should be considered.

(D) Potential training of accelerator laboratory staff including availability of coursework and night classes for professional growth of the laboratory staff should be considered.

VII. COMMUNITIES

(A) Proximity of sizable communities within an hour's commuting time of the accelerator laboratory. A minimum population of 50,000 is required to assimilate the 2,000-staff member families and the transient staff.

(B) Availability of housing for the laboratory staff and laboratory visitors in important. The growth record of the community and its capability of adapting to change should be considered. Guest facilities in the communities should be available.

(C) The quality and adaptability of public school systems including the growth record and community interest in education are important.

(D) Availability of medical facilities. The adequacy, growth record, and community support of medical facilities are important.

(E) Churches, entertainment, recreational and other cultural facilities such as museums and libraries should be available.

VIII. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

(A) Consideration should be given to the special responsibility of the AEC for its own laboratories and the advantages of effective utilization of present AEC facilities.

(B) Consideration to the establishment of a new center of excellence. The impact of the accelerator laboratory on a local university makes possible the transition to a new level of performance. Desirability of broadening the educational base of the Nation should be considered.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri that I intend to comment on his remarks. If he wishes to stay, I would be happy to have him listen.

Mr. President, the 200- or 300-billion electron-volt proton smasher, which has been under consideration by the Atomic Energy Commission for some time, may well be before Congress this year for financing, or it may be that a decision will not be made in time for financing this year.

I believe that the National Academy of Sciences and the Atomic Energy Commission have considered and have had before them applications for some 185 locations in the United States for this particular project.

It is, of course, a desirable project from the standpoint of any State, and recently all but six sites were eliminated by the Atomic Energy Commission. Those six sites have been under visitation by members of the Board, the Atomic Energy Commission, by their staff of experts, and by others.

When I speak of this I believe I speak with some firsthand knowledge inasmuch as I was present at the visitation by the Atomic Energy Commission at the site close to Denver less than a month ago. So that when I speak of this, I speak of a matter with which I am familiar, and not of something I am conjuring out of the air.

First of all, I want to make it clear, Mr. President, that it may well be or could be—although I hope not—that Colorado would not be the final selection of the Atomic Energy Commission as to this site. It could just as well be that one of the five sites other than Colorado would not be the final selection of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Nevertheless, it would not occur to me to downgrade any of the sites included at the present time—Ann Arbor, Brookhaven, Chicago, Denver, Madison, Sacramento—or the people associated with them, nor any of the facilities offered by the sites, in the illusory concept that I would in any way be helping to locate the plant in the State of Colorado.

I want to comment on certain remarks that the Senator from Missouri has made, and I want to lay them out cold, because either he does not know what he is talking about, or he has never been to Colorado, or he has never bothered to do the necessary research. His must have been only very casual research, to have made his remarks so meaningless.

First of all, let us consider the power supply, which he says is "hopelessly inadequate" in Denver. I was present at the visitation of the Commission in Denver, and they asked many questions about the power supply. The graphs which were placed before the members of the Commission showed double lines of service, which are now almost complete, to the area under consideration. The members of the Commission seemed completely satisfied with this showing.

The criteria indicates that approximately 200 megawatts would be required. In this connection the Public Service Co. of Colorado has a large system of generating plants interconnected with high voltage transmission lines concentrating in the Boulder-Denver area, with a total at the present time of 1,000 megawatts. The total system capacity is in excess of 1,240 megawatts. A pump storage project now under construction will add 300 megawatts in 1966.

In addition, it is no secret that a large nuclear plant is planned for the area immediately north of Denver, which would greatly expand even this large amount of power.

As a matter of fact, there is not one iota of evidence here, or anywhere else, to support the statement of the Senator from Missouri: "the Denver and Madison sites, both have a hopelessly inadequate power supply." I know nothing about Madison, and I would not do anything to downgrade our sister State of Wisconsin, even if I did.

The item alleged by the Senator from Missouri about power is completely out of the ball park. I think he completely misunderstands the facilities that are available. The Public Service Co. of Colorado is unmatched anywhere in the United States with respect to the forward looking technology it has applied to the electrical supply system for the service areas that it supplies.

Incidentally, this would not be the only plant, if it were built in Colorado, that the Public Service Co. would supply on a double line basis and some of these plants are critical to the welfare of the United States.

Originally there were eight criteria. However, our people used 10 even more critical criteria, which were not put together by the AEC or NAS. I shall discuss some of them, one by one.

One of the requisites in the original call of the AEC was proximity to a major airport. Mr. President, there is not a finer airport in the United States than the Denver Airport. One can alight from a plane in the Denver Airport, rent a car, and drive to this site within 30 minutes, without ever approaching the speed limit. How do I know this? Because we did it less than a month ago, in the company of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There is now available at the site one paved road. But if the site were selected, I think the more obvious solution would be to black top about 4 miles of road directly off the interstate highway, and it still would take less than 30 minutes for anyone arriving on a plane to reach the site.

It is true that this is not flat bottom land, but apparently the Atomic Energy Commission did not want flat bottom land on which to construct the bevatron. We discussed the details of the amounts of excavation that would be required for the construction of the bevatron and the kinds of materials that would have to be moved for its construction. The amounts of materials did not seem to be of particular concern to the commission at that time. It is a fact that a high-water table in interference with the activities of the bevatron never can be a problem at this site.

The Senator from Missouri says that there are 169 days a year in Colorado on which the temperature is below freezing. In his prepared text—or at least in the news release from his office—he said that Denver and Madison have 160 days of severe weather annually, which would cost the U.S. Government $1 million per week. In his statement in the Senate, he said that Denver had 59 inches of snow, and that that "practically brings panic." Here, again, I say to the Senator that I do not know, speaking off the top of my head, what the actual snowfall in Denver is. It was only today that I learned that he was to make his speech. Whether it is 59 inches or any other

amount, I have lived in Colorado all my life, and I have never seen the time when snowfall caused panic anywhere in the State.

As a matter of fact, we have towns like Fraser and Aspen, places from 8,000 to 12,000 feet high in the mountains, in which we have the great and glorious ski country which the Senator seems to envy so much.

It is true that those parts of our State get cold. We not only get large amounts of snowfall, but we also pray for them in the wintertime because it means good skiing, a wonderful tourist season, and also the lifeblood of our State for our farmers in the summertime.

The implication of what the Senator says is that on 160 days out of the year the weather in Colorado is so severe that it would be impossible to operate.

Mr. President, I want to say a couple of things about the weather. I expect that I have flown between here and Colorado not less than 120 times—and perhaps 150 times—in the last 12 or 15 years. In all of those flights, I have been weathered out only one time.

If the weather were the kind that the Senator describes, certainly they would not put $5, $6, and $7 million jets down on the airport in snow that is 3 or 4 feet deep. The circumstances themselves just do not justify the statement of the Senator. If the Senator had ever taken any trouble to investigate, he would know that they did not. If he had ever gone to Colorado in January and seen people working in their yards in their shirt sleeves, as I have on hundreds of occasions, he would know that while we often do have snow in the wintertime—and we never regret it at all—the snow is so dry there that often the snow simply sublimates into the air. We often have a 4- or 5-inch snowfall in the morning, but we have great difficulty in finding any of that snow in the evening except under a few bushes.

Mr. President, I want to add one thing with respect to transportation. One of the criteria put on this particular subject by the Atomic Energy Commission was that the operation be close to some large universities doing work in astrophysics.

I should like to say for the benefit of the Senator from Missouri that within 25 minutes by high-speed, four-lane, separated highways there is the University of Denver which has gained preeminence and outstanding recognition by NASA and many other institutions in the field of science. Within an hour, at the maximum, there is the University of Colorado which has great capability in nuclear physics and physics of every kind.

Immediately north, and still available by four-lane highway, is the great Colorado State University with a similar professional and scientific capability.

Mr. President, two of these institutions can be reached from this site without ever going through any kind of a traffic light. Of course, that situation is not true with respect to the university in downtown Denver.

In addition to that, we have our own great Colorado School of Mines, the only really true separate mining school in the Nation today, one of the great schools of this country, with a great scientific capability in this area.

Our people were not just whistling in the dark when they put in an application and spent many hundreds of man-hours preparing the most detailed reports for the Atomic Energy Commission. However, when the flat statement is made here that we simply do not have the power supply and when the statement is made that we have 160 unfavorable days a year and 59 inches of snow which practically brings panic, my friend does a disservice to a sister State which I think does not do service to him. I do not know what particular place in his own State made application for this project, but whatever place it was, I am sure that it had good reason for making application and some reason for thinking that it could fulfill the criteria.

I want to say now, that I hope our chances of success do not rest upon the denegration and downgrading of another State in the Union. If these statements by the Senator from Missouri were based on actual facts, it would be an entirely different situation, but they are not based on facts. For that reason, I think the remarks of the Senator do a great disservice to him and to my State of Colorado.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I have listened to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado, with some concern.

I realize that in speaking on matters of this kind, after the development has been created, a Senator is always laying himself open to the statement that it is "sour grapes" because his State did not win.

I stated that Missouri was not selected. I have no intention at any time of downgrading Colorado or the State of any other Senator. But I am concerned about the entire program on a national basis.

As I pointed out in the earlier stages of my statement, certain criteria were set out that we were to follow and go by. These criteria were to serve as our guidelines. That is what not only Missouri but also many other States did. Then we woke up at the last moment and found that the guidelines were changed.

It raised a question in my mind, not that I have any thought that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado, or other Senators from States in which sites were selected, would do the least thing wrong. They did present their best side and they are entitled to do that, and I would expect them to do it.

The Senator from Colorado always does that for his State, and he does a very able job of it. But when the Senator implies that we have not done any research on this and do not know what we are talking about, and when he bases his statement that this is entirely proper on the fact that it is done by the Atomic Energy Commission or the National Academy of Sciences, then I must say that the Senator from Colorado himself has done no research.

Mr. ALLOTT. Can the Senator name a time or date when the snowfall in Denver practically brought panic?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Yes. It just so happens that the people doing the research on this are from Denver and from Colorado. Those are the words that were called to my attention not later than 5 minutes ago.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not know who those people are. Can the Senator name them?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. The Senator takes great issue with the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission and other people with authority have done this. Let me read what they say. If the Senator wishes to call them liars, that is his privilege. I do not know them, but this is what the National Academy of Sciences report states:

> The climate in Denver is characterized by a wide variation between day and night temperatures. The daily maximum temperatures, even in winter, tend to be above freezing, but temperatures drop sharply at night. Similarly, summer daylight temperatures are typically higher, the humidity is low, and nights are cold. Average daily maximums above 90 occur about 41 days each year.

I guess those are the days on which people are in their yards in their shirtsleeves.

I continue to read:

> Daily minimums on the average are below 32° on 161 days a year.

That is what the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Academy of Sciences report states. I do not know them, but these are the people who are making the rules and that is what they say about the conditions which exist there.

I am not trying to downgrade the State of Colorado. I do not know on what basis they make their selection.

Mr. ALLOTT. Will the Senator yield while I read the official Weather Bureau temperatures for Denver?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Yes, I should be glad to do so.

Mr. ALLOTT. The daily maximum—and I am reading, starting in January. I shall read the maximum, the minimum, and the mean.

In January, it is 43.1, 16.8 and 30.

In February, 45.6, 19.3, and 32.5.

In March, 50.9, 24.8, and 37.9.

In April, 60.5, 34.3, and 47.4.

In May, 69.5, 43.8, and 56.7.

In June, 81, 53, and 67.

If the Senator wishes to say that the temperature varies between the day and the night, I would have to agree with him. Of course it does, because in the summer time we have temperatures over 90 degrees, and yet a blanket is commonly used at night for sleeping. That is why it makes such a delightful place, and why they like to live there.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. The Senator realizes, of course, that when the temperature drops below freezing, below 32 degrees Fahrenheit, this atom smasher cannot operate at capacity; and when it does not, that may cost us $1 million more per week based on the $60 million annual operating budget. The Senator

is not telling me that there are fewer than 160 days per year that the temperature drops below freezing?

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree with the Senator. But I should like to ask the Senator if he knows that this atom smasher will be completely underground and thus, to a great extent, completely unaffected by temperatures.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I only know what the National Academy of Sciences, upon whose report the Senator bases his argument, says. They say it falls below 32 degrees 161 days of the year, and they say the average annual snowfall is 59 inches. That is what they say. I thought that would be from the horse's mouth, for me to go get their figures. They are the ones making the decision. I only wonder what they are basing that decision on.

Mr ALLOTT. I do not quarrel about the 59 inches of snowfall per year. We will take it and be happy to get it, every year in the century.

But I do wish to say I have never seen the time that the snowfall in Denver caused panic. As a matter of fact, we have in the State of Colorado at least a dozen mountain passes, all of which approach an altitude between 11,000 and 12,000 feet, and those passes are used constantly by people the year around, never being closed more than 3 or 4 hours, at the most, at any time; and many of the people do not even use snow tires.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. The Senator has a beautiful State and a great State. I am mighty proud that one of the mountains out there is named Long's Peak. I only wish I could say it had been named after me.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator had been there early enough, we might have done it.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. There is one other matter I should like to call to the Senator's attention. He mentioned power, that we had not done any research on that. Let me read once more what the National Academy of Sciences says about the power out there. I did not intend to go into all this detail about the Senator's State, but these are their words, what they say. After the Senator's statement about how much power they have, here is what the people making the decision say—and I want to know how they can make decisions on this basis:

> A detailed study would be needed to determine whether the power transmission system which would supply the area will have sufficient capacity to insure acceptable voltage and frequency stability under all possible load conditions. The board of water commissioners has committed the city and county of Denver to supply the required amounts of water.
>
> Denver is an attractive growing city with a population of more than half a million. The communities east of Denver in the direction of the site are good residential communities. The area offers adequate cultural opportunities. Schools are good. Recreational facilities are excellent. Industrial services in the Denver area are diversified enough to support the project.

Those last statements are in the Senator's favor; but they do say there is some question about the power to be supplied there.

There is one other matter. The Senator is justly proud of his schools, as we are in Missouri, and as I am sure people are in every State. I am sure the State of Colorado has great schools.

But what did the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Academy of Sciences, who are deciding the matter, say about it? And I should like to know, after what they did say, how they could reach the decision they did.

They mentioned that the University of Denver is 20 miles from the site, the University of Colorado at Denver, 20 miles, and the University of Colorado at Boulder, 40 miles.

Then they add:

> The sixth site, Denver, Colo., has neither the university strength nor the existing design group that is considered desirable.

I do not know those things. That is what I am reading from their report. And the more I read this report, about not only this but the other sites considered, the more I wonder upon what basis they could make such a determination.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator read correctly from the report of the Atomic Energy Commission. I think they are in error about that, and I should like to comment. Since the Senator has raised the problem of water, I do not think anybody in the world knows as much about their water supplies as some of our Western States. I do not mean just Colorado, I include all of our Western States, because we have to study and work on it, to take care of the problem.

The report says:

> Domestic water will be required at an installation employing up to 2,000 people; and cooling water will be required for a synchrotron requiring approximately 200 megawatts of electrical capacity.

In this particular area, both the city of Aurora and the city of Denver have been able to guarantee, and we have developed, the water to fully supply everything that the proposed installation could possibly need.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I say to the Senator, I do not raise any questions about the water. We only raised the question about the power and about the schools after the Senator mentioned those matters, and about the temperature and the snow.

I do not wish to be critical of the Senator's State. I want to make that clear if I can. This is not an attempt to be critical of the site chosen, but it is an attempt to see the overall picture. The people have made these statements, but I cannot determine the basis upon which they made their selections. They have changed the rules on us, because those are the things the Atomic Energy Commission said were important, and that the decision had to be made on those bases.

Mr. ALLOTT. Let us talk about power a moment. In addition to the things I have mentioned concerning the Public Service Co., the Bureau of Reclamation and the Public Service Co. of Colorado are now engaged in working out a joint plan for additional facilities; so as to power, I do not think the Senator can justify his statement in any respect with respect to the power.

Then, as concerns the weather, I simply wish to say to the Senator that when he says the snowfall is 59 inches a year, and there are 160 days a year with below freezing weather, which practically brings panic, he is going clear outside the ball park.

PROGRESS IN THE SOLUTION OF THE POPULATION PROBLEM—PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FARSIGHTED LEADERSHIP

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, where do we stand today in relation to the dissemination of birth control information upon request at home and overseas?

Today, I am pleased to report that we are moving slightly ahead to help bring our world population and our food supply into attunement.

This past week has been historic. Private citizens, the executive branch of the Federal Government, and the House Committee on Agriculture here in Congress have taken steps aimed at helping solve the population explosion by means acceptable to individual belief.

On May 5 and 6 more than 1,000 participants from across the Nation, representing 65 national organizations, met in Washington, D.C., to attend the National Conference on Family Planning: Partners for Progress. The conference, sponsored by Planned Parenthood-World Population and Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington, turned out to be a historic first conference on family planning. It was, I suggest, a good preliminary for a White House Conference on Population which should be preceded by well-planned State conferences.

I had the privilege of speaking before the men and women attending the conference, and I ask unanimous consent that the summary of recommendations forthcoming from the conference appear at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 1.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, these recommendations touch on the pressing need to extend our domestic programs, our assistance to other nations, our research, our training and education, and on the general problem areas.

Said the recommendations in conclusion:

> The clear message of this conference is that planning is an urgent issue in the United States and throughout the world, and that we have the knowledge and the resources to get the job done within the foreseeable future through a creative partnership of public and private institutions.

The national conference included panels on a variety of subjects of general interest. I ask unanimous consent that the program and panels and panel members appear as exhibit 2 at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Further, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the available list of participating organizations and the available names of the international sponsors council appear at the close of exhibit 2.

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

(See exhibit 2A.)

WISE AND FARSIGHTED LEADERSHIP

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the man who deserves the praise of mankind for his wise and farsighted leadership on the issue of population is President Lyndon B. Johnson. On 20 occasions he has spoken publicly on this urgent issue and his eloquent exhortations have concerned the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations, the need for our making bold and daring response to go to the root causes of misery and unrest, the fact that less than $5 invested in population control is worth a hundred dollars invested in economic growth, and he has thereby given positive mandates to the executive agencies for positive action. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his 20 public statements appear in the RECORD at the close of my remarks as exhibit 3.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we see welcome indications that the executive departments are budging slightly from their previous inadequate approaches.

On Monday, April 11, 1966, the Department of State's Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, the Honorable Thomas Mann, when he testified before the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures at the 27th public hearing on S. 1676, announced that he was naming a Special Assistant for Population Matters.

It is with deep regret that I learned this morning of the untimely death of Under Secretary Mann's special assistant for population matters, Mr. Robert W. Adams. He had started to take progressive and forward-looking action in this field and was in the process of cabling our embassies overseas to make certain they knew what our Government's policy was in regards to the dissemination of information concerning family planning. Further, Mr. Adams was requesting the embassies to let him know what the individual countries were doing in this area.

I hope the work he was initiating can be carried forth as he would have done.

On Thursday, May 5, 1966, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Under Secretary, the Honorable Wilbur Cohen, announced that Secretary John Gardner was naming a Deputy Assistant Secretary for Science and Population who would work directly under his Assistant Secretary for Science and Health, Dr. Philip Lee. As I told those persons attending the national conference last week, I hope this budge is the beginning of a longer stride forward. It would appear this action comes as a result of further investigation into the problem by Secretary Gardner following his appearance before the subcommittee on April 7 when he did not think the changes necessary. In any event, these are long-needed changes.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also announced that it was holding regional and State meetings on population and that it had appointed a task force to consider a national conference on population.

I do want to give assurance that the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures intends, while continuing its hearings on the population crisis, to watch closely the extent of change and meaningful activity in this area by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as well as other pertinent executive agencies. The subcommittee will look hopefully for signs of such increasing activity and will be more than happy to accord the Departments full credit when such signs become more visible and results tangible.

HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE MOVES HISTORICALLY

We of the Congress can with pride applaud the action of our colleagues on the House Committee on Agriculture who last week approved the world war on hunger by expanding broadly America's food-for-peace program and by encouraging other nations to become self-sufficient in food production.

The House Agriculture Committee recognized legislatively for the first time in the history of the Congress the world population explosion relationship to the world food crisis, by providing that the food-for-freedom program would encourage and assist those activities related to population growth which are undertaken by recipient nations.

A major provision of the bill which amends and extends Public Law 480 authorizes the use of foreign currencies for family planning if the recipient nation wishes.

This concept was proposed to the House committee by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] who believed that making available soft currency funds generated by the sale of surplus American food abroad for programs of family planning, maternal and child health, and child nutrition is sensible and logical. And so it is.

When he introduced his amendments in March, Representative TODD suggested that if the 89th Congress moved forward legislatively in the area of family planning it would be remembered far more in this context than in any other. He is correct, and I believe that Representative TODD may properly be called a successful pioneer legislator in this field. Certainly the approval of this legislation will mean that the doors are open a little wider to help us solve the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations.

They will open wider still this Tuesday, May 10, 1966, when the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] holds hearings on S. 2993, introduced by the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] which proposes to provide long-overdue Federal funding for family planning clinics, private or public, in communities where they are desired.

Many books have been written about the population explosion. I hope that persons interested in the problem have had the opportunity to read a book written by the ecologist Dr. William Vogt of New York City entitled "People! Challenge to Survival." It contains some grim reminders of what will happen to our beloved earth and to our quality of life if we do not take steps to bring people and resources into better alinement.

EXHIBIT 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

(Presented by George N. Lindsay, chairman, Planned Parenthood-World Population, at final plenary session, National Conference on Family Planning, May 6, 1966)

This has been a historic National Conference on Family Planning and an exciting one. On Wednesday, we saw the repeal of the Nation's last remaining restrictive law on birth control. Yesterday we heard of a major step forward in the policy of the Federal Government in the domestic field, and today, in the action on the House Agriculture Committee on the food-for-freedom bill, we have learned of a similarly promising breakthrough in our ability to help nations overseas. We can feel some satisfaction that these developments are not entirely unrelated to our conference.

All of us have worked hard for 2 days. We have had the privilege of hearing from some of the most knowledgeable physicians, scientists, health and welfare administrators, religious, business, and political leaders in the United States.

The highlight statistics themselves tell an impressive story: More than 1,000 participants, including representatives of 65 national organizations; 84 panelists; 8 major addresses. The groups participating in this conference comprise one of the most representative arrays of national organizations ever brought together under private auspices in this Capital. Surely this distinguished assemblage augurs wells for the great partnership of public and private effort which will be necessary to meet the world population crisis and U.S. family planning needs.

There have been no formal resolutions at the conference and not all participating organizations would necessarily be in agreement with all the recommendations for a positive forward program which have been made in the various panels and addresses. The significant contributions of organizational representatives to our deliberations, however, have made clear that Americans of diverse beliefs and viewpoints share a deep common concern over this issue. In this summary we have attempted to distill the sense of the discussions as a broad framework for continued creative collaboration.

Running through all of the panels and addresses has been the basic concept that the right to high-quality family planning services is a fundamental human right which enlarges the individual's opportunity freely to make basic, lifesaving choices. In the spirit of the movement for emancipation which Margaret Sanger launched a half century ago, this conference has been committed to two central propositions: First, that family planning is a personal and private matter which must remain entirely free of outside coercion. Second, that parents' voluntary decisions in this area can only be made when competent medical services are actively offered and made accessible to all with dignity and without discrimination. It is the task of our pluralistic service system, encompassing a variety of health, welfare, religious, and educational institutions in both private and public sectors, to work together to make these goals a reality without further delay.

There was overwhelming agreement on two major program emphases:

1. In the United States, we face a considerable backlog in the provision of family

planning services. This backlog is the result of long standing deficiencies in our medical care system and of widespread discrimination in the provision of health services to the poor. At the same time, the United States has the resources, capacity and obligation to face this backlog forthrightly and to provide, within the foreseeable future, competent family planning services to all families that need them and want them. The services should be offered with the aim of enhancing individual freedom of choice in regard to family size and child spacing. A variety of methods must be made available to guarantee that the family can choose a technique consistent with personal or religious beliefs.

2. In the United States, we presently have the resources, capacity and obligation also to provide far greater assistance—financial and technical—to nations overseas which require and request help in this field.

The extension of family planning was seen as decisive to the success of efforts to reduce poverty both at home and abroad. In addition to its intrinsic importance in helping poor couples and poor nations to help themselves, reports from many communities made clear that the initiation of family planning services can be instrumental in improving the general health services available to the poor and in opening up many new opportunities for employment of the poor in creative subprofessional jobs.

Although our existing knowledge and experience provide an adequate base for immediate and rapid expansion of programs at home and abroad, there is a continuing and pressing need for the extension of our fundamental knowledge in the area of fertility and infertility, and for further testing, experimentation and development of new medical techniques and improved methods of delivering this service.

At the same time, there is an immediate as well as a continuing need to train the physicians, scientists, nurses, social workers, administrators and subprofessional workers who will be required in these programs. Therefore, considerable expansion of educational and training efforts at undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate levels will be required, as well as a wide variety of in-service training programs.

Perhaps one of the most extraordinary developments of this extraordinary conference was the clear and heartwarming demonstration that the dialogue between the major religious faiths has been transformed into a true working partnership for the enhancement of world and family health, welfare and freedom.

DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

In keeping within President Johnson's characterization of family planning as one of four critical domestic health problems demanding special attention, the panels yesterday and today attempted to define the scope of the need, assess the adequacy of current programs and project feasible means of meeting these needs. There remain substantial groups of Americans for whom family planning services are not currently available. The economically, culturally and geographically disadvantaged are deprived of adequate care in this field, as they are still deprived of other types of health care. It has been estimated that approximately 5 million fertile impoverished women are not pregnant or seeking a desired pregnancy at any given time, and that only one out of ten currently has access to competent family planning services. Low-income parents want as few children as higher-income parents—or even fewer—and respond in significant numbers when quality family planning services are made available with dignity and skill. To provide competent services to these families will require an estimated $100 million annually. Legislation to earmark the necessary Federal funds to augment local public and private funds for this program has been introduced by Senators TYDINGS, GRUENING, CLARK and others; but whether through new legislation or through the already existing administrative authority residing in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the allocation of such funds, this relatively modest amount, in terms of our total national health budget, is needed for family planning services over the next 5 years. Federal and State funds should be made available on a matching basis specifically to make programs possible in local public and voluntary hospitals, health departments and suitable voluntary agencies.

Family planning must receive higher priority among the Nation's health services. The gap between the overwhelming professional consensus and existing programs must be closed without further delay so that family planning enters the mainstream of American medical practice. Federal, State and local governments must take leadership, in cooperation with private agencies, to establish and maintain an adequate network of family planning services.

Among the specific recommendations for domestic programs were the following:

1. Rapid establishment of comprehensive free or heavily subsidized post-partum family planning clinics in every public and voluntary hospital with an obstetric service, as the most efficient and economic base for an adequate network of services.

2. Massive expansion of family planning clinics operated by health departments, with special attention to the needs of rural areas.

3. The rapid implementation of the new forward-looking policies announced yesterday by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Department must assign its best resources to this program and should call for the inclusion of voluntary family planning services in any comprehensive State health plan utilizing Federal matching funds.

4. Higher priority to family planning in the war against poverty: Encouragement of a family planning component in all community action programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide neighborhood-based services in the heart of poverty areas, and removal of arbitrary restrictions on eligibility for service, such as the limitation on use of OEO funds to purchase family planning supplies only for married women living with their husbands.

5. Sufficient trained staff and consultants in both HEW and OEO to provide on-the-spot technical assistance to local hospitals, health departments and community action programs in the organization and delivery of family planning services.

6. Planning at Federal, State, and community levels to coordinate public and private programs, guarantee comprehensive coverage and secure better deployment of manpower and improved use of facilities.

7. Special attention must be directed to social, health, and educational services that meet the needs of adolescents. Acceptable programs must be devised with proper safeguards, to assist our young people in reducing the incidence of out-of-wedlock births and early marriage necessitated by pregnancy.

ASSISTANCE TO OTHER NATIONS

The United States must provide substantially greater assistance to the developing nations to help them reduce their rates of population growth which threaten to nullify all efforts for economic and social development. Such assistance should be given at the request of the recipient nation and should be integrated into comprehensive aid for general economic and social development.

While there has been progress in U.S. aid in the population field during the last several years, much more can and must be done. Among the recommendations were the following:

1. Larger expenditures for assistance on family planning programs, similar to the proposal of the White House Conference on International cooperation that the United States make available up to $100 million annually over the next 3 years to help other countries implement these programs and strengthen national health and social services necessary for their support.

2. The United States should forthrightly make known to recipient countries that counterpart funds in sizable amounts can be utilized to help finance family planning programs in those countries, as authorized in the amended food-for-freedom bill reported by the House Agriculture Committee today.

3. The U.S. Government, in cooperation with the United Nations and other international organizations, private organizations and universities, should encourage the substantial expansion of facilities for education and training of U.S. and foreign personnel in all aspects of the population problem and the implementation of family planning programs.

RESEARCH

If the population problem is, as the President put it, second only to the search for lasting peace in its importance for the future of mankind, this priority remains to be reflected in the allocation of scientific resources in the United States. Almost every other field of scientific and medical interest—space, cancer, heart disease, blindness, mental health, and so on—commands a considerably larger share of Federal research funds than the $2 million which Secretary Gardner stated will be spent this year for research directly related to the regulation of human fertility.

There was agreement that the time has indeed arrived to correct this situation. With our scientific capability and financial resources, it is indisputable that one of the most significant contributions we can make to the solution of the population problem throughout the world is through massive research to discover methods of fertility control suitable for use in different nations and cultures and acceptable to all faiths; to determine optimum patterns for implementation and administration of family planning services; to illuminate the factors which condition family size preferences; and to explain the relationship between population growth and economic development. It was suggested that the global population explosion is of such urgency as to require a crash program in which the great strides forward in biological knowledge are applied to this field.

1. An aggressive, large-scale program should be initiated by the Federal Government and private institutions to recruit scientific investigators to work in this field. Appropriate incentive programs, such as fellowships, professorships, and career development awards, should be established on a broad scale to insure that enough workers in the scientific disciplines involved are attracted to the field.

2. This year's appropriation for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development should be increased substantially to allocate a minimum of $25 million, specifically and categorically, for research directly related to fertility control.

3. Federal funds and energetic leadership should be provided to establish an appropriate number of major institutes throughout the country within the next 5 years for the interdisciplinary study of human reproduction, fertility, and family planning.

4. Special emphasis should be placed on research to increase the acceptance and reliability of method, and to discover and make available other new techniques of fertility control.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION

To carry out these programs will require thousands of trained workers—physicians, nurses, social workers, scientific investigators, administrators, planners, minister-counselors, clinic aids, community workers, and other subprofessional workers. In addition, the next generation must be given adequate opportunity to learn about population dynamics, human reproductive and fertility regulation. Such education should be made available to children at the earliest ages, consonant with their level of comprehension.

At the present time, education on family planning and population dynamics is inadequate in the Nation's professional schools and almost nonexistent in the Nation's colleges and high schools. Specific recommendations in this area include:

1. A coordinated program involving the major professional groupings—the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Public Welfare Association, the American Nurses Association, the National Association of Social Workers, and the religious groups—to insure the inclusion of comprehensive material on family planning and population dynamics in the curriculums of the relevant professional schools, and to develop intensive programs at the postgraduate level.

2. Regional training institutes for the diverse professional groupings, financed by the Federal agencies with responsibilities in this field (Public Health Service, Children's Bureau, Office of Economic Opportunity).

3. An extensive training program, conducted jointly by the operating agencies and appropriate educational institutions, to train persons for subprofessional jobs in family planning clinics and the community education program associated with them. It has been estimated that the equivalent of 55,000 full-time jobs would be created in domestic family planning services alone. Such a training program should receive high priority in the war against poverty.

4. A major effort, involving educational and professional organizations and private foundations, to integrate appropriate material on population dynamics, reproductive physiology, and fertility control in high school and college curriculums.

5. Development by the Public Health Service of mass educational materials on population dynamics and family planning for all Americans.

6. Special training for clergy and ministerial students to equip them to counsel parishioners in this field.

GENERAL

Additionally, there were several more general proposals. It was felt that the dialogue among the major religious groups which has developed in this field during the last several years demonstrated beyond doubt overwhelming agreement on the necessity for family planning, as long as personal beliefs are respected in these programs. It was evident that the dialogue will be intensified to deal with such questions as the moral issues associated with more widespread use of family planning and the need to involve all segments of the religious community in the social action and cooperation that will be necessary to provide family planning help to those most in need. Interfaith cooperation and mutual understanding in this field is not only desirable but has indeed become a moral imperative. The need for increased attention by the schools, the churches and other institutions to the total fabric of family life was also emphasized.

Similarly, the dialogue among business leaders and economists on the relationship between various rates of population growth and the future of the economy must be continued and broadened. Questions were raised as to the quality of life in an overcrowded America if present growth rates continue. The first order of business was seen as the extension of competent family planning services to those Americans now deprived of them, but it was clear that a major educational effort must be initiated now to alert all Americans to the threat posed by rapid population growth. We need more systematic exploration of the diverse factors influencing the family size preferences of individual parents and the potential tension between these individual desires and overall social needs.

In sum, then, the clear message of this Conference is that family planning is an urgent issue in the United States and throughout the world, and that we have the knowledge and the resources to get the job done within the foreseeable future through a creative partnership of public and private institutions.

EXHIBIT 2

PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY PLANNING: PARTNERS FOR PROGRESS

(Sponsored by Planned Parenthood-World Population and Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington, May 5–6, 1966, Shoreham Hotel)

Honorary sponsors council: Dwight D. Eisenhower, Harry S. Truman, cochairmen; John Cowles, Sr., Lewis W. Douglas, Marriner S. Eccles, Milton S. Eisenhower, Arthur S. Flemming, Harry Emerson Fosdick, J. Kenneth Galbraith, Christian A. Herter, George F. Kennan, Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, Hermann J. Muller, Arthur W. Radford, John Rock, Elmo Roper, Whitney North Seymour, Lewis L. Strauss, Henry M. Wriston.

MAY 4

Advance registration, upper lobby, 5:30–8 p.m.

MAY 5

Registration in main lobby west, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Hospitality, lower lobby, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Film showings—Ambassador Room, 10 a.m. to 11 a.m.

Margaret Sanger "The Engagement Ring," the Planned Parenthood story.

Opening luncheon, Blue Room, noon

The Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Presiding: Donald B. Straus, chairman, P.P.-W.P. executive committee.

Plenary session, Ambassador Room, 2 p.m.

Keynote address: The Honorable JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, U.S. Senate.

Chairman: George N. Lindsay, chairman, P.P.-W.P.

Concurrent panels, 3 to 5 p.m., research, Executive Room

Outstanding scientists will discuss the role of the Federal Government and the scientific establishment in enlarging research in the fields of reproductive physiology, fertility, contraceptive technology, family size motivation, and the social, economic, and cultural effect of population growth.

Franklin T. Brayer, M.D., director, Center for Population Research, Georgetown University.

Philip Corfman, M.D., program associate for population, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

E. James Lieberman, M.D., consultant, child psychology, National Institute of Mental Health.

Clement L. Markert, Department of Biology, Yale University.

John Rock, M.D., Rock Reproductive Study Center.

Sheldon J. Segal, director, Biomedical Division, Population Council.

Anna L. Southam, M.D., program specialist, reproductive biology, the Ford Foundation.

The Chairman: Richard L. Day, M.D., medical director, P.P.-W.P.

Foreign aid, Tudor Room

U.N., U.S. and foreign government leaders and demographers will discuss how we can better help other countries to help themselves meet the social and economic crises that are being brought about by the population explosion.

Robert W. Adams, special assistant to the Under Secretary for economic affairs, Department of State.

Edgar Berman, M.D., Chief Health Consultant for Latin America, Agency for International Development.

William V. D'Antonio, chairman, Catholic Committee on Population and Government Policy.

Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., chairman, Population Crisis Committee.

Stephen Enke, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Defense.

Frank W. Notestein, president, Population Council.

Robert S. Smith, Associate Assistant Administrator for program, Agency for International Development.

The Honorable PAUL H. TODD, JR., U.S. House of Representatives.

H. E. Radomiro Tomic, Ambassador of Chile.

H. E. Humberto Lopez Villamil, Ambassador of Honduras to the U.N.

Chairman: J. Mayone Stycos, director, international population program, Cornell University.

Domestic programs, Ambassador Room

The expanding role of Government in supporting birth control services through health departments, hospitals, the antipovery program, etc., will be discussed by Federal authorities and health and welfare leaders.

Leslie Corsa, Jr., M.D., director, Center for Population Planning, University of Michigan.

Arthur J. Lesser, M.D., Deputy Chief, Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Sar A. Levitan, the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

George N. Lindsay, chairman, P.P.–W.P.

Mollie Orshansky, Division of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration.

Richard A. Prindle, M.D., Assistant Surgeon General of the United States.

Alvin L. Schorr, Deputy Chief, Research and Plans Division, Office of Economic Opportunity.

Chairman: Arnold Maremont, former chairman, Illinois Public Aid Commission.

Reception, Ambassador Room, 6:45 p.m.

To honor the distinguished Members of the Congress, and the officials of the U.S. Government who have recognized the importance of responsible parenthood throughout the world.

Fiftieth anniversary banquet, Regency Ballroom, 7:30 p.m.

Address: The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senate.

Presentation of the Margaret Sanger Award in Human Rights to the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., by Cass Canfield, chairman, governing body of International Planned Parenthood Federation.

Presiding: George N. Lindsay, chairman, P.P.–W.P.

MAY 6

Regislation, main lobby west, 9 a.m.–5 p.m.

Hospitality, lower lobby, 10 a.m.–5 p.m.

Plenary session—Empire Room, 9 a.m.

Keynote address: "Public Policy at the Grassroots," Alonzo S. Yerby, M.D., commissioner of hospitals, New York City.

Chairman: Alan Guttmacher, M.D., president, P.P.–W.P.

Concurrent panels, 10 a.m. to noon

Hospital services—Diplomat Room

The directors of family planning services at leading public and voluntary hospitals, hospital administrators, and other professionals will discuss how hospital-based services can help meet the need for birth control in the United States.

David G. Anderson, M.D., University of Michigan Medical Center.

Gail V. Anderson, M.D., senior attending physician, Los Angeles County General Hospital.

Ernest Lowe, M.D., chief medical officer, Obstetrics and Gynecology Department, District of Columbia General Hospital.

Bernard J. Pisani, M.D., director obstetrics and gynecology, St. Vincent's Hospital, New York.

Nicholas H. Wright, M.D., U.S. Public Health Service officer, Emory University Medical School, Atlanta.

Chairman: Gordon W. Perkin, M.D., associate medical director, P.P.-W.P.

Public health programs, Forum Room

Public Health officials, professionals and educators will discuss the expanding role of public health departments in meeting communities' family planning needs.

Joseph D. Beasley, M.D., Material and Child Health Section, Tulane University School of Medicine.

William Cassel, M.D., chief of maternal and perinatal health, California State Department of Health.

Elizabeth C. Corkey, M.D., assistant health director, Mecklenburg County N.C.

Murray Grant, M.D., director of Public Health, District of Columbia.

David M. Heer, assistant professior biostatistics and demography, School of Public Health, Harvard University.

Mrs. Anne G. Huppman, executive director, Planned Parenthood Association of Baltimore.

Robert Stepto, M.D., Chicago Board of Health.

Chairman: Johan W. Eliot, M.D., assistant professor population planning, University of Michigan School of Public Health.

Poverty programs, Empire Room

Some 18 antipoverty programs throughout the United States now include birth control. Representatives from some of these programs, economists, and social welfare leaders will discuss the effectiveness of family planning in the War on Poverty.

Lisbeth Bamberger, acting chief, Health Division, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity.

James G. Banks, executive director, United Planning Organization, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable JOHN CONYERS, JR., U.S. House of Representatives.

Evelyn Hartman, M.D., director, Maternal and Child Health, Minneapolis Health Department.

Frederick S. Jaffe, vice president, P.P.-W.P.

Lawrence Maze, M.D., director, Family Planning Program, Homer Phillips Hospital, St. Louis.

Mrs. J. R. Modrall, board member, Office of Economic Opportunity, Albuquerque.

Ray Tardy, Sheldon Complex Community Action Program, Grand Rapids.

Chairman: Rev. Eugene Callendar, chairman of the board, Haryou-Act, Inc., New York City.

The religious consensus, Tudor Room

Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen, theologians, and philosophers will discuss the moral implications of expanded birth control programs; and the growing involvement of the religious community in social action necessary to provide family planning help to those most in need.

Rev. Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., professor of law, Georgetown University, and director, Institute of Law, Human Rights and Social Values.

Louis Dupré, associate professor of philosophy, Georgetown University.

Rev. William H. Genné, director, Commission on Marriage and Family, National Council of Churches of Christ.

Rabbi Joachim Prinz., president American Jewish Congress.

Dr. Carl F. Reus, director of research and social action, the American Lutheran Church.

Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, director, Interreligious Affairs, American Jewish Committee.

Chairman: Rev. Richard M. Fagley, Executive Secretary, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs.

Luncheon, Palladian Room, noon

The Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

The Honorable Katherine B. Oettinger, Chief, Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Presiding: Charles Horskie, Advisor (to the President) for National Capital Affairs.

CONCURRENT PANELS, 2 TO 4 P.M.

The business consensus—Tudor Room

Businessmen and economists will discuss growing corporate concern about the population problem here and abroad; social and economic consequences of unchecked population growth, and the relationship between the denial of family planning services to the poor, and the growth of the economic dependency.

Richard L. Breault, associate director research, Task Force Economic Growth and Opportunity, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Richard C. Cornuelle, executive vice president, National Association of Manufactures.

William V. D'Antonio, chairman, Catholic Committee on Population and Government Policy.

Martin R. Gainsburgh, vice president and chief economist, National Industrial Conference Board.

Harvey C. Russell, vice president, Pepsi-Cola Co.

(Other panel members to be announced.)

Chairman: Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., commerce and industry chairman, P.P.-W.P.

Americans' tomorrow—Diplomat Room

The rapid growth of U.S. population with its attendant problems of urban sprawl, water and air pollution, overcrowded schools, traffic jams, etc., is the result of "planned" three and four-child families by the middle-class and well-to-do. Leading authorities will discuss what can be or should be done to help couples recognize the possible consequences of even moderate-sized families to the "quality of life" for tomorrow's Americans.

Robert C. Cook, president, Population Reference Bureau.

Louis Dupré, associate professor of philosophy, Georgetown University.

Ray Lamontagne, associate, John D. Rockefeller, 3d.

Leonard Lesser, general counsel, Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO.

William T. Liu, associate professor, sociology; and director, Institute for Study of Population and Social Change at Notre Dame.

The Honorable William H. Robinson, program consultant, Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

Paul Lester Wiener, professor of urban planning, Columbia University.

Chairman: Donald B. Straus, president, American Arbitration Association; chairman, Executive Committee, P.P.-N.P.

The professional consensus, Empire Room

Representatives of leading medical, social welfare, family planning, public health, and nursing organizations will discuss the vital stake of the professions in expanding knowledge, training and action about population, and family planning in their ranks.

Leslie Corsa, Jr., M.D., chairman, Program Area Committee on Population and Public Health, American Public Health Association.

M. Edward Davis, M.D., president, American Association of Planned Parenthood Physicians.

James R. Dumpson, first vice president, American Public Welfare Association; associate dean, School of Social Work, Hunter College.

Elizabeth Edmands, R.N., assistant professor, population and family health, the Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health.

Jesse W. Johnson, assistant director, Health and Welfare, National Urban League.

Alan I. Levenson, M.D., staff psychiatrist, National Institute of Mental Health.

Joseph P. Martin, M.D., board chairman, Bell Center Birth Control Clinic, Cleveland.

Jules Pagano, Director, Adult Education, Office of Health Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Chairman: Mary S. Calderone, M.D., executive director, Sex Information and Education Council of the United States; former medical director, P.P.-W.P.

The response of the public, Forum Room

Nine out of ten of the Nation's poor families who need birth control are, in effect, denied it. Panelists will discuss the birth control attitudes and practices of those now without birth control help.

Do they want it? Will they use it? What kinds of services are needed?

Donald J. Bogue, director of the Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago.

Mrs. Marjorie Schumacher, executive director, Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington.

Christopher Tietze, M.D., director of research, National Committee on Maternal Health.

Charles F. Westoff, Office of Population Research, Princeton University.

Mrs. Charles F. Whitten, Michigan Welfare Board.

Chairman: Mrs. Naomi T. Gray, field director, P.P.-W.P.

Plenary session, Empire Room, 4 to 5 p.m.

Summary of panel recommendations:

George N. Lindsay, chairman of Planned Parenthood-World Population.

Closing remarks by Alan F. Guttmacher, M.D., president of Planned Parenthood-World Population.

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

(Partial list)

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

The American Assembly.

The American Association of University Women.

American Association on Mental Deficiency.

American Bar Association.

American Civil Liberties Union.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

Americans for Democratic Action.

American Ethical Union.

American Friends Service Committee.

American Jewish Committee.

American Jewish Congress.

The American Lutheran Church.

American Medical Association.

American Nurses' Association.

American Public Health Association.

American Public Welfare Association.

Arrow, Inc.

Board of Christian Social Concerns, the Methodist Church.

Catholic Council on Civil Liberties.

Central Conference of American Rabbis.

The Child Welfare League of America.

The Choats Foundation.

Community Service Society.

Congress of Racial Equality.
The Cooperative League of the U.S.A.
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.
Family Service Association of America.
Haryou-ACT, Inc.
Institute for Study of Population and Social Change at Notre Dame.
International Convention of Christian Churches.
Lutheran Church in America.
Margaret Sanger Research Bureau.
Medical Committee for Human Rights.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Association of Social Workers.
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.
National Conference of Christians and Jews.
National Education Association.
National Federation of Catholic Physicians' Guilds.
National League for Nursing.
National Medical Association.
National Social Welfare Assembly.
National Urban League.
Population Crisis Committee.
Presbyterian Interracial Council.
Protestant Episcopal Church.
Resources for the Future, Inc.
Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S.
Southern Christian Leadership Conference.
State Charities Aid Association.
Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity, Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.
The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
Young Women's Christian Association.

INTERNATIONAL SPONSORS COUNCIL
(Partial list)

Representative BROCK ADAMS; Chief S. O. Adebo, Ambassador Nigeria to U.N.; Conrad Aiken; Mohsin Alaini, Ambassador Yemen Arab Republic to U.N.

George V. Allen, president, Tobacco Institute; D. W. Ambridge, board chairman, Abitibi Power & Paper Co.; J. Amonzegar, Minister of Health, Iran.

Dillon Anderson; Robert O. Anderson, chairman, Atlantic Refining Co.; Stratis G. Andreadis, chairman, Commercial Bank of Greece.

F. S. Arkhurst, Ambassador of Ghana to the U.N.; Sverker C. Astrom, Ambassador of Sweden to the U.N.; John Bardeen;* Jacques Barzun.

Fernando Belaunde Terry, President of Peru; Thomas Hart Benton; L. V. Berkner, director, Southwest Center for Advanced Studies; Sarah Gibson Blanding.

Konrad E. Bloch;* Joseph L. Block, chairman, Inland Steel Corp.; Edward E. Booher, president, McGraw-Hill Book Co.; Lord J. Boyd-Orr;* Lord Russell Brain.

Walter H. Brattain;* Benjamin Britten; Pearl S. Buck;* Ralph J. Bunche;* Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States.

Sir F. MacFarlane Burnett;* Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, Partner, Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; Chester Carlson; Senator FRANK CARLSON; Sir James Chadwick.*

Ilka Chase; Stuart Chase, Carlos Chavez; Lieu Chieh, Ambassador of China to the U.N.; Brock Chisholm, Former Director-General, WHO.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK; Kenneth B. Clark; Sir John Cockcroft;* Lord George James Cole, chairman, Unilever.

Gershon B. O. Collier, Ambassador Sierra Leone to U.N.; James Conant; Aaron Copland; Thomas Corbishley, S.J.

Carl F. Cori;* F. H. Corner, Ambassador New Zealand to the U.N.; Norman Cousins; Gardner Cowles; Dana S. Creel.

Frederick J. Crosson, Director of General Program, Notre Dame; Sir Henry Hallet Dale*; Henrik C. P. Dam.*

William V. D'Antonio, Notre Dame; Ossie Davis; John S. Dickey, president, Dartmouth College; Edwin Dickinson; Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

Senator PETER DOMINICK; Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN; John Dos Passos; James R. Dumpson; Louis Dupré, Georgetown University.

Mohamed Awad El-Kony, Ambassador United Arab Republic to U.N.; Byron K. Elliott, Chairman, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Representative ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH.

John F. Enders;* Orhan Eralp, Ambassador Turkey to U.N.; Morris L. Ernst; Senator PAUL FANNIN; James Finn, editor, Worldview; John Fischer.

Representative O. CLARK FISHER; R. G. Follis, chairman, Standard Oil Co. of California; Emerson Foote; William Friday, president, University of North Carolina.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT; Radomir Geric, Assistant Secretary for Health, Yugoslavia; William F. Giauque.*

Weldon B. Gibson, executive vice president, Stanford Research Institute; Donald A. Glaser;* Representative EDITH GREEN; Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

Representative HARLAN HAGEN; Otto Hahn; Oscar Handlin; Gaylord P. Harnwell, president, University of Pennsylvania; Michael Harrington.

Harlan H. Hatcher, president, University of Michigan; Werner Heisenberg;* Katharine Hepburn; Ben M. Herbster, president; United Church of Christ.

Christian A. Herter, Jr.; Walter R. Hess;* Jaroslav Heyrovsky*; Hudson Hoagland, William Ernest Hocking; Paul G. Hoffman.

Jerome Holland, president, Hampton Institute; Sidney Hook; H. Mansfield Horner, chairman, United Aircraft Corp.; J. K. Horton, president, Southern Cal. Edison Co.

H. Stuart Hughes; Langston Hughes; Robert M. Hutchins; Andrew Huxley;* Sir Julian Huxley; Robert S. Ingersoll, chairman, Borg Warner Corp.

Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE; Senator JACOB K. JAVITS; J. Hans D. Jensen;* John H. Johnson, publisher, Ebony; Shidzue Kato, Senator, Japan.

Jefferson W. Keener, president, B. F. Goodrich Co.; Urho Kekkonen, President of Finland; Edward C. Kendall;* John Cowdery Kendrew.*

James R. Killian, chairman, M.I.T.; Martin Luther King;* George B. Kistiakowsky; Hannes Kjartansson, Ambassador Iceland to the U.N.; Otto Klineberg.

Douglas M. Knight, president, Duke University; Arthur Kornberg;* Sir Hans A. Krebs;* Leon Kroll; Joseph Wood Krutch; Polykarp Kusch.*

Willis E. Lamb, Jr.;* Ralph Lazarus, president, Federated Department Stores; Robert Lazarus, chairman, F. & R. Lazarus & Co.

Roger Lewis, chairman, General Dynamics Corp.; Alexis S. Liatis, Ambassador Greece to U.N.; Ulla Lindström, Minister of Technical Assistance, Sweden.

M. Albert Linton; Fritz Lipmann;* Walter Lippman; Alberto Lleras Camargo; Sir Ben Lockspeiser; John L. Loeb; Louis E. Lomax.

Bishop John Wesley Lord; Archibald MacLeish; Neil H. McElroy, board chairman, Procter & Gamble Co.; Senator GALE W. MCGEE.

Senator GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, William L. McKnight, board chairman, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.; Edwin M. McMillan *, Marya Mannes.

Giacomo Manzú, Archer J. P. Martin *, Peter Brian Medawar *, Guiseppe Medici, Karl D. Menninger, Gian Carlo Menotti, Robert K. Merton.

Senator LEE METCALF, Darius Milhaud, Representative CHESTER L. MIZE, Waldemar Molinski, College for the Study of Catholic Theology, Berlin.

Theodore Monod, Institute of France; Ashley Montagu, Douglas Moore, Edward P. Morgan, Representative THOMAS G. MORRIS, Senator FRANK E. MOSS.

Reuben H. Mueller, president, National Council of Churches; Hermann J. Muller *, Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Lewis Mumford, Willian P. Murphy *,

Gunnar K. Myrdal, Burudi Nabwera, Ambassador of the Republic of Kenya; Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Allan Nevins, Philip John Noel-Baker *.

John H. Northrop *, Frank Notestein, Michael Novak, James F. Oates, Jr., board chairman, Equitable Life Assurance Society.

Sir Duncan Oppenheim, chairman, British American Tobacco Co.; J. Robert Oppenheimer, Fairfield Osborn, Representative RICHARD L. OTTINGER.

Princess Ashraf Pahlavi, Iran; H. Bruce Palmer, president, National Industrial Conference Board; Vijayalakshmi Pandit, Member of Parliament, India.

Rosemary Park, president, Barnard College; C. Jay Parkinson, president, the Anaconda Co.; Hugh B. Patterson, Jr., publisher, Little Rock Gazette; Linus C. Pauling *.

Sir Denning Pearson, chief executive, Rolls-Royce Limited; James A. Perkins, president, Cornell University; Max Ferdinand Perutz *, Bishop James A. Pike.

Gregory Pincus, Walter Piston, Kenneth S. Pitzer, president, Rice University; Jacob S. Potofsky, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

C. B. Powell, publisher, the Amsterdam News; Donald C. Power, chairman, General Telephone & Electronics Corp.; Rabbi Joachim Prinz.

Harold Quinton, chairman, Southern California Edison Co.; Sir Chandrasekhara V. Raman *; J. Saunders Redding, Tadeus Reichstein *, Walter Reuther.

Dickinson W. Richards *, David Riesman, Frederick C. Robbins *, David Rockefeller, Representative James Roosevelt, Representative BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL.

Lessing J. Rosenwald, Zenon Rossides, Ambassador of Cyprus to U.N.; Richard H. Rovere, Representative DONALD RUMSFELD, Bayard Rustin, Jonas E. Salk.

Irving Salomon, board chairman, Royal Metal Manufacturing Co.; Carl Sandburg, Frederick Sanger *.

Henry B. Sargent, president, American & Foreign Power Co.; Representative JAMES H. SCHEUER, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Mark Schorer, Emilio Segrè *.

Frederick Seitz, president, National Academy of Sciences; Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, Ambassador of Nicaragua to U.N.; Harlow Shapley.

Roger L. Shin, dean of instruction, Union Theological Seminary; William Shockley *, Alan Simpson, president, Vassar College; Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON.

Gerald A. Sivage, president, Marshall Field & Co.; C. R. Smith, board chairman, American Airlines; Sir C. P. Snow, Wendell M. Stanley *.

Ernest Lyman Stebbins, dean, School of Hygiene and Public Health, the Johns Hopkins University; Julius Stratton, president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Jack I. Straus, chairman, R. H. Macy & Co.; Anna Lord Strauss, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Hays Sulzberger.

Albert Szent-Györgyi *, Shigeki Tashiro, board chairman, Toyo Rayon Co.; Edward L. Tatum *, Deems Taylor, Harold Taylor.

Prince A. Taylor, Jr., president, Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church; A. Hugo Theorell *, Norman Thomas, Virgil Thomson.

Lord Alexander Todd *, George J. Tomer, Ambassador, Syrian Arab Republic to U.N.; Charles H. Townes *, Arnold J. Toynbee, Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS.

* Nobel Laureates.

Representative MORRIS K. UDALL, Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; Harold C. Urey *, Mehdi Vakil, Ambassador, Iran to U.N.; Mark Van Doren.

Bruno Visentini, chairman, Ing. C. Olivetti; Mr. and Mrs. DeWitt Wallace, James D. Watson *, Lagroua Weill-Hallé, Paul Weiss, Thomas H. Weller *.

Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., chairman, Pitney-Bowes; Fred L. Whipple, director, Smithsonian Astrophysics Observatory; George H. Whipple *.

John F. White, president, National Educational Television; Paul Dudley White, Jerome B. Wiesner.

Francis O. Wilcox, dean, School of Advanced International Studies, the Johns Hopkins University; Maurice H. F. Wilkins *, Roy Wilkins.

Erwin H. Will, board chairman, Virginia Electric & Power Co.; C. Vann Woodward, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Alonzo S. Yerby, Whitney M. Young, Jr.

Representative ARTHUR J. YOUNGER, Karl Ziegler *, Sir Solly Zuckerman.

EXHIBIT 3

STATEMENTS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON CONCERNING POPULATION

1. State of the Union address before Congress, January 4, 1965: "I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources."

2. The 20th anniversary of the United Nations at San Francisco, June 25, 1965: "Let us in all our lands—including this land—face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of all the world. Let us act on the fact that less than $5 invested in population control is worth a hundred dollars invested in economic growth."

3. Swearing-in ceremony of John W. Gardner as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in Rose Garden, the White House, August 18, 1965: "This administration is seeking new ideas and it is certainly not going to discourage any new solutions to the problems of population growth and distribution."

4. Text of letter to U.N. Secretary General U Thant at Second United Nations World Population Conference opening in Belgrade, August 30, 1965:

"MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY GENERAL: The U.S. Government recognizes the singular importance of the meeting of the Second United Nations World Population Conference and pledges its full support to your great undertaking.

"As I said to the United Nations in San Francisco, we must now begin to face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying population. Our Government assures your conference of our wholehearted support to the United Nations and its agencies in their efforts to achieve a better world through bringing into balance the world's resources and the world's population.

"In extending my best wishes for the success of your conference, it is my fervent hope that your great assemblage of population experts will contribute significantly to the knowledge necessary to solve this transcendent problem. Second only to the search for peace, it is humanity's greatest challenge. This week, the meeting in Belgrade carries with it the hopes of mankind."

5. State of the Union address before Congress, January 12, 1966:

"That is what I have come to ask of you.

* * * * * *

3. "To give a new and daring direction to our foreign aid program, designed to make a maximum attack on hunger, disease, and ignorance in those countries that are determined to help themselves, and to help those nations that are trying to control population growth.

6. "I will also propose the International Health Act of 1966—

"To strike at disease by a new effort to bring modern skills and knowledge to the uncared-for suffering of the world—and by wiping out smallpox, malaria, and controlling yellow fever over most of the world in this decade;

"To help countries trying to control population growth, by increasing our research—and by earmarking funds to help their efforts."

7. Ceremony held at the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace, January 20, 1966, Independence, Mo.:

"We will increase our efforts in the great field of human population. The hungry world cannot be fed until and unless the growth in its resources and the growth in its population come into balance. Each man and woman—and each nation—must make decisions of conscience and policy in the face of this great problem. But the position of the United States of America is clear. We will give our help and our support to nations which make their own decision to insure an effective balance between the numbers of their people and the food they have to eat. And we will push forward the frontiers of research in this important field."

8. Foreign aid program message to the Congress, February 1, 1966:

"Yet today the citizens of many developing nations walk in the shadow of misery—

"Half the adults have never been to school;

"Over half the people are hungry or malnourished;

"Food production per person is falling;

"At present rates of growth, population will double before the year 2000.

"These are the dominant facts of our age.

"They challenge our own security.

"They threaten the future of the world.

"Our response must be bold and daring. It must go to the root causes of misery and unrest. It must build a firm foundation for progress, security, and peace."

9. "Only these people and their leaders can—

"Invest every possible resource in improved farming techniques, in school and hospital construction, and in critical industry;

"Make the land reforms, tax changes, and other basic adjustments necessary to transform their societies;

"Face the population problem squarely and realistically;

"Create the climate which will attract foreign investment, and keep local money at home."

10. "In many other countries food output is also falling behind population growth. We cannot meet the world food needs of the future, however willing we are to share our abundance. Nor would it serve the common interest if we could."

11. "We stand ready to help developing countries deal with the population problem.

"The United States cannot and should not force any country to adopt any particular approach to this problem. It is first a matter of individual and national conscience, in which we will not interfere.

"But population growth now consumes about two-thirds of economic growth in the less-developed world. As death rates are steadily driven down, the individual miracle of birth becomes a collective tragedy of want.

"In all cases, our help will be given only upon request, and only to finance advisers, training, transportation, educational equipment, and local currency needs.

"Population policy remains a question for each family and each nation to decide. But we must be prepared to help when decisions are made."

12. "Technical cooperation: This request—$231 million—will finance American advisors and teachers who are the crucial forces in the attack on hunger, ignorance, disease, and the population problem. The dollar total is relatively small. But no appropriation is more critical. No purpose is more central."

International Education and Health Acts message, February 2, 1966:

13. "We have committed ourselves for many years to relieving human suffering. Today our efforts must keep pace with a growing world and with growing problems."

14. "Therefore, I propose a program to—

"Create an international career service in health;

"Help meet health manpower needs in developing nations;

"Combat malnutrition;

"Control and eradicate disease;

"Cooperate in worldwide efforts to deal with population problems."

15. "Food production has not kept pace with the increasing demands of expanding population."

16. In part 5, the President carefully spells out his proposal "to cooperate in worldwide efforts to deal with population problems:

"By 1970, there will be 300 million more people on this earth. A reliable estimate shows that at present rates of growth the world population could double by the end of the century. The growing gap—between food to eat and mouths to feed—poses one of mankind's greatest challenges. It threatens the dignity of the individual and the sanctity of the family.

"We must meet these problems in ways that will strengthen free societies—and protect the individual right to freedom of choice.

"To mobilize our resources more effectively, I propose programs to—

"1. Expand research in human reproduction and population dynamics. We are supporting research efforts through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, AID, and the World Health Organization. I am requesting funds to increase the pace and scope of this effort. The effort, to be successful, will require a full response by our scientific community.

"2. Enlarge the training of American and foreign specialists in the population field: We are supporting training programs and the development of training programs through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and AID. We will expand these programs at home and abroad.

"3. Assist family planning programs in nations which request such help: Here at home, we are gaining valuable experience through new programs of maternal and infant care as well as expansion of private and public medical care programs. Early last year we made clear our readiness to share our knowledge, skill, and financial resources with the developing nations requesting assistance. We will expand this effort in response to the increasing number of requests from other countries."

War against hunger message, February 10, 1966:

17. "Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in death rate."

18. "A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine. In my message on international health and education, I described our increased efforts to help deal with the population problem."

19. Domestic health and education message, March 1, 1966:

"FAMILY PLANNING

"We have a growing concern to foster the integrity of the family, and the opportunity for each child. It is essential that all families have access to information and services that will allow freedom to choose the number and spacing of their children within the dictates of individual conscience.

"In the fiscal 1967 budget, I have requested a sizable increase in funds available

for research, training and services in this field. The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development will expand its own research and its grant program to study human reproduction. The Children's Bureau and the Office of Economic Opportunity will support family planning to the maternal and infant care programs in local communities when requested. State agencies will be aided by Federal welfare funds to provide family planning services to mothers."

20. Economic aid to India message, April 1, 1966: "The Indian Government believes that there can be no effective solution of the Indian food problem that does not include population control. The choice is now between a comprehensive and humane program for limiting births and the brutal curb that is imposed by famine. As Mrs. Gandhi told me, the Indian Government is making vigorous efforts on this front."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 10, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by Senate May 9, 1966:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Donald Opie McBride, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 18, 1975.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 9, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

Findley Burns, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officers to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be generals

Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, [redacted] (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Gen. Robert M. Lee, [redacted] (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Gen. Jacob E. Smart, [redacted] (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be generals

Lt. Gen. William S. Stone, [redacted] (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, [redacted] (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. David A. Burchinal, [redacted] (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, [redacted], U.S. Army.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

May 5, 1966

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade indicated on the retired list, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233, effective from the date of his retirement.

IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning W. Michael Blumenthal, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, and ending James A. Smith, to be a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 29, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Seaborn P. Foster, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, and ending Murray David Zinoman, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 25, 1966.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Philip N. Austen, to be colonel, and ending Thomas Zalewski, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 19, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Norbert H. Adams, to be second lieutenant, and ending Donald L. Zumwalt, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 25, 1966.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Entrance Fee Policy Needs Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important pieces of legislation recently passed by Congress was the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The law marked a great stride forward in a comprehensive program for developing recreational areas in the United States. I supported this bill which received almost unanimous endorsement from the Congress.

There are, however, several points that need to be ironed out in connection with the language of the bill. Particularly in light of the recent announcement by the Corps of Engineers to charge entrance fees at recreational areas at Federal reservoirs, does it become imperative that Congress take a second look at the fee policy which is one of the key features of the land and water fund.

On four Federal reservoirs in my State of South Dakota the fees will be initiated on May 30. There is, however, before Congress, in particular before the Public Works Committee, a bill which would exempt those Federal reservoirs which are not deriving more than half of the benefits in the form of recreation. Since all Corps of Engineers projects are designed primarily for conservation and flood control purposes, it would mean no fees could be charged at recreation areas on corps reservoirs. The bill H.R. 13313 must be passed before the May 30 deadline at which time fees will be collected.

These fees would tend to discourage the second largest industry in South Dakota, tourism, because most of the adequate sites for launching boats and for just viewing the reservoirs will be under the "chargeable" category of the present law. Where there are facilities such as hydraulic boat launches and showers or other developed facilities, it is only fair that some type of user fee be charged. But an admission fee does not seem equitable with the purposes of the current law.

Hopefully, Congress will act soon on H.R. 13313, which clarifies the current law, clears up an important omission of the original law, and yet does not disrupt the intent and purpose of the Land and Water Conservation Act in any way.

The Artificial Water Recharge System of Minot, N. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1966

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, thanks to some ingenuity in planning, and the scientific and technical skills displayed by representatives of the U.S. Geological Survey, the North Dakota Water Commission and the city of Minot, N. Dak., that city today appears to have temporarily solved a serious water supply deficiency problem.

In 1963–64, the water level in aquifers—subsurface, water-bearing rocks—in the Minot area, which provides the

water supply for nearly 51,000 people at Minot and the Minot Air Force Base, was declining rapidly and approaching a critical level. A serious water shortage was considered imminent. The problem: how to "recharge" the water supply.

A geohydrologic and artificial recharge study was undertaken by the North Dakota Water Commission and the city of Minot, and Wayne A. Pettyjohn; of the U.S. Geological Survey's Water Resources Division in Bismarck, N. Dak., was named as project leader. Pettyjohn is a ground water geologist.

The study, which began in November 1963, showed that Minot's ground water reservoir would provide only about 3 million gallons of water per day without additional water-level declines. The city required an average of nearly 4 million gallons per day. Test drilling indicated that no additional ground water sources capable of large yields were present in the Minot area.

To halt the rapid water-level decline, an artificial ground-water recharge system was considered in which water would be diverted from the Souris River into a "spreading" basin where the water would rapidly filter downward to the natural ground water reservoir. Tests indicated a potentially good area for the construction of a recharge site at the extreme west end of Minot. However, because of the small area of available land, a new system of recharge had to be developed.

Following a period of experimentation, a recharge facility was constructed whereby untreated water is pumped from the Souris River to a rectangular basin about 70 by 125 feet, and nearly 35 feet deep.

The lower few feet of the site consists of sand and gravel, and the upper part is clay. Connected to the basin is a Y-shaped canal system. The canals were excavated in clay to a depth of 7 to 10 feet. In the canal system, are thirty-six 30-inch, and four 72-inch-diameter, gravel-filled bore holes ranging in depth from 20 to 30 feet. The lower feet of the bore holes are in dry sand and gravel, and the upper part is clay. The dry sand and gravel represent a part of the ground-water reservoir that was "dewatered" with the lowering of the water level.

Water is pumped from the Souris River to the large pit, and when the pit is full, water flows along the canals and into the bore holes. The water that filters through the bore holes reaches the ground-water reservoir and raises the water level.

The recharge system adds between 3.5 and 4.5 million gallons per day to the underground reservoir. Minot is now pumping about 40 percent of the daily water requirement from the Souris River and the remainder from the ground-water reservoir. Consequently, artificial recharge is adding to storage at least 2 million gallons per day that would normally flow as waste water down the Souris River. The water added to underground storage can be used in times of drought when the Souris River is very low.

The water level in the Minot ground-water reservoir has risen, in places, more than 20 feet since artificial recharge was first started in June 1965.

The cost of the bore hole type of artificial recharge is considerably less expensive than other conventional recharge methods if the geology permits this type of construction.

This cooperative effort on the part of local, State, and Federal representatives demonstrates what can be done to meet an immediate and pressing problem. This, however, is only a temporary solution. The long-range answer to the city of Minot's water supply problem can and will be found in supplemental water from the Garrison diversion project authorized by the Congress.

A preliminary open file report entitled "Geohydrology of the Souris River Valley in the Vicinity of Minot, North Dakota," by Wayne A. Pettyjohn, U.S. Geological Survey, Bismark, N. Dak., is being prepared and is expected to be ready for examination at Geological Survey offices before the end of this month.

Women's Club and Community Action Associations of Clay County Combine at Widen, W. Va., in Presenting Successful Arts and Crafts Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is being engendered in West Virginia, as in much of the Appalachian region, a movement to bring to the fore the heritage and traditions of Appalachia. Consistent with this activity there is emphasis on the development of programs and methods of fostering the excellent handiwork and craftsmanship which is found in the region.

Last fall, I was privileged to participate in the statewide Mountain State Arts and Crafts Festival initiated at Cedar Lake in Jackson County, W. Va. During its life, that fair was visited by more than 10,000 persons interested in observing and procuring items of unique mountain culture, crafts, and art forms.

Last Saturday, I was the guest of one of the contributing community components of the statewide Cedar Lakes festival when I visited the Widen Arts and Crafts Fair in Clay County. It was a truly inspirational experience in a community which formerly was a prosperous hub of profitable coal mining and timbering, but which has suffered considerable from obsolescence.

Yet, Mr. President, Widen Women's Club—now reduced to 17 determined, enterprising, and skillful ladies—and the hardy and resolute members of the 25 community action associations of Clay County combined to sponsor a superb fair. The display of mountain art and handcraft was such as to assure that the Widen and Clay County booth at the forthcoming statewide arts and crafts fair at Cedar Lakes will be among the most interesting and attractive. And those of the Widen fair's products to be displayed and sold by concessionaires at the Summersville and Sutton Reservoirs will doubtless be in demand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my speech at the first annual Arts and Crafts Fair of the Widen Arts and Crafts Center.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH AT THE FIRST ANNUAL ARTS AND CRAFTS FAIR OF THE WIDEN ARTS AND CRAFTS CENTER, WIDEN, W. VA., MAY 7, 1966

It is a genuine privilege to join with you at this first annual arts and crafts fair, sponsored by the Widen Women's Club and the Community Action Associations of Clay County.

Public acceptance and appreciation of the arts and crafts fair movement has been enthusiastic and outstanding. Many of these events have been so successful that they have been continued on an annual basis, just as you plan to continue the arts and crafts fair here. A tangible example of the attraction of these efforts to display West Virginia's unique mountain culture, crafts and art forms is the fact that in 1 year the Cedar Lakes Arts and Crafts Fair was visited by more than 10,000 persons. Residents of our Mountain State and also people from numerous States of the Nation attended. It has been brought to my attention that from the hundreds of articles on display here there will be selected exhibits to be shown at the statewide Cedar Lakes festival.

In developing this program, the organizational efforts of the Widen Women's Club, local community action associations, various art, craft, and business groups have been highly commendable. I am aware that your organization has been entirely financed by local contributions, in keeping with the traditions of the independence and hearty spirit of our mountaineer forebears.

There are gathered here artisans and craftsmen representing the entire spectrum of pioneer handicraft as well as outstanding examples of more modern artistry.

It is my understanding that your activities have attracted so much attention in Clay and neighboring counties that the State department of commerce has arranged to have these products sold by concessionaires at the Summersville and Sutton Reservoirs. In addition to providing an added source of income for many of you, this distribution will afford an opportunity to show thousands of persons from other States the distinctive handiwork and skills passed from generation to generation of mountain folk.

The march of time and the results of an automated society regrettably have necessitated the elimination of much of our primitive crafts and arts. However, it is my belief—which I am sure you share—that we are witnessing a revitalization and revival of past artistic forms and cultures so that the unique skills of earlier generations will not be lost, but will be preserved for the education and enjoyment of others.

There is an awareness in America of the importance of preserving the rich heritage which is ours. The Congress enacted legislation last year, which I cosponsored, which

provides for the establishment of a National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities.

One of the provisions of this law especially meaningful is the section which authorizes a one-time grant of $25,000—with matching requirement—to States for establishment of a State agency on the arts and crafts. I am happy to report that we moved ahead of the provisions of the law and, under the guidance of Governor Hulett Smith, established a West Virginia State Arts Council. Again, we have an example of the progressive spirit of the mountaineers, manifesting itself in this notable event. West Virginia is now qualified for and has submitted an application for a $50,000 grant from the national foundation to assist in programs and services to provide facilities in the arts to communities and people in the State. The implementation of the provisions of the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 will result in considerable stimulus to the spread of cultural appreciation and attainment in our State and in other States as well.

Many persons believe—and wrongly so—that this legislation does not include the development of arts and crafts festivals such as we enjoy here. You may be assured that the definitions within the law do include folk art and projects in the craft arts.

In addition to this progress, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities has been involved in detailed discussions with the Appalachian Regional Commission toward the development of programs and methods of fostering the excellent handiwork and craftsmanship which is found in the 12 States comprising the Appalachian area. This is in no way an effort to intrude on established arts and crafts centers. It is only an endeavor—and a vital endeavor—to bring to the fore the regional heritage and traditions of Appalachia for the enjoyment of all citizens. And, this coordination with the Appalachian Commission does tie in effectively with the precepts of regional economic development. It can provide means of supplementing individual income and the development of profitable tourist attractions.

In a broader sense, the Nation, under the leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson, is engaged in an expansive campaign of beautification and conservation.

The Widen Arts and Crafts Fair constitutes a wholesome involvement in these efforts.

The President has called for an allout effort to make beauty and conservation and the preservation of our heritage the responsibility of business, private groups, all levels of government and, more importantly, of every citizen. He has reminded the Congress and the people that for centuries Americans have drawn strength and inspiration from the grandeur of their country—a fact which is familiar to West Virginians.

At the heart of this new conservation is the concept of balance. In the past, conservation has too often been viewed as an unequal battle between a few nature lovers and the implacable forces of city growth and industrial development. However, the realization has gradually developed—and the President's unprecedented messages to Congress on this subject are expressions of that realization—that a partnership can and must be effective.

Today, more than 7 out of every 10 Americans live in urban surroundings. There can be no romantic or pastoral escape from that basic reality, and herein lies our challenge. The challenge of conservation in our generation is to develop a proper balance among our various necessities—the need to earn a living; to enjoy the advantages of urban life and the equally desirable advantages of recreation in some reasonably accessible place; to have sparkling rivers, remote valleys and scenic beauty to visit if we choose; to protect wildflowers, forests, rivers, and other natural resources for the future.

It is not true that any two of these necessities must be diametrically opposed. It is not necessary to destroy scenic beauty in building a road. It is not necessary to pollute a river to such an extent that it kills the fish in order to have an industrial plant in which men and women can make their living. There is no necessary conflict between preserving areas of untrammeled wilderness and also establishing expanded facilities for mass recreation. There is no necessary conflict between preserving the individual craftsmanship and handiwork and the products of an automation-oriented society.

This broad challenge of conservation and beautification has been translated into proposals such as the Highway Beautification Act which I authored in the Senate, legislation on wild rivers and scenic areas, and the arts and humanities law.

But it is citizen participation in events such as the Widen Arts and Crafts Fair which is providing the groundwork for the widespread regeneration of public interest in beauty, history, and the rewarding cultural heritage which is ours.

West Virginia has surely been blessed with natural beauty, scenic attractions, and citizens who possess distinctive skills and crafts. We are proud of our legacy of pioneer independence and creativity. We are determined that our State will be at the forefront of the drive toward building a better America—a land of opportunity where we strive to encourage productivity, progress and prosperity for all.

I am confident that the Widen Arts and Crafts Fair will continue to make meaningful contributions to that end.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

Rev. Emory S. Ellmore, pastor, Nimmo-Salem Methodist Parish, Virginia Beach, Va., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the many blessings which Thou hast given to our country that we may use them to Thy service. We thank Thee that Thou hearest our prayers as we call upon Thee.

Bless these Members of the U.S. Senate, and endow them with a right understanding, and pure purpose. Help them to rise to the larger sentiments of public good and human brotherhood. Bless all our citizens from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same. Stretch forth Thy hand of protection to guard our land and grant that we may be devoted to Thy service and defended by Thy power. Of Thy goodness give us, with Thy love inspire us, by Thy spirit guide us, by Thy love protect us.

Unite us all in Thy common blessing and may the knowledge of Thy righteousness and Thy love reign in all our hearts, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. INOUYE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 9, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

S. 1611. An act to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 2263. An act to establish a Traffic Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and to provide for the appointment to such court of five additional judges.

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

H.R. 9824. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, as amended;

H.R. 13558. An act to provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of