

which does not have a single strong civic organization pushing for the good of the village.

Mayor Rabe noted that projected studies of population for the area in and around Newtown show that in 1990 there will be over 830,000 people living in an area where 430,000 now live. He said that the village is in the very heart of the Little Miami Conservancy District watershed which contains large tracts of land for industrialization and residential development.

Because much of this land is flooded often, the Corps of Engineers has made studies and recommended action to contain the flow of the Little Miami River. When this is done, the currently empty farmlands will fill rapidly, and it will be necessary that this growth be directed in such a way that maximum benefit can be obtained, and that the current popula-

tion of Newtown not be pushed aside and ignored.

Mayor Rabe said that industry in the Newtown area could stabilize the tax rate, give many in the area employment closer to home, and increase the tax duplicate to provide better government services.

At the meeting, the mayor urged that leadership of this new group be taken by interested persons in the community, so that the latent vitality he knew existed in the village could emerge. Immediately a steering committee was formed, which contained over a dozen interested persons from all walks of life. It is probable that the group will activate the old Greater Newtown Civic League, Inc., as the means for organization.

Mr. Speaker, Newtown is the fourth oldest community in Ohio, and next year will celebrate its 175th anniversary.

Originally one of the outstations ringing the core city of Losantiville, now Cincinnati, during pioneer days, Newtown has a distinguished history. I suggest that the community is having a rebirth of a sense of accomplishment. It should be noted also that although the present Congress by its action has aided communities like Newtown to solve its problems using tools that the National Government alone can provide, it is not the National Government which has caused the impetus to organization.

In Newtown, as in every other community which is experiencing similar problems, it is the local citizens and the locally elected officials upon whom the opportunity and responsibility rest. They alone provide the spirit. They alone can organize. They alone provide the initiative for self-help. We at the national level can help, and will.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. FRANK CARLSON, a Senator from the State of Kansas.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, we bless Thee for the life that Thou hast given us. Breathe even through these leaders' lives the breath of hope and peace.

We thank Thee for the Nation of which we are a part. Lead through the life of this Nation to ways of solution and rebuilding of fallen foundations of understanding and principle in man's humanity to man.

We beseech Thee to hasten the day when sin's fierce wars shall cease. Help us to build a new and better world in which goodness, honesty, truth, justice, peace, and good will shall prevail. Grant that we may use the rich gifts of our lives, not for selfish living, but as an opportunity to serve. In the name of 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 12, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRANK CARLSON, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CARLSON 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 Tuesday, May 10, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 10, 1966.

The Secretary of the Senate on May 11, 1966, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

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

H.R. 13367. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13368. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

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

H.R. 13373. An act to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

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

H.R. 13579. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile;

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

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

H.R. 13774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 14012. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of May 10, 1966,

The following reports of committees were submitted on May 11, 1966:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 179. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons (Rept. No. 1155).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor (Rept. No. 1156).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

H.R. 11487. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1157).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 10, 1966,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on May 11, 1966, reported favorably Executive A, 89th Congress, 2d session, the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 2) thereon.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 10, 1966:

S. 518. An act for the relief of Joanna K. Georgoulia; and

S. 1924. An act to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit referees from acting as trustees or receivers in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act.

On May 11, 1966:

S. 948. An act for the relief of Frantisek Vohryzka; and

S. 1804. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee, the Subcommittee on

Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution and the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Robert Emmett Quinn, of Rhode Island, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals.

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

Francis M. Wheat, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission;

H. Ralph Taylor, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

Don Hummel, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

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

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and sixty-one postmaster nominations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, for reappointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Maj. Gen. Glen R. Birchard for special assignment and promotion to the grade of lieutenant general in the Air Force; Gen. Dean C. Strother, U.S. Air Force, to be retired in the grade of general; and Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves for special assignment and promotion to the grade of general in the Air Force. I ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, for reappointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff;

Maj. Gen. Glen R. Birchard, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Gen. Dean C. Strother (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list, in the grade of general; and

Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 1,120 appointments and promotions in the Navy in the grade of commander and below, and 1,125 appointments in the Marine Corps in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Charles S. Abbot, and sundry other midshipmen (Naval Academy), for permanent assignment in the Navy;

Andrew A. Blanchard, and sundry other Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates, for permanent assignment in the Navy;

Charles A. Alcon, and sundry other graduates from the Navy enlisted scientific education program, for permanent assignment in the Navy;

Pierre E. Biron, and sundry other Naval Reserve officers, for permanent assignment in the Navy;

Robert H. Nicholson and sundry other officers, for permanent promotion in the Navy;

Thomas E. Albright, and sundry other Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps officers, for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Bernard F. Halloran, and sundry other Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps officers, for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Vance Baker, and sundry other U.S. Naval Academy graduates, for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps; and

Dean R. Aggers, and sundry other persons, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps.

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

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read nominations in the Coast Guard, placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomina-

tions 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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

LIMITATION OF 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.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO INEQUITIES IN ACTIVE DUTY PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove inequities in the active duty promotion opportunities of certain officers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DETERMINATIONS RELATING TO DEFERMENT OF 1966 CONSTRUCTION CHARGE PAYMENT DUE THE UNITED STATES FROM OKANOGAN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting pursuant to law, on determinations relating to deferment of 1966 construction charge payment due the United States from the Okanogan Irrigation District, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF LAW ESTABLISHING THE REVOLVING FUND FOR EXPERT ASSISTANCE LOANS TO INDIAN TRIBES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the law establishing the revolving fund for expert assistance loans to Indian tribes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SELL CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, State House, Boston, May 6, 1966.

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES IN FAVOR OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ALCOHOLISM CENTER IN BOSTON

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson in his message to the Congress of the United States on the health needs of the Nation called for the creation of a \$20 million Federal Center for research into the cause, prevention, control and treatment of alcoholism; and

Whereas Alcoholism is the major cause of mental illness in Massachusetts and the primary cause of fifty per cent of our highway death toll; and

Whereas The educational and medical resources available in the Boston area to work in conjunction with Federal authorities is unequalled anywhere in the entire country; and

Whereas The religious community in Boston and throughout Massachusetts has achieved an outstanding degree of unity of thought and action in aiding alcoholics and their families to cope with the problems of alcoholism; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary for the establishment of the United States Public Health Service Alcoholism Center in Boston; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, April 21, 1966.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

A true copy.
Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 14 RELATIVE TO EXPERIMENTAL FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE PLANTS

WHEREAS The development of a means for low cost production of fish protein concentrate would mean that more than a thousand million human beings, who now suffer the misery of chronic malnutrition, would have an opportunity for a better diet; and

WHEREAS Protein deficiency diseases are the largest single source of infant mortality in the world today; and

WHEREAS The ocean resources off California contain vast numbers of fish, other than anchovies, such as the Pacific hake, which could be used for such a program without endangering either their population or the other fish resources of the state; and

WHEREAS Proper development of a fishery for such purpose could greatly aid the commercial fisheries of this state and be a substantial addition to the state's economic prosperity; and

"WHEREAS The Conservation and Wildlife Committee of the California Assembly has considered this matter on numerous occasions and attempted to further the development of a program to provide such a concentrate; and

"WHEREAS California has increased its expenditures in this area, including an appropriation in the budget for this year of \$92,000 from the state's General Fund for research; and

"WHEREAS Legislation has been introduced in Congress which would authorize the expenditure of \$5 million for the construction of up to five experimental fish protein concentrate plants in the United States; and

"WHEREAS The earliest possible construction of such plants is essential to the development of an acceptable fish protein concentrate which can so immeasurably aid in relieving the suffering of so many persons in the world: now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorizes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation at the earliest possible time to authorize construction of experimental fish protein concentrate plants; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 9 RELATIVE TO REMOVAL OF RESTRICTION ON TITLE TO MORRO BAY ROCK

"Whereas to preserve Morro Rock as an historical site, natural landmark and public park, the Congress of the United States, prior to 1935, was requested to authorize the conveyance of said rock to the State of California; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, by an act approved May 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 311), authorized the Secretary of Commerce to convey Morro Rock to the State of California for public park purposes; and

"Whereas the United States did so convey Morro Rock to the State of California for public park purposes by deed dated August 17, 1935 (covering approximately 30.00 acres), executed pursuant to said act, and by deed dated September 15, 1960 (covering 0.69 acre), executed pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; and

"Whereas the deed dated August 17, 1935 reserved to the United States of America the right to resume ownership, possession, and control, for government purposes, of any of the property so conveyed, at any time and without the consent of the State of California; and

"Whereas the right so reserved impairs the use and management of Morro Rock by the State of California for public park purposes, and its preservation as an historical site; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to authorize the removal of the restriction on the title to Morro Rock without monetary consideration based upon its character as an historical site and public park, qualifying it for transfer at no cost; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the

House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 10 RELATIVE TO THE EAST SIDE DIVISION OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

"WHEREAS Congressman B. R. SISK has introduced H.R. 14030, Congressman HARLAN HAGEN has introduced H.R. 14031, and Congressman JOHN MOSS has introduced H.R. 14202 in the Congress of the United States to authorize the East Side Division of the Central Valley Project; and

"WHEREAS The east side division will provide a much needed supplemental water supply to portions of Kern, Tulare, Kings, Fresno, Madera, Merced, Stanislaus and San Joaquin Counties; and

"WHEREAS There is presently a serious overdraft of the ground water resources of this service area which has resulted in an immediate need for supplemental water; and

"WHEREAS There are some 5,000,000 acres of land within the east side division, of which a considerable portion will require a substantial supplemental water supply; and

"WHEREAS Forty-five percent of California's agricultural production, valued at nearly two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000), is produced in the San Joaquin Valley, and

"WHEREAS Several San Joaquin Valley counties are among the Nation's leading producers of agricultural commodities; and

"WHEREAS The initial planned development will provide 1,500,000 acre-feet annually of supplemental water, primarily for agricultural use at a price the farmer can afford; and

"WHEREAS In addition to irrigation benefits, substantial flood control, recreation, fish and wildlife, and water quality control benefits will also accrue as a result of this project; and

"WHEREAS The initial supply will be made available through the operation of existing facilities of the Central Valley Project supplemented by unappropriated flows from the American Stanislaus, and Sacramento Rivers; and

"WHEREAS The proposed project will have a dramatic economic and social impact upon the affected area by increasing agricultural production and farm income in addition to providing thousands of new jobs and otherwise benefiting the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California supports H.R. 14030, H.R. 14031, H.R. 14202, and similar legislation to authorize the East Side Division of the Central Valley Project and urges the Congress to enact such legislation at the earliest possible time; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the United States Commissioner of Reclamation, to the Regional Director of Region 2 of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 12, RELATIVE TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

"WHEREAS Under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 federal funds are available to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies, including school districts, for the education of children of low-income families; and

"WHEREAS Although under such act a state is allocated the total amount of fed-

eral funds which all the local educational agencies in the state are eligible to receive, the maximum amount each local educational agency may receive is limited; and

"WHEREAS If an eligible local educational agency determines that other local educational agencies within the state are in greater need of such federal funds and does not apply for its share thereof, the state cannot reallocate those federal funds to another needy eligible local educational agency within the state beyond the permissible maximum for that local educational agency; and

"WHEREAS There are many local educational agencies in this state who are in need of funds beyond the maximum permitted under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to permit the state to approve grants to school districts of federal funds allocated to the state under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 beyond the present maximums permitted under that act for individual school districts for the education of children of low-income families, where the school district is in need of such additional funds and the funds are made available by the failure of other eligible school districts to apply therefor so that the more needy school districts within the state could obtain additional funds; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States and to the United States Commissioner of Education."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; ordered to lie on the table:

**"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 11
RELATIVE TO COMMENDING WISHARD A.
BROWN, AND JACK CRAEMER**

"Whereas Wishard A. Brown has been a resident of Marin County since boyhood, graduating from San Rafael High School prior to attending College of Marin and the University of Oregon; and

"Whereas He served with distinction in the United States Army during World War II and was on the personal staffs of General Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., and General Joseph W. Stillwell; and

"Whereas He joined the staff of the Independent-Journal after his release from the armed forces in 1946; and

"Whereas He has been extremely active in civic affairs and has served as president of the San Rafael Chamber of Commerce and as a member of the Marin Safety Council, the Boy Scouts of America Marin Council, the National Board of the Junior Chamber of Commerce and many other boards; and

"Whereas He was honored by the Marin County Real Estate Board in 1955 as Marin County's outstanding citizen; and

"Whereas He is expected to continue the fine record of community service associated with the Brown family during the long tenure of his father, the late Roy A. Brown, as publisher of the San Rafael Independent-Journal; and

"Whereas He was named publisher of the Independent-Journal and president of California Newspapers, Inc., on March 23, 1966, the 105th anniversary of the founding of the Independent-Journal; and

"Whereas Jack Craemer joined the staff of the Independent-Journal in 1947 after working on the Turlock Daily Journal; and

"Whereas He graduated from Stanford University and worked for a time for the Holt-

ville Tribune in Imperial County prior to entering the United States Army in which branch of the armed forces he served for five years, being discharged as a major of artillery; and

"Whereas He is immediate past president of the highly prestigious California Newspaper Publishers Association and past northern California vice chairman of Sigma Delta Chi Professional Journalism Society and serves the County of Marin on many boards and commissions; and

"Whereas He was named copublisher and editor of the Independent-Journal on March 23, 1966; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California (the Assembly thereof concurring), That the Members of the Legislature take pride in commanding Wishard A. Brown and Jack Craemer for their outstanding records of achievement, and congratulate them on the occasion of their being named publisher and copublisher, respectively, of the San Rafael Independent-Journal; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to Wishard A. Brown and Jack Craemer."

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

H.R. 136. An act to amend sections 1, 17a, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1159); and

H.R. 3438. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy (Rept. No. 1158).

**BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION
INTRODUCED**

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

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 3339. A bill for the relief of Peony Park, Inc., and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 3340. A bill for the relief of Garabed Eknayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3341. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to restrict further the use of customers' funds by commodity futures commission merchants, to authorize further the regulation of records of contracts markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. DOMINICK):

S. 3342. A bill to require authorizations of appropriations for the Environmental Science Services Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 3343. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. CASE, Mr. PROXIMIRE, Mr. RIBICOFF, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 3344. A bill to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3345. A bill for the relief of Vittorina Micol Squires; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 3346. A bill for the relief of Camile Najib Rabah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3347. A bill to make certain expenditures of the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, eligible as a local grant-in-aid for the purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. BASS:

S. 3348. A bill to establish the Department of Education; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 3349. A bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code concerning bias or prejudice of a judge of the court of the United States;

S. 3350. A bill to amend section 401 of title 18 of the United States Code dealing with the power of the courts of the United States to punish for contempts of its authority;

S. 3351. A bill to amend section 1651 of title 28 of the United States Code governing the issuance of writs by the courts of the United States; and

S. 3352. A bill to amend section 1292 of title 28 of the United States Code governing appellate jurisdiction of courts of appeals from interlocutory decisions of the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S.J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the 1st day of June in 1966 as "Quality Control Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

**SUPERVISION OF ELECTIONS TO BE
HELD IN VIETNAM**

Mr. RIBICOFF submitted a resolution (S. Res. 258) relative to supervision of elections to be held in Vietnam, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. RIBICOFF, which appears under a separate heading.)

ANNUAL AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require annual authorizations of appropriations for the Environmental Science Services Administration, Department of Commerce.

The Committee on Commerce has held long and elaborate hearings on the subject of weather modification. Research in weather modification is essentially indistinguishable, in many respects from research in the atmospheric sciences generally. The Environmental Science Services Administration, which includes the Weather Bureau is deeply involved in this area.

Much concern and interest has been expressed to the Committee on Commerce about the operations of ESSA. It therefore seems useful that the Committee on Commerce be given the opportunity to review ESSA's operations on an annual basis and to examine their proposed budget. In this way, closer attention can be given to this expanding, dynamic agency which plays such a significant role in our daily lives.

I am pleased to have as cosponsors Senator CANNON and Senator DOMINICK who have shown great interest in this subject.

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

The bill (S. 3342) to require authorizations of appropriations for the Environmental Science Services Administration, Department of Commerce, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. DOMINICK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

A BILL TO AID HOMESTEADERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries which has been submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior with a recommendation for enactment. The bill would permit the Bureau of Land Management to sell lands in the public domain on which entries are made in good faith but the entrymen are prevented from full compliance with legal requirements for property improvement and thus are required to give up the land. The entrymen on homesteads, small tracts, trade and manufacturing sites, home sites, and other settlement or use and occupancy claims in Alaska would be given a preference right to purchase the land by meeting the high bid when it is offered at public auction by the Interior Department. In a case where the entryman becomes the purchaser of the land in question his purchase price would be reduced by any value added by him or his predecessors in interest.

If a purchaser other than the entryman acquires the land in a case where the original settler cannot or does not meet the price set at auction, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to compensate the entryman from the purchase price for the value of improvements added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest where such value is included in the appraised price.

In the case of removable improvements, an entryman who does not purchase the land in question he may, with

the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, remove or sell to the purchaser those improvements which he or his predecessors in interest made; which can be removed without substantial injury to the land, and were not included in the appraised price.

The legislation which the Department has proposed and which I now introduce appears to provide a solution to the extremely difficult problems repeatedly presented by cases of individuals who, in good faith, enter upon the public domain for the purpose of establishing a home, but then find themselves unable to comply with the myriad rules and regulations of the Department of the Interior and are, thus, forced to give up their effort. This is a problem which has concerned me greatly ever since I came into the Senate 7 years ago and has been the subject of constant efforts on my part on behalf of Alaska's homesteaders.

As the Interior Department has recognized, it is highly desirable that legislation be enacted to protect the interest of settlers on the public domain who, through no fault of their own, are unable to obtain title to their land.

Individuals who attempt to acquire land by meeting requirements of the homestead or desert land laws, the Small Tract Act and other public land laws, must expend considerable sums of money and great physical efforts in making improvements which are unfortunately only too often met with failure because they cannot meet all the standards required by the Department of the Interior.

More entries are made in the State of Alaska on the public domain than any other State; therefore, the people of Alaska have a special interest in this legislation. Of course, more land is found in the public domain in Alaska than in any other State. Indeed, the latest estimate of the Bureau of Land Management—Public Land Statistics 1964—states that the Federal Government owns 100.004 percent of the land area of the State. It is explained that the acreage in excess of 100 percent is reported as a result of survey errors; however, it is certain that the Federal Government owns considerably more than 90 percent of Alaska.

For many Alaskans the only way of acquiring land on which to establish a home is by application under one of the public land laws and heroic efforts to meet the rules, regulations, policies, whims and fancies of the officials of the Bureau of Land Management. The number of homestead entries in Alaska was larger, by far, than in any other State as reported by the Bureau of Land Management in its 1964 statistics. Of 432 homestead entries patented in all the States in the Union in 1964, 405 of these were in Alaska. Among 1,429 small tract patents issued in 1964, 376 were in Alaska, with only the State of California showing a larger number of these entries completed. The entries completed and for which patent is issued are, however, a very small number of all those for which application is made. Unfortunately, it is the repeated experience of Alaskans that their best efforts are unavailing in

their attempt to overcome the many obstacles placed in their way to final success.

Being well aware of the heartbreak and suffering caused by failure to complete requirements for patent on a homestead, I am pleased to introduce legislation which would give some relief by establishing in an entryman a preference right to buy land on which an effort has been made to complete requirements for patent. I believe the provision that would, in any case, provide compensation for improvements made on the land by an unsuccessful entryman is extremely useful.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and the communication from the Secretary of the Interior recommending its enactment be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

It is my hope the bill will be acted speedily and favorably and that it lie on the desk for 1 week to permit the co-sponsorship of other Senators.

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

The bill (S. 3343) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3343

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of this Act—

(a) The word "entry" means or includes (1) a right to acquire title to public lands upon compliance with improvement requirements which may include, but are not limited to, irrigation and cultivation of the lands; (2) an application erroneously allowed embracing withdrawn lands; (3) any uncancelled allowed application even though not in good standing; or (4) any claim to withdrawn land in Alaska based upon settlement, use or occupancy, and purportedly initiated under the public land laws.

(b) The word "entryman" includes, in addition to its usual meaning, qualified assignees where the public land law under which the entry was made authorizes the leasing or assignment thereof.

(c) The term "value added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest" means the increase in market value of the land due to work performed, or improvements made, by such entryman or his predecessors in interest.

(d) The term "good faith" means honest intent and does not necessarily relate to the degree of compliance with statutory or regulatory requirements. With respect to withdrawn land, the term "good faith" also means the exercise of diligent inquiry and efforts leading to a reasonable inference that the land was open and available for appropriation under the particular public law involved.

(e) The word "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 2. Where the Secretary determines with reference to any pending entry made under the public land laws, other than the mining laws, whether made before or after the effective date of this Act, that—

(a) the entryman has in good faith made an attempt to comply with the law;

(b) there is no reasonable prospect that such entryman will be able to comply with the law to the extent necessary to earn title to the entered land;

(c) the land is proper for disposition under this Act, considering such factors as, but not limited to, Federal program requirements, sound land use and conservation principles, and effective management of the public lands; and

(d) in the case of withdrawn land, there has been demonstrated by substantial, positive, and compelling evidence that diligent inquiry was made by the claimant showing that the land in the entry was open and available for appropriation under the particular public land law invoked; the Secretary is authorized to sell at public auction all or part of the land included in the entry for not less than its current fair market value. No land shall be offered for sale until after termination of the entry and after reasonable public notice. The entryman shall have a preference right to purchase the land by meeting the high bid within ten days after the date of the auction, or such further period as the Secretary may allow.

SEC. 3. (a) The determination of fair market value shall be made by the Secretary through appraisal which shall not include improvements which can be removed without substantial damage to the land; if the improvements cannot be so removed their value shall be separately appraised and added to the appraised value of the land.

(b) If the entryman acquires the land pursuant to the sale, the Secretary shall grant him a reduction in the purchase price for the value, as determined by the Secretary as of the date of the bidding, added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest if such value was included in the appraised price of the land.

(c) If a party other than the entryman acquires the land pursuant to the sale, the Secretary shall compensate the entryman from the purchase price for the value, as determined by the Secretary as of the date of the bidding, added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest if such value was included in the appraised price of the land. The determinations by the Secretary under this subsection and subsection (b) shall be final and not subject to review.

(d) If a party other than the entryman acquires the land pursuant to the sale, the entryman, with the consent of the Secretary, may remove or sell to the party acquiring the land the improvements which (1) were made by the entryman or his predecessors in interest; (2) can be removed without substantial injury to the land; and (3) were not included in the appraised price of the land.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act to the contrary, the Secretary, prior to the issuance of patent, may vacate any sale held pursuant to this Act if he finds that the land, or any portion thereof, included in the sale is needed for Federal program requirements.

SEC. 5. (a) Where the land has been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency, or of a State, county, municipality, water district, or other local subdivision or agency, the Secretary may dispose of such land only with the consent of the head of the governmental unit concerned and under such terms and conditions as such head may deem necessary.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall apply to land in any national forest, national wildlife refuge, wildlife range, game range, wildlife management area, waterfowl production area, or area reserved for the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife which are

threatened with extinction, or to any Indian land or land set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including land over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Secretary by Executive order for the use of Indians, or to any land administered by the Secretary under the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 6. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of (a) any of the following named minerals for which the land is deemed by the Secretary of the Interior to be valuable or prospectively valuable as of the date of issuance of patent: coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, and for lands in the States of Louisiana and New Mexico sulphur also; and (b) the right of the United States, its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law.

SEC. 7. At least ninety days prior to the sale of any land under this Act, the Secretary shall notify the head of the governing body of the political subdivision or other instrumentality of the State having jurisdiction over comprehensive planning and zoning in the area within which the land is located or, in the absence of such political subdivision or instrumentality, the Governor of the State, in order to afford the appropriate body a reasonable opportunity to take such action as may be necessary to assure that the conveyance of the land, and the provisions thereof, will be consonant with local planning and development needs. If no such action is taken, no disposal of the land shall be made under this Act unless the Secretary determines that such disposal is reasonably consonant with State and local land use and development needs.

The letter presented by Mr. GRUENING is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1966.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell lands embraced in certain terminated entries, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted.

The Public Land Law Review Commission will undoubtedly consider the issues involved in this proposal. Ideally, the subject could await Commission's deliberations. However, it is remedial in nature, designed to assist persons who appear to be receiving harsh treatment from their Government. As such, we think the Congress would want to consider enacting the proposal so that equity may be served over the next 3 or more years. If necessary, we would have no objection to making the legislation temporary as was done in the case of Public Laws 88-607 and 88-608 in 1964.

The objective of the bill is to mitigate the hardship encountered by public land claimants. The bill would provide an equitable approach in certain situations where the existing relief laws would not be applicable. For example, from time to time situations arise where entrymen under the homestead or desert land laws, lessees under the Small Tract Act, and other persons in good faith expend considerable sums of money in making improvements on public lands, but for

one reason or another fail to qualify for patent under the law.

The Desert Land Act, as amended, 26 Stat. 1096 (1891), 43 U.S.C. sec. 321 (1958), casts the problem into sharp focus. Some desert land entrymen, after expending thousands of dollars in efforts to reclaim the land and "prove up," fail to do so after exhausting all relief provisions (i.e. act of March 4, 1915, 38 Stat. 1161, 43 U.S.C. sec. 337 (1958) and the act of March 4, 1929, 45 Stat. 1548, 43 U.S.C. sec. 339 (1958)) of existing law. We have no way of protecting their investment in the land. We think that such protection should be afforded to them consonant with the public interest.

Under existing public land practices, an entryman who has placed valuable improvements on his entry, upon its termination, is permitted to remove those improvements. Where a person has placed improvements on public lands and the lands are disposed of to another party, the Department has taken steps to assure that the person acquiring the land will reimburse the owner of the improvements for the reasonable value thereof which are left on the land and which are of value to the person acquiring the land. See *Lee Kisner et al.*, A-27189 (November 7, 1955); *Keith Specking et al. v. Charles S. Carter et al.*, A-26190 (July 24, 1951); *Maynard R. Stutzman*, A-25844 (May 17, 1950).

However, an entryman whose entry fails and who has expended money in disking, harrowing, etc., thus improving the land, is without recourse. Our proposal would afford relief to him and to others who have expended funds on entries in vain efforts to acquire title thereto.

Some of the problems which this bill is designed to meet stem from archaic laws, addressed to an essentially agrarian economy. The Public Land Law Review Commission will undoubtedly consider the suitability of these laws, and the need for continuing them or modifying them. Regardless of the recommendations offered by the Commission, however, some entries arising under these laws will be in effect for a number of years. We therefore believe that the enactment of the proposed legislation need not be deferred until the Commission study has been completed. The bill will serve an immediate and useful purpose, and it will not prejudice the work of the Commission.

Our bill is not an amendment of the equitable adjudication provisions, Rev. Stat. §§ 2450-2451, 2455-6-7 (1875), as amended, 43 U.S.C. §§ 1161-1164 (1958), but rather takes up where equitable adjudication ends. Equitable adjudication governs public land cases " * * * where the law has been substantially complied with, and the error or informality [e.g., the late filing of annual proof] arose from ignorance, accident, or mistake which is satisfactorily explained * * * ", Rev. Stat. § 2457 (1875), as amended, 43 U.S.C. 1164 (1958). The bill is applicable where there has not been substantial compliance with the law, albeit good faith is present. This bill differs from equitable adjudication in that equitable adjudication requires substantial compliance with the law and permits the conveyance of land without regard to its fair market value. However, such substantial compliance is not necessary under the bill, but the fair market value of the land must be paid to the United States. Therefore, the bill is not a duplication of equitable adjudication, but may afford a vehicle for relief where patent cannot issue under the equitable adjudication laws or under any other statute.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell at public auction any or all of the land in a terminated entry, made other than under the United States mining laws, where he finds that (1) the entryman has made a bona fide effort to meet the requirements of the law to earn patent; (2) there is no reasonable prospect that he will

be able to do so; and (3) the land is proper for disposal under the bill, considering such factors as, but not limited to, Federal program requirements, sound land use and conservation principles, and effective management of the public lands. Such sale could be held only after adequate public notice of the sale.

If the former entryman becomes the purchaser, he would be entitled to buy the land at his bid price less any value added to the land by the entryman or his predecessors in interest. The entryman would have a preference right to buy the land by meeting the high bid. Any patent issued under the bill would reserve to the United States those minerals which are leasable under the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended, 74 Stat. 781 (1960), and supplemented, 30 U.S.C. §§ 181-287 (Supp. V, 1964), for which the Secretary deemed the land to be valuable or prospectively valuable on the date of the issuance of the patent.

The bill would (1) embrace entries, inadvertently allowed on withdrawn lands; (2) apply to trade and manufacturing sites, homesites and other settlement or use and occupancy claims in Alaska, and to asserted claims under such laws, but made on withdrawn lands; (3) apply to entries which are not in good standing by reason of failure to meet statutory requirements, e.g., the filing of annual proofs in desert land cases. The term "good faith" as employed in the proposed bill is not intended to be equated with the degree of compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements. No withdrawn lands would be disposed of without the consent of the governmental agency for which the land is withdrawn and subject to such terms and conditions as that agency might deem appropriate. However, no lands in national parks, national monuments, national wildlife refuges and other areas dedicated to fish and wildlife purposes, national forests, and no Indian lands would be subject to disposal under the bill.

The provisions in the bill would not require the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land, but rather would permit him to do so in appropriate circumstances. We believe that the bill would obviate consideration of individual bills, e.g., S. 394, 88th Congress, culminating in the Act of May 17, 1963 (Private Law 88-4), H.R. 2291, 88th Congress, culminating in the Act of April 26, 1963 (Private Law 88-2), and H.R. 5302, 88th Congress, culminating in the Act of August 13, 1964 (Private Law 88-281).

We believe that the appraisal of the land should not encompass any improvements which can be removed without injury to the land, whether or not such improvements under the general rules of real property would be regarded as a part of the realty.

If the improvements are not so removable, their value would be separately included in the appraisal of the land. If the entryman acquired the land pursuant to the sale, he would be afforded a deduction in the purchase price for any improvements made by him or his predecessors in interest to the extent that the value of such improvements was an element in the appraised value. If another person acquired the land, the entryman would be compensated out of the purchase price by the Government for nonremovable improvements to the extent of the appraised value of the improvements. Furthermore, where a person other than the entryman acquired the land pursuant to the sale, the entryman, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, could remove the removable improvements or sell them to the person acquiring the land. The consent of the Secretary to such actions is deemed necessary to assure that (1) substantial injury to the land would not occur as a result of the removal of any improvements, and (2) the person acquiring the land would not be put in a position of paying both the Gov-

ernment and the entryman for the improvements.

In brief, where the entryman acquired the land pursuant to the sale, he would not be required to pay for the value added to the land resulting from improvements by him or his predecessors in interest. If the land is sold to anyone else, the entryman would be compensated for such improvements either by the Government or the purchaser of the land.

Our proposal requires the Secretary, 90 days before making a sale, to notify the head of the governing body of the political subdivision or other instrumentality of the State having jurisdiction over comprehensive planning and zoning in the area within which the land is located, or in the absence of any such instrumentality, the Governor of the State, in order to afford the appropriate body an opportunity to take appropriate land planning or zoning action to meet local planning and development needs. If no such action is taken, no conveyance of the land is to be made unless the Secretary determines that the conveyance and the provisions of the conveyance, will be reasonably consonant with local land use and development needs.

This provision is similar to section 2 of Public Law 88-608, 78 Stat. 988, an Act "To provide temporary authority for the sale of certain public lands."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, JR.,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

ELIGIBILITY AS A LOCAL GRANT-IN-AID OF CERTAIN EXPENDITURES OF THE CITY OF CINCINNATI, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on April 28, 1966, I received a letter from the city of Cincinnati requesting that I introduce legislation to achieve the objectives set forth in the letter.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill in behalf of the city of Cincinnati, as requested.

I request unanimous consent that the full contents of the letter referred to above be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3347) to make certain expenditures of the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, eligible as a local grant-in-aid for the purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter presented by Mr. LAUSCHE is as follows:

CITY OF CINCINNATI,
OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER,
Cincinnati, Ohio, April 28, 1966.
Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: In 1962, the voters of the City of Cincinnati approved a ten million dollar bond referendum for the construction of a Convention Center for the City. This Convention Center is now under construction on ground made available through the Queensgate III Urban Renewal project (Ohio R-82).

The Convention Center is strategically located in the downtown area, adjacent to the Central Business District Urban Renewal project (Ohio R-55) now in execution. The benefits derived from this Convention Center will be of great value to the revitalization of the City's Core area. If the construction costs of this facility of nearly ten million dollars could be applied as a Non-Cash Grant-In-Aid Urban Renewal credit, it would allow the City to move more quickly into the implementation of many other needed City projects.

A weekly Washington report on housing entitled, "Housing Affairs Letter" dated April 22, 1966, indicates that the subcommittee Chairman SPARKMAN has introduced four bills to credit the Huntsville Civic Arts Center, the Birmingham Civic Center, the Mobile Cultural and Convention Center and the University of Alabama Medical Center Expansion Efforts as Non-Cash Grant-In-Aid. Another bill would credit New Haven's proposed Coliseum-Convention Center.

It would be most helpful to the Urban Renewal projects of this City if you could see fit to introduce such legislation for Cincinnati's Convention Center. Including the cost of this structure as a Non-Cash Grant-In-Aid would enable us to proceed with other needed and worthwhile projects aimed at improving other blighted areas of the City.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

W. C. WICHMAN,
City Manager.

A DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would create a U.S. Department of Education to be headed by a Secretary of Education with Cabinet level status. This measure would transfer from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other agencies which have jurisdiction over programs of education all the agencies, functions, and programs involving education to this new Department and consolidate them under one authority.

Mr. President, the problems in the field of education are so enormous they are difficult to conceive. A few examples illustrate this. For instance, since World War II—a scant 20-year period of time—the number of colleges and universities has increased by 250 percent, from 866 to approximately 2,300. About 10 percent of these 2,300 institutions of higher learning have not met the minimum standards for accreditation. In 1955 there were approximately 2.7 million students in the fall enrollment of our accredited colleges. By 1964 this number reached almost 5 million, and it is estimated by 1970 it will have reached 7 million. The rate of increase during the last 4 years has been approximately 8 percent. In addition, the cost of attending public institutions has increased over 30 percent between 1955 and 1965 and another 20 percent increase is estimated by 1970. The cost increase for attending private institutions is even greater. Our education experts estimate a cost spiral amounting to a 50-percent increase in tuition over the next decade.

In addition, there is also the problem of the increased demand for financial

assistance. Under our existing loan programs, 600 thousand students have borrowed approximately \$450 million. However, this is far from sufficient and far too many potential students have been left out. For instance in 1960, 1.1 million high school graduates were not attending college. Forty-two percent of these listed financial problems as the reason for not enrolling in colleges and universities. Twenty-two percent of the students that did attend dropped out at the end of the first year and of this group 28 percent listed lack of money as the chief reason for such dropouts. In June of last year, the largest senior high school class in the history of our country graduated. The September freshman class was estimated at approximately 1.4 million students. However, many promising young people were not able to attend. Of the top 50 percent of high school graduates, 37.9 percent of the boys and 57.9 percent of the girls from families with less than \$3,000 annual income did not enroll in college.

It is interesting to note that two-thirds of the families whose heads of the household had less than 9 years schooling live in poverty; that 20 percent of the young people between ages 18 and 24 with less than 9 years of school were unemployed; that keeping a family on relief cost a minimum of \$2,500 a year; and that keeping a young person in a detention home cost \$1,800 a year, and a person in prison \$3,500 a year. This is contrasted with the average cost of \$450 a year for keeping a child in secondary school. This is not to say that this latter amount is sufficient, but the fact remains that at the present time it is the average.

Against this background of problems—and because of the efforts of the Federal Government to alleviate these problems—our involvement in the field of education has undergone one of the most rapid expansion programs of any area of government. For instance, the staff of the Office of Education increased during the fiscal year 1966 by 646 people. Appropriations for fiscal year 1965 increased over 200 percent to \$1.5 billion. In fiscal year 1966 it again increased over 200 percent to \$3.3 billion. This increase reflects both the stepped up activity in existing programs and in the inauguration of several new ones.

The Office of Education at the present time has one of the largest organizations in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. On January 1, 1966, it had 2,202 employees in four major bureaus with 21 divisions or offices, 9 other major offices, a contracts and construction service, and a national center for educational statistics, not to mention its regional offices. For this reason I feel that it is imperative that we reorganize the Office of Education and the various other offices which deal with educational programs into a new and separate department. When the increasing complexity of educational programs is viewed, and when the broader scope of these programs is considered, the urgent need to consolidate them in order to coordinate more closely all national educational efforts becomes very apparent.

At the present time, with the many different agencies which handle the educational problems, it is almost necessary that an institution of higher education, with respect to even the local boards of secondary education, employ a staff assistant specialized in contacting the Federal Government and its various agencies which handle these problems in order to be assured that full advantage is being taken of the opportunities afforded now for education at the national level.

I believe that, with the increased necessity for educational assistance at the national level, this new department should be created in the very near future. We know that, even though this is the first year in which we have entered the field of secondary education, the demands will become even greater in the next few years and that secondary education will receive an increased amount of assistance from both the Federal and the State level of government. Certainly if any political unit or any entity of government in the Nation has a responsibility in the field of education; whether it be the higher educational level or secondary level, the Federal Government has a responsibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 10 days for cosponsors.

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

The bill (S. 3348) to establish the Department of Education, introduced by Mr. Bass, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF QUALITY CONTROL DAY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which will authorize the President to proclaim the first day in June as Quality Control Day. This date coincides with the 20th anniversary of the American Society for Quality Control.

Quality control, with its associated discipline and reliability engineering, assures the public that the products it uses are safe, sound, and durable. The society, which started with 1,000 members in 1946, now number 20,000.

The quality control man in the factory is often referred to as the customer's voice in the plant. Proof of industry's forthright intent to provide good service to the consumer is the inclusion of a quality control program in the plant.

The establishment of a Quality Control Day will reaffirm Government's commitment to the protection of the American consumer.

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

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 159) to authorize the President to issue a pro-

clamation designating the first day of June in 1966 as "Quality Control Day," introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 159

Whereas the quality of American civilization is dependent, in large measure, on continuing improvement in the quality of goods and services; and

Whereas the survival and success of the free world depends to a great degree on the quality and reliability of its products and services in open competition on the international market; and

Whereas quality control unites the interests of consumers and producers alike in the joint pursuit of excellence; and

Whereas there is great need to draw wider public attention to the contributions made by quality control and reliability of scientists and engineers throughout the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the first day of June in 1966 as "Quality Control Day" and inviting the Governors of the several States and mayors of the local governments of the United States to issue similar proclamations.

THE NEED FOR THE U.N. IN SOUTH VIETNAM'S ELECTIONS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, last week, I called for United Nations supervision of the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam. At that time I said:

We must request that a special session of the United Nations General Assembly be called.

We should introduce in that special session a resolution requesting that United Nations observers be assigned to the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam.

And we should lend the full prestige of the United States to this effort, in the person of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

I emphasized that elections would be held within areas of South Vietnam which could reasonably be secured against violence and intimidation, and where U.N. observers could gain access to assure impartiality.

It is my belief—and the belief of many others—that the elections scheduled in South Vietnam must be held. At present the United States has committed over 250,000 men and substantial resources to the struggle in Vietnam. Our Nation is helping the South Vietnamese to fight the enemy in the jungle. We are helping to bring social and economic progress to the villages. Yet, the period of recent political turmoil and bickering in South Vietnam has shown that neither an effective military effort, nor successful economic and social development efforts—the so-called "pacification" program—is possible without the direction and support of a strong and stable central government. Also, if we are ever to have fruitful negotiations, they must rest on the same solid base. In fact, no effective or permanent solution to the problems of Vietnam is possible without political stability. Political stability, in turn, can best be based on institutions that are responsive to the needs and desires of the people—stitutions that can

accommodate the conflicts between divergent groups within the society in Vietnam.

Last month the Buddhists demanded elections. Premier Ky promised to comply with their demands. Thus, the South Vietnamese Government has committed itself to the elective process for developing political institutions. Elections must take place. And most important, they must be honest and free.

Let us face the issue squarely when we discuss the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam. The complexity of problems—the intricacy of the web that must be disentangled in setting up the electoral machinery required for a fair election—cannot be underestimated. The difficulties to be met are immense. South Vietnam—a country at war—is torn by violence and terror. South Vietnam is inexperienced in the ways of the elective process. And South Vietnam is a country where contending political and religious groups have had ample time, and ample reason, to accumulate a vast catalog of grievances against each other—grievances that have not been dissipated in the give and take of a political arena. Thus, if the elections are to succeed, it will take patience and understanding—perseverance and will—on the part of every political and religious group concerned.

One point seems clear. If the Ky government supervises elections, the results will be contested—and may well be rejected—by the other elements of the Vietnam power struggle. Buddhist-supervised elections, as Tri Quang has proposed, would be equally unacceptable to the military, the Catholics, and other groups. Pollwatchers supported by the United States alone would also be unsatisfactory.

The need for objective outside supervision of the forthcoming elections is clear. The kind of supervision required can come only from an international presence.

On many occasions I have stated my belief that every elected official, and every concerned individual citizen should analyze the issues and make every effort to contribute constructively as we search collectively for a solution to the situation in Vietnam. This is our right. This is also our obligation. It is recognized by the President of the United States who has said time and again that he welcomes suggestions and ideas concerning Vietnam.

Following my speech last Thursday, the Department of State was asked by the press to comment on my suggestion for U.N. supervision of the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam. The Department gave the following reply:

We have seen Senator Ribicoff's suggestion. As far as the United States is concerned, we have urged on many occasions that the United Nations find a way to contribute constructively to a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem. Specifically, Ambassador Goldberg has recently reaffirmed at the U.N. our interest in a United Nations role in supervising elections designed to implement the Geneva Accords. Regrettably, the Soviet Union, Hanoi and Peking have frequently opposed any United Nations participation in the solution of the Vietnam

problem. This opposition has apparently led the Secretary General and many members to conclude that there is no effective role for the United Nations to play in the present circumstances. However, we are glad that Senator Ribicoff has added his voice to those who believe the U.N. can play a constructive role in Vietnam.

In my approach to the complex problems of Vietnam, I have tried to be constructive. My proposal for U.N.-supervised elections is concrete. Yet, the Department's comments on my proposal are indecisive and misleading. Let me discuss State Department's statement point by point.

I do not doubt for a moment that the United States has urged the U.N. to find a way to contribute constructively to a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem. In my speech last Thursday I described the President's search for peace through diplomacy—his peace offensive which reached into the Security Council of the United Nations, as well as to some 115 countries. I fully support and encourage the breadth and intensity of his efforts.

Yet, when the Department of State says that Ambassador Goldberg has reaffirmed this country's interest "in a United Nations role in supervising elections designed to implement the Geneva accords," I am admittedly puzzled and dismayed. For the elections referred to by the State Department are those in point 7 of the final declaration of the Geneva Conference. They are not the elections promised by the Ky government. They bear no relation to my proposal. Thus the elections the Department refers to are the elections that were supposed to be held in July 1956, in both North and South Vietnam, with the object of unifying the country. At the concluding plenary session of the Geneva Conference, on July 21, 1954, Walter Bedell Smith, on behalf of the U.S. Government, explained the purpose of the elections set out in the final declaration:

In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted freely.

Mr. President, the elections that I hope to see supervised by U.N. observers—the elections I discussed on the floor of the Senate—are not "elections designed to implement the Geneva accords"—though conceivably they might have some bearing on a future settlement negotiated according to the Geneva agreements. I am talking about the forthcoming elections demands by the Buddhists, agreed to by the Ky government and expected by the entire world. Their purpose is to choose the members of an assembly that will write a constitution for the Republic of South Vietnam. I think my statement was clear. The Department of State has not only side-stepped completely the critical issue involved in my proposal—the question of U.N. supervision of the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam—but the State Department has once again muddled the waters of discussion.

In its statement, the Department further states that the Soviet Union, Hanoi, and Peking have frequently opposed participation by the United Nations in the solution of the Vietnam situation. This comment also begs the issue. Two of the three countries named—Communist China and North Vietnam—are not members of the United Nations, nor do they control any significant number of votes in the U.N. Therefore, the Department's next point—that opposition by these countries "has apparently led the Secretary General and many members to conclude that there is no effective role for the United Nations to play in the present circumstances"—simply does not follow from the earlier premise.

Mr. President, if the Department of State believes my proposal has no merit, let it say so. If the Department wants or needs time to consider this suggestion, let the comment be made that the proposal is under study. But let us avoid the meaningless statement—the misleading phrase. The issues involved in Vietnam require that we say what we mean as clearly as we can.

And let us be clear about the elections in South Vietnam. They are vital. I believe that their failure would be a significant setback for the future of South Vietnam, the United States, and the cause of peace. And I believe that if those elections are to be free and honest, an international presence in South Vietnam is essential. So let our Government do everything in its power to obtain U.N. supervision. Let us commit our Nation to the success of the elections. The stakes have seldom been higher.

Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution urging the President to request the United Nations to send observers to the coming elections in South Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 258) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Republic of South Vietnam is actively engaged in making preparations for elections to choose a constituent assembly in a constructive effort to bring about a more representative government, and

Whereas the United States is dedicated to the principle, in the conduct of its foreign affairs, that peoples everywhere have the right to determine their own destinies through free participation in elected governments; and

Whereas the success of the promised elections in South Vietnam will depend on the assurance that they will be free, fair, and open; and

Whereas the United States has committed its resources and the lives of its men to the cause of freedom for the South Vietnamese people; and

Whereas an objective and international presence would make a significant contribution to assuring that the promised elections in South Vietnam are free, fair, and open, and thus help substantially in bringing about political stability and the establishment of

effective political institutions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should encourage the Government of South Vietnam to seek United Nations observers for its forthcoming elections; and

That the President should call upon the United Nations to assign United Nations observers to the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Mr. Joseph Kraft has written a perceptive series of articles in recent weeks concerning the prospects for the coming elections in South Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent to have his articles, together with editorials from the New York Times, Hartford Times, Hartford Courant, Middletown Press, and New Britain Herald, printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1966]
INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK: VIETNAMESE CRISIS—I

(By Joseph Kraft)

SAIGON.—The most recent Vietnamese crisis brought to the surface all the complex social and political currents that the war and its drum-beaters tend to suppress. Indeed, precisely because these elements have been eclipsed in the past, their sudden outcropping now tends to catch Americans by surprise and to fill them with alarm and confusion.

But while the denouement remains in doubt, the outbreak and development of the crisis followed a logical course. They are subject to analysis, and I will offer an analysis in subsequent columns dealing with the two chief forces at work—the Buddhists and the Catholics.

First, however, I must try to describe the mosaic of Vietnamese policies. For it is a subject in which interplay is everything—a case of minority politics, a matter of action, reaction and counteraction by tiny groups. Indeed, in its basic elements, its geography, its history, its beliefs, South Vietnam is a divided country—"a huddling together," as Hazlitt once said of Shakespeare tragedy, "of fierce extremes."

Geographically, the basic division in South Vietnam is between the Center and the South. The Center, once known as Annam, is the coastal plain stretching from the 17th Parallel down the outskirts of Saigon. It happens to include—in Da Nang, Anake, Camranh Bay and Nhatrang—the main American air and sea bases. It is a region of tiny parcels of relatively poor land, much subject to salinization by repeated incursions of the sea. Though the population is only 3 million and though fish are plentiful, Central Vietnam cannot support itself.

The South, or Cochin China as the French called it, includes Saigon and the delta of the Mekong River and its many mouths. The delta region is one of the great rice-producing areas of the world and Saigon its entrepot. Though the combined population amounts to perhaps 8 million people, in normal times, the South produces a large export surplus.

Historic difference tended to follow geographic lines. Central Vietnam has been the heartland of the country, the site of the imperial court, a center of Buddhist studies, and the historic seat of strong resistance both to Chinese pressure from the north and to French pressure from the south. Its elite is a traditionalist elite, looking back with nostalgia to the days of complete freedom from foreign presences and thus highly nationalistic, even xenophobic—especially in its attitude toward other regions of Vietnam that have accommodated more easily to foreign presences.

The South was a frontier province for the Center, settled late and, as usual with frontier provinces, in rather large holdings. The French invasion of the last century found easy pickings in the South, notably with the large landholders. The native elite that emerged from the process tended to be relatively well off economically, civilized in the French manner and totally divorced from the uneducated peasant masses.

Not surprisingly, differences in belief are in harmony with the geographical and historical divisions. The harsh, traditionalist xenophobia of the Center has found its purest expression in the Buddhist revival led by the famous Bonze Tri-Quang. A similar Catholic attitude was reflected in the family of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem, although more recently the Catholics of the Center have reverted to the more self-effacing role of a heavily outnumbered minority. Before World War II, some of the same xenophobic spirit was channeled into two parties—the Dai Viet, or Greater Vietnam Party, and the Vietnamese Kuomintang, or Nationalist Party—which still have strength in the Center.

In the South, leadership in the cities tended to fall into the hands of the French-educated local notables. The colonialist atmosphere dissolved native Catholicism, and even more Buddhism, to the point of decay. Among the peasantry they developed several revivalist groups—notably the Hoa Hao and Cao Dai sects. The mixture was further thickened after the Geneva conference of 1954, when hundreds of thousands of Catholic refugees and some leading Nationalist politicians fled from Communist North Vietnam and settled, mainly around Saigon.

All of these forces have been jockeying for position ever since then. While the war has tended to submerge their activities, they have made themselves felt in every change of regime, beginning with the overthrow of the Diem government in 1963. Now the political forces are out in the open. The important question over the next few months is whether they will yield chaos and a running down of the war effort or a kind of consensus that could lead to an organized settlement.

[From the Washington Post, May 6, 1966]

INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK: THE VIETNAMESE

CRISIS—II

(By Joseph Kraft)

SAIGON.—What do the Buddhists really want?

That question is at all times being put by Americans to the militant Buddhist leader, Thich Tri Quang. A skillful politician, far above average in the capacity to develop calculated ambiguities, Tri Quang keeps returning dusty answers.

It thus becomes possible to see him either as a Communist tool or as the potential savior of his country. And therefore the questioning game continues—ad nauseam and ad infinitum.

A more pertinent question, it seems to me, is to ask who the militant Buddhists are. The answer is that they are a tiny minority with respect to size, locale, and viewpoint.

Apart from Thich Tri Quang, a gifted leader in my view, the Buddhist militants include only a few hundred veterans of protest demonstrations. They are mainly drawn from the center of the country and notably from the children of good families, often of royal blood, who attended the University of Hue.

Their viewpoint is the viewpoint of narrow, xenophobic traditionalism, which, as I have indicated, is common to the educated elite of the central region of South Vietnam.

It happened that this tiny group played a dramatic role in the anti-Catholic protests that ended in the fall of the regime of the

late President Ngo Dinh Diem. That (largely accidental) bit of history has combined with self-consciousness of their small numbers to define what I would call the minimum, and destructive goal of the militant Buddhists.

The minimum Buddhist goal is to prevent power from passing into the hands of any leaders who might try to reverse the events of 1963—who might, to be more specific, crush the militant Buddhists as an act of revenge for what happened to President Diem. That minimum goal has largely governed the actions of the military Buddhist leadership since 1963.

Thus when Gen. Nguyen Khanh seemed about to take dictatorial powers after the Tonkin Gulf incident of August 1964, the Buddhists went into the streets to force Khanh to rescind his declaration of one-man rule. Similarly, in May 1965, when Premier Tran Van Hough, a leading personality from the South, moved into a position to crack down, the Buddhists again went into the streets and forced his regime from power.

More recently, the specter of Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky's using his Honolulu meeting with President Johnson to gather supreme power set in motion the latest set of Buddhist-inspired troubles. And, if the Buddhists are now prepared to settle for free elections, it is again within the perspective of their minimum objectives.

For free elections, apart from demonstrating for all the world to see that the Catholics really are a minority, would wipe the slate clean. They would be a new beginning. They would serve to normalize the political situation, to ratify the events of 1963, to prevent the purge of revenge that the Buddhists most fear.

If avoiding a purge is the minimum, destructive goal, however, the Buddhists also have a larger and more positive aim—an aim that has been broadening in the course of time. The constructive goal, as I see it, is to become the nucleus for a popular majority in South Vietnam that might, in time, serve as a means of bringing an honorable peace to this country, and perhaps, even, to all of Buddhist southeast Asia.

To this end, the tiny knot of militant Buddhist leaders has developed a gamut of techniques for reaching the rest of the population. By emphasizing dislike of Saigon and the central government, they have won over most of the army and civil service of central Vietnam. Cryptic talk of peace appeals to the war-weariness that, at times at least, afflicts almost everybody in the country. A slight dash of anti-Americanism, by confronting the rich foreigner with the poor native, does duty for the one thing the Buddhists lack most of all—a social program with appeal to the poor.

My feeling is that the Buddhists hope to combine these tactics with elections to some kind of assembly to organize a popular national majority. Once the majority is in place, they believe, I think, that they could talk to the other side and arrange a peace that would be neither victory nor defeat for either party.

For the moment, however, the Buddhists are searching for allies to form the majority. Mindful of their own tiny size, they do not seek to dominate a national assembly. My information is that Tri Quang would like to see an assembly made up of one-third Buddhists, one-third Catholics, and one-third other groups.

Already the Buddhists are working to form alliances that could lead to the majority they seek. To establish a footing in the South, they have put out lines to leading southern personalities, notably former Gen. Tran Van Don, the president of the alumni association of southern high schools comprising most of the upper middle class of Saigon and the delta.

But the big hope for the Buddhists, the key to building a majority, is that they can

work with the Catholics. I will be examining that possibility in the next column in this series.

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 1966]

INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK: THE VIETNAMESE CRISIS—III

(By Joseph Kraft)

SAIGON.—Mention the Catholics of South Vietnam and most Americans think of people who are first, fervently anti-Communist, and only next Vietnamese. But that is not even a half-truth.

To be sure, about half of the 1½ million Catholics in South Vietnam are refugees who fled their native villages when the Communists took over North Vietnam in 1954. Most of these refugees are settled around Saigon in small, often armed, villages dominated by the local parish.

Thus cut adrift from their old moorings and isolated in present surroundings, the refugees represent a potent mass, easy to stir against any regime suspected of being willing to negotiate with the other side—the more so, since the fall of their great patron, the late President Ngo Dinh Diem. They are, in the words of one high official in the American Embassy, "like medieval fanatics." They have tended to form the popular backbone of the recent military regimes, and to be the death weapon against more moderate regimes.

But the other half of the Catholic population—the Catholics native to the southern and central regions of this country—are by no means fanatic, or even edgy. They are used to coexisting as a minority with a large Buddhist majority. Through the archbishop of Saigon, Nguyen Van Binh, they have felt the influence of the updating that has recently come to dominate attitudes in the Vatican. To some extent, Archbishop Binh has been able to take in tow the chief refugee leader, the Reverend Hoang Quynh.

The institution for this takeover by the more moderate Catholics of South Vietnam has been the liaison office of the archbishopric of Saigon. Over the last year the office has been issuing a series of communiques on political subjects.

For example, in its fourth communique put out in November of last year, the liaison office made an obvious effort to have all Catholics work to cooperate with the Buddhists. The communique said: "The office calls upon the faithful to pay very careful attention when speaking or writing on matters related to other religions, strictly avoiding any actions which might be harmful to friendly relations."

In its fifth communique, issued on January 7 of this year, the liaison office lined up with the Buddhists in supporting a compromise negotiated end to the war.

Most recently, the more moderate Catholics seem to have been working with the Buddhists against the military government of Air Marshall Nguyen Cao Ky. The most recent communique of the liaison committee, issued on April 6 said: "The most pressing problem * * * is the present political vacuum * * *. The political situation in South Vietnam is still a cold emptiness. The authorities are still unable to lay a legal foundation for the country, and they still lack the support of the people."

In short, the Catholics native to South Vietnam led by the highest authority in the local hierarchy are not far distant from the position of the militant Buddhists under Bonze Thich (venerable) Tri Quang. The possibility of an alliance exists.

If such an alliance could be struck, elections could yield a coalition majority dominated by the militant Buddhists of the Center and the moderate Catholics of the South.

A government based on that majority could transform the situation here. It would at long last command the loyalties

and faith of the most dynamic political forces in the country, and it could enlist these forces in support of the war effort. It could finally activate the pacification campaign which is now more than ever necessary as a supplement to American military successes.

To be sure, the Ky government, the old political parties and the undisciplined fanatics among the Catholic refugees are now at work trying to break up the prospective working alliance between Buddhist militants and moderate Catholics. These forces have produced recent anti-Buddhist demonstrations in Quang Ngai, in Dalat and in Saigon. They have inspired repeated statements emphasizing the dangers of elections.

Indeed, the election campaign is already shaping up as a struggle between the government, on the one hand, and the Buddhists on the other, for the support of the Catholics and the local notables of Saigon and the delta region. As a matter of fact, the winning combination will probably be a coalition of the present government, the Catholic refugees and the old-fashioned notables of the South. In that case, it seems to me that the essentially political struggle in South Vietnam will have been lost.

But it also seems to me that there is a dim chance of promoting the alliance between Catholic moderates and militant Buddhists from which so much could flow. That chance depends to a large extent on what the United States does, or does not do, in the period leading up to the elections and to that subject I will devote the concluding column in this series.

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1966]

INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK: THE VIETNAMESE CRISIS—IV

(By Joseph Kraft)

SAIGON.—Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge's return to the United States is happily timed. For the central theme of his consultations will have to be the coming elections in Vietnam. And on that score Washington has a huge contribution to make to American thinking here in Saigon.

Without outside help, indeed, the American mission here is almost incompetent to frame a broad approach to the elections. For one thing, the mission is preoccupied with the day-to-day not so say minute-to-minute, business of supporting the war effort.

The emphasis is on moving goods and people, arranging appointments, making telephone calls and other tedious administrative tasks. That emphasis leaves little, if any, scope for thinking big. In consequence, the American mission here has yet to develop a coherent program for dealing with the elections and their predictable problems.

Precisely because the mission is so much geared to doing business, it tends to favor people in power who can get the job done. That is how such diverse figures as the late President Ngo Dinh Diem, former Premier Nguyen Khanh, and, now, Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky all acquired virtually unconditional American support.

By the same token, the focus on getting things done puts a discount on uncertainty. But a free election is uncertainty writ large—a leap in the dark. It is thus precisely the kind of thing the American mission in Saigon does not like to think about.

Already the unease of the mission here in the presence of an election prospect has yielded two exceedingly damaging impressions.

And in large measure, Washington's work during the consultations with Ambassador Lodge should develop a means for dissipating these bad impressions.

First, there is, rightly or wrongly, a widespread impression among both Americans and Vietnamese in Saigon that the United States is opposed to free elections. This

feeling at this time is exceedingly dangerous. For insofar as they believe that the United States has misgivings about elections, by so much the Vietnamese military leaders in office will be tempted to stage a coup or phony coup designed to head off the elections.

There is also a widespread impression that if the United States does accept elections, it is only in order to provide a fig-leaf of legitimacy to the present military regime. This impression is reinforced by rumors of covert American efforts to set up some political notable from Saigon or the delta region as a front for the present military leaders. It is further reinforced by rumors of American efforts to line up a majority of refugee Catholics, nationalist parties, and members of the Hoa Hao and Cao Dai religious sects to support the government against the Buddhist militants under Bonze Tich Tri Quang.

The mere prevalence of these rumors, whether they are true or not, works against the American interest. For the rumors lend color to the suspicion that the United States is not in favor of a free choice in South Vietnam, that, instead, the United States only wants a regime that will continue to sponsor the war.

Even if the schemes attributed to the Americans here could be brought off, they could not yield lasting results. For the present government plus a politicalized front would fence out not only the Buddhists but the whole central region of South Vietnam. And the center, which has been the source of the present trouble, would react by making even more trouble.

The true American interest, in fact, lies in the one thing the American mission here finds it most difficult to contemplate. It lies in making a leap in the dark—in fostering a process that will give free play to local political forces. And the starting point for that process can be the coming elections.

But that means unrigged elections.

It means elections which hold out the possibility of a passage of power to a new government based on an alliance of the moderate Catholics of the South and the militant Buddhists of the Center.

It means elections from which there could at least develop a meaningful political opposition.

The consultations with Ambassador Lodge can be a success only if they advance the prospect for honest elections, only if they make clear beyond any doubt the American commitment of free choice in South Vietnam.

[From the New York Times, May 10, 1966]

ELECTIONS IN VIETNAM

Premier Ky's announced intention of holding office for another year, despite the promise of elections this fall, reduces his chances of doing so. His own Government has felt obliged to censor this latest evidence of political ineptitude out of the Saigon press in an effort to avoid new Buddhist demonstrations. And the Buddhist leaders, who fortunately are reacting with restraint, are undoubtedly right in their judgment that the elections will determine the outcome, not Marshal Ky.

Whether the Constituent Assembly elected in the fall limits itself to the task of drafting a constitution—as the military junta desires—or pronounces itself a legislative assembly, its existence is bound to alter the political context. The Ky government will be unable to ignore the views of a popularly elected body if the elections are fair and the Assembly is generally accepted as representative.

The real issues are whether the elections will be held on schedule and whether they can be organized in a fashion that produces a popularly accepted result. Ambassador Lodge's vaguely expressed reservations about

the elections unfortunately have provided encouragement to those elements in South Vietnam which wear a Buddhist victory and want the voting postponed—through a military coup, if necessary. If the elections are called off or rigged, the damage in world opinion would be exceeded only by the destructive effect on political cohesion in Saigon itself.

Mr. Lodge's visit to Washington this week provides an opportunity for the Administration to remove any doubts about where the United States stands. An unequivocal statement is needed, but it ought to go beyond mere words. The most useful contribution would be a decision to seek international observation—and, preferably, supervision—of the entire electoral process from the current drafting of an electoral law through the campaign and the actual balloting.

Senator RIBICOFF has proposed that President Johnson invite the United Nations to take on this task through a special session of the General Assembly. This suggestion deserves thorough discussion with Secretary General Thant and other U.N. members.

Some form of international supervision could help assure that the election results will not be contested. More important, it would set a valuable precedent for the broader elections, including the Communists, that ultimately will be needed to achieve a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam conflict.

[From the Hartford Times, May 9, 1966]

TRAVESTY OR VALIDITY?

Premier Ky's expectation that he will retain power into 1967 and his evident hesitancy to commit himself to abide by the outcome of the proposed election may bring disorderly Vietnamese protests. The results hoped of the election may have been promised.

But if the plans for it are pursued and the exercise of the popular will is to have any substantial meaning—or even an opportunity to be meaningful—more thought and preparation must be given to the election machinery.

For it would be witness to rely on the outcome of an election as a solution of South Vietnam's governmental problems when that election still has only the slightest prospect of being organized.

Senator RIBICOFF's call for U.N. supervision of the election process summons sense to a hectic situation.

This is true because the prospective elections are not to be conducted under such auspices of order as govern some similar event in Connecticut. The Vietnam balloting must take place in a nation torn, terrorized and shattered by a vicious guerrilla war, a nation lacking experience with campaigning or national election procedure.

In view of those conditions, Senator RIBICOFF in a major policy speech has asked that President Johnson personally lend the full prestige of the United States to a request that the UN assign observers for the Viet Nam voting.

The intention is to insure by the international presence, insofar as is possible, the validity of the election process and its outcome.

In response to Senator RIBICOFF's initiative, doubt has been expressed that the UN can arrange to assist. Certainly the arrangement would be difficult to make.

Yet, without such disinterested supervision, it is hard to imagine the holding of an election, much less to have confidence in its result. Without safeguards, the most extreme pressures would be employed in an attempt to make sure that this was anything except a free and open decision. The inclusiveness of the election is another point.

For example, as the Senator notes, only 20 per cent of South Viet Nam's 16 million peo-

ple live in urban centers where, presumably the government alone might offer personal safety to those who went to the polls.

The masterful and perceptive analysis of the Viet Nam problem offered by Senator RIBICOFF in his speech lends weight to his plea that at this decisive time, the best possible expression of the will of the people of Viet Nam be obtained.

Senator RIBICOFF supports President Johnson, but he is convinced of "the powerlessness of sheer power" to effect a settlement in Viet Nam.

He asserts that our military, diplomatic and socio-economic assistance programs there are all drained down by local political instability arising from government that lacks consent as expressed by the people.

It seems to us, as it does to Senator RIBICOFF, that the proposed election offers opportunity to certify Vietnamese opinion and thereby solve some of the vast uncertainty and instability that surround the United States relation with South Viet Nam.

[From the Hartford Courant]

TENSE PROSPECTS

South Vietnam, Premier Ky's weekend assertion that he intends to stay in power at least another year brought a swift reaction both in Saigon and Washington. In Saigon, the physical evidence of the reaction was the prompt prohibition of any domestic publication of the statement, dramatized by the blank spaces in the first pages of the newspapers.

In Washington, the news brought Secretary Rusk to the TV screen on Sunday to insist that the news stories in the American press Sunday morning were misinterpretations of what Premier Ky had actually said. On Monday, he told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that, while the text of the statement he had was incomplete, it had been misinterpreted to mean that the General would not step down after a civilian government was established.

What the incident did establish was evidence of the tenseness in both Saigon and Washington over the political prospects in South Vietnam. And it lends point to Senator RIBICOFF's suggestion, repeated in Hartford Sunday, that the State Department seriously consider his suggestion that it call on the General Assembly of the United Nations to lend a hand in supervising the elections there next fall.

[From the Middletown (Conn.) Press, May 7, 1966]

THE U.N. AND VIET NAM

Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF's call for United Nations supervision of the forthcoming elections in Viet Nam is an inspired suggestion. It would give currency to the validity of the elections, it would involve the prestige of the U.N. in the outcome, and it would tend to stabilize the date on which the elections would be held.

As Connecticut's junior Senator put it:

"The elections must be held. But let us face reality. Under the supervision of the Ky government, the results would be challenged and rejected by the other elements of the Viet Nam power struggle. Elections supervised by the Buddhists—as Tri Quang has proposed—would be equally unacceptable to the military, the Catholics and other groups. Pollwatchers supported by the United States alone would also be unsatisfactory. The tides of colonialism have long since receded, leaving a residue of strong suspicion of Western man."

"There is a clear need for objective outside supervision of the forthcoming election. That kind of supervision and that kind of objectivity can come only from an international presence."

"There is no magic method that will assure the international presence needed—we must work, and work hard toward that goal."

"First, we must request that a special session of the United Nations General Assembly be called."

"Second, we should introduce in that special session a resolution requesting that United Nations observers be assigned to the forthcoming elections in South Viet Nam."

"Third—and most important—we should lend the full prestige of the United States to this effort. I can think of no better way to present the case to the U.N. than in the person of President Lyndon B. Johnson—who has demonstrated time and again his unwavering devotion to the cause of peace."

"The elections should be held within areas which can reasonably be secured against violence and intimidation, and where the U.N. observers can gain access to assure impartiality."

"We must work toward the establishment of a strong—stable—and independent government in South Viet Nam. Let us at least recognize that the elections offer the chance to begin."

In his speech, Senator RIBICOFF also pointed out that the pacification program now stands on a tenuous base because the peasant is not really assured that he plays a role in his government. We could commit a million men in Viet Nam, he said, stamp out the Viet Cong, and still lose the war. All this is quite true, and anything that the United States can bring about to insure the credibility of the elections, both within Viet Nam and without, will contribute to a shortening of the war.

[From the New Britain (Conn.) Herald, May 7, 1966]

VIET NAM ELECTION FORMULA

Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF has fired off his second major Senate floor speech in 3 months on the subject of Viet Nam, and this message, like his first, deserves a careful hearing.

The Senator carefully traces the parallel military and political efforts to sustain South Vietnamese independence, and casts his lot with the political program as being most likely to produce the desired goal of achieving a Vietnamese society capable of governing itself and maintaining a semblance of control of the countryside.

He said, "Let me clearly state my belief: No solution to the problems of Viet Nam is possible without political stability—which must in turn be based on institutions which can accommodate the conflicts between divergent groups within the society of Viet Nam. Such institutions have developed in the West over the course of the centuries. South Viet Nam faces the incredible task of compressing the political experience of generations into several months."

To that end, RIBICOFF advocates United Nations presence during the elections; and that the elections be held only in those parts of Viet Nam where there is "reasonable" assurance that balloting can be conducted without Viet Cong interference. To emphasize the importance of such U.N. supervision, RIBICOFF proposes that President Johnson personally should go to the U.N. and appeal for its involvement in the elections.

In effect, RIBICOFF has consolidated a major idea that is being discussed in Washington, and has put it into proper focus. The two major variants to the U.N. supervision theme which were suggested by RIBICOFF—the President's appeal and the limiting of voting to "safe" areas—both make consummate good sense.

If the U.N. 115-member nation General Assembly cannot fulfill this obligation, then its value in this strife-torn world will have become so diminished as to be worthless.

WEATHER MODIFICATION PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 564

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 2916. I previously introduced S. 2916 as a vehicle to promote discussion and as a background for the extensive hearings by the Committee on Commerce.

Those hearings have been completed. The Library of Congress has prepared a special report on the subject of weather modification which I have presented to the Senate. The Committee on Commerce, thus far, has developed extensive knowledge on the subject.

S. 2916 has served its purpose. Reflecting what our hearings have revealed and what the Library of Congress prepared, I now offer the amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this amendment be printed in the RECORD.

I am pleased to have as cosponsors Senators CANNON and DOMINICK who have shown great interest in this subject, and conducted the committee hearings.

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

The amendment (No. 564) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

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

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Weather Modification Act of 1966'.

"TITLE I—DECLARATION OF POLICY AND DEFINITIONS

"Declaration of policy

"SEC. 101. (a) The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to develop, encourage, and maintain a comprehensive and coordinated program in weather modification in order to contribute to:

"(1) the protection of life and property, "(2) the maintenance of adequate water resources for the United States, and

"(3) the enhancement of commerce, transportation, agriculture, natural resources, health, and security in the United States.

"(b) In order to achieve the objectives of this Act, the weather modification activities of the United States shall be conducted with full consideration of:

"(1) the development of the necessary scientific basis in a strong and balanced program in the atmospheric sciences;

"(2) the mutual dependence of weather modification, weather forecasting, climatology, and other aspects of atmospheric sciences and meteorological services;

"(3) the effective utilization of all applicable scientific and engineering resources of the Nation, including those in industrial, academic, and other public and private organizations, in all regions of the United States;

"(4) the close cooperation of all agencies and organizations concerned in order to avoid waste or unnecessary duplication of effort, facilities, or equipment;

"(5) the effective utilization of scientific and technical knowledge, instrumentation, equipment, and techniques in all scientific and engineering disciplines applicable to weather modification;

"(6) the advancement of education and training in the atmospheric sciences and meteorology; and

"(7) the cooperation of the United States with other nations and international organizations, whenever such cooperation is in the national interest, in order to facilitate the exchange of scientific and technical information and the peaceful and beneficial application of weather modification.

"(c) It is the policy of the Congress that whenever the President deems any transfer of a function of any department or agency of the United States to any other Federal agency having responsibilities under this Act is necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, he shall accomplish such transfer under the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

*"Definitions**"SEC. 102. As used in this Act—*

"(a) The term "weather modification" includes any artificially produced changes in the composition, behavior, or dynamics of the atmosphere.

"(b) The term 'research' means an activity leading to increased scientific knowledge and understanding of weather modification, and includes related basic research in the atmospheric sciences.

"(c) The term 'development' means the conception, design, and first creation of experimental or prototype devices or systems, and the testing thereof, for weather modification, including the assembly of separate components thereof, but does not include the construction of such devices or systems through repetitive duplication to fixed specifications designed for operational application.

"(d) The term 'operational activities' means the construction and the use of devices and systems for weather modification designed to achieve a result of social, economic, commercial, biological, medical or military significance.

"(e) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Commerce.

*"TITLE II—WEATHER MODIFICATION**"Functions of Federal agencies*

"SEC. 201. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act—

"(a) The Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) carry out a research and development program in the field of weather modification, including a specific program designed to control or modify tornadoes, hurricanes, and other severe storms.

"(2) furnish technical assistance and information in the field of weather modification to any other Federal agency requesting such assistance or information; and

"(3) conduct such other activities in the field of weather modification as are delegated to him by the President.

"(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to carry out a research and development program in weather modification in the field of water resources in the United States;

"(c) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to carry out a research and development program in such aspects of weather modification as relate to the control of lightning and hail, and to the protection of vegetation from the effects of other weather phenomena;

"(d) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to carry out a research and development program in such aspects of weather modification as relate to the control of air pollution and other similar deleterious effects of urbanization upon the composition of the atmosphere; and

"(e) The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is authorized to—

"(1) carry out a research and development program for the effective and beneficial dispersal of fog and cloud cover interfering with airports or air transportation in the United States; and

"(2) conduct operational activities for such fog or cloud cover dispersal.

"Administrative powers

"SEC. 202. In order to carry out the provisions of this Act, the head of any Federal agency charged with responsibilities under section 201 is authorized to—

"(1) adopt, amend and repeal regulations governing the exercise of his duties under this Act;

"(2) acquire by purchase, license, lease, donation, or otherwise such inventions, patents, patent applications, licenses, real property and interests therein as he deems necessary;

"(3) accept as a gift, money, material, or services and notwithstanding any other provision of law, use of any such gift, if the donor so specifies, may be restricted or limited to certain projects or areas;

"(4) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions, including the making of grants, as may be necessary to carry out his duties under section 201 and on such terms as he may deem appropriate; and

"(5) use, with their consent, the services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of other Federal agencies with or without reimbursement, and on a similar basis to cooperate with other public and private agencies and instrumentalities in the use of services, equipment, and facilities, and each department and agency of the Federal Government shall cooperate fully in making its services, equipment, personnel, and facilities available to an agency charged with responsibilities under section 201 and, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, each department or agency is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to loan to such agency, without reimbursement, property, equipment, and facilities required for the performance of its duties under this Act.

"Hearings; documentary evidence

"SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary, or any employee of the Department of Commerce designated by him, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places and take such testimony as he deems advisable. The Secretary or any employee of such Department designated by him may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Secretary or such employee.

"(b) (1) The Secretary may obtain by subpoena or otherwise such information in the form of testimony, books, records, or other writings, may require the keeping of and furnishing such reports and records, and may make such inspections of the books, records, and other writings and premises or property of any person or persons as may be deemed necessary by him to carry out the provisions of this Act, but this authority shall not be exercised if adequate and authoritative data are available from any Federal agency. In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpoena served upon, any person referred to in this subsection, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Secretary, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"(2) The production of a person's books, records, or other documentary evidence shall not be required at any place other than the place where such person usually keeps them, if, prior to the return date specified in the regulations, subpoena, or other document issued with respect thereto, such person furnishes the Secretary with a true copy of such books, records, or other documentary evidence (certified by such person under

oath to be a true and correct copy) or enters into stipulation with the Secretary as to the information contained in such books, records, or other documentary evidence. Witnesses shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States.

(3) Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required, by the above provisions of this subsection, or any regulation issued thereunder, shall upon conviction be fined not more than \$500.

"Access to information"

"SEC. 204. Information contained in any statement, report, record, other document furnished pursuant to section 203, and information developed by any agency in the performance of its functions under this Act shall be made available at all reasonable times for public inspection except (1) information authorized or required by statute to be withheld and (2) information classified in accordance with law to protect the national security. Nothing in this subsection shall authorize or require the publication, divulging, or disclosure of any information described in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code, except that the Secretary may disclose information described in such section 1905, furnished pursuant to section 203, whenever he determines that the withholding thereof would be contrary to the purposes of this Act.

"Commercial operations"

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, to issue regulations governing the weather modification research, development and operational activities of private business concerns, which conflict with or impede any activities conducted under this Act and to encourage compliance with such regulations by such business concerns.

(b) The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other Federal agencies charged with responsibilities under section 201, and after consultation with representatives of such business concerns, shall conduct a thorough study of the need for the regulation of weather modification research, development and operational activities, and report to Congress not later than one year after the enactment of this Act recommendations for additional legislation concerning such regulation including enforcement of such regulation.

"TITLE III—FEDERAL COORDINATION AND PLANNING

"The President"

"SEC. 301. In order to achieve the objectives of this Act, the President, through the Office of Science and Technology, is authorized to—

"(1) direct the planning and supervision of the weather modification program authorized by this Act;

"(2) establish the goals to be achieved by such program;

"(3) establish priorities and resolve conflicts between agencies engaged in such program so that the activities of one agency conducted under this Act will not conflict with or impede activities of any other agency conducted under this Act;

"(4) coordinate the activities of each agency engaged in such program in order to insure an effective and balanced effort and to avoid waste and duplication;

"(5) consult with the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and private scientific and educational organizations on scientific and technological developments and new opportunities for the beneficial application of weather modification; and

"(6) conduct a thorough study and investigation, in cooperation with all Federal

agencies engaged in such program, of the need for new national facilities for weather modification research, including a consideration of the adaptability of existing Federal facilities, and report to the Congress not later than one year after the effective date of this Act such recommendations for such additional legislation as he deems advisable.

"International cooperation"

"SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary is authorized to cooperate in any international activities relating to weather modification consistent with the provisions of this Act. The authority to cooperate in international weather modification activities shall be exercised only with the approval of the Secretary of State to assure that such authority is exercised in a manner consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States. Subject to the provisions of this section, if negotiation with foreign countries or agencies thereof becomes necessary, such negotiation shall be carried on by the Secretary of State.

(b) The Secretary shall cooperate to the fullest practical extent with the Secretary of State in providing representation at all meetings and conferences relating to weather modification and climate control in which representatives of the United States and foreign countries participate. The Secretary of State shall designate the Secretary, or his designee, as a member of the United States delegation attending such meetings and conferences and also as a member of the negotiating team of any such delegation.

"Conduct of Federal operational activities"

"SEC. 303. (a) Before any Federal agency conducts any weather modification research or development activity which is designed to affect the atmosphere more than 200 kilometers from the source of such activity, it shall obtain the prior approval of the Congress. Enacted into law.

(b) Unless otherwise specifically authorized in this Act, before any Federal agency conducts weather modification operational activities, it shall obtain the prior approval of the Congress. Enacted into law.

"Investigations"

"SEC. 304. (a) The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Attorney General, shall conduct a thorough study and investigation to determine under what circumstances the United States and private parties should be liable for damages attributable to weather modification activities, including indemnification of contractors and grantees of the United States engaged in such activities, and report to the Congress not later than one year after the enactment of this Act recommendations for additional legislation concerning such liability.

(b) The Secretary in cooperation with the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare shall conduct a thorough study and investigation into the social and economic effects, both deliberate and inadvertent, of weather modification activities and report the results of such study to the Congress not later than two years after the enactment of this Act.

(c) The Secretary in cooperation with the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of the biological and ecological effects of weather modification and report the results of such study to the Congress not later than two years after the enactment of this Act.

"TITLE IV—GENERAL

"Amendments to National Science Foundation Act of 1950"

"SEC. 401. (a) Section 3(a)(2) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1862(a)(2)) is amended by adding

'atmospheric,' immediately after 'engineering.'

(b) Section 3(a)(7) of such Act is amended by adding 'and' after the semicolon at the end thereof.

(c) Section 3(a)(8) of such Act is amended striking out the semicolon at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(d) Section 3(a)(9) and section 14 of such Act are repealed.

"Reports"

"SEC. 402. The President, through the Office of Science and Technology, shall transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include (1) a comprehensive and detailed description of the activities and accomplishments of each Federal agency under the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year; (2) an evaluation of such activities and accomplishments in terms of obtaining the objectives of this Act; (3) an analysis of recommended expenditures for all weather modification activities authorized by this Act for the succeeding fiscal year; (4) a description of non-Federal weather modification activities; (5) a description of weather modification activities carried out by foreign countries; and (6) any recommendations for additional legislation which the President may consider necessary or desirable.

"Records and audit"

"SEC. 403. (a) Each recipient of a contract grant or party with whom a cooperative agreement is entered into under this Act shall keep such records as the head of the appropriate Federal agency shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition of the funds received under the grant or cooperative agreement, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which the contract or grant was made or cooperative agreement entered into, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The head of each Federal agency charged with responsibilities under section 201 and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient of the grant or party to the cooperative agreement that are pertinent to the grant received or cooperative agreement entered into, under this Act.

"Appropriations"

"SEC. 404. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for a weather modification program."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION, AND RESOLUTION

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] be added as a cosponsor of the following bill, concurrent resolution, and resolution:

S. 3306. A bill to provide for establishing and maintaining reserve supplies of agricultural commodities for national security and other purposes;

S. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution relative to parity prices for agricultural commodities; and

S. Res. 256. Resolution relating to United States denunciation of the Warsaw Convention.

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

MR. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] be added as cosponsors at the next printing of Senate Resolution 256, the Warsaw Convention.

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

MR. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], be added as cosponsors of my bill S. 3303, amendments to world war GI bill, and that their names appear thereon at the next printing.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 3, 1966, the names of Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HILL, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. SPARKMAN were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3303) to authorize on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the educational assistance allowances paid under such chapter, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and other Senators) on May 3, 1966.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON IMPROVEMENT OF JUDICIAL MACHINERY

MR. TYDINGS. As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, and for my distinguished colleague, Senator ERVIN, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I announce that the joint hearing on S. 2855, scheduled for May 18, 1966, at 9:30 a.m., will be held in room 6226, New Senate Office Building, rather than in room 2228 as previously announced.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

H.R. 14088. An act to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14921. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commission, corporations, agencies,

offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 14088. An act to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 14921. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

WASHINGTON POST LAUDS EXCELENT KENNEDY LATIN-AMERICAN SPEECH

MR. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Monday and Tuesday of this week, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] delivered one of the most significant Senate speeches of the year.

It was not only a major speech because of the national stature of the Senator from New York, but it was significant in the depth and obvious quality of the research and study that went into it.

There have been many press comments on the significance of the speech and its great portent for future American policy in Latin America.

One editorial comment on the KENNEDY Latin-America speech came from the Washington Post in its lead editorial yesterday.

Mr. President, the first paragraph of that editorial reads:

Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY has delivered in the form of a congressional speech what amounts to an encyclopedia on policy toward Latin America. His diagnosis is so good, his prescriptions so pertinent on matters ranging from land reform and education to private investment and relations with military regimes, that his remarks constitute a valuable one-piece guide to what ought to be this country's objectives. Happily, for the most part they are the objectives of the Johnson administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DIAGNOSIS BY KENNEDY

Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY has delivered in the form of a congressional speech what amounts to an encyclopedia on policy toward Latin America. His diagnosis is so good, his prescriptions so pertinent on matters ranging from land reform and education to private investment and relations with military regimes, that his remarks constitute a valuable one-piece guide to what ought to be this country's objectives. Happily, for the most part they are the objectives of the Johnson administration, although performance has sometimes fallen short.

Whatever his occasional past aberrations, Mr. KENNEDY has put his studies and travels to excellent use. His analysis of the real

danger but exaggerated fear of communism in Latin America is especially astute. He also has courageously redeemed his unfortunate gaffe in Peru last fall by coming out foursquare for birth control assistance to countries that seek it. If there is a significant omission in his catalogue, it is in his failure to stress the responsibility of Latin American countries for self-help. No one can confer a better life on them. Ordinary change is first of all a matter of facing hard political facts.

"Unproductive agriculture is probably the major factor in Latin American poverty," Mr. KENNEDY correctly observes, citing the dramatic statistic that 90 percent of the land is controlled by only 10 percent of the landholders. Hence his great interest in land reform, credit and technical assistance. This is an area in which this country's vast knowledge can be of enormous help. Yet there are massive obstacles, one of which is the political reluctance of some governments to take on the oligarchy with such essential accompanying measures as tax reform.

Education is Mr. KENNEDY's other passion; 50 percent of the people in Latin America are still illiterate. He does not minimize the difficulties with university students, many of whom are fanatically anti-Yankee. Such attitudes distract attention from real problems and cause instability. But Mr. KENNEDY argues for understanding that motives often derive from nationalism and a demand for social justice. To counteract warped ideas of the United States he pleads for more effort to bring Latin American students here. He also has a useful suggestion for channelizing idealism with a multinational hemispheric peace corps.

Senator KENNEDY wisely recognizes the important role of private investment and suggests a uniform code of behavior. At the same time he criticizes overzealous efforts to protect such investment, as when all aid to Peru was suspended because of a disagreement over oil properties. The most immediate need in governmental economic aid, he suggests, is in projects that help generate foreign exchange.

Likewise his appraisal of military regimes is balanced. Mr. KENNEDY would make clear this country's support of free elections, and he would maintain contact with forces of reform whether or not they are represented in governments. In military regimes he would confine the identification of the United States to projects within the scope of the Alliance for Progress. But he also properly notes that "The Alliance for Progress was not meant to be—and could not be—a means for the United States to determine the government of every American nation."

There is a paradox here, which the Senator touches on in his remarks about Brazil (where he gives credit to the Castello Branco government while listing the dangers of extra-constitutionality). Although he does not say so, in situations where the ballot is restricted to persons who are literate and therefore come largely from the advantaged classes, it is conceivable that a conscientious military regime can be more representative than a bad government elected behind a facade of democratic institutions. In other words, dogmatism and total judgments must be avoided in the Hemisphere.

Unquestionably communism is a real threat in Latin America. But, says Mr. KENNEDY, it is not merely a Soviet-and-Chinese-financed conspiracy; many who voice its slogans "seek a nonexistent shortcut to economic progress and social justice." Counter-insurgency training, particularly with civilian police, is part of the answer. But the allegiance of men "can be won only by positive programs of social justice; by land reforms; by schools; by honest administration; by roads and clinics and labor unions and even-handed justice, and a share for all men in the decisions that shape their lives. Coun-

ter-insurgency might best be described as social reform under pressure."

The best antidote for Communist appeals, in short, is confidence in orderly social change. This country cannot promote such change in Latin America merely by advocating it; but an adequate identification with the forces of change in practice is still the foremost need of American policy.

SCHOOL MILK BILL DESERVES SPEEDY SENATE ACTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I appeared before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices, of the Senate Agriculture Committee in support of my bill to make the special milk program for schoolchildren permanent and increase Federal funding for the program.

There is a tendency to downgrade the importance of securing early passage of this legislation because of recent House action providing \$103 million for the program in fiscal 1967. Many strong program supporters are now inclined to say that the program is safe for yet another year, so why worry. The truth of the matter, however, is that failure to pass the school milk bill this year could very well have a disastrous impact on the program, as I pointed out in my testimony today.

The legislation authorizing the school milk program expires on June 30, 1967. Although this date is over a year away, tens of thousands of school administrators have been placed under a cloud of uncertainty by the administration's proposal to slash the school milk program by 80 percent. They do not know what is going to happen after June 30, 1967. We cannot expect these administrators to effectively promote this fine program until Congress lifts the cloud of uncertainty by acting on the school milk bill.

In addition, next year will see the beginning of a newly elected Congress. The housekeeping functions that consume so much time at the beginning of a new Congress could easily cause postponement of final passage of school milk legislation introduced next year until after the June 30 deadline.

Mr. President, I am very hopeful that the bill to make the school milk program permanent will pass in the near future.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my remarks before the Holland subcommittee on "The Children's Special Milk Act."

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

THE CHILDREN'S SPECIAL MILK ACT

(Statement by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE Before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices, Thursday, May 12, 1966)

Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure to appear before your subcommittee today in support of The Children's Special Milk Act which would make the special milk program for schoolchildren permanent and set guidelines for the program's funding.

As you know so well, Mr. Chairman, the special milk program has been an unqualified success over the years. In 1966 the number of participating outlets will increase by nearly 1,000, while half pints of milk distributed under the program will climb by about 50 million. This impressive type

of program growth has taken place annually since the program was initiated back in 1954.

The program itself fills a substantial child nutrition need. It helps provide children with milk in midmorning and midafternoon by authorizing the Federal Government to share the cost of this milk with the child. At the present time the Federal reimbursement amounts to approximately 3 cents per half pint. The child usually pays the remaining 2 to 4 cents, although in cases of demonstrated need the local school district will pay the additional cost, thus providing the milk to the child free.

I believe the facts will show that this program is essential to the health of our Nation's schoolchildren. Although it supplements in most instances the school lunch program it enables children attending schools, daycamps, Headstart nurseries and other institutions to receive vital supplementary nourishment. This is especially important to the child who may come to school without a decent breakfast or who may be going home to a meager dinner. The sustenance given by nature's perfect food is particularly helpful to children who have to travel long distances to their classes.

The school milk program has played an important part in relieving the Federal Government of the expense of purchasing and storing surplus milk. Milk not purchased for use in this program simply has to be purchased and stored at Federal expense under our dairy price support program. However, the school milk program is now generally regarded by school administrators and parents alike as first and foremost a child nutrition aid and only secondarily as a means of holding down dairy surpluses.

The administration has proposed an 80 percent cutback in the school milk program. It would redirect the program to the needy and those children attending schools without a lunch program. The number of children participating in the program would drop from approximately 18 million to 3 million as a result.

The passage of such a proposal could kill the school milk program. It would mean that only 1 million needy children would receive milk under the program. Yet almost 5 million school-age children come from families with incomes of under \$2,000 a year according to statistics published by the Office of Education. Apparently the remaining 4 million children would either have to pay the full cost of the milk, receive a full subsidy from local school districts whose finances are already badly pinched, or stop taking milk breaks. I predict that the majority will follow the last-mentioned course.

Furthermore the administration's proposal would require children qualifying as needy to pass a means test. This is disputed by the Department of Agriculture, but I have with me today a number of forms used by local school districts to qualify children for free school lunches. Obviously these same forms would be used under the proposed redirection of the school milk program. I will gladly submit these forms, which cover communities with populations from a few hundred to hundreds of thousands for the subcommittee's records if it so desires.

My conversations with officials of the American School Food Service Association indicate that it would be impossible for the home room teacher or school nurse to choose those who were to receive the benefits of the school milk program without grave abuses developing. These are the very administrators who run the program. They certainly are in a better position than the Department of Agriculture to discuss the day-to-day problems of program operation on the local level.

These administrators say that many schools would simply abandon the school milk program rather than go through the complicated and discouraging task of dis-

criminating between those who were to receive free milk under the program and those who were to receive no milk under the program.

The administration's proposal would mean that youngsters who did not pass an onerous means test would not receive milk under the program. It would bar the sons and daughters of many proud parents whose children need the benefits of the program, and could qualify to receive free milk, because these parents refuse to undergo a demeaning means test—refuse to have their children classified as needy. Many of these children simply could not afford to pay the extra dollar or two a month the withdrawal of Federal support would cost them.

Thus literally millions of children would stop taking nutritious milk breaks—the very children who need the milk most and can afford it least.

Study after study has indicated that as the price of milk drops, participation in the milk program increases. Some, such as an Illinois study made a few years ago, indicate that as the price of school milk goes up participation drops off substantially. Thus even in families with moderate incomes, there will be a substantial reduction in milk-breaks at school.

Take for example a family of six children whose breadwinner earns \$6,000 a year. I cite this example because it is a real one—it springs from a constituent letter. This man works in Milwaukee. Because he is from a metropolitan area his expenses are greater than they would be in a small town. The added cost to this man, if the administration's proposal is passed, of providing milk breaks for his children would be equivalent to a pair of shoes per year per child. Yet he has to keep his children in shoes. He doesn't have to give them money for school milk. It's obvious that these children would no longer receive supplementary milk at school.

Passage of my bill which is being cosponsored by 67 of my Senate colleagues would eliminate the cloud of uncertainty that the administration's new proposal—the Child Nutrition Act of 1966—has placed over tens of thousands of school administrators. It would enable them to make their future plans with certainty in the knowledge that the school milk program as we know it today would continue.

The House of Representatives, fortunately, has dissipated the confusion to some extent by providing \$103 million for the school milk program in the fiscal 1967 Department of Agricultural Appropriations bill. I'm sure the Senate will take similar action.

However additional legislation is needed. Although the legislation authorizing the school milk program does not expire until June 30, 1967, Congress must act this year to foreclose with any certainty the death of this vital activity. Next year may be too late. The housekeeping functions that consume so much time at the beginning of a new Congress could easily postpone final passage of school milk legislation introduced next year until after the June 30 deadline.

The time is now. The place is here. And the purpose is the enrichment of the diets and lives of millions of schoolchildren who have grown and prospered under the overwhelmingly popular school milk program.

A NEW LIFE FOR "KING" COTTON

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in August of 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt wrote:

No nation has ever achieved permanent greatness unless this greatness was based on the well-being of the great farm class, the men who live on the soil; for it is upon their welfare, material and moral, that the

welfare of the rest of the nation ultimately rests.

Agriculture continues to hold a key place in our society through its unique contributions to this Nation's greatness. The best example of this contribution to our greatness and our security lies in the most important cash crop in America—cotton.

From its first entry into the New England States, to the development of the great Cotton Belt, to its most recent expansion to the valleys of our Western States, "King" cotton became the source of income for more Americans than any other crop.

Today, cotton still affects the lives of more Americans than any other crop. It has been estimated that from 12 to 14 million persons in the United States depend directly on this crop for at least a part of their livelihood. On some 1,500,000 cotton-producing farms there are 10 million persons—approximately one-third of the farm population of the United States—who rely on cotton for a considerable part of their income. About 3 million or more persons derive their income from cotton textile and garment manufacturing. Cotton warehousing, ginning, distributing and marketing employ an estimated 500,000 persons. In addition to those directly dependent on cotton and the cotton industry, millions of persons throughout the United States are vitally affected by cotton. They include persons engaged in the manufacture, wholesaling, transportation, and retailing of commodities made by other industries and sold to those who produce, merchandise, transport, and manufacture cotton.

This tremendous growth and influence of cotton is reflected in my own State of California. Since the Second World War, there has been an increasing area dedicated to cotton production, principally in the southern San Joaquin Valley and the Imperial Valley. In the decade 1940 to 1950, the value of cotton produced in California increased 1,048.3 percent. By the end of the succeeding decade, cotton became and is today, with an annual crop valued at more than \$300 million, the most important cash crop in California.

Cotton has played and continues to play an important role in our history, our economy, our security, and in our everyday lives. But "King" cotton no longer reigns alone in today's world of increased trade and fiber development. After 1951, cotton consumption in the United States has drastically declined. Exports of cotton cloth have diminished, imports of cotton goods from Japan, India, Pakistan, South Korea, Formosa, Egypt, and others have increased, costs of Government cotton programs are high and rising, there has been a rapid increase in carryover due to increased yields, and most of all, there has been an extensive competitive increase in other fibers, primarily manmade.

The biggest competitive gain in the domestic market has gone to the broad class of manmade fibers which go by the term "noncellulosics." This class includes nylon and the entire list of

synthetic fibers which sell under such names as Dacron, Fortrel, Orlon, and Acrilan. These fibers now have a total U.S. market that equals nearly 7 million bales of cotton, and they have gained over 2 million bales of that in the last 2 years. These fibers are further backed up by \$135 million worth of research compared with cotton's \$26.5 million; and the \$70 million a year they spend for promotion overwhelms cotton's \$4 million. Lower cotton prices have been effective against rayon. But the noncellulosics, though costing better than 80 cents a pound as compared to cotton's 24 cents a pound, threaten all the markets served by cotton as a result of new yarns, new fabrics, new finishes, and greater promotion.

We seek a policy which will effectively assist cotton in meeting its competition—programs to improve farm operations, control insects and diseases, develop improved cotton varieties, and establish effective controls and price supports. The ultimate objective of these Federal programs is to adjust supply to demand in the interest of benefiting producers and all others concerned with the production and handling of cotton as well as improve the general economy of the country.

For this objective to be fulfilled, there must be a demand for cotton; there must be an increased market that will eventually reduce or eliminate the need for limiting marketings and supporting the price of cotton. But the demand is lessening each day as reflected by the increased losses on growing cotton surpluses. The U.S. Department of Agriculture states:

Realized losses incurred by Commodity Credit Corporation on upland cotton price support and related programs and expenditures under direct payment programs have totaled \$3,006 million during the past 10 years—ranging from \$62 million in 1956 to \$601 million in 1965. In addition, losses on loan and owned inventories as of June 30, 1965, were estimated at \$541 million. These losses and expenditures do not include administrative costs or costs incurred in operation of the Public Law 480 programs that have accounted for substantial volumes of cotton exports. In spite of these expenditures, the carryover of cotton has mounted steadily since 1961, reaching a near record high of 14 million bales in 1965, and a projection of about 16 million bales in 1966.

These surpluses and losses can be directly related to the overwhelming competition from manmade fibers such as rayon and the noncellulosics. Again, according to the Department of Agriculture:

From 1930 to 1960, cotton's share of the total U.S. fiber market dropped from 85 percent to 65 percent. Since 1960, cotton's share has declined at a much greater rate, dropping to 53 percent in 1965. In contrast, the manmade fibers' share of the U.S. fiber market increased from 3.9 percent in 1930 to 29 percent in 1960, to 41 percent in 1964, and to 42.5 percent in 1965.

It has been estimated that U.S. producers of noncellulosic fibers will spend over \$200 million for developing and promoting these products—a figure seven times greater than the combined public

and private outlays for development and promotion of cotton in 1965.

Cotton, therefore, is facing its greatest challenge in its long history, for the success of every governmental program, every regulation, every legislative effort in the past as well as the future is dependent on increased quality, research, advertising, and promotion.

To meet this challenge, H.R. 12322 has been introduced. It provides enabling legislation for a program of advertising, trade promotion, research and development to promote the sale and use of domestic cotton, with direct costs to be financed by producer assessments. This effort is to be accomplished through "cotton research and promotion orders" to be issued by the Secretary of Agriculture after notice and hearing and following approval by two-thirds of cotton producers participating in a referendum. The orders would allow for one or more of four permissive provisions: First, for advertising and sales promotion projects, second, for research and development projects, third, for handler reporting and recordkeeping, and fourth, for incidental terms and conditions needed to effectuate other provisions of the order. Participation in this program is completely voluntary on the part of the individual growers. Not only must there be approval by the farmers in a referendum for the program to become effective, but even during its operation any farmer may request not to participate and receive a complete refund of his money.

This is legislation which does not seek large amounts of Federal money or dominant Federal control. It seeks but the assistance of the Federal Government in helping the farmer help himself; in helping cotton become a strong competitor again. There is no question but that the cotton industry has the know-how to develop its abilities in research and promotion and turn its markets upward. But it needs concentrated finances similar to those of the large synthetic producers in order to enter effectively the modern world of fiber competition. The farmers, the producers, the cotton organizations are confident that they can get the money, but they need a uniform organization and system to eliminate haggling among various processors and handlers and establish an effective competitive mechanism. H.R. 12322 attempts to do this. It attempts in its own way to repay cotton for what it has given America in the past by giving it a new competitive life in the America of tomorrow. I urge the Senate to support this bill dedicated to helping the farmer and preserving an industry that means so much to so many Americans.

NEW VERSION OF OLD SHELL GAME IS CHARGED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star of May 10, 1966, there appears an article by James J. Kilpatrick, entitled "New Version of Old Shell Game Is Charged." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW VERSION OF OLD SHELL GAME IS CHARGED
(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The slickest skin game of the old county fairs, at least in the gullible South, was the skin game known as the old shell game. It flourished for years, until some educated cops came along. They put the thimble-riggers on the run and the shell game all but disappeared.

Last week it came back to town. You will find it, if you look fast enough, in H.R. 14544, which came shooting out of the House Banking and Currency Committee like a little green pea under three walnut shells. This is President Johnson's sensational gimmick for turning \$4.2 billion in Federal assets into \$4.2 billion in Federal liabilities, all without adding a penny to the Federal deficit. Or liabilities into assets. It is all the same thing. Come one, come all, and try your skill. The hand in truth is quicker than the eye.

Johnson sketched the general outlines of his "Sales Participation Act of 1966" back in January, but it wasn't until Wednesday, April 20, that the bill turned up in the House. Then presto. On Thursday April 21, with the ink still wet on the printed bill, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas, scheduled 3 hours of hearings. Only administration witnesses were called. By a party-line vote of 22-3, with 8 disgusted Republicans not voting, the bill came bombing out. A classic committee report followed on April 25. And last week the White House was proceeding in terrorem to get the bill whipped through the Rules Committee for an immediate vote on the floor.

The situation had its funny aspects, which is doubtless part of the game.

On the surface, this is a financing scheme by which the government would "sell off some assets." But the trick is that no assets would really be sold off.

The committee's majority report declares, deadpan, that the plan would "carry forward the objective of substituting private for public credit in funding the loan programs" of various federal agencies. But by its own terms, the bill provides for continued federal subsidies to make the private creditors secure.

The sponsors of this legislation are shouting from the housetops that this "participation" plan is truly nothing new—that it is in fact an old plan, devised by President Eisenhower in 1959. But when Eisenhower undertook to sell off some federal loans, he sold them off in straightforward transactions. Johnson's dazzling runaround is something else entirely.

Under terms of this legislation, the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, would sell certificates of participation in "pools of assets" to be provided from the outstanding loans of various federal agencies. Up to \$4.2 billion in such certificates could be sold, provided the market would absorb them, and why shouldn't the market absorb them? These handsome instruments would cost the taxpayers a rate of 5.4 or 5.5 percent, at least half a point higher than the rate on regular Treasury borrowings.

As the outraged Republicans point out in their minority report, this 0.5 percent represents an expense of \$5 million a year on each \$1 billion of participations sold. If the entire authority were exercised, the cost to the people would approximate \$21 million a year. Over an average maturity of 10 years, these higher outlays for interest would amount to something in excess of \$200 million.

Yet the cost of this scheme is the least of the objections to it. The purpose of this legislation is not to promote private credit.

The purpose is to conceal a \$4.2 billion deficit by entering the certificate sales as a "negative expenditure." Where has the deficit gone? It lies under the third shell on the left. If this maneuver works for 1967, we may never set eyes on a deficit again, for federal agencies have \$33 billion in such assets to slide in Fannie May's direction.

By the same token, as the Republicans remark, the federal debt limit can be subjected to hocus-pocus-dominicus. Now you see it, now you don't. If the proceeds of these participations are applied on paper to debt reduction, the government's total debt will not have been reduced in fact. The debt will simply have been transferred to the debt of FNMA, which is outside the statutory limit. In the course of this vanishing act, government credit would be used, if indirectly, to effect a reduction in the federal debt. This isn't done with dollars; it's done with mirrors.

There were signs last week that the administration's razzle-dazzle might prove to be self-defeating. Missouri's influential Rep. RICHARD BOLLING, a key man on House Rules, was balking hard. He describes the scheme flatly as "deceptive." Without a lot of sober persuasion, he won't be won around.

The administration's top persuaders have been summoned to the battle. With the President's prestige at stake, they may win in the end, but their problem is that members of the House and Senate stand a cut above the rubes of the county midway.

FHA PROCEDURES IN CERTAIN PROJECTS QUESTIONED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Federal Housing Administration has called the director and the chief underwriter from each of the respective offices throughout the country into Washington for a conference this week. This conference, beginning last Tuesday, will extend through May 12.

During the past few weeks I have had correspondence with Commissioner Brownstein asking questions concerning both the procedures followed and the status of certain projects.

The replies which I have received and the information furnished do not coincide with the facts of the cases as they are outlined in the official records of the agency, and I am most respectfully suggesting to Commissioner Brownstein that while these directors are in town he ask them to reexamine the replies furnished in response to my recent questions and to advise him promptly of the omissions.

For example, in certain instances the manner in which the land was over-appraised has been ignored. A damaging report concerning the administration of the Houston, Tex., office has been completely ignored, and this report alone contains enough information to have justified the dismissal of the Houston director months ago.

I recognize that Commissioner Brownstein signs these replies after the data has been assembled by his subordinates and oftentimes the director of the office may be reluctant to tell the whole story, but this is no excuse. He should hold them responsible.

These partial replies that I get only further arouse my concern.

Again I most respectfully suggest that Commissioner Brownstein take advantage of this most convenient opportunity

to discuss these incomplete reports with the directors while they are in Washington.

PILOTAGE SERVICES ON THE GREAT LAKES AND ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on May 1, 1961, a coordinated United States-Canada system of pilotage on the Great Lakes was inaugurated under joint administration of the Secretary of Commerce and the Canadian Minister of Transport.

Pilotage services to ocean vessels traversing the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Great Lakes began at that time with 104 United States and Canadian registered pilots, operating under joint regulations which I understand are unique. In the intervening 5 years this number of pilots has grown steadily to a total pilot force today of 148 pilots.

In the initial year the pilot force, half composed of U.S. citizens and half those of Canada, carried out duties throughout the Great Lakes on more than 9,000 assignments. Last year the number of assignments approached 14,000. This large increase in services rendered is ample evidence of the growth of trade. It is also recognition of the need and value of pilotage services.

We cannot praise too highly these American and Canadian pilots who have contributed so much in professional skills—in the highest tradition—to the furtherance of the foreign trade of the Great Lakes under the administration of the Great Lakes Pilotage Administration. The outstanding safety of navigation record during these past 5 years is clearly attributable to the high standards of qualification set by the Great Lakes Pilotage Administration for appointment of the U.S. registered pilots. It can be said that no ocean vessel with a U.S. registered pilot on board has in all these years sustained major damage nor has any person suffered serious injury or loss of life.

The pilotage facilities, equipment and communications systems which barely existed in May 1961 now can be counted among the best. The pilot stations, pilot boats, radio stations and equipment are valued in the hundreds of thousands of dollars which the pilots as independent contractors own or operate through their independent voluntary pilot associations. The adequacy and efficiency of these facilities can also be attributed to the high standards set by the Great Lakes pilotage regulations and the good business practices applied by the Great Lakes Pilotage Administration in the regulation of these facilities.

As with any new endeavor this system of internationally regulated pilotage has had many problems requiring solutions unique without precedent. There are difficult problems yet unsolved and unquestionably there will be many more in the future. However, the mutual recognition by the United States and Canada of the common need to encourage foreign trade on the Great Lakes and the longstanding friendly relations between us have greatly facilitated this task of providing for the safety of navigation on the Great Lakes.

INFLATION: ITS CAUSES, AND PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on May 10, the senior Senator from Virginia and chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, spoke to a group of bankers in Minneapolis regarding legislation of interest to the financial community. Among the topics discussed, was inflation, its causes, and prospects for the future.

There are many indications that in the first quarter of this year, expansion was at a too rapid rate—one which cannot be sustained. Prices have been rising at a significantly faster pace than we have experienced over the past few years. Despite the rise in interest rates, and price increases, consumers have increased their purchases in the past quarter by over \$11 billion compared with an average increase of \$7 billion to \$8 billion per quarter over the last few years.

I think that Senator ROBERTSON's remarks are timely. They make a valuable contribution to the present discussion of what actions should be taken to keep our economy on an even keel. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

CURRENT BANKING LEGISLATION AND BANKING PROBLEMS

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, before the American Bankers Association's Sixth Annual National Mortgage Conference, Minneapolis, Minn., May 10, 1966.)

In Washington today two related conflicts are receiving major attention. One concerns the military activities that have been going on in Vietnam and seem likely to continue for an indefinite period. The other is concerned with the economic fight that is being waged domestically against the forces of inflation. The latter struggle could be won more easily than the first, or it could be lost by failure to adopt the right instruments or to be adequately aggressive.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Compared with these major conflicts and problems, the legislative program concerning banking seems to lack glamour. Yet some of the proposals being considered can have important long-run considerations for financial institutions. Of particular concern to bankers are proposals for changes in governmental supervisory powers over financial institutions. These include suggested revisions in laws governing bank holding companies to close some gaps in existing laws and Administration proposals to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations.

The Administration proposals have met some opposition as being undue extensions of Federal power over financial institutions and will probably be amended along the lines advocated by the American Bankers Association.

Already passed by both Houses of the Congress, after considerable controversy, and approved by the President, is an Act to amend previous legislation relating to bank mergers. This law establishes new standards for both the banking agencies and the courts to follow in approving or disapproving bank mergers.

These new standards prohibit the approval of a merger that would result in a monopoly. In addition, a merger which would have substantial anticompetitive effects could not be approved unless its anticompetitive effects are "clearly outweighed in the public interest" by the effects of the merger on the convenience and needs of the community to be served. That is less restrictive than Section 7 of the Clayton Act.

ANTI-INFLATIONARY MEASURES

Perhaps the most important problem facing banking, as well as the whole country and the world, today is the fight against inflation. This problem has not called for any new legislation in the field of banking, from the Administration although a House Member is sponsoring standby consumer-credit controls.

There seems to be a popular view that inflation could be prevented by legislating or otherwise fixing ceilings on prices. Price increases are considered to be the causes of inflation. It is even said by some that increases in interest rates have inflationary consequences. Actually these are evidences or manifestations of inflation, not basic causes. Price fixing by fiat would merely attempt to suppress inflation without removing its underlying causes.

Causes of inflation are basically monetary. There can be no inflation without an expansion—past, present, or in the immediate future—of the supply of money greater than the supply of goods and services available for purchase. In our monetary system, increases in the money supply result almost wholly from expansion in bank credit. The banking system, therefore, has a pivotal role in bringing about or in curbing inflation—particularly the latter.

This does not mean that banks alone can bring about inflation. Nor does it mean that inflation cannot be stopped by other measures than restraint on bank credit. Banks cannot create credit expansion unless there are strong demands for credit. To cause inflation, moreover, these demands must exceed the volume of savings by the public.

Some expansion in credit and in money is desirable and necessary to supply businesses and individuals with cash balances they need and want to hold. Inflation occurs when monetary expansion greatly exceeds production—i.e., when people have more money than they want to hold and then spend the excess in amounts that exceed the goods and services available.

Inflation is generally associated with increased governmental borrowing, although it can occur as a result of private credit expansion. On the basis of current indications and estimates, the Federal Government and its agencies will probably need to increase borrowings in this calendar year by about \$9 billion, which is more than in any postwar year and over three times as much as in 1965.

These estimates include not only direct borrowing by the Treasury but also borrowing and sales of assets or participations by various governmental financial agencies contemplated in the budget estimates. A bill to authorize the sale of participation certificates has passed the Senate.

Inflationary effects may also arise from increased private borrowing, particularly if it accompanies expansion in the public debt. Private borrowing needs in the aggregate will probably be in record volume in 1966, but the increase in net private borrowings would be less inflationary if smaller than in 1965. Although bank loans have been expanding at a very rapid rate during the past 3 years, private credit demands still appear to be much larger than the amount of credit that can be made available to meet these demands. This is especially true with savings & loan associations.

It will be difficult to find savings in amounts adequate to meet the record credit

demands in prospect. There will, therefore, continue to be heavy demands for bank credit. Although further bank credit increases in moderate amounts are desirable and may be anticipated, to endeavor to meet all borrowing demands by the easy process of bank credit expansion, based on additional reserves supplied by the Federal Reserve, would mean an inflationary expansion in the supply of money.

Easy monetary policies of this nature would no doubt further stimulate inflationary price increases. A continued price rise or its prospect would not only result in further expanding domestic credit demands but would cause deterioration in the competitive position of the United States in world markets for goods and services and for money. The consequence would be a worsening of our balance-of-payments position and a loss of gold that would diminish our monetary reserves. In that event, credit restraints would not only be desirable but would be unavoidable.

THE NERVOUS STOCK MARKET

Another manifestation of inflationary sentiment is seen in the behavior of the stock market. Common stock prices have continued to rise, with occasional interruptions, for over 15 years, and trading activity has recently increased sharply. The rise in stock prices has reflected in large part the desire of investors to put their savings to use in a manner that will enable them to share in the profits resulting from our actual and anticipated economic growth. It is an expression of confidence in our future. To some extent, however, the buying of corporate shares has represented the search for a "hedge against inflation," and to some degree it has been speculative. Because of this speculative aspect, the market is susceptible to severe reactions, like that just occurring.

Increases in stock prices have outrun the growth in corporate earnings and the growth in dividends. Rates of return on common stocks at current prices and dividends have declined to relatively low levels—averaging around 3 percent for high-grade stocks. In the meantime, interest rates have risen, so that average yields on high-grade corporate bonds are now close to 5 percent and yields on U.S. Government bonds are above 4½ percent.

To validate these relationships and justify purchases of stocks instead of bonds at current prices, corporate earnings and corporate dividends would have to increase even more rapidly than they have in recent years.

To some extent the increases in stock market commitments have been based on credit. Yet, because of the high margins now required on borrowing to hold stocks (70 percent), the volume of stock market credit, relative to the total value of stocks outstanding, to the total volume of all credit, and to national income, is not at all comparable to similar relationships prevailing in 1929. For these as well as for other reasons a sharp decline in stock prices at this time should not be expected to have the cumulative and far-reaching consequences of the 1929-30 debacle.

It may well be that the latest decline in stock prices should not be considered as a precursor of disasters expected to ensue, but rather represents, as did other declines in recent years, a readjustment to the realities of the current situation.

CONCLUSION

As an essential ingredient of this equation let us remember an old maxim: "Man proposes but God disposes." Politicians with the endorsement of prominent business leaders planned a program of rapid economic expansion. For 10 years that expansion has been underway and with minor inflation. Two years ago, the politicians were so pleased with their handiwork that they decided to accelerate the business expansion with vast

new spending schemes. But, just as our financial institutions began to creak and groan under the unprecedented credit demand to finance a broad scope of domestic projects, the politicians suddenly woke up to the fact that an additional billion dollars per month would be needed to finance the war in Southeast Asia. That is where God enters the picture.

Proud of the fact that at the end of World War II we were the greatest military power in the world, and proud of our economic wealth which enabled us to give and loan to foreign nations far more than \$100 billion since the end of that war, we made commitments to Western Europe and Southeast Asia to answer their call to defend them against Communist aggression. The temple of peace that we sought to erect in the United Nations, in NATO, and in SEATO was never dedicated to the victory of moral force. Suddenly, the businessmen and those who invest in business enterprises realize that we have become overextended.

We have neither the cash nor the credit to finance both the Great Society and a war against communism in any and every area of the world in which the Communists choose to attack. So, we find the head of one of our biggest automobile companies, Henry Ford, II, a previous champion of domestic expansion, calling attention to violence, riots, urban crime, juvenile vandalism and wildcat strikes, undermining, as he said "everything that stands for order and responsibility and tradition." That note of pessimism and lack of faith in our manifest destiny was accompanied by a General Motors announcement of reduced production. As a result, on May 5th listed values on the New York Stock Exchange experienced the sharpest drop since the bleak, black day of the assassination of President Kennedy, and on May 9th the Dow-Jones average fell another 16 points.

Our banks were as sound on May 5 as they were on May 4. There had been no reduction in employment nor curtailment in private spending. Yet, there was a new and potent factor in the equation—the psychological factor of pessimism. Like the old Arab Sheik of the desert, Job, we had been relying on our strong right arm, and all of a sudden we questioned its ability to save us.

The true answer, of course, was given this nation by a great political philosopher, President Woodrow Wilson, when broken in both body and spirit by the materialism evidenced by the American people in 1920, he said in his last message to the nation he loved: "The sum of the whole matter is this: If our civilization is to survive materially, it must be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming imbued with the spirit of Christ and made free and happy by the practices that spring from that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and the shadows lifted from the road ahead."

ADDRESS TO 1966 COAL CONVENTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was privileged to speak at the welcoming luncheon of the 1966 Coal Convention of the American Mining Congress on May 9, in Pittsburgh, Pa.

Because of the important role which coal plays in our national economy, and its integral part in the economic development of my own State of West Virginia, I am pleased to have had the opportunity to provide remarks on the coal industry's share in our future economy.

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

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

ADDRESS BY U. S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD BEFORE THE 1966 COAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS, PITTSBURGH, PA., MAY 9, 1966

Members and Guests of the American Mining Congress, Allen Overton and his staff are to be congratulated on the excellent program for this convention. I wish I could attend every session. Unfortunately, I must return to Washington this afternoon.

Appropriations Committee work alone is enough to hold a Committee Member at his desk until late at night . . . every night. With inflationary pressures gnawing at the vitals of economic balance, every federal expenditure must be scrutinized with maximum care.

Our commitment to the enigma that is Viet Nam requires enormous expenditures, for frugality must sometimes be sacrificed when American lives are at stake. Degrees of waste will always be attendant to the waging of war, inasmuch as we cannot chance the tragedy of undersupply that might deprive our men of necessary equipment or support. For this reason, if I am to be guilty of a miscalculation in the expenditure of funds for the armed forces, my error will not be on the side of parsimony where men on the front lines are concerned.

But to attempt to explain away the disparity between federal income and federal outgo as attributable wholly to our military effort would be less than honest. I am convinced that there is entirely too much extravagance in our bulging bureaucracy. Only by curbing it can we hope to check inflation and its vicious debilitation of our economy, for runaway inflation can impoverish families faster than the war on poverty could rehabilitate them even if conducted with utmost efficiency. Inflation, furthermore, is an exceptionally cruel cumbrance to those who expect to sustain themselves in the twilight of their lives on savings, pensions, and other fixed incomes.

Yes, the national budget requires a watchful eye, and membership on the Appropriations Committee is a sacred trust that calls for full attention. As chairman of the District of Columbia subcommittee, I have had an opportunity to inject a semblance of economy into an area where waste had long been rampant—the welfare program. While my efforts in this direction have elicited painful outcries from certain quarters, response from citizens who object to chiseling at taxpayer expense has been most gratifying. The average American is generous to a fault, but he will not tolerate policies that nurture indolence and perfidy.

My Committee activity has also brought me into close association with law enforcement officials. Under prevailing attitudes, theirs is a difficult lot. With riots becoming a commonplace in the city streets and on the college campus, it is incumbent upon all dedicated citizens to take an active interest in the problem. To start at the beginning, there must be a return to the philosophy that the child needs proper parental supervision if he is to become a responsible member of society as he grows into maturity. It is ludicrous to attempt to excuse riots in Newport and Fort Lauderdale as a normal outlet for vacationing college students; it is equally absurd to exonerate disorder in Los Angeles or Washington on the theory that products of poverty and frustration are understandably given to rebellion.

America must get back into proper perspective on this matter of law and order, and I feel that this responsibility supersedes any other domestic problem existing today.

Lest there be some feeling among you that there was a misunderstanding about

my topic for today, I assure you that Mr. Overton's invitation in no way suggested a sermon on the social responsibilities of our time. But I believe that the problem is so serious as to merit much more attention than it has been getting in the proper areas. Certainly it cannot be dismissed in the manner of this Gilbert and Sullivan recipe:

"Life's a pudding full of plums;
Care's a canker that benumbs,
Wherefore waste our elocution
On impossible solution?
Life's a pleasant institution,
Let us take it as it comes."

No, Gentlemen, we cannot afford to be complaisant about these matters any more than we could go unconcerned about problems primarily affecting the coal industry. Certainly without diligent work on the part of such groups as the Mining Congress, my State and this State of Pennsylvania could hardly expect to share proportionately in the growing economy ahead.

But before surveying that road into the future, I should like to recall a Spring day in 1961 when a group of government officials visited West Virginia. On the assumption that coal might benefit if the new Administration's Secretary of the Interior were to visit a mining region, I invited Stewart Udall to a mine tour even before he was officially confirmed for the job. Steve Dunn made the necessary arrangements, and the trip was on. My fellow West Virginian, Mr. Overton, did not accompany us because he was still serving on the Tariff Commission at the time.

It seemed reasonable enough to have the Secretary and his party familiarize themselves with an industry in which they are so involved. There was also the hope that we might enjoy a residual benefit: after experiencing the dilapidated economic status of our mining communities, Mr. Udall might just become sympathetic enough to go back to Washington and set up tighter controls on the Number 6 oil shipped into this country.

In the final calculations, we not only failed to make much headway in this respect, but we almost lost a very important coal man in the process. Our tour called for a stop at the Gary preparation plant, and today's presiding officer promised to meet us there. He did, too, but a heavy overcast made flying conditions difficult and his airplane tipped over on landing at the airport. Mr. Core, it is mighty good to have you with us today.

No, despite our persistent appeals, a cutback in residual oil imports did not materialize. Shipments continued in ever-increasing volume. Early this year the mandatory control program was, to all intents and purposes, placed aside in willful disregard of our appeals for more reasonable restrictions.

For West Virginia, the Government's attitude on alien oil's arrogation of our domestic markets is particularly bitter. By far the greatest percentage of the coal displaced by the products of foreign refineries would come from the mines of our State, and be transported by our railroads. Secretary of the Interior Udall has given as assurance that he will not permit importers to interpret the new order as an open invitation for further invasion of coal's current markets, yet he cannot very well police all the tanker traffic that moves into our Eastern seaboard. For this reason I hope that coal dealers will keep vigilant surveillance over the competitive situation, and I invite you to inform my office if there is any violation of the intent expressed by the Secretary.

While foreign oil has surged into coal's markets in progressively greater volume, another competitor has found coal a formidable rival. Natural gas, which five years ago had 27 per cent to coal's 65 per cent of the electric utility market, has finally begun

to lose some ground, dropping to 25 per cent while coal went to 66 per cent in 1965.

Additional hydroelectric capacity has gone on the line, but it has been primarily in the West and may be considered inconsequential from the standpoint of total generation of electricity in this country.

Meanwhile, however, the atom looms as a definite competitive threat to coal, not from existing plants but from those in the planning stages. At present the capacity of atomic plants actually producing power is less than 2 million kilowatts, but the future offers a much more alarming picture. Last year atomic plants with a total capacity of 5 million kilowatts were ordered, and already this year contracts have been signed for facilities amounting to 3 million kilowatts in total capacity.

Coal has still other problems—including the air pollution and water pollution issues—yet the industry emerged from the depths of a 403-million-ton output in 1961 to reach 510 million tons last year. And we expect that figure to be exceeded in 1966.

Coal has come back because you men who produce it and your allied industries refuse to be beaten in the competitive market. Although the average price of bituminous coal at the mine had already been shaved from \$4.99 a ton to \$4.58 a ton between 1948 and 1961, you continued to invest in modern equipment and modern methods that drove your price still lower in the face of inflationary winds affecting almost every other commodity. Last year's average price at the mine was \$4.45 per ton.

The unit train is to me one of the brightest chapters in railroad history. It has reduced the cost of delivering coal through drastic savings in freight costs, without which extensive losses to other forms of fuel would unquestionably have taken place. In 1961 it was in the planning stage; today the unit train delivers 50 per cent of all the coal moving to electric utilities.

To feed the growing energy appetite of other nations of the world, the United States bituminous coal industry last year exported 50 million tons as compared with 35 million tons in 1961. I was happy to have been able to assist in obtaining an appropriation for the deepening of channels at Norfolk, where ships much larger than we envisioned just 5 years ago will soon be standing in to receive the product of our mines, leaving behind dollars urgently needed to improve our balance of payments position.

We have come a long way since 1961. But there is no stopping here. We cannot forever expect to drive production and delivery costs down. We may already have reached the bottom from a cost standpoint. There must be a new approach to keeping coal competitive so that it will be able at least to maintain its ratio of the increasing energy market. Research would seem the logical answer.

In 1961 the Office of Coal Research was established under a law enacted the previous year. The father of that legislation, Congressman JOHN SAYLOR, is scheduled to address you tomorrow. I supported the original bill when I was in the House, and then was able to vote for the final measure in the Senate. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, I am in the extremely fortunate position of being able to support—and initiate where necessary—the funds needed to carry on activities of the Office of Coal Research.

Mr. fellow West Virginian, George Fumich, has performed admirably as Director of OCR. It is my pleasure to work closely with him.

Mr. Overton has asked that I review briefly some of the principal OCR projects, but I shall make no attempt to go into technical details on any of them.

The Office of Coal Research was five years of age last month. During its short but

dramatic history, it has let contracts for some 40 projects involving about \$26 million in federal appropriations. In insisting that all of these projects have great promise, I do not exaggerate. For—believe me—each has been scrutinized carefully not only by Mr. Fumich's staff experts but also by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House.

From a tonnage standpoint, OCR's liquid fuels and gasification projects offer greatest potential. I am sure that most members of this audience are familiar with Project Gasoline, which, it is hoped will lead to the establishment of a commercial industry for the production of high-octane gasoline from coal. Project Gasoline bench-scale experiments far exceed the most optimistic estimates, and a pilot plant is presently under construction at Cresap, West Virginia. It is expected to go into operation later this year.

There are other coal-to-liquid projects being conducted under OCR auspices, but I shall not enumerate them here. We are confident that one or more will lead to the development of a synthetic liquid fuel industry, initially competitive with petroleum products in areas where large reserves of coal are available. Later, as petroleum supplies dwindle, our markets will be extended. Meanwhile the substitute for petroleum would be ready to assume a vital role in the Nation's defense posture in the event of another world conflict.

OCR has also contracted for research on several projects aimed at producing a substitute for natural gas from coal. One of these is taking place within a few miles of this meeting hall—at Monroeville. Bituminous Coal Research is developing a gasifier which preliminary studies indicate has a good potential for producing competitively priced pipeline gas from coal. I have visited the laboratory at Monroeville, and I was impressed with the variety of scientific studies that are taking place there. I note that BCR's president, Mr. Garvey, will address tomorrow's session here.

In letting its contracts, OCR also has an eye on the removal of sulphur and ash from coal and on various improvements in the field of combustion. With air pollution control laws being tightened at all levels of government, particularly in the large cities, progress in sulphur and ash removal is mandatory.

Another local project which has considerable merit is the Westinghouse Electric Corporation's contract with OCR for the development of a coal-energized fuel cell. It would not only improve efficiency in electric power generation, but also reduce air pollution and eliminate the requirement for large quantities of cooling water.

Tomorrow OCR will sign a contract for a project beyond the dreams of Jules Verne—or perhaps I should say of Thomas Edison. The Gourdin Laboratories in New Jersey have, through basic research efforts, demonstrated the possibility of producing electricity in large volume without the use of steam or the conventional turbine and generator. Mr. Fumich is so impressed with the potential that he asked me to obtain from our Appropriations Subcommittee permission to shift current fiscal year funds rather than wait until July to get started on the project. The National Coal Association also urged my support of such a reprogramming of funds and I was instrumental in helping to bring this about. I am so impressed that I suggested to Mr. Overton that he ask Dr. Gourdin to come to Pittsburgh to attend this convention and thus be available to any of you who may wish to discuss the project.

While each OCR project holds exciting hopes for coal's future, I assure you that I do not intend to talk to you about all of them. I should like to mention, however,

one of the few that can be understood without a scientific education. Fly ash has always been a problem in the combustion of coal. In former years it was discharged into the atmosphere and then collected on your windowsills. Along came the electrostatic precipitator and other devices to capture fly ash before it leaves the stack. But now that we have it, what do we do with it? * * * deposit it in unsightly piles or drop it into the water? For some time it has been known that it could be used as a mixture for concrete, but the volume used in this way has been entirely too limited. Probably only about 5 per cent of the 20 million tons of fly ash each year is ever put to use. It is my hope that the current developments will permit a sharp increase in this percentage.

Through the Office of Coal Research, the University of West Virginia is conducting a study of a new type of brick and other construction materials made largely from fly ash. Meanwhile I am looking into the possibility of expanding the use of fly ash in the construction of highways under the Appalachian Regional Development Act and in other government sponsored programs. Such application would not only help relieve the disposal problem but would also have the effect of reducing the cost of burning coal in large central station power plants.

By references to my own State, I may have implied that we on the Appropriations Committee and at the Office of Coal Research have been concerned exclusively with the coal industry of this area. Let me assure you that what is being done with these federal funds will serve to revitalize the industry in other parts of the country, just as it will react to the benefit of coal operators and coal miners here in the east. The University of Utah, for example, is studying the processing characteristics of Western coals under an OCR contract. There is also a study of potential markets for Western coal and lignite sponsored by OCR. And the CO_2 acceptor process is a pipeline gas project centered on the use of Northwest lignite as a raw material.

The coal industry of the West, particularly in the Four Corners area, is already entering an era of infinite promise. Through the use of unit trains and long distance transmission lines, Los Angeles and other coastal cities will be served with electricity generated with coal that lies beneath the soil of Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado. In a few short years the vast lignite fields of Montana will supply generating stations that feed power into lines now served exclusively by hydroelectric stations.

Back in the East, our own mine-mouth plants in West Virginia and Pennsylvania are being readied to serve the megalopolis of the Eastern seaboard.

The coal industry has accomplished miracles in the past. I congratulate those operators who had the confidence to invest in progress at a time when pessimism should seemingly have been the order of the day. I congratulate you gentlemen who have applied your engineering and scientific skills to the development of this great industry. Through your genius and the versatility of mine workers who quickly adapted to mechanization's magic techniques, we have left the other mining nations of the world far behind in comparative productivity capabilities. We shall never stop improving where improvement is possible.

There is no question but that the coal industry is primed to do its part in meeting the unprecedented energy demands of the future. With synthetic oil and gas from coal assured a promising role in the projection, some of the problems that divided our fuels industries in the past will tend to bring them closer together in the future. Where inequities persist, however, the people of our mining states must stand as one to

demand relief from undue competitive hardship.

Our coal industry is moving forward, and the impetus must be maintained if we are to enjoy the economic benefits that have been so long in coming. There is no doubt about the confidence, determination, and intention of management and production personnel. And I hope that there is no doubt in your minds that you have in Washington some deeply interested and highly steadfast supporters pledged to do everything possible to keep clear the path of coal industry progress.

TRADE BRIDGES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I believe Senators will be interested in a New York editorial commenting on President Johnson's announcement that he wants to liberalize trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

The Times states:

An expansion of mutually advantageous trade between the United States and the Soviet block countries cannot help but strengthen the forces on both sides that press for reciprocally beneficial cooperation rather than discord.

I am sure others will want to see this editorial so 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:

TRADE BRIDGES TO THE EAST

President Johnson's announcement that he will send Congress legislation aimed at liberalizing trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union is a welcome implementation of his long-expressed interest in building more bridges to the Communist world. Much of the delay in moving toward extended relations has undoubtedly been linked to the fears of adverse domestic political reaction because of the strain of the war in Vietnam. Yet the dangers created by that conflict actually make it more rather than less important that the United States extend such a hand of friendship to the more reasonable Communist states.

An expansion of mutually advantageous trade between the United States and the Soviet bloc countries cannot help but strengthen the forces on both sides that press for reciprocally beneficial cooperation rather than discord. Substantially to increase that commerce will require at least three basic measures: Ending the discriminatory tariff barriers that now hinder sales of Soviet and most Eastern European goods here; removal of the legal obstacles to extension of normal commercial credits to those countries, and revision of United States strategic export controls to put them on a par with the more liberal—and more sensible—regulations in effect in Western Europe and Japan.

The President has now begun the process of making the needed changes, but he will need effective and vigorous support in Congress to make his proposals law at this session. If Congress fails to act positively, the result can only be more cynicism and disillusionment about the United States in the countries involved.

THE POLISH MILLENNIUM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on May 3 millions of Americans of Polish descent joined with many others around the world to commemorate the Polish millennium. A number of Senators have already commented on the significance of this occasion and on the important con-

tributions which Poland has made to science, religion, literature, and other aspects of our civilization, and the Senate has passed Senate Resolution 255 saluting Americans of Polish descent. It is indeed appropriate that we pause to consider the achievements of this great people, and I am pleased to be associated with this commemoration.

Throughout its long and illustrious history—from 966, when it became a Christian nation, to the present—Poland has been the scene of major world events. Despite partitions, wars, and the scars of foreign domination, Poland has been a cultural inspiration. One need only mention Chopin, Paderewski, Hofmann, Rubinstein, and Madame Curie to understand the size of our debt to this nation.

In our own country, Mr. President, individuals of Polish descent have contributed substantially to our cultural and spiritual life. It is only fitting that this devoted loyal group be recognized on this 1,000th anniversary.

TORNADO ALLEY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, there is a corridor which runs from the Gulf of Mexico, up through the center of our Nation which climatological experts have dubbed "Tornado Alley." The "alley" cuts through the States of Oklahoma and Kansas, and its southernmost origin in my own State of Texas.

More tornadoes are reported in these three States, on an area-by-area basis, than in any other part of the Nation. The residents of these States are in the midst of the tornado season at the present time. This "season" begins in April and extends until June, with the greatest violent weather activity in May.

During the past 50 years, 1,991 tornadoes have touched ground in my State alone, causing 879 deaths, thousands of injuries, and countless property damage.

Each year in the United States, an average of 240 tornadoes strike, killing, during the average year, 204 persons.

On May 11, 1953, 114 persons died in a single tornado which struck Waco, Tex.

As I am sure my fellow Senators are aware, Mr. President, virtually all sections of my State were affected by heavy rain storms, violent weather, and flooding in April and in this month. Hardest hit were areas and communities along the Trinity River from Fort Worth to the Gulf of Mexico. Flooding in the Dallas area was responsible for 19 deaths, and millions of dollars were lost in property damage.

But, as was pointed out by the Army Corps of Engineers, the greatest story was the flood that did not happen. The corps' flood control and reservoir projects, such as the Garza-Little Elm Reservoir, the Lavon Reservoir, and the Grapevine and the Benbrook Reservoirs, saved the city of Dallas and surrounding communities—indeed communities down to the gulf—from an estimated \$51 million in damages.

Mr. Kent Biffle, of the Dallas Morning News, assessed this "flood that did not happen" in a most interesting and, I believe, most important article which appeared on May 8. I ask unanimous con-

sent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Mr. Biffle makes a thorough assessment of the value of the various flood control projects which saved Dallas and other cities along the Trinity River from additional disaster and costly destruction. The corps planners have done their jobs well.

At the same time, Mr. President—and this is the crux of my remarks today—additional actions can be taken to safeguard and warn communities of the imminent danger of flooding, hail, lightning storms, hurricanes, and tornadoes.

The Department of Commerce has proposed the establishment of a national natural disaster warning system, which, it seems to me, would be of inestimable value in saving human lives and safeguarding against property damage. The Department's proposal would establish an integrated natural hazards detections system, utilizing existing facilities, and would, also with the help of existing facilities, expand its communications network for dissemination of violent weather information and upgrade its capabilities for immediate alert to all sections of the Nation.

I have had a chance to study the Department's proposals for the nationwide natural disaster warning system, and I am in complete accord with the objectives of this program. It is my hope that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses will include funds for the system—called Nadwarn—in their final appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce.

With such a system in effect, our Nation would make valuable headway in reducing the number of deaths attributable to natural disasters; estimated at between 500 and 600 yearly. It would assist in halting the economic losses to our country, estimated at between \$11 billion and \$15 billion annually, caused by tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, seismic sea waves, blizzards, forest fires, earthquakes, severe local storms, and other adverse weather conditions.

I urge Senators to study the Nadwarn plan and give it their support. It would benefit every citizen in our Nation, since there is no State in the country which has not been visited by some sort of natural disaster in its history or which is not subject to future tragedy of this kind.

EXHIBIT 1

DALLAS SPARED FROM GREATER FLOODS—LEVEES, FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIRS HELD BACK MOST OF WATER

(By Kent Biffle)

Recent flooding in Dallas was blamed for 19 deaths, damage to more than 270 homes and property damage counted in the millions of dollars.

But even greater than the flooding between April 23 and May 4 was the flood that didn't happen.

To grasp the extent of what might have happened it is helpful to look at what was going on upstream from Dallas.

During the peak of the rainfall, water was pouring into Garza-Little Elm Reservoir at a rate of 90,000 cubic feet a second. That's

"a second." And each cubic foot of it contained $7\frac{1}{2}$ gallons.

At Lavon Reservoir, water was cascading in at a rate of 50,000 cubic feet a second. Other flood control lakes were experiencing similar inflows.

Lavon, Garza-Little Elm, Grapevine and Benbrook reservoirs held back water that would have kicked the Trinity at least 10 feet higher than its 39.7-foot crest in Dallas. (Flood stage on the Trinity is considered to be 30 feet.)

A U.S. Army Corps of Engineers spokesman said Saturday that during the flood period, 1,239,000 acre-feet of water fell into the upper Trinity basin. But—thanks to the flood control lakes—only 376,000 acre-feet of water went down the Trinity during the wettest period.

If some old-timers saw a Trinity that didn't compare in volume with the great floods of the past, it was only because of the amount of water arrested by the reservoirs.

The 1,239,000 acre-feet of 1966 compares with the greatest floods of record. Floods of 1957 and 1908 were each booted up by about 1,300,000 acre-feet of runoff in the upper basin.

Existing flood control measures on the Trinity—including both the Fort Worth and Dallas floodways plus the lakes—were credited by the Corps of Engineers with preventing about \$51 million in losses all along the river's route to the Gulf Coast.

Despite flood control measures, losses in the neighborhood of \$14,500,000 were experienced throughout the Trinity basin.

Congressman EARLE CABELL's contention last week that completion of the Trinity River Improvement Program (a \$900 million program that includes a barge channel as well as flood control projects) would have averted much of the loss, was verified by the Corps of Engineers.

A corps spokesman said that about \$12 million of the \$14,500,000 in losses could have been prevented if the big program were completed.

Lavon may have been typical of effects of the flood control measures taken during the stormy period. While peak inflow was 50,000 feet per second, the maximum outflow was held to 6,000 cubic feet per second.

In Dallas, scores of homes were flooded when White Rock Creek waters combined at the creek's mouth with waters from the swollen Trinity to flood Roosevelt Heights and Bexar Street areas.

This confluence of White Rock and the Trinity is included in the Trinity River Improvement Program. Engineers have recommended that the White Rock channel be moved from the west side of Roosevelt Heights to the east side. There it would be restrained by existing high ground on the east side of the new channel and by levees that would be built on the west side.

On White Rock Creek, in the Samuell Boulevard area, the City of Dallas is preparing to advertise for bids on about \$365,000 worth of channel work and straightening that would protect roughly a mile of property along the creek between Samuell and the Texas & Pacific Railroad tracks.

Dallas City Manager Elgin Crull said the city will advertise for bids within a few weeks on this and another project—an estimated \$130,000 worth of work aimed at relieving a White Rock bottleneck in the Winsted-Garland Road area.

These projects would be coordinated into a proposed \$15 million program that would carry flood control on White Rock Creek all the way north to the Collin County line.

The construction cost is based on \$10 million in anticipated work on upper White Rock Creek and \$5 million on lower portions of the stream. It would not affect, however, the Trinity River Improvement Program pro-

posals for the area of the creek near its meeting with the Trinity.

Work on White Rock Creek included in the program would install reinforced concrete channels such as were built along Five Mile Creek to prevent flooding. Portions of the creek would not be lined, however. They would be deepened and, in crooked spots, straightened. Where practical, Crull said, an open-space approach to the problem would be used.

In these areas, the city would buy the property adjacent to the stream and permit floods to spread harmlessly over vacant property in wet seasons.

There are advantages to the open-space approach in certain areas, said Crull. The taxpayer not only gets flood protection in the purchase of open space but park area as well.

While flooded a few days each year, the areas would be useful during the rest of the year as park area, he explained.

Another possible advantage to the open-space idea is participation by the federal government in the purchase of land for this purpose. The \$15 million figure doesn't include the cost of right-of-way for open-space purposes.

A group of city officials will soon depart for Washington where, with the help of Congressman CABELL, they will meet with officials of four of five agencies that might offer assistance to Dallas, both in recovering from the flood and in preventing a recurrence.

Public Works Director H. H. Stirman, Parks Director L. B. Houston, and Assistant City Manager W. S. McDonald are expected to make the trip.

"We're going to take the problem to Washington and let the federal officials analyze it," said Crull.

The Corps of Engineers made early estimates that Dallas had received about \$2,500,000 damage. The city, according to Crull, suffered something less than \$750,000 in damage to streets and city-owned property.

"The city's primary responsibility in these situations is to protect the movement of traffic," he said. "Bridges, roads, and culverts must be constructed so that traffic will continue to move under all but the most severe circumstances."

A number of aging culverts and bridges in North Dallas would hopefully be rebuilt so that they would not slow the flow of runoff water, he indicated.

"The principle is this," said Crull. "Water will flow more slowly through a rough concrete pipe than through a smooth, glass-lined pipe. At any point where we can streamline the flow of water, the less water we'll have backing up."

Crull admitted, however, that there were certain aspects of the spring floods in Dallas that the city is almost powerless to guard against.

He quoted U.S. Geological Survey records on rainfall in Dallas during the early morning of April 28.

At Northaven Road at St. Michaels, starting at 12:45 a.m., a total of 5.8 inches of rain fell in 85 minutes.

At Walnut Hill Lane and Inwood Road, starting at 12:50 a.m., a total of 4.8 inches of rain fell in 85 minutes.

At Northwest Highway and Hillcrest, starting at 12:40 a.m., a total of 4 inches fell in 75 minutes.

At Webbs Chapel and Lombardy, starting at 12:40 a.m., a total of 4.65 inches fell in 80 minutes.

In Richardson, at Belt Line Road, 1 mile west of Central Expressway, starting at 12:35 a.m., a total of 5.1 inches fell in 90 minutes.

While other areas of the city escaped the sudden cloudburst, all across the North Side rain funneled out of the sky with an intensity that no drainage system could anticipate.

The result was flash floods that knocked out roads and inundated some of the most luxurious homes in the Nation.

Some of Dallas' wealthiest citizens joined the impoverished people of Roosevelt Heights as flood victims.

Water barged into the homes of Troy Post, Clint Murchison, Jr., and Jerome Crossman. One North Dallas man suffered \$50,000 damage to his home. Another family this week reportedly discarded a carpet that had cost \$100 a yard.

Paul Jacobsen, assistant executive director of the Dallas Chapter of the American Red Cross, said 40 businesses were damaged by high water.

At the Small Business Administration where flooded merchants were offered long-term, 3 percent Government loans, one businessman who lost a large inventory was inquiring about a loan of more than \$100,000.

Jacobsen said that in addition to the more than 270 homes that were flooded, 350 families evacuated their homes and then returned when the water failed to reach them.

Crull noted that the disaster, while severe to those involved, touched only a fraction of 1 percent of Dallas' 150,000 homes and 40,000 businesses.

And at the end of last week, long after water had receded from homes, Crull was still getting calls from Eastern radio newsmen who wanted to know how much of Dallas remained under water.

"They don't understand about flash floods," he said.

Lee Halford, a field engineer for the Dallas County Flood Control District, said there were "eight or nine" earth slides on the Trinity levee during the rainstorms.

"Some of them were very minor," he said. "And none of them critically damaged the levee." The floodway through Dallas was never taxed, said Halford. Damage to the levee will be repaired this summer, he said.

The 12-mile-long system of levees on each side of the Trinity is equipped with seven pump stations that move runoff water from behind the levees into the channel of the Trinity. All seven were in use during the siege of rain, said Halford.

The swollen river did not look menacing as it rolled through Dallas because of the flood control activities upstream by the Corps of Engineers.

By the end of the week you could walk through Roosevelt Heights without getting your shoes muddy. Belongings of the victims were still littered in yards—furniture, old clothes, pieces of toys.

The smell of a receding flood and the smell of poverty were thick in Roosevelt Heights.

"At least our lives were spared," said a Negro woman, chipping dried mud off a piece of furniture. "But that was all that was spared for us," she sighed.

Many other Dallas residents were spared a great deal, however. They were spared by 12 miles of levees and flood control reservoirs upstream.

They were spared by that greater flood—the one that didn't happen.

CLOSING OF ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH, NEW HAVEN, CONN., AND DEATH OF TERRI ALTIERI

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently, Charles T. McQueeney, managing editor of the New Haven Register, has written two exceptionally fine pieces on the passing of two well-known and beloved institutions in that city.

One, on April 2, was devoted to the closing down of St. Patrick's Church at Grand Avenue and Wallace Streets in New Haven.

This particular parish enjoyed a long, illustrious, and constructive history in

New Haven and the surrounding area. As Mr. McQueeney concludes in his moving article:

So, St. Pat's may be passing from the New Haven scene but it will never pass from memory. It has been too noble an institution for too long to permit that.

The second article, which appeared on April 9, was a tribute to Terri Altieri, for many years the able and dedicated staff photographer of the New Haven Register.

I was very saddened to learn of his death earlier this month. I remember Terri Altieri well; many are the times that I was the subject of one of his photos.

I ask unanimous consent to have both of these articles printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New Haven Register, Apr. 2, 1966]

ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH

The passing of St. Patrick's Church at Grand Avenue and Wallace Street not only marks the end of an era but more importantly strikes a note of sadness in the hearts of those who were once members of the parish and those whose ancestors could make the same boast. And the use of the word boast is not in the spirit of bragging or overemphasizing, for St. Patrick's once played a very important role in the life of New Haven—the influence of its long-ago pastors as well as its communicants having tremendous impact on the city which at the time was struggling to make its mark in world affairs. And in its early days, its influence was apparent beyond the city, as far away as Branford, Guilford and Clinton. At that time, there was no Catholic church in any of those communities and members of the faith were forced to drive by horse-drawn carriage or walk the distance to attend mass on Sundays and holy days. That was at a time way back around the 1850's, the 1860's, and 1870's; when the Reverend Matthew Hart was the shepherd of the small but devout flock. From all accounts, he was a saintly man and it was he, as the first pastor, who was responsible for giving St. Patrick's a strong foundation. He took over not too long after his ordination and served for 25 years, until his unexpected death in July 1876. At the time, he was only 51 years old, but he was the oldest Catholic clergyman—in the point of service—in the city. We have a letter, written in 1876, which mentions his death. It was written by James Collins to his son Patrick, who was in Westfield, Mass., at the time. Patrick later returned to New Haven and for years ran his own tea business here. The letter writer is the great-grandfather of Larry Collins, of West Hartford, coauthor of "Is Paris Burning?" An excerpt follows:

"Now you will be sorry to hear of the death of Father Hart. He went in the boat to New York of a Wednesday night to St. Vincent Hospital and was found dead of a Sunday morning about 9 o'clock so the dispatch came before last mass. Father Lynch and another priest went to New York and returned with the body by boat of a Monday night at 8 o'clock. There was no less than 6,000 in the street and about the hall when he came. For two nights his body was in the hall in an icebox and on Wednesday morning the casket arrived and he was placed in it. At 5 o'clock everyone had to leave work to go and see him. He looked the same as ever. There were two masses said. The body was brought from the hall about 10 o'clock up to St. Mary's Church where there was a mass said. There were nearly one hundred priests and a great deal

of the most respectable men of the city in attendance. There was a considerable crowd of other people as well. After the mass the body was brought back from St. Mary's and buried at the foot of the small steeple facing Grand Street. That is the steeple next to his house. Some went to the mayor and asked leave to have his remains there so he felt sorry for him and said to have him in any part of the property they fancied. So they began to dig the grave, and while they were digging it Father Hughes came from Hartford and said he should be buried in the cemetery. So the men said they had leave from the mayor and that would be the place for his remains, so he gave the contest up. Now, the grave is about 12 feet long, facing Grand Street, about 12 feet wide, and about 10 feet deep. A large flagstone was placed at the bottom of the grave and a brick wall built around it to about four feet high. The coffin was laid on the flagstone at the bottom and a similar flagstone was placed atop the brick wall covering the casket. Then they covered the top flagstone with the earth that was dug up. The remainder was carted away. It is not certain whether a monument will be built there as yet. Father Lynch was placed in charge of the parish for awhile and no one can say who will be named the parish priest. * * *

Long after Father Hart's death we were born while our good parents were members of St. Patrick's parish. We were baptized in the historic edifice and our early memories of it go back to childhood and Sunday attendance at mass there. It was quite a chore for mom to get her brood of five ready, but for her it was a pleasant task and off we went each Sunday to mass feeling quite rich holding our "penny for the basket." Then it was back in the afternoon for catechism class in the little wooden school at the rear of the church under the direction of the Sisters of Mercy. That was in the era when the Reverend John Russell was pastor. He served the longest pastorate in the history of the Hartford Diocese, being stationed at St. Patrick's for 55 years. He was a tremendous person and around his distinct personality flourished the high traditions of the parish. There were few boys born in the parish who at christening were not given the middle name of Russell in his honor. He was a colorful figure and commanded great respect about the city. It was he who prevailed upon the city fathers of that time to add the good nuns of the parish school to the city teaching staff. It was probably the only such setup in the entire country. The convent was up on Franklin Street, at State, and the nuns were transported to and from school first in horse-drawn vehicles and later in a big motorbus. Outstanding among the sisters was one named Sister Celestine. And there are many women in New Haven today, one-time members of the old parish, whose middle name is Celestine in honor of that wonderful soul. We also recall the Reverend David Hutchinson and the Reverend Joseph Casey as outstanding curates there. Also, a Professor Lynch, the organist who was really a master of the keyboard. There is a recollection of some of the soloists, outstanding among them Margaret Hogan and a Mrs. Tobin. Fond thoughts also remain of the well-attended masses there when the old balcony on either side of the church was filled as was the main floor section. Then, shortly after World War I, things began to change down Grand Avenue way, the Irish families and some of the Italians, too, began to move away and little by little, the parish dwindled. In recent years redevelopment delivered the last blow and there was only a handful left in the parish and the shadows of death became more apparent. Last Sunday, the last masses were celebrated there and the one at 11 o'clock drew an attendance reminiscent of the old days. For the first time in many years, the balcony was used and held an over-

flow congregation. Many, who themselves had been a part of old St. Pat's and those whose parents once worshipped there, returned. The grand old church had come into its own once again and for the last time. And we have a feeling that Father Hart, Father Russell, Sister Celestine, and all of the good priests and nuns who labored there were watching and no doubt joyously recalling their days at Grand and Wallace. We think, too, that they joined with many in the congregation in shedding a tear as the once mighty organ concluded the services with "Danny Boy." So, St. Pat's may be passing from the New Haven scene but it will never pass from memory. It has been too noble an institution for too long to permit that.

[From the New Haven Register, Apr. 9, 1966]

TERRI ALTIERI

To those of us on The Register who had the happy experience of working with him, the death this week of Terri Altieri, a staff photographer for many years, brought genuine sorrow. Terri whose name really was Theodore, was with the paper for more than 40 years both as a part-time and full-time employee. For a long span he was a familiar figure at any place a good news story was breaking. His contributions of top grade photos won him wide recognition long before Art Dietle and his Mystery Photo came on the scene. Some years back, in addition to his being a member of The Register staff, Terri was also a "stringer" for the old International News Photo setup and as a result, many of his photos were given world wide exposure. Friend of long standing, our own fond memories of Terri go back to our first days with The Register. At that time, he used to dash about on assignments astride a motorcycle with sidecar attached. He was a colorful figure, bedecked in puttees, leather gloves up to his elbows, goggles, a leather cap worn at a jaunty angle and other apparel that was part of the well dressed motorcyclist's wardrobe of the era. A daring soul, Terri paid little heed to speed regulations or other rules of the road and the reporters who rode in the sidecar beside him often came back with harrowing tales, sometimes more exciting than the story they were sent out to cover.

Stories about Terri are legend. We recall asking him how come he came by the name of Terri in view of the fact that most people named Theodore were known as Teddy. He replied that it was because he liked the nickname of a great hero of his early life in this country, Terri Roosevelt. His embarking on a career in photography came about because of a misunderstanding. Upon arrival in this country from Italy as a youth, Terri joined his brother Wally in the barber business downtown. While serving his apprenticeship, he was entrusted one day with the job of shaving one of Wally's best customers, Big Dave Fitzgerald. A little nervous, Terri had an unsteady hand and in one of his swipes down the side of Dave's face, Terri knicked his ear and the blood began to flow very freely. Dave got excited and began to give Wally a good going over for letting an inexperienced hand work on him. He concluded by telling Wally that "the best thing for this guy to be doing would be working with a pick." Dave, of course, was referring to a job with the pick and shovel. Terri, however, not being too familiar with our tongue thought he meant pictures so a few weeks later he gave Wally his notice and told him he was enrolling in a camera school in Rochester. It didn't take Terri long to master the camera and in a comparatively short time he was back in New Haven to set himself in business. His first studio was in the old Poli Building on Church Street. On occasion we visited with him there and enjoyed each instance. For, in addition to his photographic equipment, he had the

greatest collection of gadgets that we have ever seen. If ever Rube Goldberg needed ideas for his famous cartoons, Terri's studio would have been the place to find them. While working out of the Poli Building he struck up a warm friendship with the late theater magnate, Sylvester Z. Poli. Mr. Poli enjoyed Terri's company very much and was a frequent passenger in the sidecar on Terri's motorcycle. Mr. Poli was a great pool player and he and Terri often squared off at a green felt-covered table. Friend Terri would say: "I let him wins to make him happy."

During the football season, it was our assignment over a long stretch to accompany Terri to the Yale Bowl to keep a record of the action that he and his "Big Bertha" snapped. Our point of vantage was atop the press stand and in rain, snow, freezing weather and—once in a while favorable conditions—Terri never failed to come up with a variety of good shots. Before they resorted to taking movies of the games, the Yale coaches grabbed up as many as possible of Terri's photos to illustrate plays to the squad. We saved his life one day, pulling him from the harbor waters at Lighthouse Point after he had plunged in when the pier collapsed. It was a cross-harbor swim and Terri had stationed himself at the end of the pier to get a good shot of the first swimmers touching the finish mark. Others had the same idea and it wasn't too long before Terri had quite a crowd with him. The combined weight was far too great for the creaking old structure and as it broke up everyone—including Terri—was plunged into the water. We were on a nearby barge and reached down to grab Terri. We gave a helping hand to others as well and fortunately no one drowned or was injured. Terri lost his camera in the plunge and it was like losing his right arm. But he was completely crushed a while later when he walked into the news room, clothing still dripping water, and got a blast from the city editor of the day for not having any pictures. We'll never forget the look on Terri's face as he bemoaned: "Howsa you likea dat. I'm nearly drown and he wanna pic!" But, alas, Terri is no longer in our midst. He has gone to join a long line of former Register staffers who like himself helped to make this the great newspaper that it is today. Soon he'll be with them on the staff of the paper Up There, "The Heavenly Star." And it won't be long before he comes dashing into the newsroom with a wet print and exclaiming: "Heva boss, 1 minutes please, I gotta nice shot for Pagea 1."

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we are all aware of the remarkable progress our Navy has made in developing nuclear-powered submarines, thanks to the genius of Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover.

A few days ago, I received a letter from Admiral Rickover, which reveals him also as an accomplished writer. The purpose of his letter was to tell me about the first sea trials of the Polaris nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. *George Washington Carver*, which was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.

But, the admiral went on to review the life of George Washington Carver, and in so doing, produced a fascinating account of how that distinguished Negro raised himself up from slavery to become an outstanding scientist in the fields of botany and agriculture. The narrative is such an interesting one that I believe it is worthy of much wider distribution. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Rickover's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S.S. "GEORGE WASHINGTON
CARVER" (SSBN-656),

At Sea, North Atlantic, May 8, 1966.
Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our 37th Polaris nuclear submarine. The U.S.S. *George Washington Carver* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va. We also have in operation 22 attack type nuclear submarines, making a total of 59.

This ship is named for George W. Carver, a botanist and chemurgist renowned in the annals of American scientific agriculture. The child of slaves, he did not know the day of his birth. Even the year is not certain, but he thought it was 1860. Where he was born, however, is not in doubt. In 1943, shortly after he died at Tuskegee Institute, Ala., both houses of Congress passed, without a dissenting vote, a bill authorizing erection of a national monument at his birthplace in Diamond Grove, Mo. In fourscore years, George W. Carver had come a long way and accomplished a great deal.

None of it had come easy. His start in life was most inauspicious. A sickly infant, orphaned before he was a year old, it seemed unlikely he would survive. He lost his father in an accident and was soon after kidnaped, together with his mother and sister, by marauding nightriders. Those were lawless times. Stealing slaves for sale to plantations in the Deep South was not uncommon. But George Carver was such a puny baby that the kidnapers had no use for him, and so his master was able to get him released in return for a racehorse valued at \$300. Of mother and sister nothing was ever heard.

Hard as it was to be a slave child without kith or kin, by great good fortune his master Moses Carver (from whom he took his surname) was not a typical planter but a plain farmer, one of the so-called Black Republican abolitionist Germans, or lop-eared Dutch, as they were contemptuously called, who had migrated to Missouri in the 1830's. He was opposed to slavery, but he and his wife were childless and middle-aged; they needed help and servants were not to be had. So Moses bought a slave girl from a neighbor for \$700. After she had been abducted, he took it upon himself to raise her small son. Slavery ended when the boy was 4 years old but he remained with the Carvers and was treated much as any other farm boy. There was a lot of work to be done and George was expected to do his share. He was an especially apt pupil in all the domestic chores around the house and showed early that he had a way with growing things. People called him "plant doctor" for he could cure any ailing plant; he seemed to know instinctively what it needed in order to grow.

The boy was born with a keen mind, fantastically clever hands and so great a thirst for knowledge that no obstacle could bar him from obtaining an education. Of rebuffs he suffered many, but he was also often given a helping hand. The free school nearby was barred to him, whereupon Mrs. Carver gave him an old blue-back Speller and with her help he taught himself to read and write. Thereafter he was hardly ever without a book in his hand. He would prop it up while he washed and ironed, these being some of the chores that earned him a living while he gradually accumulated school credits.

At 10 he decided he must find a school and so he left the Carvers, all his possessions in a small bundle over his shoulder. Thus began an Odyssey that was to take him in short

stages northward geographically and upward educationally. At several critical times during his 30-year quest for an education, luck or his pleasing personality, or perhaps a combination of both, brought him into contact with warm-hearted childless couples who gave him the concern and care usually found only in one's own family. With a few he stayed but he was never a burden. He earned his keep for he was a prodigious worker, determined never to accept charity.

George Carver literally inched himself up the educational ladder, working his way not just through college but through grade and high school as well, working all the time to support himself. He was 20 before he got to high school, 25 when he graduated. Highland University accepted his credentials but when he presented himself, he was told Negroes were not admitted. He was 30 when he finally entered Simpson College in Iowa. A year later, he entered Iowa State University, graduating with a bachelor of science degree in 1894. Invited to become a member of the staff in charge of systematic botany, the bacteriological laboratories and the greenhouse, he continued his studies and received a master of science degree in 1896. That year, he was invited by Booker T. Washington to organize and direct a new agriculture department at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. There he remained the rest of his life.

From earliest childhood, Carver had the habit of rising at 4 and walking about the countryside for an hour or two. Soil, plants, and trees interested him intensely; he wanted to know how they were put together, what made them fruitful. Nature was both a consolation and a challenge. In Tuskegee, he found the land exhausted from one-crop cotton culture, robbed of its mineral content, eroded from lack of plant cover, treeless and sun parched. The campus was bare earth, dusty in dry weather, a sea of mud when it rained. He went about looking for ways to restore the overworked earth and found it in green manure and the growing of nitrogen-producing legumes—pod bearers such as vetch, peas, clover, peanuts—plants which enriched the soil. Crop rotation which European peasants had practiced for a thousand years had to be relearned by Southern tenant farmers who knew no other crop but cotton. Carver went among them preaching diversification. He urged them to grow peanuts and sweetpotatoes; those who heeded his advice rode out the disastrous invasion of the bollweevil.

On the experimental farm he developed at Tuskegee, he evolved a cross between the short-stalk and the tall-stalk cotton known as Carver's Hybrid, besides three other new strains. With green manuring, he grew enormous potatoes, cabbages, onions, watermelons, and cantaloupes. He instituted a visiting day each month for neighboring farmers to show what could be grown with scientific methods. They were most impressed with his new cotton strain which carried 275 huge bolls on a single bush, and yielded nearly a bale and a quarter per acre, in contrast to the usual one-third of a bale most tenant farmers produced.

To bring the message of scientific agriculture to those who could not come to Tuskegee, Carver loaded a wagon with tools, boxes, jars, and packages of seed and set out every Friday evening after class to give demonstrations to meetings of farmers. In 1906, with money donated by Morris K. Jesup, a member of the Slater Foundation, he designed the so-called Jesup Wagon which served as a movable farmers school and was adopted in other countries.

Carver's skill as soil scientist and plant breeder was to him but a means to help raise the standards of the Southern farmer, not just in productivity, but in his whole way of life. It was obvious to Carver that the prevalent diet of pork, meal and molasses

lacked the vitamins and minerals necessary for good health and stamina. So he urged farmers to grow more vegetable and fruits, showed them that many common weeds, properly cooked, were edible and nutritious, taught their women how to prepare them. His own boyhood had been spent on a multi-purpose farm where everything the family needed was grown and processed, only sugar and coffee being bought. He called this living at home and preached it throughout the land. By avoiding store purchases, a little could be saved each week and eventually a piece of land bought. This, he said, was the way out of poverty. Tenant farmers lived in drab cabins. Noticing the beautifully colored clay in which Alabama abounded, Carver developed a simple method for making color wash and demonstrated how much even the shabbiest cottage could be improved by a paint that cost not a penny.

Carver is best known as a pioneer "chemurgist"—a word, coined by Dr. William J. Hale in 1934, which means chemistry at work. In his book "Pioneers of Plenty," Christy Borth called Carver "the first and greatest chemurgist." Carver made paper from Southern pine "at least a quarter of a century before Dr. Charles H. Herty tackled the problem," and synthetic marble from wood shavings "years before a rocklike plastic made from wood waste became a chemurgic promise." He saw promise in the peanut when it was still a lowly weed growing along fences and tolerated by farmers only because their children liked its taste. From the peanut and the sweet potato, Carver developed more than a hundred different products, including plastics, lubricants, dyes, medicines, ink, wood stains, face creams, tapioca and molasses. He developed these in his laboratory at Tuskegee which he had put together out of odds and ends salvaged from scrap heaps.

When he first arrived to take up his post, he discovered there was no money to equip a laboratory. In the course of his life, necessity had made him a genius at making do out of nothing. He and his students made the rounds of the rubbish heaps on campus and in town. They collected bottles, cut their necks off evenly and turned them into beaters. A thick, chipped teacup became a mortar, a piece of pipe the pestle. An old ink bottle with a wick made of string stuck through a cork became a Bunsen burner. Pieces of tin were punched and became sifters. Reeds served as tubes to transfer liquids. Carver had brought with him the one indispensable and costly thing not to be found on scrap heaps: a microscope. It was a parting gift from colleagues at Iowa State.

The products of his laboratory made his name known and brought him tempting offers of positions in industry, and checks for advice that had been sought from him. He politely declined the positions and returned the checks. He had no interest whatsoever in money and could not be bothered with the problem of marketing his inventions. His head was too full of ideas for new products. Advice, he thought, should always be free. He hoped it would reflect favorably on people's attitude toward his race, if he helped others with their problems. His own needs were minimal. Indeed, out of a salary of \$1,500 a year at Tuskegee, he saved \$33,000 which he donated to the Carver Foundation for creative research in chemistry.

Many people from all over the world sought out this shy and retiring man, wanting to talk to him and to observe his work. Edison, Henry Ford, Theodore Roosevelt, and other important men became his friends. Honors and honorary degrees came his way. One was the Roosevelt Medal for distinguished service in the field of science (1939). He was introduced to the dinner guests in Theodore Roosevelt's New York home with these words which are a summing up: "I have the honor to present not a man only,

but a life, transfused with passion for the enlarging and enriching of the living of his fellowman."

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

THE ROAD AHEAD

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the National Society of the DAR recently heard an outstanding address by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, entitled, "The Road Ahead." Since this is such an outstanding account of our heritage and such an excellent program for our future, I ask unanimous consent that the speech by Lieutenant General Trudeau made before the annual defense luncheon in Washington, D.C., on April 18, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ROAD AHEAD

(Remarks by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, USA (ret.), president, Gulf Research & Development Co., Annual Defense Luncheon, Daughters of the American Revolution, International Inn, Washington, D.C., April 18, 1966)

Mrs. Sullivan, Mrs. Griswold, Members of the D.A.R., Distinguished guests, Fellow Americans, I am greatly honored to address this distinguished group, the Daughters of the American Revolution.

This historic date in 1775 is a landmark to your association, I am sure. The lantern in the tower burned brightly as Paul Revere mounted his horse and took the road to Lexington to warn the people of Boston that the enemy was on its way. The subsequent skirmishes from Lexington to Concord, from Concord back to Lexington to Charleston—"the Battle of Lexington"—took many lives that next day, but the casualties would have been greater without his warning. Freedom, neither then nor now, can be secured or maintained without struggle.

These are days that try all men's souls and some men's nerves. However, where the soul is serene in forthrightly facing our problems, the nerves are calm, too, but the doves seem irritated and nervous. While there is no fox in the chicken coop yet, there appear to be some chickens in their aviary.

One hundred and ninety-one years after Paul Revere's journey, our road is heavily beset with the enemy, both hidden and out in the open. Our road leads either to freedom—or to oblivion. Some travelers (and their fellow travelers) are blind or indifferent to the signposts along the way. There are still too many, who, if faced with Paul Revere's mission today, would say, "Why me? Why should I ride all night? Other people have horses. Let them do it."

Others, like Paul Revere, are deeply concerned with the course we are taking and are trying to warn of the dangers around us.

Today, I want to touch on some of our problems as I see them down the road ahead. I know you share the concern of so many of us about our receding stature in this distraught and chaotic world. For twenty years, I have heard that time will solve our problems, but time is not on our side unless we use it more wisely and courageously. Too often I have heard that "He who fights and runs away, lives to fight another day," but this is a sad philosophy and gets more difficult and less likely as time goes on. There most certainly comes a day when that statement can no longer be true. As someone said, "When spirits are low and principles ignored, people don't give a damn if their own ox is gored." Some seem to have reached that point, but the majority have decided the time has come to take a firm stand.

I believe we are witnessing a struggle today on the national scene between the proponents of principle versus expediency. This is not to question the sincerity of some who, I believe, are badly misguided.

The contest doesn't break out clearly along either religious, racial or party lines; but it is here. It involves the interpretation of the Constitution and Bill of Rights in the moral climate that prevails today, and scratches the very touch-stones of our Republic. It involves a challenge to accepted foreign policy by a few but powerful voices.

I believe the challenge to law and order in this world by both the proponents of anarchy and chaos and the advocates of compromise and surrender must be met firmly and without surcease.

I believe the attempt to avoid the road to World Communism by taking the detour through Socialism will only make the trip to oblivion a little longer and must be reversed.

I believe the restoration of individual pride by upgrading our code of morals and ethics and by fostering greater freedom of enterprise, better and more responsible state and local governments and more severe punishment for criminal actions within just laws is essential if any sense of personal responsibility for government is to persist.

I believe the restoration of national pride by rejuvenating the Monroe Doctrine and pursuing a positive foreign policy (including the use of force where necessary) to repulse the advance of World Communism and world chaos is likewise essential if America is to remain the bulwark as well as the symbol of freedom and dignity of men and nations throughout this world.

These things I believe.

America still marches in the forefront of history, though precariously at times. We stand at the opening of a new and promising era—the most powerful nation in all the world; a nation recognized as blessed beyond measure, with the most enlightened form of government in the world. Yet, at the same time, and this has been historically true of other mighty states which have preceded us, we find ourselves challenged to defend—or even to assert—our rights at a score of vital points along a widespread defensive periphery (even in our front yard), and hesitant to stand fast for principle and right. We seem to still wallow in the doldrums of the decade following the Korean War when victory meant compromise and compromise meant appeasement or accommodation or convergence, as they call it now. Despite bold words in some high places, this remains the temper of a few of our policy makers today.

Do you know that the so-called "wars of liberation" are entirely in consonance with the Communist policy of "peaceful co-existence"? If time permitted, I could quote you chapter and verse on this. Do you know that Marx defined peace as a condition that could only exist in a classless state? Consequently anarchy, chaos, subversion, and "wars of liberation" are all justifiable means of achieving their goal. Anyone who endorses "peaceful co-existence" is either unaware of what the Kremlin policy is or is parroting the party line.

Let's quit coddling the Communists. There is no country in the Free World where they are not fomenting revolution and subversion and chaos and disorder. Despite this, there are those who would tell us not to be overly disturbed about such explosive developments because the tenets and goals of Communism are changing. This is untrue and highly dangerous.

We must indeed beware of the machinations emanating from the Pugwash conferences, the Fabian Socialists and the One Worlders. They, rather than the card-carrying Communists, constitute the major internal threat to our Republic today. I see

nothing on the world scene today that would permit the relinquishment of one iota of our sovereignty or the reduction of a balanced military superiority by one jot or tittle. We should be just as assiduous in guarding our power as we are in avoiding belligerency. We must explain, again and again, that the possession of power is not synonymous with the use of force but that aggression will be dealt with firmly.

Our goal must still be to reduce or eliminate Communist imperialism as a threat to world peace by all means short of war. Some of our policies in this regard are hard to understand as we provide aid and comfort to our self-declared enemy. We even relieve internal pressures on the Russians and Chinese by feeding their people and expediting the buildup of their industrial base to compete with ours at a time when they are involved in military operations against us.

We see our Government defied by young men, indoctrinated by Communist propaganda, mutilating their draft cards and demonstrating against an established foreign policy which affects our very life's blood. Can you believe that the demonstrations against our involvement in Viet Nam, which appeared on our college campuses and around the world on the same day, were not organized and directed from some central headquarters? Where was it? In Cuba? The demonstrators, for the most part, are beanie-haired, misguided misfits looking for an outlet for their energies.

While they are a minority, our task today is to get Communism out of our schools and to get Americanism back into them. Our traditional type of education has always sought to develop the mind and to build character, to encourage self-reliance and engender a competitive spirit that brings out the best efforts of which each is capable. The so-called progressive system submerges the individual in the group, disregards character and faith in God, and eliminates competition as a spur to initiative. If democracy is only to be the triumph of such mediocrity, God help us.

You must be aghast at the widespread efforts to declare that "God is dead."

You needn't be. The scientific atheist is more dangerous to our society than the Russian Communists or our own Fabian Socialists.

This effort to destroy the remaining shreds of ethics and morals on which our Christian civilization and the culture and progress of the modern world were built, is the most insidious challenge of our times. To claim that this universe has no Creator but developed from the hydrogen atom leaves at least one very important and fundamental question unanswered. Who created hydrogen?

Let us bow our heads in humility and shame before a Creator on whose mercy, even more than his justice, all life on this planet depends.

As General MacArthur—God bless him—said, "There is no substitute for victory." The law of life is one of struggle. All the world knows this, but in this favored segment of the world we, as a people, seem to be forgetful. With three billion people unlike even in their fingerprints, the dawn of a Utopia full of milk and honey is still only a social scientist's dream. Struggle is a cross mankind is destined to bear as long as the world exists. It will never be made of foam rubber, nor will the psychiatrist's couch ever replace it. We don't need any more tranquilizers to help us ignore our problems, but we do need a moral adrenalin to stimulate us to solve them courageously. The erosion of the moral integrity of Western man is too prevalent to ignore. It pervades our atmosphere like a poisonous fog. No kind of air pollution is as dangerous as this one. We are being numbed by mounting violations of our ethical, as well as our criminal, codes in official, adult and adolescent life. Our sense

of individual pride and responsibility is fading in the expanding grasp of a welfare state.

After twenty years of so-called containment, there is hardly a section of the Free World's frontier that is not overtly or covertly being eroded or penetrated today. Only the torch left in Castro's hands could have lighted the fires in Panama and Guantanamo that smoulder throughout Latin America. Only our dilatory tactics in Korea fourteen years ago permitted Red China to challenge us in Southeast Asia as she does today. Unchallengeable power and determination to stop further erosion and preserve ourselves and western civilization is the priceless ingredient to any successful solution. Any weakening of our present relative nuclear deterrent or conventional military power in the face of this challenge could be devastating. Neither magic "black-boxes" nor the Ouija board of disarmament can give the solution to this struggle.

Today, change is more rapid and meaningful than in any period during the past five hundred years, at least. This situation is typified by not only the dramatic fading of the boundaries of empires, but by the ever-increasing rate of obsolescence of both commercial products and military weapons and even by ventures beyond the long-standing frontier of the atmosphere.

The explosion of science and technology has opened doors never dreamed of a few years ago. In the nuclear field as well as in space, all of us, both friend and foe are still infants. For one thing, we have no way of determining how much we don't know. More important to our security, we don't know how much our potential enemies do know, or how long it will be before—or even if—they know more than we know today. I am concerned that their 1962 tests may have provided them knowledge that seriously degrades our deterrent power today. With our vision limited to a second-strike missile system, we may be as wrong as France was in depending on their Maginot line. The blind ban on high altitude nuclear testing and on the development and testing of nuclear devices in space for deterrence and defense may have been disastrous to our nation's security as the failure to guard our freedom with continuing vigilance and courage along our far-flung earth-bound defense perimeter.

People talk—but only talk—about our nuclear defenses against enemy missiles and satellites. What nuclear defenses? We have none. We are naked. We have even offered the Russians an agreement never to build any. The Nike system—imperfect though it may be—is our best hope today but it is not in production. Had the same criteria of perfection before production been applied to our other major weapons systems or space ventures over the last decade—we would have nothing today—not even early warning. The growth potential of this basic system to defeat missiles and even satellites is our best hope for an effective nuclear defense tomorrow. Today we are the world's greatest nuclear nudist colony.

Recently, the Soviet displayed some new anti-missile missiles. They continue to make remarkable advances in space. If they are concentrating their current resources on the production and deployment of such a system, building an assault base in Cuba and placing supermegaton warheads on near-earth, orbiting, maneuverable satellites, we are facing the greatest threat that has evolved to date. I hope we have a strategy equal to the threat. We must strive to maintain an adequate deterrent and build a defensive capability of suitable magnitude. We must push new weapons systems and counter measures.

Military procurement must be greatly expanded. I do not intend to discuss shortages publicly but even an optimist would know there are areas where no surplus or reserves exist. Troopwise, our strategic re-

serve is already depleted and we are assuming risks no military commander would countenance. The demands in Southeast Asia must not blind us to the dangers in our own front yard or on a second front anywhere.

From a standpoint of cost-effectiveness, Newsweek mentions a United States cost of \$375,000 per Viet Cong casualty. This is startling as we certainly aren't fighting a war of attrition. Are we using the right weapons systems? The right strategy? How about sealing off Halphong by blocking or blockading the harbor since at least 75 percent of enemy supplies arrive by sea in both Communist and "friendly" ships? The principal logistic support comes from Russia, not China, of course. Such is peaceful co-existence, but we still ship them wheat and industrial plants.

Likewise, one of our leading columnists says we "lost the war in North Korea." That is not true. We didn't lose it. We could have won it. Instead, we let the Chinese "off the hook" and are now paying for it in Viet Nam, thirteen years later.

I rise to defend General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. His assurance that China would not intervene in Korea was based on his justified confidence that he could smother them in Manchuria if they did. He didn't know his hands were to be tied by making it a sanctuary, nor would he ever have thought that perhaps the Chinese knew this when he didn't. Now the Bay of Tonkin is their sanctuary as our Navy watches the ships go by.

Today is a time when our country faces the gravest crisis in its history. In Cuba, Southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America—or you name it—the fires are burning beneath the thin veneer of civilization and order we enjoy. It seems to me that unless leading citizens like you—in business—with the utmost seriousness and dedication—engage more actively in urging our Government to face the challenging problems before us, America and the whole Free World can suffer the most dire consequence. We still have a Congress that must listen. Communism, Socialism and the One World proponents of health, wealth and happiness-for-all fear a fully-awakened America and their No. 1 effort is to lull us to sleep.

It is the anomaly of our times that while Cecil Rhodes failed to found an African empire, the country named for him is fighting for its freedom while some of the dynasty enriched by his scholarships here are trying to give our sovereignty away.

We must also beware of domestic policies that destroy individual, local and State identities and initiative by overcentralization of government. Brainwashing is not confined to enemy prison camps. When the distinction between patriots and traitors grows dim in the public mind, as it seems to do today, the doctrine of Marx and the techniques of Pavlov have made their imprint. Maybe Johnny can't read but I am sure you can, and the handwriting is on the wall and in the papers.

The keys to our survival are still faith—not fear; firmness—not fuzziness; courage—not complacency; patriotism—not patronage; and sacrifice—not selfishness. The clarion call to be bold, decisive, creative, and morally strong is as clear as it was to our forefathers through the long painful decades when they stood alone and fought for liberty and progress. We, in our time, will be stronger and better when we weave back more brilliantly into our own fabric of thought and heart the epic days and deeds of our forebears and of our immortal great. As someone said one hundred years ago when we pushed the frontiers of Freedom out to the Pacific and built this great country, "The cowards never started and the weak never arrived." I hope history will write a favorable verdict of us, but what we need are more strong men with

convictions throughout this nation if we are going to arrive at the dawn of the coming century intact.

Remember, at the age of only one hundred ninety years, our country is the oldest and proudest symbol of liberty in the world. Forty years after our Revolution we had ejected the British a second time. Then President Monroe told everybody else, including the Russians, to keep out of the Western Hemisphere. They did.

Another forty years, and our own sad conflict ended, we had to tell the French to get out of Mexico. They did.

Another forty years and we ejected the Spanish from Cuba, and told the Germans in no uncertain terms to stay out of Venezuela. They did.

Then on twenty-year cycles, we fought two World Wars to insure our freedom and hemispheric solidarity. We did.

Now, after another twenty years, our Cuban front yard is a playground for the "dead-end kids" and termites are in the woodwork from Passamaquoddy to Panama and Patagonia. I, for one, deplore this low state of American affairs.

The threat from Cuba today exceeds the one that existed in 1962, in my opinion. The overt withdrawal by Khrushchev then, has permitted the covert installation of major offensive and defensive installations since then, according to many on-site observations and reports that cannot be disregarded but have not been denied by our Government. I cannot believe our intelligence is so poor that these claims cannot be checked. What is at San Andrés? A major underground control center? A major missile installation? Are the Soviet submarine pens at Nipe Bay completed? What is going on at the Margot Mines? Are we blind to the threat of a major Communist headquarters now operating in Cuba to create chaos and anarchy throughout our hemisphere?

Let us remember, among the interesting words of Rudyard Kipling, the following, perhaps prophetic verse:

"Fenced by your careful fathers, ringed by your leaden seas,
Long did ye wake in quiet and long lie down at ease;
Given to strong delusion, wholly believing a lie.
Ye saw that the land lay fenceless, and yet let the months go by . . .
But ye say, 'It will mar our comfort.'
Ye say, 'Twill 'minish our trade.'
De ye wait for the spattered shrapnel ere ye learn how a gun is laid . . .
For the low, red glare to southward when the raided coast-towns burn?
(Light ye shall have on that lesson, but little time to learn.)"

It is fitting, as we contemplate our serious domestic and international problems and gaze at the critical months ahead, that we appraise again our humble beginning and shore up our nobility of purpose if we are to gauge successfully the rough course down the road ahead. While I regret all the unhappiness in this world, I refuse to be brainwashed by those who seek to instill in us a feeling of guilt by association for every maladjusted and unhappy person who exists or every unfortunate incident that occurs. Let us build up pride by association instead—pride to be countrymen of leaders like Washington and Lincoln, Tom Marshall and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Teddy Roosevelt and Douglas MacArthur, Longfellow and Will Durant, Victor Herbert and Gershwin, Edison and Henry Ford and a host of others, big and little, who lived (and a million who died) to give us the United States of America we know today.

With due regard and regret for both our past failures and our yet incomplete victories, we need apologize to no one for the causes we have advanced so greatly for the

benefit of mankind. We must not lose our pride in accomplishment nor our loyalty to the ideals that made us great. The protection, the prosperity, and the progress of our country demand our fullest dedication, struggle and efforts if we are to achieve these goals.

This struggle will yet be won by the superior spirit, determination and tenacity of the victor. I hope it will be our side. If not, God knows we will deserve our fate. Greater devotion to the true spirit of America and continued expansion of the phenomenal moral and industrial power of the United States of America would be among the most reassuring signs that this country and the Free World, under God, will not fail. On this day that so symbolizes the beginning of our struggle for freedom, with the security of our country still challenged from without and threatened from within, let us pause to remember with calmness and good judgment that the nation we love will only remain the land of the free as long as it continues to be the home of the brave—and that means every dedicated American.

Thank you very much.

DR. VAN DER KROEF'S ANALYSIS OF VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, our perspective with regard to the nature of the war in Vietnam is often one-sided. We are correct in understanding this war as an attempt by world communism to expand its influence and control through the tactic of movements of "national liberation." This is what Communist leaders have repeatedly told us about Vietnam, and these are the stakes we have properly understood to be involved in that country.

Yet there are two distinct revolutions occurring in Vietnam, both of which are essential if the Communists are to achieve their stated goal. One is to remove American influence from southeast Asia and destroy the established governments in that region. The other is to transform these states into Communist dictatorships, just as China and North Vietnam have been transformed into such tyrannies.

Justus M. van der Kroef, chairman of the department of political science at the University of Bridgeport and senior fellow at the Research Institute on Communist Affairs at Columbia University, has clarified these dual aims in a recent article in "Vietnam Perspectives."

He points out that—

This dual aim of the war in the South * * * is for Democratic Republic of Vietnam leaders not simply relevant to Vietnam alone, but is generally characteristic of all "anti-imperialist" or "national liberation" struggles now going on in the world. Le Duan, chairman of the Lao Dong Party and one of the DRV's top theoreticians, addressing a central committee session of his party in December 1963, said that the national struggle against imperialism evident in the modern world could not be separated from the class struggle within the nations concerned; and that the wars to win national independence in Asia, Latin America, and Africa were "originally linked" to the fight for genuine "democracy" waged against domestic "feudal" and other "reactionary forces, agents of imperialism."

Many critics in this country have repeatedly stated that in their view the war in Vietnam is essentially a civil war, and

the National Liberation Front is an indigenous movement seeking to achieve real national independence.

Professor van der Kroef rejects this view, and concludes by stating that—

Seen from Hanoi, the Vietnam war aims not simply at driving American forces out, or at establishing some kind of "truly independent" government in Saigon, as one sometimes hears. DRV war aims go far beyond this and encompass, according to the pronouncements of its own leaders, a phased social and economic revolution in the South, in tandem with the North and directed toward the creation of a Communist state.

All who urge an American withdrawal should understand that were this to be done, all freedom and hope of future freedom in South Vietnam would die. A Communist tyranny would descend upon that country, free speech would end, and the slaughter of all those who dared to resist would ensue.

Since I feel that Dr. van der Kroef's analysis is so important for all of us to understand and ponder, I wish to share it with my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to insert it into the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, Dr. van der Kroef's analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR SEEN FROM HANOI (By Justus M. van der Kroef)

(Note.—Professor Justus M. van der Kroef is Chairman of the Department of Political Fellow at the Research Institute on Communist Affairs, Columbia University.)

In recent months, various published statements by the leaders of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV) and of its creature and ally, the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam (commonly known as the National Liberation Front, or NLF), have outlined a comprehensive and interlocking set of Communist objectives in the Vietnam war. These go much beyond the mere withdrawal of United States forces from South Vietnam, the cessation of attacks on the North, or even American recognition of the NLF as the sole bargaining representative of the South Vietnamese people. Seen from Hanoi, the Vietnam war has far-reaching domestic and international implications that must be taken into account in whatever settlement is eventually reached in the area. This article attempts an analysis of Hanoi's view of the Vietnam war as projected in Communist doctrinal terms by leaders of the DRV.

II

To begin with, the official United States position that North Vietnam is committing aggression against South Vietnam, that North and South are two separate states, and that the war in Vietnam is therefore not a "civil war," finds needless to say no acceptance in Hanoi. An exchange between the NLF Central Committee and the Vietnam Fatherland Front (the predecessor of the NLF and now little more than a paper organization) on war aims, published in March 1965, affirms the essential indivisibility of the country and the war. "Vietnam is one, the Vietnamese people are one. North and South Vietnam are of the same family . . . the heart cannot but suffer when the hand is cut. That the people in North Vietnam should be resolved to fulfill their duty towards their kith-and-kin in South Vietnam fully conforms to sentiment and reason." To this NLF pronouncement, the Vietnam Fatherland Front quickly responded that "Vietnam is a single territory from Lang Son to Point Ca Mau," and noted that the defense of "our Fatherland" is the

sacred duty "of our 30 million-odd people," that is, of the combined populations of North and South.¹

For Hanoi the paramountcy of national unity in turn requires reciprocal military assistance as between North and South. In September 1965 Nguyen Van Vinh, chairman of the DRV State Committee for Reunification, declared that "If the defense of the North is the bounden duty of our Southern compatriots, in return the support given to the South is the sacred duty of our Northern people. Vietnam is one, the Vietnamese people is one." The NLF statement of March 1965 also included among its objectives the duty not only "to liberate South Vietnam," but also to "defend the North" with a view to the reunification of the fatherland.²

But the emphasis on the oneness of Vietnam and on the requirement of mutual military assistance does not mean that, from Hanoi's point of view, the nature of the struggle is exactly the same in North and South. In the North there already exists a Communist "people's democratic government," while in the South there does not. This creates significant tactical differences which DRV spokesmen, along with their appeals to unity, have stressed over and over again. Necessarily, it also influences Hanoi's view of the war. Various signed or unsigned articles in *Hoc Tap*, the theoretical journal of the Central Committee of the Lao Dong (Workers) Party, the Communist Party of the DRV, have explored the implications of the "two aspects of the gigantic struggle put up by all our people," that is, "The Socialist construction carried out in the North" as opposed to "the revolutionary struggle waged by our compatriots in the South."³ This difference is not simply a semantic exercise, but goes to the root of Communist theory and hence of DRV views as to the nature of the war, and the appropriate strategy and tactics for prosecuting it. Although on the one hand the struggles in North and South are considered to be "mutually complementary and must be closely coordinated," on the other hand the North is seen as having already overcome certain difficulties on the road toward Communist development while the South has not. Therefore "the building of the North itself cannot replace the resolution of the inherent social contradictions of South Viet Nam."⁴

As early as September 1960, the Central Committee of the Lao Dong Party declared

that "the revolution for the liberation of the South" involves a "solution of the two basic contradictions" existing in the South: first, the contradiction between the people of the South and the "aggressive imperialists, above all the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen;" and secondly, the contradiction between the people of the South, "especially the peasants" and "the feudal landlord class."⁵ This means that the war from the DRV point of view must be prosecuted not only in purely military terms in order to defeat the United States and its South Vietnamese "henchmen," but also in terms of certain socio-economic reforms. Among these one of the most important is the land tenure question, which, in customary Communist jargon, stands for a whole range of problems typical of a country still presumably in a socially backward agrarian stage. The disparities between North and South, and the double aspect of the struggle in the South, have remained standard dichotomies in DRV and NLF pronouncements. At a recent scientific symposium in Peking, for example, Professor Nguyen Van Hieu, Central Committee member of the NLF, described South Vietnam as "a backward agricultural region subject to imperialist domination and at the same time semi-feudal in character. The national liberation struggle in South Vietnam is therefore closely linked with the struggle for the liberation of the peasants."⁶

North and South thus are considered to represent different levels of political and economic development, as generally indicated by Communist revolutionary theory today. According to such theory, for example, the "national democratic" revolution precedes the socialist revolution; the former is waged against "imperialism" and "feudalism," the latter against those class obstacles (at home and abroad) which may still resist the complete socialist transformation of state and society.⁷ The national democratic revolution ends, according to Communist theory, with the complete dominance of the local Communist Party. As one Lao Dong Central Committee member put it during the Third Congress of the Party. "The North, completely liberated, has achieved the peoples national democratic revolution and is entering the period of transition to socialism. But the South is still under the yoke of the imperialists and feudalists," and hence the "people's revolutionary task" lies in promoting the "socialist revolution in the North, and at the same time the national peoples democratic revolution in the South."⁸

It may seem superfluous to emphasize the implications of this DRV position. But in some Western quarters the operations of the Viet Cong or the NLF are occasionally viewed as if they are somehow divested of any ideological character, except for a vaguely described "nationalistic" or "anti-colonial" commitment. The fact is that for Hanoi and its Southern ancillaries, the purpose of the war is not just a matter of winning a military victory in a broadly nationalist cause. It is also a question of bringing about the complete transformation of South Vietnam.

¹ March 22, 1965, statement of the Central Committee of the NLF, and March 27, 1965, reply by the Central Committee of the Vietnam Fatherland Front, in *Vietnam Courier* (Hanoi), no. 23, April 3, 1965, pp. 5-6. In his interview with the British correspondent Felix Greene on November 24, 1965, Ho Chi Minh reportedly ridiculed the notion that North Vietnam had been committing aggression against South Vietnam, declaring that "Vietnam is one" and the "the Vietnamese people are one, children of the same fatherland." *The New York Times*, December, 19, 1965.

² Nguyen Van Vinh, "How Should the Most Correct Solution to the Vietnam Problem be Understood?", *Vietnam Courier*, no. 36, September 23, 1965, p. 4, and March 22, 1965, NLF statement in *Vietnam Courier*, no. 23, April 3, 1965, p. 6.

³ *On The Problem of War and Peace* (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, 1964), p. 93. The citation is to an article in the January 1964 issue of *Hoc Tap*, which together with three other *Hoc Tap* articles has been reprinted in this volume.

⁴ Nguyen Chi Tan (a Lao Dong Politburo member), *Who Will Win in South Vietnam?* (Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1963), p. 9. Originally published in the July 1963 issue of *Hoc Tap*.

ese society and economy, a transformation predicated on the Communist concept of a successful "national democratic" revolution led by the Communist Party, and exemplified by the experience of the North.

This dual aim of the war in the South, it may also be noted, is for DRV leaders not simply relevant to Vietnam alone, but is generally characteristic of all "anti-imperialist" or "national liberation" struggles now going on in the world. Le Duan, chairman of the Lao Dong Party and one of the DRV's top theoreticians, addressing a Central Committee session of his Party in December 1963, said that the national struggle against imperialism evident in the modern world could not be separated from the class struggle within the nations concerned; and that the wars to win national independence in Asia, Africa, and Latin America were "originally linked" to the fight for genuine "democracy" waged against domestic "feudal" and other "reactionary forces, agents of imperialism."⁹ It is not, moreover, a question of postponing the desired transformation of society until independence has been won. On the contrary, the "national liberation" struggle must go hand in hand with the establishment of a "democracy" free from "feudal" landlords and other bourgeois and imperialist elements. In this connection, an interview of General Vo Nguyen Giap, the victor of Dien Bien Phu and the present DRV defense minister, which was published in a recent retrospective volume on the Dien Bien Phu campaign, is instructive. Giap notes that although, as the war against the French went on, the techniques and equipment of his forces improved, the truly decisive element in bringing final victory, including the surmounting of technical difficulties, was "the political factor. Our army fought for just political objectives." And what, Giap was asked, did this political factor consist of? The national consciousness and spirit, the general replied, and went on to explain:¹⁰

"Our revolution is in the first place a national revolution. It is also a democratic revolution. Our Party launched the agrarian reform while the war was raging. Our soldiers were mostly poor peasants. During their political studies each of them recalled how he had been exploited, oppressed by the feudal landlords * * * Our men at the front received many letters from their wives, their parents, informing them of the agrarian reform then in full swing, describing their joy and enthusiasm of the seething peasant masses. Our Party ceaselessly inculcated in our troops a double consciousness: national and class consciousness."

How effective the "agrarian reform" actually was, and what degree of enthusiasm it may or may not have aroused in Giap's forces, we can pass over here; in any case, from Hanoi's point of view they are not debatable. The point, again, is that the DRV avowedly is not simply fighting a war for national independence, but simultaneously a struggle for the elimination of "feudalism" and the bourgeois henchmen of "imperialism" in South Vietnam. The "double consciousness" to which Giap refers, and with which Hanoi seeks to inculcate its fighters, is but a reflection of this whole double purpose of warfare. DRV reports, meanwhile, continue to be fulsome in their praise of the revolutionary social and economic changes now being wrought in "the liberated zones in South Vietnam" (that is, the areas under NLF or Viet Cong control), noting the "bold program of land reform," education and public health services, and the new spirit being fostered by "art ensembles" and "song and

⁵ Third National Congress of the Vietnam Workers Party. *Documents* (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, n.d.), vol. 1, p. 5.

⁶ Nguyen Van Hieu, "Special War"—An Outgrowth of Neo-Colonialism (Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965), p. 15.

⁷ On the phase of "national democracy" in Communist revolutionary theory, see J. M. van der Kroef, "On National Democracy—Evolution of a Concept," Survey, April 1963, pp. 134-145, and "The Communist Concept of 'National Democracy,'" *Studies on the Soviet Union*, vol. 4 (1964), pp. 39-63.

⁸ Third National Congress of the Vietnam Workers Party. *Documents*, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 243.

⁹ Le Duan, *On Some Present International Problems* (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, 1964), pp. 154-155.

¹⁰ Contribution to the History of Dien Bien Phu," *Vietnamese Studies* (Xunhasaba, Hanoi, 1965), no. 3, p. 20.

dance troupes" in "every zone, province, district or village," and so on.¹¹

III

The conceptual link between "national liberation" and social reform in the context of an "anti-imperialist" war cannot be separated from the theoretical acceptance of the role of violence currently voiced by DRV leaders. This is not the place to appraise the influence of the Sino-Soviet split on Hanoi, or the impact of Peking's presumably more militant approach in world affairs. But it would appear from their published statements that DRV spokesmen are wholly committed to the proposition that violence is the indispensable midwife of revolutionary change. "Ruin and mourning," an already cited Hoc Tap article asserts, "is caused by capitalism, not by us. We do not tell the people to remain with folded arms looking helplessly at these ruins," but rather "we tell them to rise up" and, if necessary, "to wage revolutionary wars against capitalism for our own salvation." Of course, in the process of such resistance "ruin and mourning" will be inevitable. But only by making such sacrifices can capitalism be eradicated.¹² DRV military and political leaders have generally echoed this line. According to them, the Lao Dong Party has always had a thorough grasp of the Marxist-Leninist concept of revolutionary violence and, indeed, has consistently favored the use of violence to overthrow reactionary and counter-revolutionary elements, thus "enforcing" the dictatorship of the proletariat. This tactic has been, and still is, particularly necessary in Vietnam. The Vietnamese Communist movement arose in a colonial and "semi-feudal" society whose rules drowned the masses' struggle in blood; and very early it was realized that in order to achieve their self-liberation the people would have to follow the path of armed struggle. Yet Vietnam is not a unique case in this respect. The "national liberation" struggle in other parts of Asia, and in Africa and Latin America, has been developing against a background very similar to Vietnam. Today "the U.S. imperialists" face millions of people in the world who have risen against them; and like the people of South Vietnam, the peoples of many countries realize that the "imperialist aggressors" can only be dealt with by means of popular violence.¹³

Within the context of Hanoi's dual war aims, this acceptance of the tactics of revolutionary violence also applies to the social and economic transformation sought by the DRV in South Vietnam itself. Just as revolutionary violence is necessary to eliminate the military resistance of the "imperialists" and their "feudal" and bourgeois henchmen, so violence may also be necessary to destroy their social and economic resistance as well. Again, "ruin and mourning" may accompany this process of destruction, but this is unavoidable if, as the above mentioned Hoc Tap statement indicated, the people are to "be spared forever of the ruins and mournings caused by capitalism."

IV

The theory that violence is inescapable in the realization of revolutionary objectives at home is inseparably linked with the DRV concept of the international significance of the Vietnam war, a linkage that may now

¹¹ Vietnam Courier, no. 34, August 26, 1965, p. 8.

¹² "On the Problem of War and Peace," op. cit., p. 89.

¹³ Major General Van Tien Dung (chief of staff, Vietnam People's Army), "On the Building of Our Revolutionary Armed Forces," Vietnam Courier, no. 16, December 17, 1964, p. 4; and Pham Van Dong (DRV prime minister), Vietnam Courier, no. 24, April 15, 1965, p. 5.

perhaps be briefly examined. At the outset, it is necessary to stress the open acknowledgment by DRV leaders of their theoretical debt to Maoism. Such ideas as the use of the peasantry as the "main force" of the revolution led by the proletariat, the reliance on rural base areas and the encirclement of cities by villages, the building of a broad "anti-feudal" national front, and the concept of protracted struggle, have all been specifically acknowledged by no less a figure than Le Duan as being of Chinese origin. "Chinese revolutionary tactics are at present exemplary tactics for many Communists in Asia, Africa, and Latin America." By means of the "creative" application of Chinese tactics, Le Duan goes on, the Vietnamese Communists have been able to guide their revolutionary cause to victory.¹⁴

Not least because of the alleged similarities in social and economic conditions among the underdeveloped countries struggling against American "imperialism," and the general applicability of them of Chinese revolutionary tactics, DRV leaders have emphasized the close identification of the Vietnam war with "the World Peoples' Front against U.S. imperialism."¹⁵ In a recent memorandum castigating Washington's offer to hold unconditional discussions on the Vietnam war, Hanoi noted that the Vietnamese people were not making sacrifices simply for their own cause but "also for the freedom and independence of other peoples, and for world peace."¹⁶ Indeed, the NLF avowedly conceives one of its main tasks to be to "internationalise" its struggle, that is, to make the people of South Vietnam fully aware that their national liberation struggle is part of the "common struggle" throughout the world against imperialism and in favor of "democracy, peace, and social progress."¹⁷ It is no small measure because of this international emphasis that NLF leaders also declare their movement to be the "genuine representative and champion of the South Vietnamese people's present basic interests and aspirations."¹⁸

Today, however, DRV spokesmen no longer think of the Vietnam war simply as a single salient in the "world people's" struggle against American imperialism, but rather as the principal testing ground of that struggle, and hence as a prime example for the anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movement throughout the world. Hanoi's claims in this respect are loudly supported by the Chinese Communists. Peking's defense minister, Lin Piao, in a widely noted address on China's victory over the Japanese in World War II, published early in September 1965, declared that the "struggle of the Vietnamese people against U.S. aggression and for national salvation is now the focus of the struggle of the people of the world against U.S. aggression."¹⁹ But more than a year before, General Giap had already struck a similar note. The "war for liberation" in South Vietnam, he said, was setting an example for other national liberation movements in the way in

¹⁴ Le Duan, *Some Questions Concerning the International Tasks of Our Party* (Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1964), p. 13. Originally delivered before the Ninth Plenum of the Third Central Committee of the Lao Dong Party and published in the February 1964 issue of Hoc Tap.

¹⁵ See, for example, the report of Pham Van Dong to the DRV National Assembly, April 1965, in *Against U.S. Aggression*. Main Documents of the National Assembly of the D.R.V. 3rd Legislature—2nd Session (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, 1964), p. 73.

¹⁶ Vietnam Courier, special issue, September 23, 1965, p. 2.

¹⁷ Ibid., no. 29, June 17, 1965, p. 7.

¹⁸ Lin Piao, *Long Live the Victory of People's War!* (Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965), p. 66.

which a weak and small nation, by means of stubborn struggle, could be victorious over the American "imperialists" and their "special war" (counterguerrilla) strategy. The failure of the American "special war" effort in South Vietnam, Giap declared, "would mean that this war can be defeated anywhere in the world."²⁰

It is difficult to assess the importance of this interpretation of the international significance of the Vietnam war. But there seems to be little doubt that it adds a dimension to Hanoi's war aims, and that this aspect of the struggle is not always taken fully into account by outside observers. To be sure, even for the DRV leaders themselves, Hanoi's self-proclaimed role as the vanguard of a world struggle against United States imperialism doubtless has considerable value simply as propaganda. Even so, one cannot altogether depreciate in this way the kind of statement made by Premier Pham Van Dong to the DRV National Assembly in mid-1964:²¹

"Recently when the Song and Dance Ensemble of the Republic of Guinea visited our country, the head of the Ensemble made a very significant statement: 'The successful Vietnamese revolution against colonialism has given us the determination to persistently carry out revolution in Guinea and Africa. The struggle of the Vietnamese people in the South is also our struggle, and the successes of that struggle are not only those of the Vietnamese people but also those of the Asian-African bloc and of the whole of mankind.'

"We can hear such heartfelt words in every part of Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

More than a year later Pham was still elaborating on the theme when he noted the "deep and broad sympathy and support from the peoples of the world" which the Vietnam "patriotic" struggle was now receiving, including support from various groups in the United States. The movement "for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam is closely coordinated with the struggle for democracy and peace and the struggle against racial discrimination," he said, and added that "This movement is developing."²²

There is one part of the world, however, to which the Hanoi government, by virtue of its geographic location, apparently believes that its concept of the international significance of the war particularly applies. "We must see the situation in the Indochinese peninsula against the background of the general situation in Southeast Asia," Pham Van Dong has emphasized;²³ and, indeed, Southeast Asia has been a focus of DRV policy for a long time. The reasons are not hard to find. Throughout the region there has been a notable upsurge in Communist guerrilla and united front activity as the war in Vietnam itself has begun to intensify. In Laos, the Communist Pathet Lao virtually control the eastern half of the country, and afford important geographic cover for DRV infiltration into South Vietnam. In Northeast Thailand, a new, Peking-backed "Thailand Patriotic Front" has launched a "national liberation" style guerrilla campaign; while in the southern part of the country, along the Thai-Malay border, there have been new attacks by remnants of the (largely

¹⁹ Vo Nguyen Giap, "The South Vietnam People Will Win" (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, 1965), p. 70.

²⁰ Some Documents of the National Assembly of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, 3rd Legislature—1st Session, June-July 1964 (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, 1964), p. 73.

²¹ Vietnam Courier, no. 35, September 9, 1965, p. 5.

²² Pham Van Dong, "Vietnam Ten Years After Geneva," Vietnamese Studies (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Hanoi, 1964), no. 1, p. 55.

Chinese Communist) guerrilla force that formerly operated in the Malayan jungles during the so-called "Emergency" of 1948-1960. In Sarawak, Communist guerrillas (also ethnically Chinese) have been engaged in a terrorist campaign against outlying settlements and police posts for some time. And in Luzon, in the Philippines, the Communist insurgency of the Huks has flared up again.

This is not the place to analyze the various causes behind all these manifestations of Communist violence in Southeast Asia, except to note the specific and strong expressions of support for them emanating from Hanoi. Thus the Pathet Lao have been assured of Hanoi's "militant solidarity," the new Thai "independence movement" has been described as "particularly welcome," and the new upsurge in the Philippines has been "hailed" as an indication that U.S. "imperialism" will be "defeated part by part and finally will meet complete failure."²² While there has been no evidence of direct DRV participation in these developments, Hanoi's interest is clear. It is also obvious that a DRV victory in South Vietnam would give much encouragement to Communist elements involved in these scattered Southeast Asian insurgencies.

V

Thus, seen from Hanoi, the Vietnam war aims not simply at driving American forces out, or at establishing some kind of "truly independent" government in Saigon, as one sometimes hears. DRV war aims go far beyond this and encompass, according to the pronouncements of its own leaders, a phased social and economic revolution in the South, in tandem with the North and directed toward the creation of a Communist state. This revolutionary process specifically acknowledges the use of violence as central and indispensable to ultimate victory. Hanoi's war aims also include development of military and other tactics which will be applicable to Communist insurgency movements in other parts of the world. "If we can do it," Hanoi seems to be saying, "so can you." Herein lies the true significance of the Vietnam war.

INVESTIGATING THE INVESTIGATOR

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a funny thing happened to a Boston, Mass., State senator on his way to investigate the use of wiretapping. His own phones were "bugged," both at his office and at his home.

State Senator Mario Umana is chairman of a special legislative commission on electronic eavesdropping. Apparently the "bug" was discovered when the senator's administrative assistant—carrying on a conversation from his office—suddenly realized that he was also listening in on the senator who was having a personal phone conversation from his own home. Some so-called wiretap "experts" are of the belief that since the crossover occurred between different telephone exchanges, phone conversations from both the home and the office were being led into a wiretapping "plant" where the conversations were intercepted.

Mr. President, must it be that every time we pick up our daily newspaper, another wiretap episode is reported? The situation in Boston is most tragic—especially since Senator Umana is attempt-

ing to investigate the use of these electronic eavesdropping devices.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a report of this case from an article in the May 5, 1966, edition of the Boston Herald.

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

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, May 5, 1966]

SENATE HEAD OF WIRETAP PROBE DISCOVERS HIS PHONES BUGGED (By Ronald Kessler)

The State House and home telephones of a state senator investigating wiretapping are being tapped.

The charge, made by State Sen. Mario Umana, was confirmed by the top law enforcement expert on wiretapping in the state and by a high official of the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, D.C.

Sen. Umana told The Herald he was making a call from his home telephone in East Boston to another telephone in East Boston April 15. At the same time his administrative assistant was talking on the senator's State House telephone to a person in West Newton.

The administrative assistant, Ernest Ratto, Jr., heard Sen. Umana talking on the same line. Ratto gave the receiver to another person in the office, Sanford A. Kowal, a lawyer, and he too heard Umana's voice.

According to the two wiretapping experts contacted by The Herald, the fact that the crossover occurred between different telephone exchanges means conversations over both the senator's State House and home telephones were being led into a wiretapping "plant" where the conversations were intercepted. The wiretap was apparently a sloppy job.

A high-ranking wiretap expert in a state law enforcement agency said, "There is no doubt in the world that his phones are being tapped." The expert said he did not want his name used because it would impair his effectiveness.

In addition, Charles Cowan, FCC chief of the Domestic Service and Facilities Division of the Common Carriers Bureau, said from his Washington office, "I don't see how the incident could have happened unless the phones were being tapped."

Senator Umana is chairman of a special legislative commission on electronic eavesdropping.

The bizarre story came to light Wednesday as other developments unfolded.

A telephone company repairman in a Boston suburb said he personally found "about 30" wiretapping devices attached to lines in the suburb in the past year.

He said the devices were of all types—transmitters, direct connectors, and recording devices attached to lines in homes.

The devices and their services are easily obtained.

Meanwhile, a reporter posing as a prospective client called three detective agencies prominently advertised in the classified telephone directory and asked if they would perform wiretapping for him in a divorce case.

TWO ARE WILLING

Two of the three agencies indicated they would.

One said, "Let's put it this way, it's supposed to be illegal, but come in and talk to us about it and we'll see what can be done."

A check with state and Boston police disclosed the telephone company does not report wiretaps found by telephone company employees, despite the fact that wiretapping is prohibited by state law.

The company did report two instances of wiretapping to the Federal Bureau of Investigation last year.

The information comes from J. I. Hanley, FBI special agent in charge of the New England bureau; Capt. William F. Powers, state police director of public relations, and Department Superintendent William Bradley of the Boston police.

The telephone company has maintained that wiretapping is not widespread. J. M. Gepson, vice president and chief counsel of New England Telephone and Telegraph Co., said in an interview published in the Herald April 22, that only three cases of wiretapping have been uncovered in New England in the past two years.

NO PRECAUTIONS

He also said, in response to questions, that no precautions are taken to prevent tapping of telephone lines used by the governor, attorney general, state police, or other state agencies and officials; that terminal boxes are not locked; routine tests to detect wiretaps are not made; no special code is used when repairmen request information to locate a subscriber's line; and it is "possible" for anyone who knows the proper telephone number to obtain such information.

Telephone lines to some law enforcement agencies in New York City are enclosed in pressurized cables so that a tap can be located immediately.

Gepson was asked where the thousands of wiretapping devices being manufactured and advertised in mail order catalogues are going. He replied, "I don't really know. Probably some of it is used in messy divorce cases and by industry to get trade secrets."

He asserted stricter laws are not needed to cope with wiretapping.

Sen. Umana (D-East Boston) said he was told six months ago by a friend who is a telephone company employee that his lines seemed to be tapped.

He made a complaint to a telephone company lobbyist, but he did not report the April 15 incident because, "It wouldn't do any good. You're not going to get the phone company to tell you your line is being tapped. The prevalent attitude in the Legislature is that legislators' lines are being tapped. You just go on that assumption, because there's nothing you can do."

Umana, a Harvard Law School graduate, has served two terms in the House and six terms in the Senate. He was assistant district attorney of Middlesex County and has a law practice in East Boston.

TELL OF CALL

The Herald interviewed the four parties to the telephone conversation, as well as the fifth person who was asked to listen in.

Here is their story:

At about 10 a.m., April 15, Sen. Umana called from his home telephone (LO 7-3199) at 82 St. Andrew Rd., East Boston, to his brother Guy's telephone (LO 7-9884) at 92 Brooks St., East Boston.

At about the same time a constituent of Senator Umana, Luigi Vuzzi of 39 Orleans Street, East Boston, was calling from his place of employment, the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority in West Newton (969-8751), to Senator Umana's State House line (727-2564). The senator's other three lines were not in use.

As Umana's administrative assistant, Ratto, was talking to Cuzzi, both men heard Senator Umana's voice clearly but not as distinctly as in a normal telephone connection.

Ratto summoned Kowal, counsel to the commission investigating wiretapping, and he also heard Umana. He could not speak to him. When Umana finished his conversation, Ratto and Kowal called him and told him what had happened. Umana confirmed he had just been talking on the telephone.

WILL CALL AGAIN

Umana said Tuesday he intends to request the telephone company and private detec-

²² Vietnam Courier, no. 17, January 7, 1965, p. 8; no. 37, October 7, 1965, p. 7.

tive agencies to appear before future hearings of the wiretapping commission. The commission has subpoena power.

At the legislative group's first hearing April 14, a New York manufacturer of wiretapping devices demonstrated the range of devices being produced.

Umana believes the manufacture and use of such devices should be strictly regulated.

Manufacture of these devices is legal under present statutes.

However, wiretapping is prohibited by the Federal Communications Act of 1934. Penalty is up to a \$10,000 fine or a year in jail, or both.

According to Gepson, no prosecution has ever been initiated in New England under this law.

Wiretapping is prohibited by State law, but it contains a loophole which permits snooping by "corporations subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Utilities of the commonwealth or to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or to employees engaged in the conduct of its business."

WIDE SANCTION

Wiretapping is therefore sanctioned, according to legal experts, for stock brokerage firms, gas, electric, water, telephone, telegraph, railway, bus, trolley, and trucking companies—all under the "jurisdiction" of the State DPU.

In addition, tapping is permitted for all corporations whose trucks or products cross State lines, thereby under the "jurisdiction" of the ICC. Included are department stores, manufacturing and food product firms, and newspapers.

Penalty for infraction of the law is \$1,000 or two years in jail or both.

The first prosecution under this law was completed last week. Earl E. Jaycox, 41, of 212 Davis Street, Springfield, a former telephone company employee, pleaded guilty to four counts of wiretapping.

Jaycox was given a six-month suspended sentence and a year's probation.

RAILROAD MERGERS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, starting in Chicago on May 4 and continuing during forthcoming weeks, the Interstate Commerce Commission is holding hearings and receiving testimony on which it will base an extremely important decision. This will be a decision that will have widespread and long-lasting effects on the Nation's heartland—the great Midwest between the Great Lakes and the Continental Divide and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. The State of South Dakota, by virtue of its location and an economy highly dependent on the preservation of a healthy railroad transportation system, has much at stake in the Commission's decision.

Now before the Commission is a positive and constructive proposal of the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. designed to create a strong competitive regional system which would bolster the economy of the Midwest. North Western seeks to merge with the Rock Island Railroad, another basically midwestern carrier. Both lines have been historically marginal in character with more than two-thirds of the North Western and one-third of the Rock Island overlapping in five Midwestern States: Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, and South Dakota. Obviously, the opportunities are numerous for the two roads

to improve service to the public through elimination of duplicating facilities, increasing car supply through pooling of equipment and other efficiencies stemming from soundly conceived coordination.

By eliminating duplicate facilities which abound in these areas, the combined railroads could function more efficiently, give far better service, and provide more coordinated schedules in keeping with the requirements of modern industry. It is significant that a combination of the two roads could only result in improvement rather than an impairment of needed transportation services.

North Western serves South Dakota with almost 1,500 miles of line. South Dakota, therefore, is deeply concerned and strongly encourages any steps that will result in improving the rail service which will have a major impact on the future of the State's economy, just as it has contributed to the growth of the State in the past.

I am convinced that a North Western-Rock Island combination can only result in what is essential for the Middle West; namely, the development of healthy regional rail systems oriented to the needs of thousands of communities throughout America's heartland of which South Dakota is a part. Such regional systems as the proposed North Western-Rock Island combination would unquestionably strengthen South Dakota's economy, broaden its opportunities to market its products, and also add to its capacity to consume products from other regions.

DESTRUCTION BY STRIP-MINING OPERATIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, strip mining without adequate regulation continues to ravish the Nation's beauty and natural resources. After mining, the broken and poisoned land is often left to nurture poverty, despair, and ugliness. The profits of strip mining are large, and, comparatively, the cost of rehabilitating much of this land is minimal. About 1,750,000 acres have been damaged or destroyed by surface mining for all minerals. To satisfy the country's growing need for electricity, more and more acres will be stripped for cheap coal to fuel the many thermoelectric plants. The Federal Government has too long shirked its responsibility to guide the coal industry in applying responsible mining practices.

Recently, an article published in the New York Times magazine of March 13 came to my attention. It vividly demonstrates the need for Federal regulation of strip and surface mining operations. The article, written by Mr. Harry M. Caudill, is entitled "Paradise Is Stripped" and describes the appalling waste that surrounds a town in a once beautiful Kentucky valley.

RESOURCE DESTRUCTION BY STRIP MINING

Evidence of resource destruction by strip mining has been accumulating for many years. Mr. Caudill's article indicates that an "enlightened industry" has done very little to alleviate the situation.

In many areas, the law condones and encourages destruction of the land and

real and personal property of those who occupy the surface to get at the minerals below. People are deprived of the sanctity of their homes and their means of earning a living. Let me quote two paragraphs from Mr. Caudill's article describing conditions in eastern Kentucky:

With this license to wreck, many operators have proceeded with complete abandon. They have rolled rocks through some homes and have pushed others off their foundations. Many have been demolished by avalanches from the spoil banks. In Knott County, a one-armed miner came home from a retraining program conducted as a part of the war on poverty to find his house and all its contents buried beneath a mammoth landslide.

When a group of mountaineers calling themselves The Appalachian Group to Save The Land and People visited Governor Edward T. Breathitt of Kentucky last June, an 80-year-old woman told him that she had stood on the front porch of her little home and watched the bulldozers invade her family cemetery. She said, "I thought my heart would break when the coffins of my children came out of the ground and went over the hill." This situation prompted one mountaineer to comment that the coal industry digs up the dead and buries the living.

The human anguish caused by these inhumane practices is outrageous.

Mr. Caudill's description of conditions around Paradise, Muhlenberg County, Ky., depicts the typical result of strip or surface mining on a community. Last year Muhlenberg County produced 17.6 million tons of coal—more than any other county in America. The cost has been staggering. He writes:

Paradise is isolated and shrunken, huddled in an appalling waste. Thousands of acres of earth are piled high into ghastly ridges, sometimes black with coal, sometimes brown with sulphur. The streams that wind through this dead landscape are devoid of life.

This is not an isolated picture. It is repeated almost endlessly. Without rehabilitation, the future productivity of these lands is uncertain.

After the strip-mining profit taking is complete, companies move out, leaving desolation and poverty in their wake. Off-site damage also results from strip mining. Silt and sulphuric acid poison streams and destroy farmlands far downstream from the mining operation. Fish and aquatic life die; timber and crops are destroyed; the natural beauty of valleys is scarred; and residents become impoverished.

REHABILITATION IS FEASIBLE

Many European countries are doing a great deal to rehabilitate strip or surface mined land. Mr. Caudill reports that in England, for example, the overburden is carefully saved and then replaced when mining is complete. He writes that costs average about \$1 per ton of coal mined. This is clearly within financial reach of the coal industry and coal users.

Now is the time to start strip and surface mine rehabilitation in earnest. Several States do require strip mine rehabilitation. Those that have effective statutes and adequate enforcement are to be commended. The problem is that many State laws are weak or are not sufficiently flexible to insure good results.

These States are also unlikely to improve inadequate laws for many reasons.

HIGH PROFITS IN STRIP MINING

Much has been written about the high profits to be gained in strip mining the rich coal fields of the Appalachians. Reports are that more than 1.3 billion tons of coal have been mined in Appalachia alone in the past 3 years with a value of nearly \$6 billion. Since 1954, when coal production was at a post-depression low, company incomes have been rising at a fantastic rate—nearly 30 percent in a little over a decade. The land companies that own this mineral wealth, and lease it to strip miners, show enormous profits. They are the highest in American industry. Mr. Caudill reports that one company retains as net profit 61 percent of its income and paid out 45 percent of its gross income as dividends. In contrast, General Motors cleared 10 percent of receipts and paid 5 percent in dividends during the same year.

The principal reason for the rising use of coal is the vast growth in demand for electricity. Cheap, strip-mined coal is, economically, the best fuel for generating it and will remain so for the foreseeable future. Atom-powered plants are seen to supply only 20 percent of the needed electricity in the year 2000 even by the most optimistic estimates.

Huge coal-burning electric plants dot the Appalachians and other eastern coal-fields. They consume enormous quantities of coal supplied from strip mines. As demands for electricity continue to increase, these plants and attendant surface mines are expected to grow in numbers in the East and spread to the extensive Dakota lignite fields.

Mr. President, last October, I introduced a bill, S. 2688, to provide for the regulation of present and future strip mining, for the conservation and reclamation of surface and strip-mined areas.

The bill would create a Mined Lands Conservation Administration in the Department of the Interior. The Secretary of Interior could establish strip-mining regulations and require operators to post bonds and obtain strip-mining licenses. The fee for the annual license and the amount of bond would be set by the Secretary. Penalties are provided for operators who strip mine without the permit or do not conform to established regulations.

There is clear need for the legislation provided by this bill. Because of the urgency of this problem I am asking the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to schedule hearings on the bill.

Mr. Caudill's article vividly describes the seriousness of the situation. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

PARADISE IS STRIPPED

(By Harry M. Caudill)

Descendants of the people who settled in the shallow valley of the Green River founded a small hamlet called Paradise, Ky. It was well-named, for the countryside was green and pleasant and the stream teemed with fish. Game abounded and a man could

live an unworried life, the tedium broken by an occasional visit to the county seat to listen to trials and swap yarns with friends from other parts of Muhlenberg County.

But times have changed. There is still a dot called Paradise on the map of Kentucky but last year Muhlenberg produced 17.6 million tons of coal—more than any other county in America—and the production record was achieved at a staggering cost. Paradise is isolated and shrunken, huddled in an appalling waste. Thousands of acres of earth are piled high into ghastly ridges, sometimes black with coal, sometimes brown with sulphur. The streams that wind through this dead landscape are devoid of life.

Here in western Kentucky, part of America's Eastern Interior coal field, the mineral lies near the surface, and the region has fallen prey to strip mining on an immense scale. Strip mining is as easy as it is ruthless. It simply tears the earth apart stratum by stratum in order to rip out the minerals. Conventional tunnel and pillar mining leaves the surface relatively undisturbed, but striping totally disrupts the land and its ecology.

In a typical Appalachian operation the development may proceed in two or more seams of coal at different levels in a mountain. The uppermost seam may be laid bare by the violent expedient of blasting away the entire overlying crest—a process known to the industry as "casting the overburden." Lower down, the seam is exposed or "faced" by bulldozing and dynamiting the timber and soil away from the coal. The uprooted trees, loose dirt and shattered stone are pushed down the slope. The coal is loosened by light explosive charges, scooped up with power shovels and loaded onto giant trucks for hauling to the nearest railroad loading docks.

Where the terrain is level or gently rolling, the bulldozers and power shovels scrape away the dirt to expose the rock layer roofing the coal. The stone is then shattered with dynamite and lifted by immense shovels or draglines onto the spoil heaps, accumulations that sometimes rise almost sheer to a height of 200 feet. Several acres of the fuel may be bared in this manner before smaller shovels begin loading it onto the trucks.

One gigantic shovel owned by the Peabody Coal Company is as tall as a 17-story building and has become a major tourist attraction. Thousands of people drive out of their way to watch it devastate the American land.

A traveler comes in along the new Kentucky Turnpike from The Bluegrass, where the lawns and fields are manicured and the miles of wooden fences gleam with fresh white paint. There the influence of the early German immigrants lives on, and in the counties around Lexington it is easy to conclude that the nation's heritage in its land is being safely guarded.

The turnpike carries the traveler through a line of lovely low hills into the west Kentucky plain. The land thins as it flattens. Muhlenberg County was never high-quality farm land, but it was adequate, and with constructive farm practices and enlightened forestry it had a substantial and permanent potential. By no stretch of the imagination did it warrant the destruction to which it has been subjected.

Aggravating the shock that accompanies one's visit to Paradise is the realization that this is TVA country and TVA is the nation's benchmark in land conservation. Two billion dollars have gone into TVA projects and a vast amount of favorable propaganda has accompanied its every venture. Millions of Americans assume that the TVA territory is in good hands.

At Paradise, TVA assumes tangible form in an enormous coal-burning electric power plant, built at a cost of \$183 million. It consumes 12,000 tons of coal daily. Modern, automated, gigantic, the plant towers above

a desolation created by its insatiable appetite for fuel. Just beyond the steel fences which surround it the desert begins. Within sight of the plant Peabody's machines rip the tortured earth while gargantuan trucks rush the coal to the voracious "cyclone" furnaces.

T.V.A. has two faces. One is composed of the green hills around Knoxville, enriched with cheap Government fertilizer and green with pines planted with Government subsidies. It sparkles with T.V.A. lakes and hums with profits from a multitude of new industries attracted by a pleasant climate, abundant water, flood control and dirt-cheap electricity. But T.V.A.'s other face is less pleasing to contemplate. The agency generates much more electricity from coal than from its hydro-electric dams and fuel-buying policies have long been the subject of bitter controversy. By insisting on rock-bottom coal prices for its growing string of huge steam plants it has stimulated strip mining enormously.

T.V.A. is the nation's biggest coal consumer and its purchasing policies have set the pace for the market elsewhere. Despite a general inflation, coal prices have remained stationary for 15 years. Squeezed by rising costs of machines and labor, countless underground pits have been forced to close. Strip mines have been able to hold the price line and meet T.V.A.'s bid requirements. Therein lies the tragedy of Paradise. And therein lies similar tragedy for hundreds of other communities elsewhere in America—and, ultimately, enduring tragedy for all Americans.

A few years ago, oil and gas interests confidently assumed that theirs were the modern fuels. Coal was "old-fashioned." In burning, it left a residue of ashes, soot and grit. The industry was archaic—fragmented into hundreds of small companies, undercapitalized and plagued with labor troubles. Obviously the future belonged to other fuels.

But coal has staged an amazing comeback. The demand for electricity has grown enormously—and for most of America coal is the best fuel for generating it. The most optimistic proponents of atomic power estimate that nuclear generating plants will be able to meet no more than 20 percent of the nation's electric needs by the end of the century.

From a post-depression low in 1954, coal production had climbed 5 percent by 1960. Then the market zoomed another 5 per cent in 1961 and nearly as much in 1962. In 1963, the gain was 6.5 per cent and in 1964 it was more than 7 per cent. Economists now predict that by 1970 the coal industry will be producing at 100 per cent of present capacity.

According to the United States Bureau of Mines, more than 1.3 billion tons of coal, valued at about \$6-billion, have been mined in Appalachia alone in the past three years. This year production is expected to reach 500 million tons. New pits are being opened, and most of the new production will come from "surface mining"—a euphemism dreamed up by the industry's public-relations firm.

The Appalachian coal field extends through Pennsylvania, West Virginia, eastern Kentucky, western Virginia, eastern Tennessee and northern Alabama. This mountain range is one of the richest resource areas in the continent—rich with coal, oil, natural gas, sandstone, limestone, low-grade iron ore, water, timber-growing potential and marvelous scenery. The hunters and wilderness scouts who first penetrated the gaps never beheld a land more enchantingly beautiful than the wooded Appalachian hills and hollows on a misty morning.

With wise management of its resources, Appalachia could have been the richest part of America today. Instead, it has become synonymous with poverty of land and people. But Appalachian destitution did not

occur by accident. It is the result of nearly a century of remorseless exploitation.

The timber stands were bought up by Eastern lumber companies, and the forests were cut down, sawed up, and shipped away in a barbarous manner which totally disregarded the capacity of the land to regenerate the stands. Few healthy seed trees were spared, and today the woods consist mainly of low-grade stock which the lumbermen have culled many times.

But the disastrous exploitation of timber never equaled that which characterized the coal interests. Traditionally, America's industrial muscle has rested on Appalachian coal seams, and mining has garnered huge fortunes for Philadelphia, Boston, Detroit, Cincinnati, New York, and Chicago.

From the beginning, coal companies displayed a reckless contempt for the earth. Near their tipplers they piled up tremendous culm heaps which they never troubled to vegetate. They poured—and continue to pour—immeasurable quantities of mine wastes into streams. Hundreds of them permitted the inhabitants of their towns to use waterways as dumping grounds for garbage and trash.

Their investment in schools and other local facilities was held to an absolute minimum. All proposals to impose severance taxes on minerals for support of local facilities and services were beaten. As successive generations of extractors prospered, they withdrew from the region, taking their money with them and leaving new accumulations of ugliness and poverty behind.

The coal industry's lack of responsibility has culminated in today's strip mining. A flight along the Appalachian crest from Pennsylvania to Alabama reveals the awesome scope of the depredations. For hundreds of miles one passes over lands churned into darkening death.

In Pennsylvania alone, 250,000 acres have been left as bleak and barren as the Sahara. As the hills steepen to the southward, contour strip mining begins. In West Virginia and in eastern Kentucky, whole valleys have been wrecked. Gigantic cuts are made at the face of the coal seam, the "highwalls" sometimes rising 90 feet straight up. The broken timber, shattered rock and dirt are shoved over the steep slopes, to be carried by the rains into streams and onto farm lands.

In Ohio, 202,000 acres in a half-dozen counties have been churned by the machines. Ohio's Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, a stanch friend of business, has repeatedly denounced the strippers who are ruining so much of his state. So complete is the devastation that in some areas once-valuable farmlands can now be bought for as little as 25 cents per acre.

In Wise County, Virginia, the coal lies near the hilltops and many mountains have been decapitated—turned into flat-topped mesas. In eastern Tennessee, where the seams are thin and the mountains a bit less steep, the damage subsides somewhat. Nonetheless, the hills which T.V.A. was established to save lie scarred as if by a monstrous whip.

In the Eastern Interior coal field the creeping ruin has spread across western Kentucky and far into Indiana and Illinois. Seventy-five thousand acres in Indiana have been ravaged. In Illinois, 105,000 acres embracing some of the world's best cornland have been turned upside down.

And the ravages of strip mining are spreading to other coal fields farther west. In North Dakota, the Truax-Traer Coal Company is strip-mining three million tons of lignite coal annually for the giant new power plant of the Basin Electric Power Cooperative. Using an ingenious device called the "launched-hammer mining wheel," the operation is incredibly swift and efficient. With the growing demand for electricity on the West Coast and the spread of extra-high-voltage transmission lines to carry the prod-

uct from generator to consumer, the vast lignite fields in the Dakotas are likely to be wrecked on a gigantic scale in the next two or three decades.

In addition, there is talk of cooking Colorado shales for their petroleum. If this occurs, the shales will be recovered by strip mining, and the beautiful hills of Colorado will face the extinction that now threatens so much of the Appalachian range.

What kind of corporations commit this murder of the landscape? One might suppose them to be obscure entities whose managers have not yet learned that in the 20th century it is good business to preserve that which cannot be replaced.

Not so. Many of the great strippers are subsidiaries of well-known American corporations—Bethlehem Steel, Republic Steel, Inland Steel, Interlake Steel, Weirton Steel, Youngstown Steel and Tube and United States Steel. Their advertisements proclaim an enlightened concern for the perpetuation of the American way of life, but in Appalachian valleys they ruthlessly kill the land on which future generations of Americans must depend. The most brutal example of corporate irresponsibility lies on the Poor Fork of the Cumberland River in Harlan County, Kentucky, where the United States Coal and Coke Company has shattered the Big Black Mountain for more than 20 miles, reducing much of this noble terrain feature to a rubble heap.

The coal companies' profits are fantastic. Pittsburgh-Consolidation Coal Corporation earned \$19,420,000 in 1955 and \$44,470,000 in 1964. The profits of Glen Alden Corporation rose from \$40,000 a decade ago to \$6,000,000 a year ago. Peabody Coal enjoyed a profit increase in the same decade from \$9,430,000 to \$30,470,000. Ayrshire Collieries increased its net income from \$2,520,000 to \$5,790,000. The profits of Pittston Coal Company zoomed from \$2,190,000 to \$13,720,000 in the same decade.

The land companies that own the mineral wealth and lease it to strip miners show the most profitable balance sheets in American industry. In 1964, the Virginia Coal and Iron Corporation retained as net profits 61 per cent of its income and paid out 45 per cent of its gross income as dividends. This record was equaled by another huge land company, the Kentucky River Coal Corporation. By contrast, in the same year, General Motors cleared a dime out of each dollar received and paid out in dividends.

And what of the people whose communities are shredded for cheap coal? Obviously, ruined lands must be abandoned, and the strip-mined counties all have shown sharp population declines. A million people have moved out of Appalachia in the past 10 years, and the Eastern Interior field has fared little better. As subterranean mining declined, thousands of families passed onto the public assistance rolls. Today, welfare, not mining, provides most of the money spent by families in the nation's coal fields.

In Appalachia, exploitation has reduced a once-proud and even violent people to the most passive and trampled-upon part of the American population. Passivity has reached its ultimate depths in eastern Kentucky, where whole communities have been impoverished and debased with scarcely a protest. There, coal companies often own the minerals underlying the lands of farmers and the state's highest court has ruled that the companies have the right to destroy the land in order to get out the minerals.

With this license to wreck, many operators have proceeded with complete abandon. They have rolled rocks through some homes and have pushed others off their foundations. Many have been demolished by avalanches from the spoil banks. In Knott County, a one-armed coal miner came home from a retraining program conducted as a part of the war on poverty to find his house

and all its contents buried beneath a mammoth landslide.

When a group of mountaineers calling themselves The Appalachian Group To Save the Land and People visited Gov. Edward T. Breathitt of Kentucky last June, an 80-year-old woman told him that she had stood on the front porch of her little home and watched the bulldozers invade her family cemetery. She said: "I thought my heart would break when the coffins of my children come out of the ground and went over the hill." This situation prompted one mountaineer to comment that the coal industry digs up the dead and buries the living.

But even in the Kentucky Mountains, suffering and patience have their limits. In the Clear Creek community, women copied the tactics of civil-rights demonstrators and stopped the strippers by lying down in front of their bulldozers. They were promptly hauled off to jail, but the machines are still stalled by recalcitrant mountaineers determined to save their lands from ruin—and themselves from total impoverishment.

America is not alone in its craving for coal or in facing the problems growing out of strip mining. In Europe, postwar reconstruction has seen a Socialist Government in Great Britain and a Communist Government in Czechoslovakia authorize the demolition of whole towns to get at the coal beneath them. In England, strip miners have gone to a depth of 700 feet—500 feet deeper than anything yet attempted in America.

But European national coal boards have demonstrated that complete reclamation of strip-mined sites is possible. In England, for example, the topsoil is carefully scraped off and saved in separate heaps. Next, the subsoil is pushed aside and similarly isolated. So is the rock above the coal. At the end of the operation, the rock goes back into the pit first; then the subsoil is pushed in; finally, the topsoil is restored to its original site. The restored land is compacted as it is replaced. After it is contoured, it is fertilized and treated with limestone. It then undergoes an intensive five-year agricultural restoration treatment. Most of the land is returned to agriculture; the rest is planted in timber. Total cost averages about \$1 a ton of coal recovered. These achievements demonstrate that "total reclamation" on the right terrain is within easy reach of American industry.

In 1875, California outlawed hydraulic gold mining, on the ground that it silted streams and caused the flooding of valuable farmlands. This type of mining was comparatively harmless when compared with coal stripping, but it is unlikely that any of the states will face up so squarely to our modern problems. In the coal states, legislatures are composed in the main of little men who yield easily to blandishments and enticements, and the coal industry is rich and ruthless.

For years, Pennsylvania had the strictest reclamation law. It required operators to obtain stripping permits and to post bonds to assure reclamation of the land in accordance with a state-approved plan. But when the stripped land is very steep, a bond guarantees only the impossible—a situation comparable to authorizing rape on assurance that the rapist will afterward restore his victim's virginity.

Early this year, conservationists all over America watched with admiration the efforts of Kentucky's young Governor Breathitt to tighten his state's reclamation law. The act, as amended, authorizes the Kentucky enforcement agency to require strippers in mountainous eastern Kentucky to drag part of the soil off the spoil banks and use it to cover the perpendicular highwalls, reducing them to a slope not exceeding 45 degrees. In western Kentucky, the mined land must be shaped so that it can be traversed by farm machinery. All disturbed

lands must be seeded to a prescribed vegetative cover or, in the mountains, planted with approximately 800 seedling trees for each acre.

To these modest and reasonable requirements the coal industry responded with outraged bellows. Scores of lobbyists descended on the State House. Huge funds were collected from operators and their suppliers for the avowed purpose of defeating the bill. Governor Breathitt spoke out against improper pressures upon legislators and the bill passed by a comfortable margin—the severest public setback ever suffered by any segment of the coal industry in Kentucky.

While Breathitt remains Governor, strict enforcement is to be expected, but his administration is likely to be exceptional. The state has had a reclamation statute since 1954, but it has been generally ignored, and it is to be feared that future state administrations will emulate this leniency.

Elsewhere in Appalachia, Virginia, Tennessee and Alabama have never bothered even to enact reclamation statutes. In the Eastern Interior field, only Illinois has any sort of reclamation law. In the Western field, such legislation has never been seriously considered.

If governmental power is to save the American land, it must be Federal power backed by a strong national will and conscience. The American population is growing rapidly; estimates of the United States Bureau of the Census indicate a population of 300 million by the year 2000. The nation's land base cannot grow by a single inch, but it can be effectively diminished by industrial processes which include not only strip mining for coal but quarrying, borrow pits, opencast iron mining and similar operations. Under any enlightened philosophy, the present occupants of the land hold it in trust for future generations and are under a positive obligation to pass it on in a tolerable state.

The blight of strip mining does not stop at the edge of the spoil banks. When freshly exposed, the soil is hot with sulphuric acid: for years nothing can grow on it. In the meantime, the sulphur and mud wash into streams, killing aquatic life and piling up in horrible weed-grown banks. The long-range cost of dredging the Mississippi and its tributaries of this coal-flecked debris will be astronomical—a burden all Federal taxpayers will share.

In my opinion, the Great Society should enunciate a clear-cut policy relative to extractive industry and its distorted practices of social accounting. Based on need and historical experience, strip mining should be permitted in those areas where terrain and weather permit complete reclamation—that is, in flat or gently rolling country. In West Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and most of Pennsylvania, coal can be extracted cheaply and efficiently by this method, and the same machines which rip the earth can heal the scars. Following British practice, the land can be restored to its original condition and perhaps, even improved. If funds are made available for the purpose, and if the State and Federal Governments make certain it occurs, intensive treatment with fertilizers, limestone and leguminous plants and trees can restore the land to beauty and usefulness. Such costs should be borne by industry as part of the price of coal.

At the same time, it should be recognized that in most of Appalachia the land is simply too steep, too rough, too rugged, and the rainfall is too heavy, to permit restoration. When a hill is decapitated or flayed, the topsoil vanishes first. There is no feasible way to separate the rock, subsoil and topsoil and then to restore them to the pits in their natural order. In such terrain, and with the precipitation, freezing and thawing natural to the region, to strip mine is to destroy. Unless technological advances make possible

a complete reclamation of mountainous land, national policy should outlaw strip mining in such terrain.

The technology of subterranean mining has made fabulous strides in the last two decades. Continuous mining machines, roof-bolting devices, battery-powered coal cars, improved ventilating techniques and strict enforcement of the Federal mine safety code have not only made the miner's life easier and safer but increased his productivity more than twofold. Coal from tunneled mines must sell for a little more per ton than that from strip mines, but the difference is a small price to pay for the preservation of the land.

The third feature of the national policy should provide an effective program for the reclamation of "orphan banks"—old strip mines worked out and abandoned long ago. Congress should appropriate funds for the purchase of these lands, and they should be smoothed and revegetated. When so restored, they could be sold, and the proceeds applied in payment of the Government's investment.

The same policy should apply to lands pitted by taconite mining in northern Minnesota, and to other areas where industries extract minerals by open-cast mining. Such rules would require only that the generation which damages the land—and benefits thereby—would pay for restoration, instead of future generations which, in all probability, will have enough problems of their own making.

To date, in the mining of all minerals, 1.75 million acres have been destroyed or severely damaged by surface mining. Some 400,000 of these acres are officially classified by state agencies as "reclaimed land," though often there is not a blade of grass or a seedling tree to support the claim.

The hour is late and the agony of the land is intense. Most Americans have long assumed that the waste of resources was curbed and that victory over greed and wantonness was achieved in the days of Theodore Roosevelt. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Shocking as were the mass slaughters of the American bison and the passenger pigeon, they were no more grotesque than the present destruction.

As wealth multiplies, hordes of Americans will purchase country retreats and seek quiet areas for recreation and leisure. Someday, every acre will be needed for its food and fiber. Unless we act now our grandchildren may inherit vast man-made deserts, devoid of life, polluted with acids, hideous to the eye, baked by the sun and washed by the rains. If this is their heritage, they will curse us so long as the deserts remain to monumentalize our greed and folly.

Continued silence by the national Administration on this urgent issue is inconsistent with the dream of a Great Society. It is, in fact, inconsistent with simple patriotism and basic common sense, for unless the land lives the people must perish.

BASIC HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the St. Petersburg, Fla., Times believes that all Americans should be proud of what this Nation has done in the past 12 years to guarantee basic human rights to all its people.

Speaking of the latest administration proposals on civil rights, the newspaper states "the President's requests would plug the largest gap remaining in America's civil rights legislation."

It adds:

We hope the President's proposal wins the support of majorities of both the Democratic and Republican parties, as did the other great civil rights acts, and that Congress will enact the new law without delay.

This editorial comment will interest many, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Apr. 30, 1966]

MORE TO BE DONE

Every American should be proud to have lived during the last 12 years.

No nation has done more in that time to guarantee basic human rights to all its people.

We have accomplished a lot. The doctrine of "separate but equal" schools, which never existed, has been exposed and discarded. Slow but steady progress toward school desegregation has been made. Discrimination in other public facilities has all but ended. In public accommodations and employment practices, it has been outlawed. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 tore down the walls built in some Southern states around their voting booths.

We've come far. But there's more to be done because discrimination still divides our nation. That's the goal of the new laws requested of Congress Thursday by President Johnson.

The President asked for four advances:

A declaration of national policy from Congress against racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing.

Changes in federal criminal statutes to protect all citizens from violence in the exercise of their rights to vote, go to school, travel, serve on juries, etc.

Banishment of discrimination in selection of federal juries and encouragement to state courts to do the same.

Broader powers for the attorney general to prosecute school desegregation violations.

The fair housing proposal promises to be the most controversial of the requests. Southern lawmakers began shouting "unconstitutional" immediately. Their protests overlooked Congress's clear authority, plus existing law.

In 1866 Congress passed a law saying: "All citizens of the United States shall have the right in every state and territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold and convey real and personal property."

By passing another fair housing act 100 years later, Congress merely will be modernizing a statute already on the books.

If states enforced their own criminal laws, additional federal statutes would be unnecessary. The sad truth, especially in Alabama and Mississippi, is that prosecutions have not been brought in racial killings. We would much prefer that state and local officials perform in such a way that no prosecutions would ever be necessary under federal law. However, that has not been the case in the recent past. We look forward to the day when all states learn that the way to maintain a balanced federal system is to enforce state laws impartially, a fact as applicable to Florida as any other state.

President Johnson's proposals on jury discrimination drive that point home. He wants discrimination prohibited by law in federal and state courts. He wants detailed guidelines for federal juries. But for state courts, the general legislation will be supported only by authority for suits against jury discrimination.

Here again, the first responsibility remains with states.

Together, the President's requests would plug the largest gaps remaining in America's civil rights legislation.

We hope the President's proposal wins the support of majorities in both the Democratic and Republican parties, as did the other great civil rights acts, and that Congress will enact

the new law without delay. Mr. Johnson pointedly called this a 1966 package.

COMMUNIST PLANS FOR GUERRILLA WARFARE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we have a tendency not uncommon in all men to believe that the bell tolls for others, but never for us. We sincerely lament the problems which other nations face, but in the deep recesses of our own minds we believe that this cannot happen here.

Thus, many thoughtful Americans have been prone to regard the recent Havana conference which called for the support and stimulation of "wars of national liberation" in the underdeveloped world as something of only indirect concern to themselves.

The fact is, however, that the guerrilla warfare which world communism is now planning for Asia, Latin America, and Africa, is being planned for New York, Los Angeles, and other areas in our country.

This point is made in telling and forceful manner by Phillip Abbott Luce, a one-time leader of the "new left" who was associated with the Progressive Labor Movement from April 1963 until January 1965. He and his wife, a former copy editor for Progressive Labor Party newspapers, broke with the organization because of its terror tactics and advocacy of violence.

Although many pressures and gross injustices caused much of the discontent which spilled over into violence in Harlem and in Los Angeles, there was also an effort by professional agitators to take advantage of these justifiable grievances. Concerning this, Abbott writes:

Once the Harlem riots reached their peak the Progressive Labor leadership considered spreading the chaos to other parts of the city. The editor of *Challenge*, the Progressive Labor weekly newspaper, signed an editorial published during the riots which stated: "The vision of half a million or a million angry black men and women, supported by allies in the Puerto Rican and other working class communities, standing up to their oppressors, is haunting the ruling class. People have already begun to speak of guerrilla warfare and revolutionaries."

Mr. Luce also discussed the recent association of American leftist groups with the Havana Conference, pointing out that American protest groups have direct affiliation with and affinity to the group of Communist guerrilla organizations which met in Havana. He writes:

Progressive Labor's latest contact with the world guerrilla movements came when it sent Rick Rhoades, in violation of passport regulations, to the Tri-Continental Conference in Havana in January. Rhoades, who previously had been sent to City College in New York by Progressive Labor to head up the May Second Movement there, shared the spotlight with Robert Williams as the only invited observers from the United States. Upon his return to New York, Rhoades reported on his various meetings with guerrilla leaders at two closed meetings of Progressive Labor. Rhoades also admitted having had conferences with the Viet Cong about plans to try to increase agitation in this country against the war in Vietnam and also made contacts with the Chinese about the possibility of a trip to that country by a group of young Americans.

I would like to share with my colleagues this important article which appears in the April 11 issue of Washington Report published by the American Security Council and, therefore, ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Report, Apr. 11, 1966]
COMMUNIST PLANS FOR GUERRILLA WARFARE
IN THE U.S.

(NOTE.—Guest editor, Phillip Abbott Luce, one-time leader of the "New Left" was associated with the Progressive Labor Movement from April 1963 until January 1965. He and his wife, a former copy editor for PLP newspapers, broke with the organization because of its terror tactics and advocacy of violence. He has since cooperated with government agencies and has just completed a book for the David McKay Company entitled "The New Left.")

At this moment, while Communist forces throughout the world are engaged in attempts to overthrow a number of governments, here, in the United States, the Progressive Labor Party (PLP) and the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM) are actively involved in the first-step operations of guerrilla warfare. Both of these groups are storing arms, training people in sabotage and terrorism and actively preparing a group of people to institute armed insurrection.

Progressive Labor, acting in its capacity as the American arm of the Chinese Communist International, has prepared a number of its members for any eventuality. During the summer of 1964 the PLP initiated a plan dividing various "trusted" members into secret groups of four and then preparing them to go "underground" if a police crackdown became imminent. The PLP members were not simply to change their names and alter their physical appearance but also were to use the weapons provided to aid and promote a guerrilla operation in those cities where Progressive Labor had any strength, such as in New York and San Francisco.

THE PLP'S ROLE IN THE 1964 HARLEM RIOTS

When Harlem erupted that same summer the Progressive Labor leader there, Bill Epton, used his previous training to instigate further rioting. He actually trained people in the techniques of preparing and using Molotov cocktails. Epton is presently out on bond, pending the appeal of the one-year prison sentence he received as a result of his role in the riots.

Once the Harlem riots reached their peak the Progressive Labor leadership considered spreading the chaos to other parts of the city. The editor of *Challenge*, the Progressive Labor weekly newspaper, signed an editorial published during the riots which stated: "The vision of half-a-million—or a million—angry black men and women, supported by allies in the Puerto Rican and other working class communities, standing up to their oppressors, is haunting the ruling class. People have already begun to speak of 'guerrilla warfare' and 'revolutionaries'."

The only reason that Progressive Labor did not try to spread the riots to New York's Lower East Side was later explained to us at a secret meeting of the Progressive Labor National Committee. Alice Jerome, the head of Progressive Labor's club on the Lower East Side explained: "We felt that we could not carry an action through with any kind of success or value, other than a blood bath. * * * If the opportunity comes again—the big question is how to consolidate whatever gains are made."

GUERRILLA TRAINING "UNDERGROUND"

By December 1964 the Progressive Labor leadership had embarked on yet another "underground" program which was to include a trip abroad during which the members would receive further training in guerrilla techniques. Today this program is operative; a number of Progressive Labor people have already dropped from sight. Jake Rosen, a former member of the Communist Party, USA, a traveler to China (1958), and the man responsible for bringing a number of guns to New York from the South, is in charge of this "underground" project. (Rosen casually left a wife behind when he went into hiding nearly a year ago.)

Progressive Labor's latest contact with the world guerrilla movements came when it sent Rick Rhoades, in violation of passport regulations, to the Tri-Continental Conference in Havana in January. Rhoades, who previously had been sent to City College in New York by Progressive Labor to head up the May Second Movement there, shared the spotlight with Robert Williams as the only "invited observers" from the United States. Upon his return to New York Rhoades reported on his various meetings with guerrilla leaders at two closed meetings of Progressive Labor. Rhoades also admitted to having had conferences with the Viet Cong about plans to try to increase agitation in this country against the war in Vietnam and also made contacts with the Chinese about the possibility of a trip to that country by a group of young Americans. Such a trip would violate current State Department travel regulations.

RAM

The other organization in the United States that is preparing to launch a guerrilla warfare operation is the Revolutionary Action Movement. Founded in Philadelphia in the winter of 1963, RAM is headed by Max Standford and Robert Franklin Williams. RAM is active in the large city ghettos and has a hard-core membership of about 250 people. RAM closely follows Williams who is listed as its "Chairman-in-Exile" and as the "Premier of the African-American-Government-in-Exile." Williams acknowledged his role while speaking in Hanoi in November, 1964: "As a representative of the Revolutionary Action Movement, I am here to give support to the Vietnamese people in their struggle against U.S. imperialist aggression."

Nearly a year ago a group of RAM followers attempted to destroy a number of national shrines and had planned a bombing raid on the nation's capital before they were rounded up by the New York police. The three Americans involved in this bizarre plot were all members of the Black Liberation Front which was formed in Cuba during the summer of 1964. This Black Liberation Front was merely a "front" operation for RAM. Even the extreme leftwing has now admitted this fact. Robert Taber, one of the founders of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and still an apologist for Fidel Castro, documents this relationship in his book on guerrilla warfare, "The War of the Flea."

Max Standford has made it perfectly clear that RAM favors any means to wrest control of the government from "white" people. Writing in the Detroit, Mich., monthly, Correspondence, he relates that RAM was informed by "Afro-Americans who favored Robert F. Williams and the concept of organized violence." He stated that the philosophy of RAM was "revolutionary nationalism and just plain blackism."

One Detroit group which amalgamated with RAM is UHURU which means "freedom" in Swahili. The program of UHURU was described by one of its leaders, who also traveled to Cuba in 1964, as "Mao Maoist. We are strong supporters of the Chinese. If you're in doubt of any position we have, look it up in Peking Review."

RAM AND THE RED CHINESE

Although the RAMers advocate strong support for the Chinese revolutionary philosophy they cannot be considered a part of the official Chinese Communist International. While Progressive Labor has a number of direct contacts (including financial ones) with the Chinese Communist government, the Revolutionary Action Movement is not considered by the Chinese as their American agent. RAM utilizes a philosophy that is a strange mixture of black nationalism, white hatred, misread Marxism and kamikaze radicalism. They idolize the Chinese because of the rhetoric they use and because the Chinese are a part of the "colored" world.

TERROR IN THE CITIES

RAM has been explicit in its outline of how it will take power in this country. Advocating a guerrilla war different in nature from that described in the writings of Mao and the Chinese, RAM envisions using the urban areas as the base of operations. The revolutionaries in RAM believe that the black ghetto areas of our major cities hold the key to a successful guerrilla war. They specifically propose that black people be organized into small guerrilla units which will use the night to spread terror through a city. According to the plans of RAM, terror will be the major weapon—terror which will, in turn, lead to a demoralization of the will of the government. Bombs will be placed in New York's Grand Central Station or other public places; key personalities will be assassinated; snipers will indiscriminately murder innocent citizens; theatres will be fired.

Max Stanford puts it this way in a recent issue of "Black America," RAM's official publication: "When war breaks out in the country, if the action is directed toward taking over institutions of power and 'complete annihilation of the racist capitalistic oligarchy' then the black revolution will be successful. * * * The revolution will 'strike by night and spare none.' Mass riots will occur in the day with the Afro-Americans blocking traffic, burning buildings, etc. Thousands of Afro-Americans will be in the street fighting: for they will know that this is it."

RAM'S GUERRILLA WAR: A RACIAL CIVIL WAR

This type of guerrilla warfare might be destructive in terms of men and money but it could not possibly succeed. One of the major ingredients of such guerrilla action is to confuse and isolate your opponent (in this case, the government) by keeping it from knowing the enemy. RAM, however, is proposing a racial civil war that would be a battle of black versus white. Under these conditions they would hope that the enemy would be misidentified and that some whites would react violently against the innocent Negro majority, thereby intensifying the struggle. Immediate terror tactics might be effectively utilized by the black revolutionaries but in the long run they would be involved in kamikaze action.

Fortunately, it should be stressed that RAM has not made any significant inroads into the Negro community but rather, has been disavowed by most Negro leaders.

While neither RAM nor the Progressive Labor Party is in any position to topple the American government in the near future, the very fact that they are preparing for some type of insurrectional action places them well outside the pale of democratic politics. And while our security agencies can control both groups, it is important to note that the Communist plan of guerrilla wars includes the United States itself.

EVALUATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS OPERATIONS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Reporter Felton West, of the Houston Post has just completed a most thoughtful, pierc-

ing analysis and evaluation of Neighborhood Youth Corps operations.

Mr. West is a former Washington correspondent for the Post and his work is well known and widely appreciated here. In order that his observations may be available to other interested Senators and Federal officials, I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 24, 1966]

BOONS AND BOONDOGGLES: YOUTH CORPS LOADED WITH ABUSES, ERRORS

(By Felton West)

When the federal war on poverty was started on such a large scale and a crash basis in 1964, critics predicted there would be a lot of snafus and mistakes.

The operations of the new Neighborhood Youth Corps bear out the critics' predictions.

A lot, but not all, of the bugs have been worked out of the new program. It seems to be working fairly well now and to be generally accomplishing its purpose.

Its local projects have been boons to the communities where they have operated.

But as antipoverty projects, some of them could only have been considered boondoggles. Until this year, the Youth Corps' rolls contained a good number of enrollees for whom Congress never intended the program.

As a poverty-fighting effort the Youth Corps has been abused in many parts of the country by enrollment of middle and upper-income family youths.

Although worse abuse has been found in other states, the program has not been free of misuse in Texas.

One of the worst examples of the Youth Corps in action in Texas in its early days was in Pasadena, where the city ran a project last summer that, by almost any standard of poverty-fighting, was a boondoggle. Many enrollees were far above the so-called "poverty level."

In Morris County, in far Northeast Texas, there was a similar program.

At La Grange, a high percentage of the youths failed to meet federal family-income-based enrollment standards when they were finally spelled out in terms of a poverty program.

In several other Texas projects among 14 surveyed by the Houston Post, there had been instances of ineligibility.

As of March 14, there were 108 different Youth Corps projects operating in Texas with enrollments totaling 21,281. Since the first Texas projects were started in late 1964, about 28,000 Texas youths have served in the corps.

The program is gaining popularity fast. Applications that would employ about 30,000 more Texans are pending in federal offices.

Dr. R. L. Williams, deputy director of the five-state Youth Corps regional office at Dallas, said he had no statistics on how many ineligibles have been in the corps in Texas. He guessed that "5 to 10 percent, closer to 5 percent" of the Texas enrollees—perhaps as many as 1,500 youths—were declared ineligible and dismissed last fall when federal income standards were enforced.

Williams said he would not consider the record bad. A long time school administrator and retired superintendent of schools at Corpus Christi, Williams said that "we'd be due an 'A' if we had no more than 6 to 7 percent (ineligible)" because "that much error was not bad error when I taught school."

However, there were other enrollees in Texas projects last summer who would never have qualified under the income standards—including some middle-income-bracket-fam-

ily members—but were never declared ineligible because their programs ended before the standards were applied.

No estimate of the number of these can be made, but in certain projects the percentage was high.

Flagrant abuses of the Youth Corps were found in Rhode Island last year by the probing Providence Journal-Bulletin. That newspaper found widespread enrollment of children from middle or high-income families; enrollment of some college students, for whom the Youth Corps was not meant; rejection of eligible youths because they had no job skills, which is supposed to be no handicap to NYC employment; employment of youths on jobs at church camps and parish houses, which is clearly forbidden by the Economic Opportunity Act; and full-time employment by Youth Corps projects with federal funds of city officials who had never left their city jobs.

The Reporter magazine recently quoted Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, chairman of the House appropriations subcommittee responsible for the Youth Corps budget, as saying he believed that as many as three-fourths of the NYC projects in the nation might have contained abuses similar to those in Rhode Island. Not enough independent investigation of the Youth Corps nationwide has been made to show if this is true.

Other instances of abuse have been reported in Boston, Kansas City, Kan., Bellevue, Neb., Wilmington, Del., Carlinville, Ill., New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago.

Leonard Burchman, special assistant to Youth Corps Director Jack Howard in Washington, told the Post the corps has made no statistics on how many enrollees have been in the program who would not have met the new poverty-level income standards.

At a congressional hearing on March 9, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, questioned by Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, Republican, of New York, said "5,000, plus or minus, a fairly small plus or minus" enrollees had been dropped from the program because of the Youth Corps' insistence on the poverty standards.

Director Howard told the congressman, "I think the program now is, in fact, for the last three or four months, in almost substantial compliance."

However, Congressman GOODELL said in a House speech March 15 that 1,700 enrollees in Chicago alone had been dropped since January 1. He cited numerous instances of Chicago enrollees from families with incomes exceeding the federal standards, including two from families of four and five with incomes of more than \$10,000.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which had as its purpose "to combat poverty," established the Youth Corps to provide "useful work experience" for unemployed youths 16 through 21 to enable them to continue or resume their education or, if not interested in further school, increase their employability. The law authorized the corps to employ such young people on publicly owned or operated facilities or projects, or on projects or nonreligious projects of private nonprofit organizations, that contribute to providing needed services not otherwise being provided or that contribute to conservation, development, or management of natural resources or recreational areas.

In-school program enrollees work an average of 10 hours a week, out-of-school (or dropout) program enrollees 24 or 30 hours a week. In almost all cases, upon steady insistence of the Labor Department, they are paid \$1.25 an hour. Two hours a week of counseling is required for in-school enrollees and four hours for out-of-school enrollees—for which they are not paid—and enrollees in out-of-school programs may be required to attend basic education, remedial, or vocational training classes.

Although Congress debate on the Economic Opportunity Act was in terms of poverty programs, with much discussion of helping families with \$3,000 or less annual income, the Labor Department failed to spell out standards definitely limiting the Youth Corps to children of poor families when it rushed the NYC into operation.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz' December 1964, NYC regulations did specify that enrollees should be from low-income families. But it was not until July 8, 1965, that the Labor Department set family-income levels for qualifying enrollees. Some Texas project sponsors said they did not receive these standards for many weeks after that and some did not apply them until November.

These rules set different incomes for different size families as "poverty levels" for eligibility. These ranged (for nonfarm families) from \$1,540 for an unrelated individual to \$2,240 for a family of three to \$5,090 for a family of seven or more. A November 30 change lowered the standard for a family of seven to \$4,685 but allowed addition of \$550 for each additional member in larger families. Levels for farm families are 70 percent of those for nonfarm families.

These standards are rigid—too rigid, many have complained. But corps officials say they have limited funds and such standards are necessary to confine the program to the hard-core poor.

Before these were put into effect, though, a lot of Youth Corps money was ladled out to sponsors on a first-come, first-served basis and some sponsors planned and executed programs they, themselves did not consider poverty programs.

They interpreted the program as one to provide a job for just about any idle youngster. And the Labor Department let them get away with it.

Undoubtedly the youngsters they served benefitted from their Youth Corps service. But Congress would undoubtedly have been bugeyed at the cost of operating a federal program to keep every idle 16- to 22-year-old in America busy with a part-time job.

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 25, 1966]

BOONS AND BOONDOGGLES: PASADENA YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM BREACHED POVERTY-LEVEL RULE

(By Felton West)

One of the worst fiascos in the history of the Neighborhood Youth Corps in Texas occurred in Pasadena last summer as the federal antipoverty program got underway on a crash basis.

The City of Pasadena-sponsored project for 80 boys and 10 girls received nothing but nice notices in the news media at the time.

On February 3, when a reporter went to City Controller Bill Baker's office to examine the project's records and determine what sort of youngsters had been employed, there began unfolding a story of how about \$43,000 in federal funds was committed to what was largely a waste of money as an anti-poverty project.

After allowing the reporter to examine a boxful of records for more than two hours, Baker noticed he was devoting considerable attention to the personal files of Youth Corps enrollees. Then Baker stopped his search and he, City Attorney James Riggs and Mayor Clyde Doyal all declared it city policy to keep such records confidential.

The files contained city civil service applications and Youth Corps Form 16 enrollment papers.

"We don't have anything to hide," said Doyal, "but those applications are between the people and the city."

Unbeknown to the mayor at that time, the reporter had already seen about a third of the personal files and noted numerous indications that youths from middle-income families had been enrolled.

Later the mayor did supply the names and addresses of the corpsmen.

Checking with a small percentage of the 101 youths enrolled at one time or another, or with their parents, produced this information:

At least two enrollees were college students, although the Youth Corps held that college students were not eligible. A Youth Corps ruling on this apparently never filtered down to the Pasadena project staff, or the staff of at least one other Texas project where some college students were enrolled last summer.

A 17-year-old corpsman was the son of an engineer for Brown & Root, Inc.

A 16-year-old was the son of a homebuilding contractor.

Another 16-year-old was the son of the personnel and safety director of a big East End industry.

Another 17-year-old was the son of a City of Pasadena secretary and an operator for a big chemical company, both working. The mother was Mayor Doyal's secretary for about a month soon after he took office last May, but she said she pulled no strings to get her son in the Corps.

Parents or corpsmen in each of these cases, as in many other instances where family occupations were less impressive, said the family incomes were considerably above the family income standards established by Youth Corps Director Jack Howard in Washington on July 8 for determining eligibility of prospective corpsmen.

Many other Pasadena enrollees were children of chemical plant or refinery employees whose wages run in the neighborhood of \$3 or more an hour, and these children could not have qualified under the July 8 standards.

In many cases the corpsmen's parents said their children's participation was not because of economic need. Most parents said they did not understand that the program was for helping only the poor. They thought their children had derived important benefits besides the pay and the project was worthwhile for them as well as poor children.

The Pasadena project was not started until July 20, 12 days after Howard established the poverty-level standards, but the new federal standards were never applied to it.

"We had no definite guidelines from the federal government as to who should be enrolled," Mayor Doyal said.

He said he never heard of the so-called \$3,000 income "poverty level" until about September, and never heard of the graduated by size of family income standards of July 8 until a reporter told him about them in February.

"I doubt if many of the enrollees would have met the \$3,000 income standard," Doyal said.

John Ray Harrison, director of the Youth Corps project, described the enrollees as "average middle-class kids" in most cases.

The project really had no standards for excluding anybody on the basis of economic status.

Doyal said the Texas Employment Commission at that time could not help with enrollee selection, as he understood it was supposed to; so before the federal grant was approved he appointed a four-member committee to screen the applicants.

This group spent 3 days interviewing about 200 applicants. Then it ranked them on a priority list of 90 and a priority list for alternates. They were to be employed in order of their priority numbers.

"We didn't understand the Youth Corps to be strictly a poor-folks program," said the Rev. Harry L. Johnson, chairman of the selection committee. "Our determination of who should be picked first was not strictly on the basis of poverty. We felt there could be kinds of poverty other than material poverty, that perhaps some needed jobs for spiritual or other reasons."

He said no applicant "who really needed work" was turned down, "but, frankly, I believe we didn't have the really poverty-stricken people sign up." He thinks Pasadena has a lot of needy people, but they were "not well represented in the number who signed up for this program."

The project was approved by the federal government and got started later than expected, after school had been out for weeks, and when the staff started calling applicants in order of priority, many already had jobs or were no longer interested.

So the sponsors filled the jobs by dipping way down into the alternate list.

Rev. Mr. Johnson said it was possible some hired from the alternate list "just wanted to support a car."

"If they went down the list far enough," he said, "it is possible a boy with a father and mother who made \$20,000 a year could have been hired."

On questionnaires in some personal files the reporter saw, several enrollees said they planned to use their earnings to buy automobiles. One said he planned to buy hunting and fishing equipment.

On one automobile-aspiring enrollee's application form, a selection committeeman noted: "Family not in financial trouble but would make the city a good boy. I would like to hire him."

Harrison, a member of the Texas House of Representatives, is a former law partner of Mayor Doyal. Doyal said he hired Harrison as director, at \$180 a week paid from Federal funds, because he could find nobody else appropriate for the job at that time. Harrison is a former youth counselor for the Pasadena police and schools. He resigned as Youth Corps director September 25, before the program ended.

Harrison "did us a favor" in taking the job, Doyal said.

How much of a favor was not fully apparent until after the Post reporter began checking into the project on February 3.

Baker said that about February 8, Harrison brought back the W-2 tax withholding form he had received from the city and asked that the city stop payment on the checks totaling \$1,552.34 (after taxes) he had received back at the time of this Youth Corps service.

Harrison, now a candidate for the state Senate, later said he had never intended to cash the checks "because I didn't want to get myself in a political box."

It just so happened that he asked the city to stop payment on them in February, months after he received them, "because that was just when the W-2 forms came out, and I wasn't going to pay taxes on them," he said.

Harrison said the checks were "stale-dated," meaning not good if not cashed within a certain period of time, anyway. However, Baker said they were still payable until the city sent the bank a stop payment order February 11.

Harrison's accepting the salary from the city, while drawing his \$400-a-month legislator's salary as he did, could have raised a constitutional issue. Certain attorney general opinions indicate he might not have been entitled to his legislative pay under such circumstances.

Although Harrison said he did not think taking both salaries would have been an "unconstitutional conflict," he agreed "it is a pretty close question."

His worthless Pasadena payroll checks now hang on his wall as souvenirs, he said.

Dr. R. L. Williams, deputy regional NYC director at Dallas, said he did not visit the Pasadena Project until near its end in November.

"I could see then that things were not in line with the way other projects operated," he said. He suggested some changes to make the project "a satisfactory ongoing, in-school

program," he said, but the city chose not to do so.

So Pasadena has no more NYC. The one it had must have been needed worse in other places.

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 26, 1966]

BOONS AND BOONDOGGLES: TWO PROJECTS, NOT FOR POOR

(By Felton West)

Two other projects, one in Morris County and one at La Grange, illustrate how the Neighborhood Youth Corps in Texas has served a lot of youths for whom Congress did not intend it.

If Pasadena's Neighborhood Youth Corps was not an antipoverty program, neither was Morris County's—and it was more than twice as big.

La Grange's Youth Corps was aimed at helping the poor, but it enrolled many who could not meet poverty-level standards when the Labor Department finally got around to specifying them. And it was cut to about one-third of its original size.

The Commissioners Court of Morris County, in the northeast corner of the state not far from Texarkana, got federal and state approval last July of an NYC project with a \$127,630 federal grant to employ a maximum of 250 school dropouts and in-school youngsters on summer vacation.

Although it was planned as a 10-week project, only seven weeks were left in the summer when federal approval came through. And when school started in the fall, the Commissioners Court discontinued the program.

The project was overfunded—at its peak, it enrolled only 212 young people, 22 more than twice as many as Pasadena's project—and if the federal money was seeking out the poor, it was outrageously overfunded.

"We didn't have a poverty program," said Stringer Wommack, the project co-ordinator. "We didn't operate it as a poverty program. We took the position that if the young people were loafing, we'd put them to work and do a lot of good."

"The ones we enrolled needed to work, whether they were poor or not. It kept them off the streets at night after they had put in a hard day's work."

"We did more good with that program than with anything that's ever been done for the young people here."

Thus Wommack, an elementary school principal at Omaha, expressed the philosophy of the Youth Corps held by many project sponsors last summer, although it did not appear to be that of either the Labor Department or Congress about the corps' purpose even then.

Wommack said that under the guidelines Morris County received from the federal government, poverty-level income was not the only criterion for selection, and "if we thought a kid needed to work, we put him to work."

The present federal income standards for enrollees were actually established July 8—before the Morris County project got going on July 19—but did not get enforced until November in some cases, and never were applied in Morris County.

Asked whether the majority of the youngsters employed came from families whose incomes would have been within the July 8 federal standards, Wommack said that "we don't have a lot of people here who would meet those standards."

Asked if the majority could be considered poor, he said, "I'll say this—the majority of them were not hungry."

But "we didn't have a child working who didn't need to work," he added.

The Dallas News reported last August that young people from families with incomes well above the poverty level, including many children of employees at the Lone Star Steel Co. at Daingerfield and the Red River Arsenal near Texarkana, were enrolled; that

the father of one boy was a supervisor at the steel plant; that families of some enrollees operated successful businesses in Morris County; and that some youths' families had more than \$10,000 annual income.

Wommack told the Post the project probably had "one or two" enrollees from \$10,000-plus-a-year families and said he knew of one whose father operated a business.

He said 30 to 40 of the 212 enrollees dropped out before school started to participate in the pre-school football practice.

A federal official checked into the program after the Dallas News story, Wommack said, but was "satisfied with the way we were running it" and called for no dismissals.

The Commissioners Court did not wish to continue the project after school started, however—partly because of administrative difficulties, partly because of the publicity, Wommack said.

The Omaha principal makes no apologies for the program and thinks the federal government "ruined the NYC" when it adopted the family-income standards. Many youngsters need jobs for reasons other than poverty, he said.

"Of course, it takes a lot of money to run that kind of a program," he said, "And they don't have it now."

At La Grange, too, it was not difficult to qualify for Youth Corps employment last summer.

The La Grange Independent School District, which has a high school population of about 530 students this year, got government approval of a summer project for 300 youths financed by a \$170,315 federal grant.

Three hundred and 28 students applied and 300 were chosen, Supt. of Schools C. A. Lemmons, the NYC director, said, after the student body was told the enrollees must be needy and the NYC would be a "real work, not play, program."

Only 186 enrolled after the summer and program became an in-school project.

On Nov. 10 Lemmons received a November 1 memorandum from the regional NYC director at Dallas saying the July 8 family-income standards, established by NYC Director Jack Howard in Washington just 2 days after Howard originally approved the La Grange project, must be "rigorously" enforced. The memo sent to all sponsors in the five-state Dallas region, ordered rescreening of enrollees and dismissal of ineligibles.

Lemmons rescreened immediately and 71 of the 186 enrollees were dropped. This reduction to 115 enrollees was further cut to 107 by voluntary dropouts by December 31. To make the project's funds stretch through the school year, the enrollment was frozen at that level.

When Lemmons furnished this information in February, he said only six eligible persons were on the waiting list to join the NYC.

Lemmons, who is now applying one of the tightest NYC income-determination tests in the state, said Federal eligibility standards were not clearly defined when his project was started.

Most of the summer enrollees were from low-income families and would have qualified under the present standards, or come reasonably close, he said. But he guessed that 50 to 60 would not.

About 30 of the summer enrollees were football players—about a dozen who played this school year, the rest who played last school year and graduated in June. Some of them would not have been eligible under the income standards.

They included the son of a pharmacist, the son of an attorney, and the son of a service station operator and oil and gasoline wholesaler.

But Edward Meyer, the NYC chief accountant, said the football players worked hard and were shown no favoritism in hiring.

Since the summer experience, Lemmons requires enrollees' parents or guardians to sign a notarized statement telling how much income they reported to the Internal Revenue Service the prior year.

Many families just bring their income tax returns or W-2 tax withholding forms in and show them, he said.

Dr. R. L. Williams, deputy director of the NYC regional office at Dallas, said the La Grange project was one of two or three in the state which appeared to have "too high a percentage of the young people enrolled." He declined to name the others to which he referred.

"As soon as we called the standards to their attention," he said, "they rescreened."

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 29, 1966]

BOONS AND BOONDOGGLES: FEW DISMISSALS UNDER TOUGHER TEXAS RULES

(By Felton West)

While many Neighborhood Youth Corps projects in Texas had rather loose admission standards last summer, many went beyond the fuzzy federal instructions and adopted standards of their own designed to confine the program fairly well to helping the poor.

So when the federal income standards were enforced last fall, only a few enrollees had to be discharged to comply, sponsors of these projects said.

Dr. R. L. Williams, deputy regional NYC director, said more than half of the State's projects had already established their own criteria that were somewhat close to the July 8 federal standards.

Williams cited one project whose criteria is much stricter than the federal standards. This project has, from inception, enrolled no applicants where the per capita family income was more than \$300 a year, he said. And it has maintained full enrollment. Such a standard means an only child may not be admitted if his father and mother's income is more than \$900 a year; the federal standard for a nonfarm family of three is \$2,440.

The Neighborhood Centers Association of Houston and Harris County, which started an NYC project for 132 dropouts and 61 in-school students last June 1 with a federal grant of \$192,700, regarded the NYC from the start as a program for the socio-economically disadvantaged.

In the absence of specific federal standards at the beginning, it used the Bureau of Social Security city workers' family income index figures on what was considered a minimally adequate family income and adjusted them to Houston. This produced income eligibility guidelines of, for example, \$3,840 a year for a family of four, \$2,880 for a family of three and \$1,920 for a family of two—slightly higher for some size families, but not a great deal, than the later federal standards.

Instead of just interviewing all comers, the NCA, through its neighborhood workers, went actively seeking out young people in economically disadvantaged families who needed the NYC in the southeast Houston neighborhoods it serves.

When the enrollees were restudied on the basis of the July 8 federal standards, the NCA found it had only six or seven ineligibles, said Mrs. Pearl Heller, the project director.

Project Coordinator Milton Womack of the Harris County Department of Education's NYC program, said the county program has been operated from the start as one to help the poor. He estimated rescreening under the new federal standards last November found only "four to seven" ineligibles.

The program operates for 200 students in the Goose Creek, Crosby, Channelview, Galena Park, Northeast Houston, Klein, Cypress-Fairbanks and Alief Independent School District in Harris County.

After an incident that brought upsetting publicity right at the beginning last summer,

the Galveston County Commissioners Court NYC programs have been conducted carefully as antipoverty projects.

Both a summer program for in-school students and a dropout program were started at Galveston last summer. When the summer program began a few weeks after the other, some students referred to the NYC by the Texas Employment Commission were put to work before they were well screened.

Their second day on the job, County Judge Peter J. La Valle said, he noticed some of the girls working in the courthouse were "pretty well-dressed and had fancy hairdos." The next day La Valle got a complaint from a prominent Galveston businessman that his daughter had been rejected by the NYC while some of her school friends, equally well off economically, had been accepted.

La Valle laid down his own criteria limiting it to children from families with less than \$3,000 income except in special circumstances, such as very large families.

Herbert Schmidt, the Galveston projects' director, said the Galveston standards were "tougher" than the July 8 federal standards and no enrollees had to be dismissed when the latter came along.

Although applications have been made for new and bigger programs, the Galveston NYC has been reduced to 67 enrollees now.

The Texas City Independent School District, which has been operating an NYC for 56 students since last summer, adopted a rule at the start to confine it to enrollees with \$3,000 or less income. Project Director C. T. Decker said he departed from that only in a few cases of children from large families; so rescreening on the basis of the federal standards eliminated only three or four enrollees.

Bastrop County's NYC Co-ordinator Harold Goerner estimated that 90 percent of the enrollees in his summer project for 200 would be qualified under the present standards. The program was operated with standards close to the federal ones and only "about four" were eliminated.

At Beaumont, Director A. P. Griffin of the Beaumont Independent School District NYC estimated 90 per cent or more of the enrollees in his program last summer would have qualified under present standards. The summer program, approved for 200, had an average enrollment of only 100.

THE BEAUMONT ISD project set a standard at the beginning of admitting enrollees from families with about \$2,500 or less annual income, except under certain other circumstances.

This school year, when the project is approved for 300 students, Griffin said he has dismissed only three or four for income ineligibility. Because of the strict income guidelines and unavailability of more jobs in locations where students can reach them, he said, only about 220 were enrolled when he was interviewed recently.

The South Park Independent School District NYC at Beaumont deliberately included about 15 "top-notch kids"—good students and leaders, without regard to economic status—in its summer program at all times in rotating groups last year, Director Ray Asbury said. Probably none of these students would qualify under the present standards, Asbury said.

About 15 enrollees had to be dismissed when federal standards were later applied, he said, but 265 of the 318 enrolled as of Jan. 31 had been in the summer program and qualified under the new standards, he said.

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 28, 1966]

BOONS AND BOONDOGGLES: YOUTH CORPS FILES

SECRET

(By Felton West)

Secrecy already hampers independent investigation of projects in the new Neighborhood Youth Corps and it is going to get worse.

In its study of 14 Texas NYC projects, the Post sought access to personal files of enrollees in 11 projects. In four cases it was denied access on the ground the records were personal and confidential.

These files contain enrollee application forms devised by the sponsors of most projects, and in all cases contain the enrollment papers (NYC Form 16) on enrollees which are sent to the NYC in Washington. In some instances they contain other records.

The information these records contain is, most of it, to determine whether applicants meet the enrollment criteria laid down by the federal government. Though often not conclusive, the information in these files often gives an outsider trying to evaluate the eligibility of enrollees indications as to eligibility or ineligibility.

Without examining these files, an outsider must make a much more extensive investigation to determine whether a project is serving only the poor, or some middle or upper-income youths.

Access to both the sponsors' own enrollee applications and NYC Form 16s was denied at the City of Pasadena, the Neighborhood Centers Association in Houston, and Galveston County. At the Texas City schools NYC, the reporter was shown the NYC Form 16s but not the sponsor's own application forms.

In all other cases, access was given to both kinds of records without any suggestion they should be withheld.

But had the sponsors been well aware of national Youth Corps policy, probably all would have denied access to the records.

Not a single project official, even those who refused to produce, seemed aware of a provision in the standard Youth Corps contract between the Labor Department and a sponsor which says "the sponsor agrees to maintain the confidentiality of any information regarding applicants, enrollees or their immediate families which may be obtained through application forms, interviews, tests, reports from public agencies or counselors, or any other source."

If the officials were aware of it, not one cited it.

The Youth Corps is about to plug up this hole.

Leonard Burchman, a special assistant to NYC Director Jack Howard in Washington, said regional NYC directors were told "weeks ago" that such records should be kept confidential.

Apparently the word had never gotten down to sponsors, he said, but it will soon. An administrative notice about this will be sent soon to all regional directors, to be passed on to sponsors, he said.

The confidentiality of such records was not written by Congress into the Economic Opportunity Act, which established the Youth Corps. Burchman said it was a decision made by Howard.

While the NYC appears to be relying greatly on citizens and news media to bring irregularities to its attention—Burchman emphasized it is happy to have anybody bring instances of ineligibility or other irregularities to its attention and will investigate and take appropriate action—the corps is thus making it more difficult for outsiders to monitor the projects.

The federal officials do not appear to be monitoring projects closely themselves.

The NYC has auditors in Washington who have the duty of making in-depth audits of programs, including studying eligibility of enrollees—indeed, sponsors have been warned they are subject to audit exceptions and withholding of federal funds for ineligibles.

But Burchman said there have been more than 1,600 NYC agreements since the program was started—there were more than 650 projects in operation in February—and all of them cannot be evaluated and audited with the limited staff.

Both Burchman and Dr. R. L. Williams, deputy regional NYC director at Dallas, said they knew of no Texas projects which had received in-depth audits—even projects that had shut down.

Williams and other officials of the Dallas office and its outstations travel constantly visiting projects in Texas and elsewhere. Williams said each project is visited about once every 2 months.

But they do only spot-checking on enrollees' personal files and do not make in-depth examinations of the records. They mainly look at fiscal operations and see that proper records are kept, he said.

"I'm not going in and investigate to see whether a sponsor is committing fraud," Williams said, "because I don't think we have that kind of sponsors. I think sponsors are people of integrity."

Except upon special request, the Dallas regional office does not even receive copies of the NYC 16 forms, which contain all the information the federal government gets to show an enrollees' eligibility. These are sent to Washington.

* * * * *

As much as they gripe about "red tape," they complain more about confusion and lack of direction.

The federal supervision does not even go as far as suggesting to sponsors any uniform procedure for determining what a family's income is, although some sponsors say such a suggestion would be desirable.

Williams said the Youth Corps does not want to tell them how to go about this because it does not want to be criticized for "trying to control everything."

A certain amount of information on each enrollee to substantiate his eligibility is kept in each sponsor's files, but there is great variation in how much.

Some sponsors have only the federal Form 16 in their files to show what enrollees' families' incomes are. This form, which is signed by the students after being filed out in an interview, shows only income ranges, such as "below \$1,000," from \$2,000 to \$3,000," or "above \$5,000."

Most sponsors have devised original applications of their own which elicit considerably more information on family income—sometimes ones which are signed by parents as well as applicants. But some of these do not elicit all the information pertinent, such as income of working brothers and sisters in the household. Some applications do not even elicit parents' occupations.

Some sponsors merely take a student's work for the family income and rely on their knowledge of where a student lives and his father's occupation.

Some rely strongly on reports of school counselors as to the family financial status, without much paperwork and with little investigation.

Some interview parents as well as the youths. In the Harris County Department of Education's program, Co-ordinator Milton Womack said he tries to visit the home of each enrollee for a personal investigation as to the family situation.

Some sponsors do considerable checking with employers as to parents' income, but most do not.

At Beaumont, Director Ray Asbury of the South Park schools' NYC uses no form except NYC 16 for determining income. Asked if he and his staff ever check with employers as to whether income figures furnished are correct, he said he did not think they should "pry" like that.

"Some of these things are pretty personal, you know," he said.

The simplest test of income seems to be that applied by the La Grange schools. Parents of enrollees are required to furnish a notarized statement of the family's income tax return figure for the prior year. Parents

bring a lot of income tax returns and W-2 withholding forms in and show them.

None of the projects studied yet uses an application form eliciting information on farm and real estate holdings. But Co-ordinator Dee Wheatley III, of the 11-county NYC project sponsored by Southwest Texas State College at San Marcos for 500 enrollees, plans to use such an application next summer.

With all the variations in procedure and record-keeping, it is difficult for an outsider to evaluate eligibility of projects' enrollees. But still the records help.

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 29, 1966]

BOONS AND BOONDOGGLES: POVERTY POCKETS HUNTED
(By Felton West)

A good deal of the millions of dollars the Neighborhood Youth Corps has spent in the war on poverty so far has been spent in places which had relatively less poverty and needed it less than other places.

This is one of the major bugs not yet worked out of the new program.

Youth Corps officials have become aware of this and are groping for a solution. An ideal one they are not likely to find.

There is nothing written in to the Economic Opportunity Act which insures that the federal funds go where they are needed most.

Projects are developed by local sponsors and proposed to the Labor Department, which approves or disapproves them. The federal government funds these and has not attempted to encourage development of projects in particular areas except by making information about the program available.

Where leadership has been aggressive and alert to the possibilities of federal aid—and had no antipathy to it—projects have been developed and the federal funds obtained.

Where such leadership has not existed, or aversion to federal aid did, the federal funds have not been obtained, even if there was more poverty than in places where the funds did go.

The Houston public school system is one agency that has not applied, although one project official thinks that the system needs an NYC for at least 1,000 enrollees.

The federal funds so far have been spent considerably on a first-come, first-served basis and now, when they are getting harder to get as there is more demand, some projects with probably more merit than some operations, are having to wait to get started.

Dr. R. L. Williams, deputy director of the Dallas NYC region, said the NYC does not want to "take the initiative away from the states and communities."

But he has been conferring recently with state officials throughout the region to work as liaison between the NYC and the state governors, who have a veto over Youth Corps projects.

Williams is asking the state co-ordinators to advise the NYC where the "real pockets of poverty" exist and where projects are most needed. With such advice, he said, the NYC may look with more favor on some proposals than others in using its limited funds.

Walter Richter, the Texas co-ordinator, who heads Gov. John Connally's office of Economic Opportunity, predicted that a greater effort will be made this year to serve the areas of greatest need rather than just approve projects on a first-come, first-served basis.

"I think the governor's office and the Labor Department will screen applications better and I predict that a lot more quality will be built into future Youth Corps projects," he said.

Williams said some projects in the past have been overfunded. In some cases this was because sponsors overestimated the number of eligible applicants they would have; he estimated 15 to 20 percent of the sponsors of dropout programs so overesti-

mated. In other cases summer projects were overfunded because their approval came so late last summer that much of the summer was gone. Approval came so late in some cases that the sponsors abandoned plans for the projects.

Overfunding some projects delays funding of others.

The Federal funds were committed to projects so fast for school year programs in the current (1966) federal fiscal year that there could hardly be a summer NYC program in the state except through "recapture" of funds not used during the school year. This is being accomplished partly by limiting all programs roughly to their Dec. 31 enrollment levels which in some cases are far below the originally approved levels.

Because the Johnson administration has trimmed domestic program appropriations requests to finance the Vietnamese war, the Youth Corps' appropriation for the 1967 fiscal year starting July 1 will be smaller than the \$500 million it wanted. It is now seeking about \$300 million in Congress—only \$41 million more than the 1966 appropriation, although the demand for project funds is much greater.

Williams said that because of shortage of funds, this summer's program will have only about 120,000 enrollees nationally, compared to the present 300,000, and only about 9,800 enrollees in Texas in addition to the 4,164 in dropout programs now that will extend into the summer—compared with about 21,000 in the Texas program now.

Unless the appropriation outlook changes, Williams said, the total program for the nation in the 1966-67 school year will be only about 160,000 enrollees.

He said that in March there were applications pending either in his office or in Washington for projects that would employ about 30,000 Texas youths—about 2,000 more than had been in all the state's projects so far.

The way the program has made some NYC projects start-stop-go affairs. Sometimes programs lapse while awaiting approval of continuance.

La Grange's program was out of operation from September 11 until mid-October while awaiting orders to proceed. Texas City's NYC was closed down from March 3 until March 28, then had another 2-week gap in January and February because extensions did not come through in time.

Such lapses are upsetting for schoolchildren dependent upon the jobs to pay their school expenses or help support their families.

Williams said about 25 projects in Texas have been started but not continued when their agreements, covering certain periods of time, expired. But he said not a single project in the state has been stopped because of federal dissatisfaction with its operation.

Hanging over the program is the threat of virtual extinction unless Congress further changes the law as to its financing. As the law reads now, project sponsors will have to pay 50 percent of projects costs after June 30, 1967, instead of the 10 percent now (which is almost always paid in services and office space rather than cash).

In the opinion of some sponsors, that would almost wipe out the Youth Corps. Terrell Blodgett, director of the Texas OEO until last December, said he doubted many communities would have projects if 50-50 matching were required. However, he said Congress is likely to extend the period of 90-10 matching for several years. It has already extended it one year.

Slowness in communication has plagued the Youth Corps in its first year and project directors complain of redtape and confusion. Several interviewed have had difficulty getting advances of the Federal funds in time to meet their payrolls. Several complained of slowness in receiving paper forms from the Government, or not receiving them at all.

Initially, three Federal forms had to be filled out to enroll every corpsman. Later, all three were replaced by one.

One director said he once received three telegrams from the Dallas regional NYC office requesting the same bit of information. He sent it back in three telegrams, plus talking to the Dallas office by telephone.

How slow communications have been may best be illustrated by the speed with which the family-income standards for enrollees were distributed and enforced.

NYC Director Jack Howard established these last July 8, to be effective immediately. Some sponsors say they received them in August, some in September, some in October.

A memorandum from W. L. (Bill) Crawford, then NYC regional director at Dallas, urged all regional sponsors to "rigorously" enforce the new standards, rescreen their enrollees and discharge ineligibles. This was dated November 1. C. A. Lemmons, La Grange NYC director, said he received it November 10.

On November 30 the July 8 standards were revised as they pertained to enrollees from families of seven or more persons. It was good news to Mrs. Pearl Heller, director of the Neighborhood Centers Association NYC project here, because it would make a lot more youths from large families eligible. But she did not get the news until a Post reporter told her on February 5.

One of the Youth Corps' difficulties has been that sponsors—particularly cities and counties—prefer to enroll skilled persons to do their jobs and sometimes have given them preference over unskilled youths. Williams said this has concerned him, but he believes the problem is now almost overcome. The Youth Corps would prefer to help the unskilled and give them some skill.

Another problem has been getting sponsors to provide good counseling as well as work for the enrollees. Williams said counseling generally needs improvement. Texas has some excellent counseling programs, but some are poor, he said. Officials say, however, that counseling in Texas is generally better than in a lot of other states.

[From the Houston Post, Apr. 30, 1966]

BOONS AND BOONDOGGLES: CORPS HAILED DESPITE ABUSES
(By Felton West)

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has certainly had mistakes, abuses and difficulties in its little more than a year in operation. But it also had mobilized a vast army of admirers ready to vouch for its value.

While the corps has been criticized for having an admission policy that was too open-armed at first, that is not all.

"On the other hand," as Office of Economic Opportunity Director Sargent Shriver told a congressional committee recently, "we are getting lashed from the other direction that our eligibility requirements are too tough."

Potential sponsors are clamoring for federal funds to start new Youth Corps projects faster than the Youth Corps can get the funds from Congress.

Most present sponsors are enthusiastic about continuing their programs and many would like to enlarge them.

There is ample testimony from enrollees, their parents, corpsmen's work supervisors and project directors to the good the corps has done in helping young people stay in school, return after dropping out, or prepare themselves for jobs they cannot get without work experience.

No meaningful statistics are available on how many have been kept in or brought back to school, or helped to get jobs.

But in the opinion of project directors, the corps has helped many children stay in school by allowing them to contribute something to the support of their families without dropping out. It has allowed them to stay proudly, able to buy their lunches and supplies, pay

their school fees, buy class rings and wear decent clothes just like their more fortunate schoolmates.

Some dropouts have returned to school in most school districts when it was possible to work in the Youth Corps.

For dropouts who do not want to return to school, the out-of-school NYC projects furnish up to 6 months of work experience and discipline to prepare them for steady work, some degree of marketable skill, work references, and even placement in other jobs. And some receive remedial English and mathematics or vocational training courses along with their NYC jobs.

For many dropouts, the NYC is meaning new hope for their futures.

Many students' school attendance and grades have improved after they became corpsmen.

Many have gone to college after finishing high school in the Youth Corps, or working in last summer's Youth Corps projects, and have told the sponsors the NYC made it possible.

Some dropouts are learning the savings habits by putting money in sponsors' credit unions.

Many who have quit Youth Corps projects have done so for as good or better jobs, or to enter the military services better prepared.

The greatest value for many enrollees may be simply learning what it is to work, to get there on time, to take and follow orders and to get along with bosses and fellow workers.

"Every teen ager needs an introduction to work," said Mrs. Pearl Heller, director of the Neighborhood Centers Association Youth Corps. "They're not born knowing."

Despite widespread enrollment last year of youths who would not be classified as poor, most enrollees have been from the lower economic stratum.

Most are from large families, many from families with eight to 10 children. Many family live in low-rent public housing units, many on only Social Security benefits, retirement pay, public welfare or aid to dependent children payments.

Many Youth Corps enrollees have needed help so badly that they falsified their ages a year to meet the minimum age of 16, only to be discovered and dismissed later.

Many are from broken homes, or children of widows or widowers, or deserted mothers.

Many are enrolled when their families have temporary financial crises because of deaths or illness, then leave when family income is re-established.

Some enrollees already have children of their own. Fifteen out of 160 enrolled in the Neighborhood Centers project recently did.

In most projects, the majority of enrollees comes from minority groups—Negro or Latin American, whichever is most prevalent in the area. Relatively greater poverty is found among them than among the population majority.

Racial discrimination is strongly forbidden in the Youth Corps and Deputy Regional Director R. L. Williams said he has never received a complaint of any in Texas.

In fact, directors of two NYC projects said the projects gave them a fringe benefit in helping prevent trouble when their schools were desegregated last fall.

At La Grange, Superintendent C. A. Lemmons said there was racial antagonism in the community last summer.

"After working the Negro and white kids side by side in the Youth Corps for 2 weeks in the hot July sun," he said, "we had our problem licked when we integrated schools in the fall. The NYC was worth all it cost and all the trouble we went through to start it just for this."

Youth Corps Director Ray Asbury said working whites and Negroes together on the

same NYC teams in the South Park school district in Beaumont last summer helped smooth the path for desegregation there in the fall.

Cities, counties, school districts, the federal government, hospitals, colleges, social agencies, and other nonprofit agencies benefit from work the corpsmen do under adult supervision.

Many work as nursing aides, clerical aides in city and county and school district offices, custodians in public buildings, garbage collectors, park or street workmen, and library assistants.

In La Grange, for example, corpsmen last summer renovated a school building, refinished the elementary school furniture, built tennis courts, a miniature golf course, and other playground facilities, cleared brush, built fences, dug ditches, moved a sewer line, and did many other jobs to improve the community.

Corpsmen's work is not always of high quality—the Youth Corps urges sponsors not to give preference to skilled—but much of it is amazingly good.

"The end result is the kid as much as the work he has done," said Bastrop County NYC Coordinator Harold Goerner.

Terrell Blodgett, who headed the Texas Office of Economic Opportunity until last December, said he received few complaints about the Youth Corps. "By and large, I think the work done was worthwhile, the kids helped needed help and the whole thing worked in pretty good fashion."

A. L. Bankston, a long-time school administrator who directs Orange County's Youth Corps, said the Youth Corps is "a long-range program that won't set the world on fire overnight" but will alleviate poverty more than any other Federal antipoverty program in operation now.

"I don't minimize the importance of the others," he said, "but dollar-for-dollar, the Youth Corps will reach more people and get more results."

Sargent Shriver, director of the federal poverty war, said recently the Youth Corps has already provided \$40,000 job opportunities for young Americans.

WASTEFUL EXPENDITURE IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a certain Thomas F. A. Plaut, of Stanford University, was allocated \$1,100,000 by the Federal Government to make a study of the subject of alcoholism and its impact upon the people of the United States.

After the agency with which Mr. Thomas F. A. Plaut has his connections spent the \$1,100,000, it came up with the sensational recommendation that the serving of alcoholic beverages at supervised teenage parties is a sound "way of preventing alcoholism."

After 5 years of study, Mr. Plaut, the researcher, recommends to parents of the U.S. teenagers that they should begin feeding their children with alcohol. He further, after 5 years of study, concludes that taboos against liquor advertising on television, radio, and otherwise should be eliminated.

He urges the adoption of future television commercials showing drinks being served in family gatherings with children present.

One does not have to be an addict or abstainer from alcoholism to condemn vigorously the recommendations made by the researcher, Mr. Thomas F. A. Plaut. He has made his sensational recommendation; also expended \$1,100,000

granted to his agency for the research work which he conducted.

The wasteful and wrongful expenditure of \$1,100,000 has been multiplied many times by the astounding and sensational recommendations made by this particular researcher.

VIETNAM WARRIORS CHEERED BY CHILDREN'S CRAYON DRAWINGS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, of the substantial amount of mail received daily, once in a while correspondence is received that is so important or tells such a moving story that a Senator is required to share the message with both his colleagues and the American public.

I received such a letter from Lt. Comdr. David W. Plank, a Californian serving as a member of the Chaplain Corps on the U.S.S. *Hancock*, an attack aircraft carrier operating in the waters of southeast Asia. Commander Plank's story is a most moving one. It tells the story of 24 boys and girls of the second grade of the Oakridge School, Sacramento, Calif., wanting to thank the Navy for "fighting for our classroom and country." To do this, the youngsters wrote a letter to the "U.S. Navy, care of Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Vietnam." For some reason the correspondence was forwarded to the U.S.S. *Hancock*. Enclosed with the youngsters' letters were 24 grease-crayon drawings. Perhaps the paintings of the youngsters from the point of view of an art critic did not rival the Mellon collection which rightfully attracted many to the Washington area recently, but the ship's exhibit featuring these 24 grease-crayon drawings, was probably appreciated more by our fighting men than those who had the good fortune to view the Mellon collection. Commander Plank tells us that the group that saw this exhibit was not the sort of crowd that you would see in the National Gallery, for these men are the fighting men of the U.S. Navy who are waging war against Communist aggression in southeast Asia. Perhaps, Mr. President, as Commander Plank concludes:

A little child shall lead them.

The youngsters seem to see the significance of the Vietnamese conflict even better than some Members of the Congress or our so-called experts. Rather than continue, Mr. President, and I do not believe that I could begin to tell the story as movingly as Commander Plank, I ask unanimous consent that the letter I received from Commander Plank together with his story of the children's letters and art be printed in full in the RECORD.

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

U.S.S. "HANCOCK" (CVA-19),
FPO San Francisco, April 19, 1966.
Hon. GEORGE MURPHY,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: I invite you, Sir, to read the enclosed short article which pertains to a group of California school children. It describes what happened when a small package of their letters and crayon drawings found their way to the aircraft

carrier *Hancock*. Not only were the weary warriors of this Vietnam-engaged ship cheered and strengthened, but they were vividly reminded of our American purpose in the world.

The story is both heartwarming and of great significance, I believe. It is my hope that you will both enjoy it and in some way find it helpful in your much appreciated work on behalf of us citizens of California—my native state.

Very respectfully yours,

DAVID W. PLANK,
Lieutenant Commander, Chaplain Corps,
U.S. Navy, Ship's Chaplain.

VIETNAM WARRIORS CHEERED BY CHILDREN'S
CRAYON DRAWINGS

(By Lt. Comdr. David W. Plank, Chaplain
Corps, U.S. Navy)

This is the story of a bundle of children's drawings that were addressed and mailed to "The U.S. Navy, Vietnam." What follows could have been repeated aboard many other ships and military installations. Hence this is not a story about the Seventh Fleet Alameda-based attack aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Hancock* (CVA-19); it is about 24 grease-crayon pictures painstakingly drawn by second-grade boys and girls in Oakridge School, Sacramento, Calif.

The story necessarily begins on April 6, 1966, the day a small ordinary-looking cylindrical package arrived in the Chaplains' Office aboard *Hancock*. At the time, she was busy operating in the tropical waters of the South China Sea, catapulting Vietnam-bound planes from her flight deck, one every 26 seconds. The package which Ship's Chaplain David W. Plank found was tattered and badly scarred from its long journey. For it had been seventy days enroute—28 January was the postmark it bore. In a child's scrawled handwriting it was addressed to, "The U.S. Navy, care of Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Vietnam." It had come from "Miss Burns Second Grade, Oakridge School, Sacramento, Calif."

The Chaplain opened the package. Out tumbled 24 grease-crayon drawings, and 19 oversized letters. The pictures bore scribbled titles such as "Our Janitor In The Hospital," "My House," "This Is Me, This Is You," and "Evelyn The Clown." The letters read in part, "Thank you for fighting for our classroom and country. I hope all of you don't die." "We have sawdust in our hair," "My mother went to the hospital. Do you have a brother?" "I am praying for you. I am crying for you. Please come back."

From where had this forlorn package of pictures and letters come? Who sent it to *Hancock*? How did it happen to arrive on board? Where had it been for seventy days? No one seemed to know or care. The Chaplain's first impulse was to simply discard them all, then write a perfunctory letter of thanks to Miss Burns.

But then came a thought. Why not give these children's expressions of concern, encouragement, and appreciation an opportunity to be heard themselves by those for whom they were intended, men of the U.S. Navy fighting in Vietnam? Mount and display them, of course. They may not be artistic masterpieces—certainly they had no commercial value. But the message they held to tell could be priceless.

Two days later, the "Miss Burns' Second Grade Class Grease-crayon Drawing Exhibit" officially opened in *Hancock*'s Library when Capt. James C. Donaldson, Jr., the ship's Commanding Officer, cut with a Navy ceremonial sword the paper chain-ribbon which stretched from wall to wall in the Library "gallery." By posters and flyers, by notes on barbershop mirrors and by word of mouth; from bow to fantail, from boiler room to bridge, the word of the unusual art exhibit spread.

The men came first by ones and twos, and then by dozens. During the first week of the exhibit alone, 1,000 men, nearly one-third of *Hancock*'s crew, crowded into the Library and browsed among the pictures. To add to the enjoyment, they participated in a contest to choose which they thought were the best pictures and letters. Officers and enlisted men came at lunch hour, before plane launches, after recoveries, during the coffee-break of an engine room watch; early in the morning, late at night. They toured the picture exhibit in green flight suits and red crash-crew jerseys; in sweaty T-shirts and mechanic's overalls; hardly what you would expect at an Art Exhibit. But *Hancock* is a fighting ship. And the men that make her so, work hard, hot, round-the-clock hours. These are the ways of war. The men look the part they play.

Thus during the heat of battle, the men of "Fighting *Hannah*" have been chosen-by-chance as "The U.S. Navy, Vietnam." They have paused and pondered twenty-four crayoned drawings; they have thoughtfully read the penciled letters. Though these be the creations of children's tiny hands in faraway Sacramento, Calif., they might have been the heart's handiwork of children anywhere. Weary naval warriors rested and listened to the pure voices of seven-year-old boys and girls from home telling them of their love and prayers, their concern and gratitude. To their duties the men of *Hancock* returned with quicker pace and lighter heart. The true spirit of America had somehow touched and lifted her distant fighting sons—through the fingers of little children.

Into the midst of war, twenty-four second-grade boys and girls have unwittingly stepped to remind us of our American purpose: to strive always to obtain and preserve for them, and all children, both those living and those of generations to come, justice and equality, peace and freedom, in Vietnam, or any oppressed place upon earth, in order to make certain that children everywhere can always draw what they please, and write whom they wish.

As was said centuries ago, "A little child shall lead them."

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

MR. BAYH. Mr. President, May 10 was a special holiday for all of our proud people of Rumanian origin. It commemorated the day on which Rumanians, who enjoy a freedom here not known presently in their native homeland, celebrated the achievement of Rumania's independence and the founding of its kingdom.

The joy of all Rumanians is dimmed by the unhappy fact that their Independence Day cannot be celebrated in the homeland. It is fitting that our friends can observe this national holiday here in the United States where every individual and group have the promise of freedom. The Rumanian National Committee planned a fitting observance of the anniversary at the Carnegie Endowment International Center in New York City.

Independence came to Rumania on May 10, 1877; but the peace that followed the victory was a hard and bitter one. The valiant nation struggled bravely through the two World Wars, losing vast numbers of its soldiers and citizens. A free and independent government has been withheld from the patient Rumanians for 19 years.

In continuing sympathy for the Rumanian people and their lack of complete freedom on their national holiday, we renew our hope that one day their wishes for full independence will be realized.

OMBUDSMAN FOR THE UNITED STATES

MR. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently the American Association of Medical Clinics, in an editorial in their monthly journal *Group Practice*, discussed the ombudsman system as it could help physicians in the "two major problems of the age: the time and effort required to cope with red tape and the related problem of apparently arbitrary actions or procedures emanating most notably from governmental administrative officers."

The association points out that the "need to do something is hardly debatable; the method of performing the needed functions, whether by an ombudsman system or some substitute method is not so clear."

We are in complete agreement with this statement. As I have informed my colleagues many times before, the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure intends to study all facets of the ombudsman concept as it could relate to the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the editorial entitled "Ombudsman for the United States." This appeared in the April 1966 issue of *Group Practice*.

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

OMBUDSMAN FOR THE UNITED STATES?

Physicians are becoming increasingly involved in, and conscious of, two major problems of the age: the time and effort required to cope with red tape, particularly—but not exclusively—that concerned with government and its agencies at all levels; and the related problem of apparently arbitrary actions or procedures emanating most notably from governmental administrative officers or bureaus and less frequently from the legislative branches of government.

Some of the smaller democracies have recognized and attempted to deal with such problems in a manner which is now being explored in the United States and which has been discussed in articles and by a number of newspaper columnists. This is the ombudsman system apparently first established in Sweden in 1809 and now spread to Finland, Japan, Denmark, Norway, New Zealand, and under consideration in Great Britain.

A person given the Scandinavian name of "ombudsman" has been variously defined as "a gad fly to government," "guardian of the people's rights against abuses and malfunctions by government, its programs and officials" and as a "cutter of red tape and righter of wrongs for citizens caught in the toils of bureaucracy." However defined, the man serving as an ombudsman (there may be more than one) has the job of representing the "little fellow" against unlawful, capricious, or other faults of his government or of government employees.

In Denmark, for example, there is only one ombudsman who is a judge of exceedingly high standing. He is independent of Parliament in the performance of his duties though the general principles governing his activities have been established by that body. It

is his responsibility "to observe if persons under his jurisdiction pursue unlawful aims in their service, make arbitrary or unfair decisions, or are guilty of other faults of commission or omission. Should he become aware of defects or shortcomings in current laws or administrative provisions, he must bring them to the attention of Parliament and the minister concerned."

The ombudsman can deal with a wide variety of problems and only one (from Denmark) is mentioned here. This concerned the question of the extent to which an administrative agent had the requisite legal authority for a decision taken. The Parliamentary Commissioner (ombudsman) investigated a case where a Chief Constable had forbidden a taxi-cab owner to seek hire at a cab-stand for a month because of a dispute between the taxi-cab owner and some of his colleagues. It was found that the Chief Constable did not have the requisite legal authority for refusing the taxi owner the use of the cab stand and this ended with a compromise under which the Constable undertook to pay the cab owner damages for lost earnings.

The question is being taken seriously in the United States. The Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure under the Chairmanship of Senator LONG of Missouri has been holding hearings to explore the feasibility of a U.S. version of this office. A distinguished Swedish ombudsman was the lead-off witness in March.

The need to do something is hardly debatable; the method of performing the needed functions, whether by an ombudsman system or some substitute method is not so clear. Thus the risk of merely establishing another bureau with still more redtape is real in a nation as vast as this and would bring little improvement. Possibly, the solution would be to set up a small experimental quasi-governmental organization which could receive and investigate complaints from individual citizens and make rough determinations of their validity. Those thought to be legitimate could be channeled to governmental individuals or agencies involved, to appropriate Congressional Committees, or to the public press if it were necessary to marshal public opinion on an important issue. No doubt new problems would be created and its success would depend entirely on the integrity, intelligence, vigor—and powers—of the heads of such an organization. Indeed, it seems highly uncertain that the ombudsman system in any modification could be suitably established in a nation like the United States!

On the other problem of redtape, however, which is a frequent irritant to physicians as well as to other citizens, it might be possible to bring about improvements with relative simplicity and this might be worthy of exploration. The reduction in governmental redtape could be assigned to a small corps of government employees whose one and only function would be to suggest simplifications of operations, procedures—and governmental language. Cutting redtape in this matter would doubtless lower the cost of operating the government itself as well as lessen the irritation of the ordinary citizen. As someone remarked recently the Internal Revenue Service has been going to simplify its forms for the last twenty years; it will probably take some outside individual or agency to accomplish such a miracle.

ACTIVITIES OF YOUNG PEOPLE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in recent days American young people have been criticized for everything from over-exuberant spring weekends in seaside resorts, to dishonesty in taking examinations, to lack of understanding of the American commitment in the world.

Most Americans have taken little stock in such criticism. They have tended to believe that this generation was not really represented by the minority of its members who participated in such activities. Each generation must face the close scrutiny and examination of the one which precedes it, and today's generation is no exception.

It is for this reason that I feel it so important to publicize the many constructive and worthwhile activities pursued by our young people—activities which demonstrate that, in many respects, our young people understand the stakes in today's world a lot better than many who are older and presume to be wiser.

While a vociferous minority has demonstrated in opposition to the national commitment in Vietnam, and an even smaller number have championed the cause of the Communist Vietcong, the overwhelming majority of American students and young people have seen quite clearly that if aggression is not defeated it will be endlessly repeated. They have also felt the need to make it clear that the few vociferous critics do not speak for them.

One example of this comes from Wolcott High School in the town of Wolcott in my own State of Connecticut.

In a letter which I received from Robert F. Carroll, a faculty member at the school, the project initiated by Wolcott students was described in these terms:

The students in my Contemporary Issues classes organized project SAVE (Students Approve Vietnam Effort) as a direct result of President Johnson's plea to the American people throughout the country to shout and make their views heard on Vietnam * * *. These students mailed out 16,433 letters and five times as many petition sheets to every public high school in the country on March 8th * * *. I am pleased to announce that returns are just beginning to come in and as of today 500 schools have made returns with a total of over 100,000 signatures.

This effort gives notice that the vast body of public-spirited high school students want neither to criticize nor stand silent. They want to be heard, and to show the world that the critics do not speak for them, that this generation of American young people understands that freedom does not come easily, and that each generation must rededicate itself to its preservation.

It gives me great personal satisfaction to know that such a national movement of support for our troops in Vietnam originated in Connecticut, and I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the details of this effort.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point information concerning the campaign started at Wolcott High School.

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

WOLCOTT HIGH SCHOOL,
Wolcott, Conn., March 29, 1966.
Senator THOMAS J. DODD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DODD: We both know that Democracy is a difficult system because it places great responsibility on every individ-

ual to contribute his share and his talents to society so that it can function successfully.

Today's high school students have the capacity to understand the problems facing our great country and a sense of responsibility to tackle them. My students have taken the Vietnam problem and have decided that a minority who have protested by burning draft cards and marching on Washington have distorted the true feeling of the majority of American students and American people toward the policy of their government. They feel they have a responsibility to do something so that other nations do not get a false impression of how the majority of us feel.

The students in my Contemporary Issues classes organized project SAVE (Students Approve Vietnam Effort) as a direct result of President Johnson's plea to the American people throughout the country to "shout" and make their views heard on Vietnam. His remarks were carried on the front page of the New York Times which each one of my students subscribe to daily. These students mailed out 16,433 letters and five times as many petition sheets to every public high school in the country on March 8. These letters were addressed to the high school principal. We asked him to circulate the petition through the Social Studies department so that intelligent discussion might precede any signing by the students asked to participate.

I am pleased to announce that returns are just beginning to come in and as of today 500 schools have made returns with a total of over 100,000 signatures. We hope this is just the beginning. AP wire service carried the story twice throughout the country, many newspapers using it as front page copy. The story was also picked up by television and radio. I have a folder with over 300 letters to date from all over the country and a number from our boys in Vietnam who read about the Wolcott High project in the Stars & Stripes. Many religious and fraternal organizations have made plans to make awards to the students involved and one man from upstate New York suggested that someone submit the project for a Valley Forge award.

The students hope to deliver the results to President Johnson personally when the country-wide project is completed. I will keep you posted on the progress of project SAVE, Senator Dodd. We all hope you can be of assistance in arranging a meeting with the President.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. CARROLL,
Faculty Advisor to SAVE.

SAVE,

WOLCOTT HIGH SCHOOL,
Wolcott, Conn., February 22, 1966.

DEAR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL: It has always been a part of our great American heritage to speak up for causes we believe in. The Vietnam War is such a cause. It is so tragic in intensity and so overwhelming in importance that we, the senior class of Wolcott High School, have decided to organize our nation's schools to take a position in support of our American policy there.

Our campaign for signatures offers students all over America an opportunity to be heard and to rally to a cause which has as its sole purpose the guaranteed independence of South Vietnam. We don't want our government to settle for anything less. If the United States gives up on Vietnam, free Asia will give up on the United States and all Asia will be swallowed up by the communist menace.

Student demonstrators against our policy in Vietnam are in the minority. Many of them are not aware of the issues involved there. We need the help of your students to help ameliorate this false impression given Peking and Hanoi. Your cooperation in this

campaign for signatures will not be forgotten by us here at Wolcott.

SAVE would appreciate your distributing several copies of the enclosed petitions to each classroom in your school to be signed by those students who support our position. This can all be done very easily and conveniently at the beginning of the school day. This can also be done through your Social Studies Department, if you find it more convenient than the method we suggested. Have the sheets returned to your office as soon as possible so that you can mail them back to our headquarters. Please address your envelope to read: SAVE, Wolcott High School, Wolcott, Conn., 06716. If there are private schools in your area, we would appreciate your notifying them of our endeavor and urging them to send in signatures of their students on facsimiles of the form we sent you.

The critical nature of the Vietnam War makes it all the more essential that we complete our projects as soon as possible so that we can notify Washington of our results. We know you will not refuse so urgent an appeal. This project has the endorsement of the Connecticut Association of Secondary School Principals.

Very sincerely yours,
RONALD BERTOTHY,
SAVE Chairman.
Mr. ROBERT F. CARROLL,
Faculty Sponsor.

SAVE STUDENTS APPROVE VIETNAM EFFORT
School _____
City _____
State _____

We, the undersigned, wish to express our support of the United States policy in Vietnam. As we understand this policy we are in Vietnam at the request of the South Vietnamese government to help them stop communist intervention. We are not there to impose our system because every nation should have the right to choose the system of government that best fits its needs. We are in Vietnam to protect this right; the communists are there to destroy it. We are not there to impose American colonialism; we are there to oppose communist colonialism.

We are seriously disturbed by the small minority of students demonstrating against our policy in Vietnam and even advocating the tearing up of draft cards. Their tactics have led to highly exaggerated estimates of their numbers. Because these tactics may lead Peking and Hanoi to seriously underestimate American commitment we, the students of America, have decided to speak up.

[Signatures.]
Mail returns to: SAVE, Wolcott High School, Wolcott, Conn., 06716.

SAVE PETITIONS HIGHLY PRAISED
(By Greg Chilson)

WOLCOTT.—"God help you, keep it up," the Army colonel wrote from Fort Worth, Texas.

The Marine in Da Nang wrote that he read about SAVE in the Pacific Stars and Stripes and "it is one of the things that can make any of us over here extremely proud of serving our country."

"You may be interested to know that the first signer is the daughter of a soldier in Viet Nam," wrote the principal of the high school in Holidaysburg, Pa.

These are some of the responses pouring into Robert Carroll's contemporary issues class at the high school here, which is trying to get millions of students to sign petitions backing U.S. efforts in Viet Nam.

SAVE is the name of the project, "Students Approve Viet Nam Efforts," and the class plans to take the signed petitions to Presi-

dent Johnson as a counter to the draft-card burnings and other protests about American efforts.

"They're coming in now," said Carroll. "We've got them back from 190 schools in 34 states and the District of Columbia. People are sending in newspaper articles and a lot of other things."

These other things included an editorial cartoon from the York, Pa., Tribune. It showed a student shouting "Support America's Viet Nam Efforts" through a megaphone bearing Wolcott High School's name.

There were clippings from across the country, newspapers in Alabama, Detroit, Oregon. From Oregon there was also an interesting letter.

"Congratulations to you and the senior class," said a woman from Forest Grove, Oreg. "It's kids like that who make this country worth fighting for. I have just clipped the article out of the evening paper to send on to my husband in Viet Nam. He has been there since 1963 and has become very disgusted with all the student demonstrations in this country. Although I campaigned for Senator Morse, I want you to know that he isn't speaking for the people of Oregon and we are very ashamed of him and Governor Hatfield."

From Detroit came a song written by a music publisher who said all royalties from it would be sent to the Wolcott class.

"Although the number of signatures are few," said a letter from Girard, Tex., public schools, "it represents 100 per cent of our high school students * * * We are a rural community and have very strong patriotic feelings toward our country." There were 40 names.

The principal of Cherokee High School in Canton, Ga., wrote that names of his students have already been turned in to President Johnson after a rally at Atlanta, and any additional petitions would be duplication but "we wish you every success."

The principal of the Houston, Minn., high school wrote that the school policy "does not permit distribution" of petitions but "the number of 'I'm behind the boys in Viet Nam' buttons I see on our students shows they are behind you wholeheartedly."

Signed petitions from Mackay, Idaho, were received one day and the next day came a letter from two girl students. "We were not available when your petitions were passed around. We would like to add our names to the list."

Patapsco Senior High School in Baltimore wrote that students made duplicates of the petition forms so every homeroom in the school could have one to sign. They even went a step further and elected one student as SAVE chairman for the school.

Ink smeared on one of the printed petitions, which were mailed to 17,500 high schools across the country, and the principal of the Stony Point High School in North Carolina wrote: "Would you be kind enough to send us a legible copy of your petitions. I feel that the Stony Point students will react favorably if they have materials they can read."

"This Midwest is radical against demonstrations, and boy did they let me know how they felt," wrote a social science teacher from Warsaw, Ill. "All but one student was willing to sign."

There were some opposing letters, too. Carroll noted. Most contended the students saw only one side of the Viet Nam picture. A Waterbury man said he'd like to obtain a speaker to tell the class the "other side" of the story. A Naugatuck writer sent a five-page letter of opposition. A principal in Hawthorne, N.Y., sent back the petitions saying the project "is not in the service of educating students."

A packet of religious tracts came from a woman in Millersville, Pa., urging the students to read them "for in so doing thou-

shalt SAVE both thyself and them that hear thee."

"Dear Nut" started another letter, criticizing Carroll and the class for its project.

Carroll said some 700 out of about 760 Wolcott High School students have signed petitions, but none have yet come in from other Connecticut schools. He said the class isn't discouraged because someone found out that schools are holding back the petitions to give all students a chance to sign them and others are duplicating the forms.

Many school officials from this and other states called or wrote Principal Nicholas D'Agostino, asking if the project had the school's official approval and adding that if so, they'd send in the petitions.

There were petitions back from Senator Morse's Oregon but none yet from Arkansas, which is represented by another critic of the Viet Nam policy, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT.

ADDRESS BY HAROLD F. LINDER, PRESIDENT, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, TO BANKERS' ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on April 26, Mr. Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington made an important speech at the annual meeting of the Bankers' Association for Foreign Trade at Boca Raton, Fla. I believe it to be of interest to the Senate and to the public to see this speech and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY HAROLD F. LINDER, PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING, BANKERS' ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN TRADE, BOCA RATON, FLA., APRIL 26, 1966

It is a great pleasure for me and my colleagues at the Export-Import Bank to be at your meeting, to see and talk with so many people whose interests and occupations closely parallel our own. I know of no organization whose members are more intimately concerned with the daily business of Eximbank than this one. And therefore I value this opportunity to share with you my thoughts on the proper relation of our bank to your member banks, to our exporters, to our nation, to our borrowers and their governments abroad, and to our foreign exporting competitors.

Let me say also that, on the advice of your President and Vice President, I am assuming that most of you already are familiar with our basic operations in long term loans for capital equipment and our emergency foreign trade loans. Thus I will confine myself to those activities of our business which concern you and us in our day-to-day relations.

As I look back over the past 5 years during which I have served the Export-Import Bank, I am reminded how much it has changed—how far the Bank has traveled toward a close partnership with the commercial banking community in bringing financial assistance to exporters. The first guarantee under our present commercial bank program was authorized on April 18, 1961, just about two and a half months after I appeared on the scene. We have since issued over \$1.300 million of these and other commercial bank guarantees.

Before 1961, commercial banks had issued letters of credit under Eximbank direct loans; we had occasionally guaranteed an export credit extended by a commercial bank; we

had experimented with a commercial bank participation program; and we had occasionally sold nonrecourse participations to commercial banks in the near maturities of our better loans.

But there was no continuing, large-scale involvement of commercial banks in the daily business of Eximbank such as we take for granted today—an involvement which extends beyond the bank guarantee program to the protection of your credits under assignments of the proceeds of Foreign Credit Insurance Association policies. In turn, commercial banks have purchased, with the right to sub-participate to others, more than \$1,700 million of participations in our Eximbank Portfolio Funds.

This widening partnership has benefited both of us. It has enabled us to increase our commitments by more than a billion dollars, while simultaneously reducing very substantially our drawings from the Treasury. It has brought more banks into export financing—one of our genuine even though intangible profits. To the commercial banks, our guarantee and insurance programs have brought added security. More importantly, they have made possible new business which would not have been done without our cover. Our Portfolio Fund sales have provided you and your subparticipants with a sound investment at an attractive return.

I can assure you that whenever we are convinced that by enlarging this partnership we can serve better our mutual goals of faster and more adequate financial assistance for sound export transactions, which will increase export receipts, we shall do so—and promptly.

This leads me to what I really want to talk about today—not the past, but the future. What would most interest you, I believe, is the current thinking of Eximbank's management on some of those proposals for changing export financing practices and facilities which are actively debated today.

The topics most frequently raised in comments or articles on our activities are, broadly stated, these:

First, whether we are overly conservative in our interpretation of the "reasonable assurance of repayment" requirement of our statute;

Second, whether a so-called National Interest fund should be established in Eximbank to finance transactions which even on a liberal interpretation do not offer "reasonable assurance of repayment";

Third, whether we should establish some sort of rediscount facility for export paper;

Fourth, whether Eximbank should greatly broaden its guarantees to commercial banks and, correspondingly, cut back its own direct lending activities; and

Finally, whether our existing programs should be made more liberal, especially in respect of fees, coverage, discretionary authority, advance commitments, and the like.

Most fundamental is this question: Does Eximbank's view of when to say "yes" and when to say "no" in the marginal case best serve our present national needs? The answer depends on what those needs are. Is the overriding need today the promotion of exports, purely and simply—exports for their own sake—regardless of the risk of non-payment, regardless of what may be the terms? Or is the need that of expanding existing markets and developing new ones wherever there is a reasonable prospect that our debtors will be able to meet their obligations?

As we bankers know, the present national need, and the need you and we both serve, is the promotion of export receipts, not just exports. In today's plethora of slogans, it is sometimes easy to forget that increasing our exports is a means to an end—not an end in itself.

The true significance of exports, whether to stimulate the domestic economy or to con-

tribute to our balance of payments, lies not in the departure of goods or services from our shores. It lies in the payments we receive for the exports. True, if Eximbank makes the payment or issues its guarantee of payment to the exporter, the domestic economy will be stimulated—even if the foreign purchaser has to postpone, or even fails to meet his obligation. But you will be the first to recognize that domestic stimulation is not what our economy needs today. The need is for credits to our balance of payments. And our financing of exports helps the balance of payments only when the foreign purchaser discharges his debt by paying dollars to this country.

Thus the interests of our nation are best served by the promotion—not of exports for exports' sake—but of exports for which we can reasonably expect to receive payment as promptly as possible from the foreign purchaser.

I suggest that the proper role of the Bank is therefore to stimulate the domestic economy when this is appropriate, but without subsidy, and at all times—particularly today—to aid our balance of payments by increasing receipts from export sales.

These are among the most important of our guideposts—the standards against which Eximbank's performance should be judged. And we try conscientiously to operate at the outer limits of these guidelines.

I do not imply that those who say that Eximbank is overly conservative use another standard. Our differences frequently come down to nothing more than differing judgments as to how short-run and long-run interests can best be balanced. The manufacturer who argues that to protect our markets we must maintain the flow of exports to a country in severe balance-of-payments difficulties, or who seeks assistance in penetrating new but risky markets, can always claim to have in mind the long-run interests of both our economy and our balance of payments. Should he be sufficiently objective he may even recognize that repayment for his sales may be highly doubtful—but if this be so I suggest that he does not recognize nor give sufficient weight to the seriousness of our country's present payments problem.

Is there any yardstick against which to measure whether Eximbank is in fact too conservative in its case-by-case decisions? I fear not. This is a matter of judgment, and into that judgment go a substantial number of considerations—political, economic, financial—which some of our critics cannot be expected to weigh or possibly even consider. Yet a reasonably dispassionate look at the contentions of some of our friends and critics may be instructive.

The proposition most frequently cited is the generalized statement that the United States is losing export sales because Eximbank will not offer credit support as liberal as that made available by other governments.

If this is true to any significant extent, we at Eximbank have been hard put to find evidence to support it. Our conviction is that the export credit facilities offered by Eximbank and other U.S. Government agencies are superior to those of any other country. We at Eximbank try to make it clear that we will consider meeting any foreign government's support for its commercial exports. If we are failing to do so in any significant number of specific cases, we would like nothing better than to know of it.

When we are confronted with the generalization that we fail in this regard, we ask that cases be documented. And then we are often met with a strange reticence on the part of our exporting friends—and, yes, sometimes our banking friends as well. Please believe me, we want to know about that export sale which may be lost because our terms, our procedures, or our require-

ments are deemed deficient. The Bank cannot weigh and judge the complaints unless it has the relevant facts.

To obtain these facts, we have established a group within the Bank to hear and assess complaints. Harry Rowntree, our Executive Vice President, is in charge. I would consider it a personal favor if you would give him in writing now or in the future the details of any cases of which you have direct knowledge, where it is clear that an export was lost just because a competing foreign exporter had better financial support from his government.

As I have said on other occasions, we do not deny that U.S. exporters may from time to time lose sales which foreign exporters may win with their government's support, just as our exporters win some sales with our help.

In a competitive world no country, regardless of its credit facilities, can expect to get all of the business all of the time. For years the United States Government has sought to persuade other industrialized nations to assume a greater share of the aid burden to developing countries. As you know, practically all such aid is "tied"; that is, it is made available through the sale on long terms of goods and services originating in the lending country. This of course means that the United States cannot at the same time expect greater participation by other industrialized countries and not expect them to take a share of the business.

We also hear that Eximbank must be too conservative because it has earnings, pays dividends to the Treasury, and has accumulated a reserve of a billion dollars. It is of course an insufficient answer merely to quote our statute: "Net earnings of the Bank after reasonable provision for possible losses shall be used for payment of dividends on capital stock. The real issue is whether our present "provision for possible losses"—our accumulated reserves—has passed the reasonable level.

Again, this is a matter of judgment. As the Chairman of one of the Congressional Committees is fond of reminding me, we will never really know the adequacy of our reserves until the Bank is liquidated. But some figures may be helpful.

As of this time the Bank has total commitments of over \$6½ billion—some \$2,200 million in so-called C and D markets, the high-risk countries. At least seventy million dollars of our loans are in protracted default. There are others we could place in this category. In the last 5 years, we have had to refund \$263 million of maturities to avoid further defaults.

For example: in one country we are owed \$275 million. Last year \$38 million of principal on this country's loans came due. Of this, we were paid \$24 million. We refunded the difference, calling for repayment over the next 7 years.

In a second country we are owed \$718 million. Last year \$47 million of principal was due. We received \$9 million and refunded \$38 million.

In a third country there is owed to us \$192 million. Last year \$24 million of principal came due. We were paid \$6 million and refunded \$18 million.

Eximbank's share of the total official external debt of these countries is also significant. In the first country, over 15 percent, in the second over 33 percent, and in the third over 23 percent of the total official external debt is owed to the Export-Import Bank—not to the U.S. Government as a whole, but to Eximbank alone.

These are not figures which we can ignore. To add substantially to the debt burden of these three countries—or any country similarly situated—could well jeopardize that country's ability to service not only new debt but its existing foreign obligations to others as well as ourselves.

These few statistics, I think, clearly justify our present level of reserves—not a lower one. They represent less than 15 percent of our total commitments, and 37 percent of this exposure is in high-risk markets. As we expand our commitments—and we hope and expect to do so in the near future—we may need every dollar set aside for contingencies.

There is another general misapprehension which I think it appropriate at this time to endeavor to correct. It is that since other export credit insurers—especially the Export Credit Guarantees Department in Great Britain—guarantees a higher percentage of national exports than are assisted by Eximbank alone, then QED—Eximbank must be more conservative than they are.

It is true that our volume of loans, guarantees, and insurance constitutes a smaller percentage of total exports than is the case in some of the other industrialized countries. But the conclusion that we are more conservative, or even less apt, certainly does not follow. It fails to take account of many differences in the economies and trading patterns of the United States and the United Kingdom, using that country as illustrative. Let me cite a few of these differences:

A sizeable volume of U.S. exports are shipped under AID, Department of Agriculture, or Department of Defense financing arrangements, and therefore do not require Eximbank assistance. U.S. exports to the least developed countries, where the need for insurance coverage is greatest, are covered to a considerable extent by such arrangements.

Bulk commodities comprise an unusually large share of U.S. exports; consequently a disproportionately large share of U.S. merchandise sales are for cash or on such short terms as to require no insurance.

A major share of our exports go to Canada, all uninsured by us.

U.S. corporations are larger and more soundly financed. They are therefore better able to be self-insurers of their export credits than are their overseas competitors. Export insurance is widely used by British firms on sales to European and, I emphasize, even to U.S. customers.

Proposals coming to us either through you or via FCIA are quite appropriately selected against us. One of the three largest automobile manufacturers uses our facilities to a limited extent to cover his higher risk sales.

The other two do no business with us on automobile or truck sales. One of the four major tobacco companies insures a portion of its business. The other companies prefer to be self-insurers, and so it goes.

Finally, a very significant share of our exports are shipped by U.S. companies to their foreign subsidiaries and affiliates. These exports seldom require government assistance.

It ill behoves a banker to proclaim too widely his liberality with the funds entrusted to his care. Accepting this risk, I hope I may have corrected some misapprehensions as to Eximbank's leanings in the opposite direction.

Our answer to whether we are too conservative is related to our thinking on the second topic of current debate—the proposal for a so-called National Interest fund. It has been suggested that Eximbank, using appropriated funds, provide export financing on concessionary terms for transactions which, in our opinion, frequently will not offer reasonable assurance of repayment, even on a liberal construction of that criterion.

Our position has been, and continues to be, that creation of such a National Interest fund is not really needed. The U.S. Government—through the various agencies to which I made earlier reference and, of course, through the Export-Import Bank itself—already engages in far, far more National Interest export financing than any other government in the world. The figures which I have already quoted seem to me clearly to

attest to Eximbank's willingness to take risks where in our judgment there are valid reasons for so doing.

We have a large exposure in Brazil. But we continue to do moderate lending there. We have had problems in Argentina. Yet during calendar 1965 we made new commitments of \$65 million there. Our emergency foreign trade credits—to Canada for \$400 million, to Brazil for \$168 million, to Italy for \$200 million, to the United Kingdom for \$250 million, to name the major ones in recent years—as well as our credits made in conjunction with the Defense Department—all fall clearly in the National Interest area. And I point out they too had very great value to our business and banking communities as well as to our government. In sum, we are not convinced that additional facilities with different criteria are indicated.

The third topic of current debate is whether Eximbank should establish a rediscount facility for export paper. We see no legal impediment to such a step. In the past, we have believed that banks and exporters had sufficient funds to carry the paper which might be eligible for rediscount by us. We therefore saw no real need for the facility. The very opposite, in fact: Eximbank sought in a number of ways to use private funds to finance its own activities—through guarantee and insurance programs and our participation sales. To reverse this trend, and greatly add to the funds we may need is a step we cannot take without most careful consideration.

Nevertheless we recognize the change in circumstances—in particular, that bank liquidity is severely curtailed. We have therefore undertaken a thorough reexamination of several rediscount proposals. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is extending us its full cooperation in our study, and other interested agencies are giving the matter active consideration. We have made real progress in the past few weeks, indeed in the past few days, and shall be in touch with you again on this subject, I hope constructively, and within the next few weeks.

Now I would like to turn to a subject which has been raised by a few of your members—namely, should Eximbank turn over more of its long-term direct lending to commercial banks for financing under our guarantee? We have done a modest amount of longer term guarantees—what we in the Bank refer to as "financial guarantees." These have been done under our 100 percent cover and we have split the interest with the commercial bank, believing this more appropriate than to charge a separate fee for our guarantee. We have also sold to the commercial banks under our guarantee some specific large loans made by us, under a like split of interest arrangement.

Generally these have been related to sales of jet aircraft, diesel locomotives, and smaller plants—equipment now calling for terms beyond the usual 5- to 7-year limit of our bank guarantee program. This financing traditionally has been brought directly to Eximbank by the potential borrower. Eximbank therefore sets the interest, at our prevailing rate for direct loans.

When we decided to lay off some of these credits to commercial banks, we extended our full guarantee. Consequently we concluded that the return to the commercial bank should not exceed a reasonable rate for our fully guaranteed paper by allowing the commercial bank, say, 4 1/4 percent out of a 5 1/2 percent interest rate.

So long as yields on agency paper were around 4 1/4 percent banks were happy to receive a comparable yield on this type of guaranteed credit. Today's yields as we all know are well above this level. Hence, if we are to continue to place some of this business with commercial banks, or if they are to

bring us more of their own longer-term business for our guarantee, we shall either have to raise our interest rate to all borrowers; raise our rate for those transactions such as airplanes where the usual financial guarantee is possible; or invent a new pattern which does not involve a split of interest.

At this time, we are quite reluctant to raise our interest rate. To increase the cost of exports in this manner will not benefit either exporters or our balance of payments. Nor do we feel that we can discriminate against aircraft, locomotives, or similar products by raising our rate only on those credits in order that this special category of loans may be done under a financial guarantee.

This leaves the third possibility: devising a new form of guarantee. This we now will do. In addition to continuing financial guarantees as in the past, when an appropriate division of interest can be agreed upon, we will offer an alternative to the commercial banks:

Where a commercial bank is prepared to make and carry a direct loan to the borrower abroad, as distinguished from buying the borrower's paper from the exporter, on terms acceptable to us, Eximbank is ready to issue a guarantee subject to these provisions:

It must have acceptable answers to any questions about the transaction, by which I mean that the borrower must supply us through his commercial bank or directly the information which we regard as necessary to justify our commitment.

The commercial bank must carry the early installments up to 30 percent for its own account; that is, without either a political or commercial risk guarantee from us or FCIA on those installments.

If these conditions are met, we will give an unconditional guarantee on all later installments, for which we will charge an appropriate fee. And in such cases we will not limit the amount of interest charged by the lending commercial bank. Indeed, we will guarantee payment of interest on the later installments up to 6 percent. We will not require a cash payment by the buyer or a participation by the suppliers.

I must emphasize, however, that what I have described will be one of three—not two—possible ways of handling a direct loan. We will issue our guarantee as just outlined; or we will issue a financial guarantee with a split of interest; or we will make a direct loan ourselves at our going rate of interest if the borrower wishes to approach us directly. Even if a commercial bank is already endeavoring to provide financing on the prospect of our guarantee, we cannot justify closing our doors to our traditional borrowers, or to other long-term borrowers, so long as our exporters find themselves faced with interest rate competition from abroad.

A few may say that we are being unmindful of that part of our statute which directs us to "supplement and encourage and not compete with private capital". But as Al Smith was wont to say, "Let's look at the record".

In the short-term field we operate only in conjunction with the FCIA.

In the medium-term field, all of our business now is channeled through either FCIA or commercial banks. These are the two areas of traditional interest to banks.

In the long-term field (where the size of the loan is usually so great as to limit those interested to only a relatively few of the largest commercial banks), the volume of Eximbank direct credits far exceeds the present appetite of the commercial banks; and the nature of most of these loans is neither to their taste nor within their traditional field of activity. And in respect of the relatively few loans which could conceivably be attractive to commercial banks or even investment bankers, we satisfy ourselves by

questioning the borrower and by applying our own judgment as to whether private financing, unsupported by our guarantee, is feasible. If there be an issue, it then relates to those long term loans made directly by Eximbank which a commercial bank might be prepared to finance with an Eximbank guarantee.

I cannot concede that our Bank competes with a commercial bank when we make a long-term loan which a commercial bank would make if—but only if—we are prepared to accept a major portion of the risk. This is not what I conceive to be competition. Nevertheless as I said, we now have a device which will enable commercial banks to engage in this type of lending to private borrowers under a substantial guarantee from us. Thus the commercial bank will have the opportunity to initiate or preserve the relationship with a good foreign customer. The advantage from our point of view is that the commercial banking system will be providing the necessary funds.

But gentleman, I must, at the risk of being redundant and in all frankness, point out that there are cases, particularly when governments, quasi-governmental institutions, or even some very large "private" companies are involved, when none of these arrangements will prove feasible—where it is essential that the borrower deal directly with the United States Government. Nor can the competitive position of our country's manufacturers be jeopardized by denying them our facilities at times when it is impossible, or at least not feasible, for the commercial banks to meet Eximbank's 5½ percent rate.

So I have endeavored to make it clear that in all areas—short, medium, and long term—we neither have nor intend to compete, but rather have in fact supplemented private capital.

I come now to my final topic—a series of decisions for liberalizing our existing insurance, guarantee, and direct lending programs. I would like to cover this by simply informing you of the essence of some 17 changes which our Board of Directors and, where necessary, the Foreign Credit Insurance Association have just authorized. Most of these changes have been under consideration for some time; others have been suggested or modified by our study of the "Report of the Action Committee on Export Financing of the National Export Expansion Council." This Report has not yet been made public but some of you are aware of it.

Rather than give you all the fine print, I shall merely outline these changes. The details will appear in the course of the next week or so.

One. I described earlier one additional proposed method of guaranteeing longer-term credits made by commercial banks directly to foreign borrowers. It does not preclude the arrangements, when money markets permit, of a split of interest with the commercial bank and a 100 percent guarantee by Eximbank. And of course both of these are outside the scope of our regular medium-term bank guarantee program.

Two. We will reduce our guarantee and insurance charges for C and D markets—by about 15 percent in C markets and 25 percent in D markets.

Three. We will permit lower cash payments in most C markets.

Four. We will increase substantially the discretionary authority of the commercial banks and FCIA to commit Eximbank in medium-term cases.

Five. We will authorize the commercial banks and the FCIA to make minor amendments to transactions previously approved by Eximbank, without requiring them to obtain our approval before acting.

Six. We will give FCIA discretionary authority to issue political-risks-only policies in a large number of markets.

Seven. We will add foreign commercial banks to the list of acceptable guarantors on certain medium-term sales to public buyers. Traditionally, we have required a Central Bank or Ministry of Finance guarantee.

Eight. The Eximbank Loan Committee, which meets daily, will be authorized to act on cases where Eximbank's liability under the transaction does not exceed \$400,000—double the present \$200,000 figure.

Nine. Our senior officers will have added individual authority to make certain changes in previous Board or Loan Committee authorizations.

Ten. We will revise the guidelines which relate the size of an order to the length of term of the credit so as to permit longer terms for smaller orders. Our willingness to make exceptions to the guidelines in appropriate cases will be reemphasized.

Eleven. We will not require that balance sheets of the buyer be submitted in certain transactions where the guarantor and credit reports are satisfactory to us.

Twelve. In appropriate medium term cases we will permit the use of bills of exchange or drafts. Heretofore we have required promissory notes.

Thirteen. After the first half of the installments on certain guaranteed or insured credits of three years or more have been paid as due, we will extend our coverage, without additional charge, to 100 percent of loss.

Fourteen. Today we require that all sales covered by our guarantees and FCIA insurance be denominated in dollars. We will hereafter provide cover for short-term credit sales denominated in foreign currencies—but not to the extent of covering the exchange risk.

Fifteen. We will permit annual payments—rather than semiannual, quarterly, or monthly—when appropriate.

Sixteen. We are occasionally asked to commit ourselves in a specific case as to a particular market before the credit information is worked up. When we give such specific advance political risk commitments, they will hereafter be firm and noncancelable on that transaction for a 90-day period.

Seventeen. In appropriate cases we will guarantee a contractor's equipment in use overseas against loss due to expropriation, war, or inability to re-export.

These changes and those being considered are evidence of the flexibility of approach, the willingness to find new solutions to new problems, which I believe have characterized Eximbank throughout its many years of service to our nation.

I come back to the overriding requirement today: export receipts. I do not pretend, gentlemen, that any innovations announced today, or any we may announce tomorrow, will provide a panacea for our payments ills. Certainly those who believe that a general loosening of credit terms on our part will result in a flood of exports are at best naive. For one thing, they underestimate the willingness of our competitors to match more generous terms. Nor do they consider fully the dangers of an international credit race.

We at Eximbank are doing and will continue to do our conscientious best to assist exports and export receipts within the framework of our overall responsibilities. But it is only when our manufacturers make a sale abroad that either we or you can help with financing. We together, as dedicated believers in foreign trade, must spread the gospel to our industrial brethren. Only when their eyes are distracted from the increasingly enticing domestic market, when they exercise their abilities and further ingenuity in style, design, engineering, pricing, and above all salesmanship abroad in the pursuit of sound export sales, then and only then can we in the financial community make our vital contribution to resolving our nation's balance-of-payments problem.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN SUPPORT OF COMPREHENSIVE FAMILY-PLANNING PROGRAMS—S. 2993

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week the Reverend Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., professor of law at Georgetown University, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty. Father Hanley appeared in support of S. 2993, which proposes a program of Federal financial assistance to public and private groups supporting family planning programs.

It is my feeling that the type program proposed in S. 2993 deserves widespread support. It is conceived in a manner which would make available family planning information to all who would wish to avail themselves of this information. Under the provisions of S. 2993 the Government would permit a free choice on the part of its citizens—a choice which would be both uncoerced and informed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Father Hanley's statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, MANPOWER, AND POVERTY OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, JOSEPH S. CLARK, CHAIRMAN, ON S. 2993, PRESENTED BY THE REVEREND DEXTER L. HANLEY, S.J., PROFESSOR OF LAW AND DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF LAW, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND SOCIAL VALUES, OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON TUESDAY, MAY 10, 1966

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am grateful for the opportunity to testify today concerning Senate Bill 2993, which is designed to provide federal financial assistance to public and private groups in support of comprehensive family planning programs.

The concern of this Congress for the civil rights of our citizens and for the religious convictions of each citizen has been manifested in the particular attention which has been given to Catholic sensibilities and interests in the area of family planning. Indeed, it would be a sad thing were it to be otherwise. And, in turn, I think it is no less important that individual Catholics should be prepared to address themselves to the broad problems of public policy.

As perhaps you may know, I have given some attention to legislative and political procedures which may serve to insure full freedom of conscience for all citizens while guaranteeing civil liberty to each and while permitting governmental action in areas of legitimate social interest. The preliminary results of this study were presented last August 24 before the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of Senator Gruening. Although that record is available to this Committee, I should perhaps emphasize a few items of that testimony at this time.

First, I will support a government program which, in its legitimate concern about education, health, and welfare in a rapidly expanding population, permits each citizen a fully free moral choice in matters of family planning and aids him in implementing choice.

Second, in making this statement, I speak for myself and not for my Church or its leaders. I have come to my conclusion with full respect for and adherence to Catholic doctrine and traditional Catholic teaching.

on the questions of morality in family planning. Still, there are other Catholics who express opposition, usually on what they consider to be sound political and social grounds. There is no definitive Catholic teaching which requires a specific position on this public-policy question.

Third, the conclusion carries certain implications: that the government will not express a preference for one acceptable medical procedure over another nor lend its authority to one moral position rather than another. The government must be neutral. But such neutrality can be present where the government permits a free choice on the part of its citizens, provided the choice is both uncoerced and informed.

Fourth, there are related areas, such as abortion and surgical sterilization, which present particular problems both in the moral and in the social spheres. I do not read the bill before this committee as encouraging, permitting, or supporting either procedure. Such procedures, in my judgment, introduce new dimensions in the problems of public policy, dimensions justifying opposition on both moral and social grounds.

If it will be of help to this Committee to study more fully the complex religious and social issues which are involved in reconciling principles of private morality with the needs of public interests in the area of family planning, I will leave with the Committee a speech on this question which I recently presented in Washington before a Catholic group. ("The Catholic and Population Policy," Apr. 22, 1966.)

The reconciliation of these principles and needs is, however, dependent upon the existence of a legitimate social interest, one which is properly a concern of government and not merely a matter of private interest for private groups. I believe that the United States has such an interest, both at home and abroad, both in terms of our own welfare and of the needs of others. I support the position presented by Senator TYRINGS that "it is a proper function of Government to provide family planning information and assistance to those, both at home and abroad, who explicitly request it." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 89th Cong., 2d sess., p. 4276, Feb. 28, 1966.)

However, the limits of this function must be very carefully drawn. I personally believe that there has been a great deal of imprecision in defining "government interests" and that there has been a confusion over its description. Though some may think that this is merely a semantic difficulty, I believe that it may rather go to the heart of the matter of finding a political ground upon which differing moral convictions may agree.

The real reason which justifies government participation in and support of family-planning programs is the general welfare, in terms of education, housing, health, and other problems. This interest is dramatized abroad where there is need to prevent hunger and famine by bringing resources and population into balance. The problem is no less real at home, where the quality of life and the opportunities of our citizens are affected by the population growth. At least, available evidence seems to point this out, and I am willing to accept such evidence at this time.

But poverty as such is not a reason for government interest in family planning. This can perhaps be made clear by supposing for a moment that all of our other problems (of housing, education, opportunity, and so forth) were solved, that adequate support could be given to those whose income was otherwise inadequate. I would find it hard to say that the federal government should then propose to enter upon a field so delicate, so involved with religious and moral overtones, merely to assure that there be an equality of choice in this question among all the citizens. There are many areas in which

economic differences are accepted and private action is preferable. This, I suggest, would be one.

I make this point at this time, however, because I think that the shift of emphasis to the poor, rather than to underlying social problems which affect all, serves to attract opposition and to make it difficult to find an acceptable common ground. If attention be given to the basic social problems, then the economically handicapped will still be well served. For, as a matter of concrete fact, many of these social problems weigh most heavily upon the economically disadvantaged. Yet, it is these factors which are the government's concern. Poverty is a reason for government action in some fields, but alone it is not a reason for establishing family planning. To make it so is to give grounds for fears that the program is one of social engineering which will give economic costs priority over human values, or reason to suspect that the program is really one which throws its weight behind particular methods or moral convictions.

Thus you will note that, while supporting Senator TYRINGS' conclusions, I do not fully accept the analysis of his reasons. He has suggested in his speech introducing this bill that "wealth cannot be the basis for determining man's rights, his responsibility as a parent, and his ability to make a decision reflecting the future of his family." I would add that this is true, if, and only if, decisions as to family size have clearly defined social consequences. That they do, we both agree. I think this, however, is a vital and necessary condition for government support.

I turn now to areas of mutual concern in the preservation of civil liberties and personal convictions.

There are two specific questions to which I would have the Congress direct its attention. First is our mutual concern in these programs to avoid coercion, both direct and indirect. To this end, we need guidelines carefully formulated. These will not always be easily arrived at. What to some will seem perfectly proper will to others seem to be coercive. This will often be due to the moral attitudes of the individuals concerned. Now I think that it must be borne in mind that it will be as difficult for the non-Catholic to shed some of his predispositions when approaching matters of public policy as it will be for the Catholic. Neutrality is not found in any one-sided surrender of interests. To avoid coercive overtones and to achieve the best kind of a program will require open and fair discussion.

To achieve this, it is clear that Catholic participation is required in the formulation of guidelines and in the administration of programs, and I am sure it will be forthcoming. Without it, I am very sure that interests which I think should be safeguarded may be overlooked. Thus I view it as a responsibility of individual Catholics, according to their convictions as to the political propriety of these programs, to cooperate in developing specific guidelines and procedures. At the same time, I would call upon governmental and private agencies to openly court such participation. I must confess that I am not so sure it will be sought as I am sure that it is available. There is an understandable tendency to avoid becoming embroiled in discussions which may slow down the immediate acceptance of a specific program, a feeling that so long as Catholics do not block the program it is better to "do it my own way." This, however, is to overlook the very fundamental civic values which are at stake; it is a failure to make best use of a democratic process.

The second question is one of mutual concern over the preservation of the public morality. By "public morality," I have reference to those standards of conduct which society has chosen to set for itself, standards which we hope embody the highest of

ethical and spiritual ideals. Law is a matrix into which many of these ideals have been poured; law itself is part of public morality and helps to form public attitudes. Now, if it be the right of those in society to try to have it reflect fundamental values, then a coordinated effort may be expected to see that these values are not lost and that support be given to public attitudes which strengthen family life. Leaders of planned parenthood themselves realize the need of channeling the resources of religion so as to protect these fundamental values. They, too, realize that the availability of contraceptives is having a profound effect on society.

Thus, a sincere attempt should be made to coordinate family-planning programs with counselling. Such counselling should touch upon the social, economic, religious, medical, and personal issues which are involved. This, I insist, is a matter of common concern to all citizens and to all religious bodies. Only so can an informed choice be made and liberty truly protected. Only so can we make available for the family all the resources which are necessary for family planning in the full sense of the words. Only so can we avoid depersonalizing the program and, in my judgment, risking a collapse of the public morality.

The development of such a program will again be difficult. But I am sure that a program which is limited solely to medical advice and prescriptions will inevitably be coercive in its effects. For, if one is freely to choose, he must be fully informed as to the full nature of his choice.

Before turning to the specifics of a federal program, I would like to say a brief word about legal arguments which I have seen which purport to show that the action of the federal government in supporting family planning would be an unconstitutional abridgement of a right of privacy. Without detailing my argument or burdening this Committee with citations, I will offer my personal legal judgment that such arguments are invalid.

But now what of the central question before you? What of the specifics of a federal program? At this time, I would like to do something I failed to do last August. Before the Gruening Subcommittee, I limited my testimony to a cautious statement that there were no grounds of private morality which would demand that I oppose the bill. Upon reflection, and specifically upon consideration of S. 2993 before this Committee, I am prepared to offer my support of the Gruening recommendation.

I have for instance tried to collect data concerning the functioning of programs throughout the United States. It is difficult to do, and it has been next to impossible to evaluate the conduct of such programs in any meaningful way. Senate Bill 1676 provides for coordinating information and for reporting on programs. This is to be done through the establishment of the office of an assistant secretary for Health, Medical Services, and Population Problems in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I shall not detail his functions; I am sure they are well known to you. Of course, there are some who feel that the power which will reside in this office is too great and is too dangerous. On the other hand, I am fearful that, lacking such a coordinating power, there is even greater danger of private programs deviating from approved guidelines and a greater impossibility of exercising supervision and control.

Indeed, I will go further and suggest that there should also be a special subcommittee in Congress to which reports on domestic and international programs will be made and which will exercise supervisory control over the guidelines and programs. Especially as such programs grow and proliferate, it is the responsibility of the elected repre-

sentatives of the people to see that the programs properly serve all the people. It will again be a difficult task, but I believe the matter is too important and delicate to be left to piecemeal implementation by government agencies, whether acting by themselves or in cooperation with private groups.

In similar fashion, I would express a strong preference for entrusting the initial programs to governmental medical services. Here I realize that there are problems of departmental organization and that this may overlook the existence of private and well-organized groups ready to begin operation. There are conflicting interests involved, but I would like to see at least some attention given to the possibility of greater utilization of government medical services. In this way, and especially in the formative periods, more prompt control and coordination is possible, along with better training of personnel for the future.

At last, I turn to the specific language of Senate bill 2993.

I am pleased that specific authorization is now being sought. The matter of population policy is too important to be left to the present procedures, which have seemed to some to be without Congressional authorization. Both at home and abroad, a clear and definitive policy must be set.

There is no doubt that authorization for studies and research carries with it an almost universal approbation. The dissemination of information and the distribution of supplies may also, for the reasons I have given, be a proper government function. I have indicated a preference for the programs being under more direct government control, rather than through private agencies. But I lack information as to the extent and capabilities of private and of government medical services. At this time, then, I do not give specific approval to a broad program of private services; I can only reserve my judgment as to which is the more advisable procedure.

I am in favor of the provision (section 2(b)) which assures that individuals will not be pressured into accepting services out of a fear they will be deprived of other welfare and medical services.

The bill provides (Section 3(c)) that the Secretary will not deny a grant on the ground that the applicant, under standards it prescribes, provides assistance to unmarried individuals.

On this point, I would like to offer specific testimony. The policy of offering contraceptive advice to the unmarried has been a perennial source of argument. It is an explosive question and one to which I can offer no definitive answer. But there are several grounds for supporting the proposal in the bill.

It is clearly true that the problem of illegitimacy creates moral, social, and legal problems. A child has a moral and a legal right to be born legitimate. I do not hesitate to affirm that premarital and extramarital intercourse is a moral evil. But it is also a moral evil to procreate a child in circumstances where he cannot be born into a family. Of course, morality requires a cessation of an illicit relationship. But where, contrary to this moral and social precept, one still engages in the relationship, can it be said there is an obligation to procreate? I suggest that there is an obligation to the contrary, and that the essential moral evil of these situations is the illicit relationship itself, not the contraceptive practice. Thus, to avoid the clear social evils of illegitimacy, I think it proper for the Government to permit the distribution of contraceptive advice.

Yet, there are those who sincerely feel that the distribution of information and supplies to the unmarried will encourage promiscuity and a breakdown of public morality. This, of course, is not the ex-

clusive concern of any one group, social or religious. It is an objection to be weighed. I think that, if contraceptive advice is to be distributed to the unmarried, two things will be necessary. First, as I have earlier emphasized, adequate counselling and increased attention to family values will have to be encouraged, both in and out of the planning programs. Secondly, doctors and counsellors will have to be able to exercise discretion. There is a real difference involved in the indiscriminate prescription of contraceptive supplies and a prescription which is concerned with an individual who has already made a mature decision. Where that patient has already made a decision to enter upon a relationship, I do not see where the social harms are increased by permitting contraceptive counselling. But, the doctor and others should not neglect the responsibility which is implicit in the giving of all such information and advice: an obligation to see that the individual has had an opportunity to make a fully informed choice. There is for instance a difference between what the doctor may choose to do for a young girl who is just thinking of entering upon a liaison and what he might do for one who has consistently borne illegitimate.

Thus, while supporting this provision in principle, I am not in favor of allowing the guidelines to be set entirely by the applicant.

There are a few questions I have about the bill. First, in section 3(a), it is stated that grants will be given to applicants whose services are limited in scope. While this may prove helpful to Catholic interests in that they will be able to operate rhythm clinics, it will also create a problem in areas where no such clinic exists and where all the counselling is done by private clinics which do not offer rhythm instruction. This lack of full freedom of choice among methods in individual clinics poses problems for careful consideration. It may again indicate a reason for my preference to have the government services (federal and state) handle the initial programs.

Second, in proposing the bill, Senator TYDINGS explained that procedures will be established to assure that "no individual will be provided with any information, medical assistance, or supplies which such individual states to be inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., p. 4277, Feb. 28, 1966.) The bill before me does not contain the word "information" in the relevant section (section 2(a)(1)). This leads to some problems. Do not the guidelines have to assure that, even in the presentation of information about the programs, there must be protection for individual beliefs? Where individuals state that information is objectionable, at this point, at least, should not the presentation cease? Will the way be left open for proselytizing? I would suggest the inclusion of the word "information" in section 2(a)(1) of the bill so as to accord with Senator TYDINGS' explanation on the floor of the Senate.

But even then a possible difficulty can arise. While we all agree that a clear statement that a program is inconsistent with one's belief should be enough, does not respect for the individual conscience begin even earlier? Suppose one is speaking to a patient who is not fully instructed in his or her own beliefs. Is there not some obligation to make referral so that the person can make an informed choice? Again, I come back to the importance of a program integrated with full family counselling and to the importance of congressional review of and responsibility for the guidelines.

In closing, I would like to express my thanks to this Committee for the invitation to appear here today. In spite of a growing consensus as to the importance of the population problem and as to the need of gov-

ernment programs, there are still unexplored areas of mutual concern about the protection of civil liberty and of freedom of conscience. These can be worked out, I am sure, in a discussion which is free, open, and honest. I am pleased to have had this opportunity to present my views on these most important matters.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, today I would like to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Portland, Maine, Sunday Telegram on April 17, describing how a Maine firm has responded to President Johnson's appeal to industry to hire and train the handicapped.

I am proud to call attention to the commendable efforts of Hillcrest Poultry Industries of Lewiston, Maine, in helping the handicapped to become productive citizens, capable of self-support.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Portland (Maine) Telegram, April 17, 1966]

PINELAND WORK PROJECT ACHIEVES HIGH SUCCESS

(By Frank Sleeper)

LEWISTON.—Since February 14, several patients at Pineland Hospital and Training Center have been working at the Hillcrest Poultry Co. here.

Fifteen started training then and six more later joined them.

Their jobs are the result of cooperative venture between Pineland and Hillcrest.

For years, Pineland officials have been trying to find jobs in larger industry where the retarded could be trained. They wanted to show how many patients could be employed and productive citizens.

With the labor shortage, Hillcrest needed unskilled workers to do repetitious jobs. Last September, Hillcrest representatives visited Dr. Peter W. Bowman, Pineland superintendent.

That meeting resulted in employment of Pineland people at Hillcrest.

And now from William J. Mendelson, Hillcrest president, comes word that the project is going well. "One third of the trainees have improved to a degree allowing them to be placed on the main production line," he says.

"Soon we hope some of this group will attain top union wage scales. The others are still on the slower or training lines but we are fairly confident that they will get closer to the standard rate of production with a little more time and experience," he adds.

Of the first 21 trainees, only three weren't able to make a satisfactory adjustment to the work and have been phased into another program.

The Pineland patients are full-fledged members of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers of America, AFL-CIO, the bargaining union for Hillcrest employees.

All the trainees' wages are placed in their own bank accounts in Pineland. Spending of the money is supervised by Pineland chaplains. When the patients are discharged, all their moneys are returned to them.

The Pineland institution has plans to expand the program to other Maine industries if enough capable people are found and agreements can be reached with prospective employers.

Here's the way the idea was worked out after Dr. Bowman was approached. He talked it over with Dr. Anthony Chiappone,

Pineland director of training, and Thomas Pooler and Sherman Hill of the Pineland vocational work training program.

Then Pooler, Hill, and two Pineland social workers visited Hillcrest's plant here. They were shown the various types of jobs that were available as well as complete plans for the proposed training-employment program. And they determined how many of the jobs they felt the retarded could be trained to do successfully.

Pooler and Hill screened many of the Pineland patients to find those willing and able to work at the jobs.

After final approval by Dr. Bowman and Mendelson, Hillcrest and Pineland officials conferred with Stanley Wollaston, regional director of the U.S. Department of Labor's Wage-Hour, Public Contracts Division's Boston office, and got United States approval. This was needed since the patients would be employed under the laws relating to employment of handicapped workers.

It was agreed that starting wages for the trainees who range from 18 to 40 years old would be in line with their ability. Job performance evaluation reports were to be made as the training program progressed. As each trainee's work improved his wages would be increased accordingly.

Mendelson agreed to provide transport to and from Pineland, 18 miles from Lewiston.

Pineland provides each trainee with noon lunches. Each would be able to draw money from his own account at Pineland each week to take care of coffee breaks and other incidentals. Each works a five-day, 40-hour week.

Allen Glidden, a production and quality control supervisor at the plant, was assigned to train the group. A metal rack simulating a production line was built for the training.

The trainees were then placed beside regular production line workers for more practice and the social benefits of seeing and working with experienced people.

The first few weeks, Hill and Pooler spent most of the time in the plant, assisting also with minor transitional problems and helping everyone get accustomed to the new program.

Mendelson says he was very pleased with the encouraging attitude of his supervisors and production line employees when news of the program got around the plant.

"I think the cooperation and understanding of our own people, evident from the very start, has played an important role in the program's success," he declares.

"This is one of the most progressive steps we have ever been able to take in our long-range rehabilitation program at Pineland," Dr. Bowman says. "A great deal of credit should go to Hillcrest for providing us with the chance to prove what many of the mentally retarded are capable of."

The union is happy with the program, too. Says Rodney P. Warren, president of Amalgamated Meat Cutters Local 385:

"Officers and members of Local 385 wholeheartedly endorse and desire to cooperate in the program at Hillcrest Poultry Co. to restore Pineland patients to useful positions in society through training for gainful employment."

Glidden is greatly impressed by the whole program. Fellow workers such as Mrs. Phyllis Martin, Miss Ruth Drinkwater, Mrs. Ruth Field, Mrs. Barbara Poirier and Mrs. Florence Heaward exclaim about the excellent behavior of the Pineland people.

Mrs. Bertha Lamb, RN, Hillcrest plant nurse and a former member of the Pineland staff, says behavior of the Pinelanders is setting an example for their fellow workers. They don't expect undue treatment and mix well, she says.

Dr. Peter Clavola, U.S. Department of Agriculture head veterinarian at the plant, is also enthusiastic about the program.

Good Friday, April 8, Hillcrest employees noticed a simple, friendly, home-made card among the many messages on the cafeteria bulletin board.

It carried this Easter message: "To all Hillcrest employees—we hope you have a happy Easter Sunday and many more to come." It was signed, "The girls and boys at Pineland."

CONTRIBUTION OF THE JOB CORPS TO THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in attempting to evaluate the contribution of the Job Corps to the war on poverty, it is really necessary to listen to the young men and women who are enrolled in the program, and who are trying to find the way out of deprivation into the Great Society. Desmond Stone of the Gannett newspapers has written a series of articles on the Job Corps urban training centers at Fort Custer, Mich., and Breckinridge, Ky. Mr. Stone gives us a realistic appraisal of the problems and accomplishments of this program, much of it in the words of the corpsmen themselves.

Mr. President, I think Mr. Stone's series constitutes a particularly valuable contribution to informed discussion of the Job Corps, and I ask unanimous consent to have the series, as it appeared recently in the Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union, printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Times-Union, Apr. 25, 1966]

A LEARNING EXPERIENCE AT A MICHIGAN CAMP

(By Desmond Stone)

JOB CORPS CHANCE AND CHALLENGE

NOTE.—In Washington and across the nation, the Job Corps is drawing political lightning and creating public controversy.

Critics condemn it as an expensive boondoggle project, a refuge for hoodlums.

Supporters see it as an important chance for poor youth, as society's only alternative to paying a much higher cost in welfare and police protection.

To find out what the urban Job Corps centers are like, a Times-Union reporter visited two of them—the Fort Custer center near Battle Creek, Michigan, and the Breckenridge center in northwest Kentucky.

Here is the first of his reports.

FOOT CUSTER, MICH.—This big military reservation is the permanent home of what's claimed to be America's biggest deer herd, running 125 to the square mile.

It's also the temporary home of 1,500 Job Corps youth.

With some bitterness, the center staff speak of a telephone recording in nearby Battle Creek in which the Job Corps was condemned as the "Mob Corps" by a citizen "survival" group.

Most Battle Creek people don't go along with the fanatical few, but the city at the moment is off limits to all but a few corpsmen making authorized home visits.

Empty beds in several of the camps barracks are one of the consequences of a recent street disturbance in Battle Creek, about 10 miles from the reservation.

The troublemakers have been shipped home.

But there are many more occupied beds than empty ones, more corpsmen staying than quitting.

Take, for example, 18-year-old Norman A. (Tony) Prescott of 792 Jefferson Avenue, Rochester.

Prescott makes no bones about where he was headed before he joined the Job Corps.

He was running with a gang or a club and was slipping deeper into trouble.

He doesn't remember exactly how it all began. He had a perfect school attendance record, he says, until ninth grade at Edison Technical and Industrial High School.

Then in spite of his mother's warnings, he recalls, he started hanging around with the gang and forgetting about school. There came a day when Prescott was arrested, given a suspended sentence and placed on probation.

He got the message.

"I knew I had to start fresh, stay out of trouble, get a trade and go back to night school."

So Prescott joined the Job Corps.

That was 6 months ago. Today he's close to graduating as a trained operator of heavy equipment—bulldozers, front-end loaders and other machines.

He likes the power of the big machines, he likes the money he'll be able to make, and he likes the prospect of getting his life back on the tracks.

He intends to get his high school equivalency certificate at night school in Rochester.

"I wish I had finished high school when I had the chance," he says. "I miss it really. It's a hard world out there."

Prescott didn't take quickly to the Job Corps.

At first he was homesick. For the first few weeks, he didn't attend classes. "I wasn't ready. I didn't like school already. I wasn't ready for 'social understanding'."

But to get a job he had to graduate, and to graduate, he had to settle down.

Prescott has a cousin in camp, Willie B. Lyman, of 33 Concord Street, Rochester. Lyman has also had his troubles.

Now he's learning building maintenance and changing some of his outlooks.

"I used to have a bad attitude at home towards school and working. I got C's at school when I might have got A's."

Getting away from it all has helped them both. So, they say, has the interest shown by their teachers.

Both feel that Fort Custer is "pretty good as it is."

Prescott, who's been in camp longer and seen more changes, says conditions are better than before.

"Things are stricter today. You have to act more seriously to make it through. They know all the tricks now."

Camp administrators confirm that discipline has been tightened.

In the earlier, more permissive days, corpsmen got involved in incidents in outside communities that gave the corps a bad name.

Some of the conditions inside the camp still appear to leave something to be desired—glass from broken windows, thick around several of the barracks, for instance. But a day has been set aside for a cleanup by the corpsmen.

"Doctors who get their degrees on the basis of some beautiful theory," says one staff man, "don't want the camps to smack of anything military, like turning everyone out to pick up paper. But you've got to be realistic. You've got to have rules."

There are other staff members who feel the administration may be tempted, under the pressure of public opinion, to swing to the other extreme and give marching orders to youth who have not seriously offended, to call in the FBI for too little reason.

If Prescott is typical, the corpsmen respect former guidelines.

"Before," he says, "there was too much mischief."

Being neither a regular military establishment nor a regular school, the center has

had to establish its own standards on the basis of daily experience.

And since it's not yet a year old, it's still learning.

There is, however, unusual commitment among the teaching staff.

One man, a former high school teacher, tore up, as he talked, an evaluation form asking him to list the extra things he had done in his job.

"There's only one requirement for this job," he said, "and that, simply, is that you be a decent teacher and a compassionate human being."

Prescott seems to have responded to this kind of feeling. He says he's liked what he's done, both vocationally and academically.

The real world of work has never been far away from him.

For example, the "social understanding" course on getting a job confronts the corpsman with such pertinent questions as:

"You have been working your tail off all afternoon while the fellow next to you has been goofing off all day. The foreman comes around and asks you to do a real dirty job that should be done by the lazy fellow. What do you do?"

The failures at Fort Custer can be seen in the empty beds and empty lockers of youth who have been unable to measure up.

The successes are in corpsmen like Prescott who know why they're there and who have decided to see it through.

[From the Times-Union, April 25, 1966]

THEY FIGHT A QUIET WAR

If he's in an urban Job Corps center, he walks among the ghosts of yesterday's soldiers—the men who once crowded the military camps in World War II and in the Korean conflict.

Like them, he's taken an oath and he wears a uniform. He must get up and go to bed at specified times and he must stay in the camp except during leave and on supervised tours.

He's in a war. Upon his training depends his survival. Upon his survival and success depends, to a degree, the health of society.

But it's a very different war, and a different survival.

No bugles summon the corpsman. No top sergeant tears him into strips. No one marches him anywhere.

His instructors rely more on persuasion than on barked-out orders.

The corpsman's weapon are his hands and his resolve.

His target is a place in a society in which he can have no place without a skill.

His goal is to become one of the "haves."

He may be anywhere from 16 to 21 years old. He gets a monthly living allowance of \$30 (minus deductions), and a readjustment allowance of \$50 for each month of satisfactory service.

He may send home \$25 of his readjustment allowance and have it matched by the Job Corps.

He begins with many strikes against him.

He's usually a dropout from school, unable to hold a good job for lack of a skill. He comes out of poverty in the cities and in the hills. And he may have been in trouble with the law.

At first, he's one or all of many things—scared, hungry, homesick, truculent, noisy, rude, aggressive, dirty, long-haired and plain bewildered.

He's at least 200 miles from home, and he's out in open view, with nowhere to run to, nowhere to hide.

He's grown up too quick and tasted life too early.

But though old beyond his years in worldly things, he's a child emotionally and, like any child, easily frightened by what he doesn't understand.

His first few weeks are critical, for this is when he usually decides to stay or to go back.

He can leave at any time. If he can't shake off the past, if he gets into a fight or commits a theft, he may be asked to leave.

Or he may quit himself if he's come along for the ride, or if he misses home too much.

But if he realizes that this may be his last chance, he decides to stay.

For the first time perhaps, he is among people who are not trying to cheat him or kick him around, but to help him on his own terms.

And being trusted, he begins to show trust. Being respected, he begins to show respect.

He takes off his cap now when he sits down to eat. He doesn't leave as much litter around. He doesn't start swinging every time he's jostled. He doesn't grab at the food—he knows there's plenty.

What's more, he's learning a trade, automotive repair perhaps. And math, when it's expressed in terms of six pistons rather than six apples, begins to make some sense.

It's not easy. He's never stuck at one thing very long before.

And when he goes into town, his reputation, based on reports of riots here and there, often precedes him.

Unlike the soldier, the corpsman gets no cheers from the people. The girls don't hang on his arm. He has little money to spend.

He's the no-hoper, it's reputed, the dropout, the addict, the guy with the prison record, the hoodlum, the drunk.

And sometimes he is just such an incorrigible, someone both camp and community are better off without.

More often, he's a basically decent youngster doing his best against odds.

In a small town, there's often little for him to do, particularly where the color line lingers. And he can't get out from under the spotlight.

The local boys, if they want to drink or neck, can take off in their cars to some secluded parking spot.

The corpsman, who has to hoof it everywhere, sneaks a drink in an alley and gets caught. He also gets marked as stupid.

But he's far from stupid—he's lived by his wits in the past.

His English may be poor, but he's smart and he's cunning, and he'd hoodwink his instructors if he could.

But his instructors care enough to take no nonsense.

And this in the end is often what stops the corpsman from throwing in the sponge. Someone believes in him.

If he sticks it out, he dares to believe a little in himself and in the opportunities he always figures were for others.

He starts to stand a bit straighter, his handshake is firmer, his hair not so long.

He isn't in the mainstream yet, but he's on his way.

[From the Times-Union, Apr. 26, 1966]

THEY'RE SKEPTICAL, HOSTILE AT FIRST

(By Desmond Stone)

BRECKENRIDGE CENTER, KY.—Gathered in a circle for an evening bull session with their counselors, the recruits are new and nervous.

Though they've only just arrived, they're already wanting to know about home leave.

"What if your sister's having a baby?" asks one youngster.

No, says a counselor, that wouldn't be a reason for leave.

"What if your girl friend's having a baby?"

"I'd stay here if I were you," retorts the counselor.

The snickers ease the tension a bit.

But skepticism and hostility can still be sensed.

There's some jeering when it's suggested that the corpsmen should treat all women as they would treat their sisters.

Answering a question about tackle football, one of the counselors says the game can get rough and that it probably shouldn't be played except under supervision.

"What would you sooner have us do?" demands a corpsman. "Play tackle football or beat someone's head in the barracks?"

Fear and ignorance are here too.

"What about those block tests they gave us?" asks another youngster. "Was it to see if we're crazy or something?"

No, he's assured, this is a test of hand dexterity.

In a way, the recruits, or some of them, are daring the counselors to prove that they're wrong in their distrust of people.

When, for example, it's suggested that they show some acceptance of youths who are feeling lost, one corpsman promptly says: "You've got to show us you want us before we can show them * * *."

But there are some hopeful signs too.

One nice-looking youth who seems too young to have been in trouble says it's good to mix with other races.

"When I went to jail, I couldn't get along with Mexicans. But I was thrown in with them, and I had to learn to get along if I wanted out."

It's clear, too, that one instructor in camp, Clark Johnson, has already made an impression on the new arrivals.

"I don't think he'd be the kind of person to tell us wrong," says one corpsman of Johnson.

Johnson is a Negro who's had 8 years of Army service and who seems to have the knack of getting through quickly to the new boys.

"First," he says, "I explain to them that none of them are losers. At 16 to 21, they're not old enough to be losers."

"I tell them also, that I don't regard them as dropouts, that some may have had good reasons for leaving school. This helps."

Johnson, something of a boxer himself in the past, says he will sometimes clear away the chairs and ask two boys who may be spoiling for a fight to put the gloves on.

Johnson has no illusions about the kind of material he's working with, about the need to be alert to anything the recruits may try.

Neither has George Todd, coordinator of vocational programs.

"They're all con men in a way," he says of the corpsmen. "We all have to become proficient in the world of con. After all, these youngsters made a living off the streets in many cases. What they lack is not smartness but a basic education."

This willingness to meet the corpsman at his own tricks, plus a compassion for him and an understanding of the things that have made him what he is, often works changes sometimes unexpectedly.

Seventeen-year-old Ken from Colorado tried the Job Corps once and quit. He was pumping gas back home one day when he found himself watching the mechanic, envying his job, his wages and his house.

He asked to return to camp then a car accident has put his leg in a cast and given him still more time to think, and was readmitted. Since "I take life a lot more seriously now," he says.

Other corpsmen have a serious purpose from the beginning.

Says one young man learning retailing: "I ran off from my step-parents and quite school, so that I had no skill. I joined the Job Corps so I wouldn't have to be a short-order cook all my life."

Says another corpsman in the landscaping school: "I had to leave school to help my family. I like it here and I know it's about the only chance I'll get."

For those who must change their attitudes to become employable, good food and good health are part of the prescription.

One staff man tells of the physical improvement in boys who once subsisted mainly on

rice or potatoes and who, in their first days in the cafeteria, might grab six oranges at a time.

The corpsman still eats well. One youngster at lunch may tackle a large plate of beef stew and Spanish rice, a salad, a slice of cake, three slices of bread, two glasses of milk and one glass of orange juice.

But he isn't tempted now to hide anything under his sweater.

He also seems to observe most of the signs put up by students in the cafeteria—"Job Corps Boys would rather Dress than Mess," "Would you kindly remove your hats," "Don't shout, you may be escorted out."

The question sometimes arises whether conformity to what might be called middle-class values isn't carried too far.

Arthur Meyers, head of job development and placement, says that the resident counselors (young themselves) are sometimes tempted to impose higher standards on the corpsmen than they set for themselves.

He cites the case of a young man who graduated recently in spite of a counselor's objection that he hadn't made his bed in a week and was thus setting a bad example.

"The point is," says Meyers, "that this young man was good at his trade. He can hold a job even if he is sloppy about making his bed."

On the question of change, James R. Forney, the camp director, says he is constantly amazed at what can happen to a young man "if we make him aware of his ability to learn and to be proud.

"Some people wouldn't give you the powder to blow some of the corpsmen off the face of the earth. But see many of these young men when they leave here and even their walk is different."

[From the Times-Union, Apr. 27, 1966]

EDUCATION TAKES A FRESH APPROACH

(By Desmond Stone)

BRECKENRIDGE CENTER.—Something of a revolution in education is going on in the Job Corps centers.

Many of the teachers have, in a sense, rebelled against the traditional system of public education. They feel it has failed too many youth, both by what it teaches and by the teaching itself.

The determination here is to find new ways of tying basic education much more closely to vocational skills, whether the trade is auto body repair, culinary arts, retail sales, or welding.

There's great flexibility and a noticeable crusading spirit among those who are driving for a new kind of education—one that has never been tried before in the U.S. on such a scale.

George Todd, coordinator of vocational programs, gives an example of the kind of flexible approach that's being tried.

The camp had two prime requirements in hiring a man to manage its auto parts store—someone who knew the trade and how to work well with youngsters.

The man chosen had owned his own store and had a large family of boys. But he hadn't taught a day in his life. He had none of the usual qualifications, and he was worried about his shortcomings.

So the camp put alongside him a retired Air Force man who had done a lot of teaching in aircraft mechanics.

It's turned out to be an effective alliance, says Todd.

"What's happening in Job Corps centers today," he says, "will affect education throughout the country."

"The square box school with the teacher out in front teaching to the group isn't adequate any more. Kids are being lost in the second and third grade."

Todd acknowledges that the public schools, over the years, have done an excellent job with most young people, particularly the middle class.

But in the atomic age, in a day when even a ditchdigger must be skilled enough to operate a power shovel, the old-established system he says, is not reaching enough students, with the result that 1½ million drop out each year.

Robert D. Collier, senior education supervisor, a former teacher with the Los Angeles city schools, points out that many of the corpsmen come from communities where the schools are overcrowded, the class loads too heavy, and good instructional materials not always available.

"These boys represent an element in the population in need of special and individual attention. In a normal public school setting, as in Los Angeles, with perhaps 44 in a class and five classes a day, the instructor can't give of himself.

"Remember, these boys are not all slow, retarded youngsters. Somewhere along the way they lost interest. We have to get them back."

But finding texts that relate basic education closely to skills (that will, for example, give a retail sales student a spelling assignment with words like "requisition" and "inventory") has proved impossible.

Breckenridge, as with other centers, has had to begin writing its own courses.

Something of what's being aimed at can be seen from the reading practice book written for service station specialist (the camp has a fully-equipped service station for training.)

A section on syllables, for example, asks how many syllables there are in the words "lubrication" and "carburetor."

An exercise for alphabet learning asks the student to arrange in alphabetical order such words as "universal joint," "king pins," "wheel bearing" and so on.

To encourage dictionary use, the student is posed with the situation where his girl friend asks him what a distributor is.

"Now that you are going to school, you can probably raise the hood of your car and point to it, but, chances are, she still won't know what it is. Have you ever tried to explain anything about a car to a woman? Open your dictionary and see if it can help you explain."

There is still much to be done in adapting education to the needs of the corpsmen.

One programmed learning machine, for example, uses, among other things, the story of Dick Whittington, the boy who rose to become "thrice Lord Mayor of London." It's a tale a long way removed from the world of the dropout.

But as fast as fresh materials can be devised, they are being used.

The main push for new educational concepts at Breckenridge has come so far from Southern Illinois University, the operating contractor for the first year.

On July 1, in line with the Office of Economic Opportunity policy to experiment as well with administration by industry, the main contract will be taken over by General Precision Equipment, Inc., with its Grafex division in Rochester carrying out the actual camp operation.

There's some evidence that industry, by reason of its organized structure, may be better equipped to run the camp.

Grafex's man on the spot, Chris L. Faegre, program specialist, and a former teacher himself, notes that the Job Corps purpose is "to make the whole man available for life in an industrial society," that employability implies "far more than the individual's skill."

Towards this end, the curriculum, he says, must, and does, stress self-understanding and such cross-occupational skills as the use of banking services, how to give and take directions.

There cannot, he emphasizes, be any question of grading the corpsmen. "They've been told they're bad and a failure so often that

they're gun-shy. So we have to turn the thing around and let the man set the goal, let him get on the ladder at whatever step he can, let him train to the standard that he himself sets."

Teachers, he further points out, are traditionally authoritarian, so that a camp such as Breckenridge has to sift out those "who love to find what's wrong in a test paper," those who tend to be punitive and corrective.

One of the failures of the public school system, he adds, is that it doesn't give enough reminders of success to potential dropouts and doesn't put enough faith in them.

"Here we ask a man to take a test and to correct it himself as he goes along, so that he gets the feeling he's being trusted."

The emphasis, says Faegre, is on a hands-on approach to education.

"The attitude of public schools is that first you do all the book work and then you get your hands dirty. Here we say, 'take the tires off now and then we'll talk about tread wear.'"

[From the Times-Union, Apr. 28, 1966]

UNEASY PUBLIC SHOWS HOSTILITY

(By Desmond Stone)

At the airport in Battle Creek, Mich., a few miles from Fort Custer Job Corps Center, a short, earnest, volatile Mexican-American proudly displays his official Job Corps blazer.

"But when I get back to New Mexico," he then says, "I'll have to take off the emblem (a shield with an arrow pointing up a ladder.) Many people don't like us."

This isn't an isolated feeling among job Corpsmen.

At the Breckenridge center in Kentucky, a young man from Pennsylvania puts on his dress uniform for a photograph and says:

"I'm proud of the uniform and I'm proud of the badge. Yet people don't seem to want us. When I ask for directions in town they turn away."

"This uniform represents the government. It may be the closest I'll get to service. But in town, I feel like I'm wearing stripes. Just because some animals cause trouble doesn't mean that the whole lot of us are bad."

The Job Corps emblem is part of the blazer. With the rest of their uniform, the corpsmen have the choice of sewing it on or leaving it off.

Watching the Breckenridge boys come off the leave buses in Evansville (a small Indiana city just over the state line), it's noticeable that most prefer not to wear their badge, though they can still be easily identified without it.

Public uneasiness about the corps has some unfortunate results.

With Battle Creek and Kalamazoo, Mich., both off limits at the moment for general leave, the Fort Custer corpsmen, and only a certain number at that, must now travel from 60 to 120 miles to Grand Rapids, Lansing, Ann Arbor, South Bend, or Flint.

"What's more," says one Fort Custer corpsman, "with more of us confined to camp, we're getting sick of the sight of each other and fighting more than we would normally."

Both centers have had their disturbances, in and out of the camp.

How bad they were depends on whom you talk with. They're variously described as riots, near-riots, and scrimmages.

Both at Breckenridge and at Fort Custer, there seems no doubt that incidents have occurred which neither camp nor community can countenance. Even though they may have been magnified, as both centers feel, they were still undesirable incidents.

And camp administrators have acted accordingly.

At Fort Custer, for example, new recruits now get closer screening.

At Breckenridge, boys who are clearly incorrigible are shipped out more quickly.

What went wrong to cause these troubles? Growing pains, the very newness of the Job Corps experiment, are blamed in some cases.

Staff members at Breckenridge are generally agreed that boys were pushed in too soon, before the camp was ready, before the vocational facilities were set up, so that there was too much idle time, too much frustration.

Numbers may have something to do with it.

Fort Custer had to learn the hard way that when you put together 1,500 boys out of poverty, some firm basic rules are indispensable.

Breckenridge now has only 800 boys, though 50 to 60 are coming in each week.

Fort Custer's experience seems to be that disciplinary problems rise with the number in camp.

There are other explanations of past difficulties.

The Breckenridge camp director feels that the camp was too concerned in the beginning with maintaining a high holding rate instead of letting the troublemakers go.

Some recruiting agents, too, he points out, have created frustration in some of the corpsmen by painting impossibly rosy pictures of camp life—even to private rooms and maid service.

Beyond these things, most of the nearby communities are too small to absorb so many corpsmen without some kind of upset.

Better community preparation might have avoided some of the troubles. The Breckenridge center at least has a reception center in Evansville where Corpsmen can come in off the streets, play games, and wait for the return buses.

It's also a place where camp security police and local police can coordinate their work, where the image of the policeman gets changed a bit when he takes time out to play table tennis with the corpsmen.

In the Michigan cities of Battle Creek and Kalamazoo, center and community are only just getting around to setting up such downtown centers.

In the perspective of what the Job Corps is trying to do with youth who might otherwise be on the streets, some disturbances were probably inevitable.

Public opinion, however, has been damaged, and the assumption made that all Job Corpsmen are alike.

"Too many people," says the Breckenridge director, "don't understand that only a small percentage of students have been involved in troublemaking."

Says John Anesi, chief supervisor of group life at Fort Custer: "The public has the idea that the corpsmen are either addicts from Harlem or moonshiners from Kentucky. This just isn't so."

The woman who directs the Mayor's Human Relations Commission in Evansville agrees that the Job Corps "isn't altogether accepted in town." * * * Last year's riot didn't help matters. * * * There's been a lot of publicity about the fact they're the so-called dropouts and dregs."

Sometimes the double standards are used to judge the corpsmen.

One Breckenridge instructor points out that college kids can come into town, tear it up, pay for the damage, and suffer no penalty. "But a Job Corpsman gets it in the neck."

The editor of the daily newspaper in Henderson, Kentucky, says some local people criticized him for reporting the facts when several local boys picked on some Corpsmen after a dance and precipitated a fight. "They figured I should have covered up for our youngsters, but I wasn't about to do that."

Says the Evansville civilian who directs the downtown Job Corps reception center: "We have more trouble with the elite youngsters of the community than with the Job Corpsmen, but the elite can get away in their

cars and create their mischief out of the public eye."

Here and there voices are being raised on behalf of the corpsmen.

Thus a high school junior wrote recently in the Battle Creek Gazette:

"The corpsmen are human. They talk, walk, breathe, eat and work the same as we do, but too many people treat them like animals. If I were treated the way a lot of these guys have been, I wouldn't want anything to do with the people of Battle Creek or any other place. Why don't people get off their high horses and do something for the guys instead of being against them?"

Said the newspaper editorially:

"The attitude of the many area citizens has not been what may be called positive. There have been grumblings, some justified, about the conduct of some corpsmen. What the complainers seem never to admit is that Job Corpsmen can have the same aspirations as any other young men. All of us would do well to recognize that and quit condemning Job Corpsmen simply because they're Job Corpsmen."

[From the *Times-Union*, Apr. 29, 1966]

TAXPAYERS IRATE OVER HIGH COSTS

(By Desmond Stone)

Cost bugs many people who are critical of the Job Corps.

Says one Fort Custer corpsman: "The college kids give us the worst time. They're paying for their education and they don't see why we should get ours for free."

The taxpayer is also troubled in many cases.

"I work hard for what I make," says a Battle Creek man. "Why should I have to pay out money for kids who should be supporting themselves?"

The cost is high.

The Office of Economic Opportunity estimates that in the period when the camps are building up to their maximum capacity, it costs about \$8,100 a year to keep a youngster in a Job Corps center.

When the camps are at capacity, the annual cost is expected to be reduced to \$7,765 a year.

These are higher figures than OEO originally talked about, and they have drawn down some congressional fire on Sargent Shriver, the antipoverty director.

Is it worth the cost?

Critics say no, that the youngsters could find success in the world if they worked at it.

"It mightn't be worth the cost," says a Breckenridge staff member, "if there was some alternative. But the schools can't cope with these youngsters. We think we can. We also can offer them a change from the environment that keeps reinfesting them."

A Fort Custer teacher who commutes over 100 miles a day from Grand Rapids to work at something he believes in, puts it this way:

"If we let these youngsters stay out of school, all we do is perpetuate unemployment and social ills.

"So either we spend millions on welfare and extra police protection or we take some of this money and try to salvage a few. * * * Sure, there's chaos and confusion, but we do have a purpose and we do feel the program is working."

It's still too early for the Job Corps' final test of success—the graduation of the corpsmen and their entry into the labor market.

A few have already done it, of course.

Jerry Oettle, one of the Breckenridge staff responsible for student development services, speaks with pride of one transformation.

"This boy was drunk when he arrived. His hair was down to his shoulders. He tore up the drunk tank."

"We started a gym team and he turned out to be the best. All of a sudden, he wasn't drunk any more. * * * Today he has a page boy job with CBS in Chicago."

"This was a boy I'd like to have beaten the tar out of at first. But he made it."

As yet, however, not enough corpsmen have completed their training to make any firm conclusions valid.

A paramount need in the meantime is a respite from disturbances, a little time for the camps to consolidate themselves and for the public to look again at the Job Corps.

Congressional criticism will certainly be renewed if discipline doesn't prevail.

Further uproar will also have the effect of discouraging more white youngsters from joining up.

OEO keeps no figures on the racial makeup of the corpsmen, which tends to vary from camp to camp. At Breckenridge, for example, there appear to be more whites than Negroes. At Fort Custer, it appears the other way round.

There is, however, concern in OEO that the Job Corps shouldn't become too heavily Negro.

This could be the effect of further disturbances, for the Negro, more often than the white youngster, has nowhere to go back to and will stick where the white youngster will decide against the Job Corps.

Until such time as the Job Corps can be measured by the employment of its graduates, more contact between camps and communities could change public opinion for the better.

A tour reveals that the camps are far from the jungles they're sometimes imagined to be.

At Fort Custer, corpsmen can be seen laboring for an understanding of Social Security, taking part in the volunteer firefighting, learning how to use a voting machine.

In his recreation, the corpsman can be seen learning to play again, for his childhood has usually been short.

At Breckenridge, corpsmen handle the tender shoots of young tomato plants, turn pieces of leather into wallets in the hobby shop, sing "Christ Is All" in the church.

To see the student government at work is to realize that the students, or some of them at least, are addressing themselves to their responsibilities.

Both at Fort Custer and at Breckenridge students are going out in groups to talk to some of the high schools, telling them how important school is and at the same time trying to give them a better understanding of what the Job Corps is and isn't.

At Breckenridge, an Easter egg hunt was held at the camp for nearby community children.

The dormitories are also trying to raise money for some of the men in Viet Nam.

The Job Corps is something new in the land.

It may turn out to be impossibly costly, or impossibly idealistic.

The publisher of the weekly newspaper in Morganfield, Ky., a small community close by the Breckenridge center, says it's unrealistic to bring in kids with juvenile records and expect a conversion overnight.

He also feels that the small, unarmed security force at the center is inadequate for the job, that even some of the universities have armed security guards.

"Washington's concern, I understand, is that it doesn't want to make cop-haters out of these youngsters. But that's a poor theory in my opinion," he says.

Center officials point out that the Job Corps holds to the belief that man is fundamentally good and decent and trustworthy, if he's only given a chance.

"You give us 100 percent (in effort and trust)," they say to the corpsmen, "and we'll give you 200 percent back."

The centers are trying to hold a delicate balance. They want to give responsibility to the students to work out their own rules (for compulsion can only be carried so far

with volunteers), and yet they have to maintain discipline for the good of the camp and the community.

Can the youngsters justify the faith that's put in them?

Can they return to their old environment with enough new values to survive?

Can the habits of 17 or 18 years be changed in one year?

Will employers give them jobs, and will the Corpsmen be able to hold them?

On all these points, the center staffs are unshakably optimistic.

The public, however, needs the evidence that only time can supply.

No one really knows how long the Job Corps may exist, for it's dependent on year-to-year funding.

But the hunch at Breckenridge and Fort Custer is that it'll be around as long as it's needed.

"And that," says one administrator, "may be 10 to 15 years. It may take that long for the public school system to adapt itself to the changes we're trying to make in education."

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1117, H.R. 14215, be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the rule of germaneness, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes.

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

SMALL TAX COURT FOR THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference, which I believe is a very important piece of legislation, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXIMIRE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 10 days for further cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk for 10 days as requested.

The bill (S. 3344) to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest that this is a very important bill. It would establish what we have termed—we sponsors—a Small Tax Court.

"April is the cruellest month," said the poet, and for millions of taxpayers, truer words were never spoken. April is the month when Uncle Sam bites and, for far too many Americans, his bite is worse than his bark.

The first 9 pages of the Internal Revenue Code define income; the remaining 1,100 pages spin the web of exceptions and preferences. The average taxpayer rarely gets beyond the 9 pages. Americans, more than any other people in the world pay their taxes. They make no speeches about it, but they pay their taxes. Many Americans pay more than their share of taxes.

For the fortunate few, April is just another month. The business tycoon has little to fear from the April 15 deadline, except to wring out of every conceivable deduction and exemption the last drop of tax-free income. If he squeezes too tightly, then his accountant and lawyer do battle for him with the Internal Revenue Service—if necessary, the courts—and most likely with success in negotiating a "reasonable settlement."

I am told that more than 85 percent of the cases brought before the Tax Court are settled by the IRS attorneys, rather than adjudicated by the Court. So successful are the lawyers and accountants that less than half of the total personal income in the United States is subjected to the Federal income tax.

But the little fellow finds himself pouring over the miserably complicated tax forms late into the night of April 15. In desperation, he drags himself off to the central post office—the one that stays open until midnight. He drops his return in the slot and goes home to wait.

Soon the intricate process of checking his return begins; first, in the Collection Division of the District Director's Office and, then, in the Audit Division. At any time within 3 years from the date the return was filed, the taxpayer may be summoned to account.

Clutching a bundle of odd receipts, canceled checks and a couple of penciled lists, the taxpayer plods timidly in to do battle with the tax agent. Bureaucrats make him nervous. He recalls vague stories about criminal tax prosecutions.

The agent is armed with a deadly weapon—the Tax Code—a document so complicated that Einstein confessed he had to seek the advice of a tax consultant in figuring out his own rate. "This is too difficult for a mathematician," said Einstein, "it takes a philosopher."

Even the former Internal Revenue Commissioner, Mortimer Caplin, conceded that "Our tax laws have become

unbelievably complex; they are riddled with exceptions and preferences"—complexities with which the revenue agent can baffle the taxpayer and intimidate him.

The taxpayer's first, and usually last, impulse is to quit—throw in the towel, pay the deficiency no matter how unjust he believes it is, rather than face bureaucracy or bear the burdens of a court fight. He knows the odds are such that by the time he wins, if he wins, the tax savings will be devoured by attorneys and accountant fees.

My office receives many moving appeals of honest taxpayers as I am sure other Senators do. Good faith errors in judgment can many times become nightmares.

A widow woman from Bellingham, Wash., sold her home shortly after the death of her husband. She sought aid from the local Internal Revenue Service in computing her tax. Together with the revenue agent, she filled out her return and paid her tax. As it turned out, she paid \$775 more than she should have paid, but, when she finally discovered the overpayment, the Service refused to rectify the mistake which its own agent had caused. After years of fruitless dispute, I introduced a private bill to restore the overpayment to her. To this just bill, the Treasury objected on two grounds: First, that the taxpayer had failed to discover the error until the statute had run and, second, that tax agents, while offering their services to assist taxpayers, could not be expected to understand all the complexities of the tax laws, so that the Treasury could assume no responsibility for its agents' errors.

Mr. President, if Einstein and the agents of the Internal Revenue Service cannot understand the Tax Code, then the ordinary taxpayers of the United States are entitled to a little help.

The legislation which Senator LONG of Missouri and I are introducing today could give them such help. We propose it on a modest scale to begin with. It would create for the very first time a "Small Tax Division" within the Tax Court of the United States. The bill would authorize the Tax Court to appoint 20 small tax commissioners—2 for each tax circuit. Any taxpayer who is assessed a deficiency less than \$2,500 could go before a small tax commissioner for himself, without a lawyer or an accountant, and be assured that his case will get a fair and sympathetic hearing from a commissioner who is independent of the Internal Revenue bureaucracy. In fact, our bill provides that—

No person who has served as an officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service shall be eligible for appointment as a commissioner until 5 years after he has ceased to be such an officer or employee.

Once a taxpayer makes his decision to go before the Commissioner, the Commissioner's decision will ordinarily be final. The Government may petition the Tax Court for review only if it pays the taxpayer's court costs and legal fees. The taxpayer, of course, retains the option which he now has of paying the deficiency and suing for a refund in the

Federal court or of petitioning the judges of the Tax Court for relief.

Mr. President, the more complex and impersonal Government gets, the more important it is that our citizens have just and speedy relief from its excesses.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a memorandum describing tax audit and deficiency procedures be printed at the close of my remarks, together with two very interesting letters which I received just this morning.

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

S. 3344

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter C of chapter 76 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the Tax Court) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

PART IV—SMALL TAX DIVISION

“Sec. 7476. Small Tax Division.

“Sec. 7477. Procedure; commissioners.

“Sec. 7478. Decisions of Small Tax Division.

“Sec. 7476. SMALL TAX DIVISION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby established, within the Tax Court, a Small Tax Division (hereafter in this part referred to as the ‘Division’). The chief judge of the Tax Court shall from time to time assign one or more judges of the Tax Court to the Division and shall designate a chief judge of the Division.

“(b) JURISDICTION.—

“(1) DEFICIENCIES.—Any taxpayer to whom is sent a notice of deficiency in respect of any tax imposed by this title may, if the amount of such deficiency (not including interest) does not exceed \$2,500, file a petition with the Division for a redetermination of the deficiency. Any such petition shall be filed within the time prescribed by this title for filing a petition for the redetermination of a deficiency by the Tax Court. The Division shall have jurisdiction to determine the correct amount of the deficiency to the same extent as in the case of petitions filed with the Tax Court, except that the Division shall not have jurisdiction to determine a deficiency in excess of \$2,500.

“(2) REFUNDS.—Any taxpayer who has filed a claim for refund of any tax imposed by this title with the Secretary or his delegate and whose claim has been disallowed (or disallowed in part) may, if the amount of such claim (not including interest) does not exceed \$2,500, file a petition with the Division for the allowance of such claim (or for the part of the claim disallowed by the Secretary or his delegate). Any such claim shall be filed with the Division within the time prescribed by law for commencing a suit for recovery of such tax. The Division shall have jurisdiction to allow, in whole or in part, the amount of such claim, except that the Division shall not have jurisdiction to allow any refund of any tax (not including interest) in excess of \$2,500.

“SEC. 7477. PROCEDURE; COMMISSIONERS.

“(a) RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE.—The proceedings of the Division shall be conducted in accordance with such rules of practice and procedure as the Tax Court may prescribe. The provisions of part II of this subchapter shall apply with respect to proceedings of the Division only to the extent provided in such rules. Nothing in such rules shall preclude a taxpayer from representing himself in proceedings before the Division.

“(b) COMMISSIONERS.

“(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Tax Court is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, such num-

ber of commissioners, not exceeding 20, as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Division. Each such commissioner shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for commissioners of the Court of Claims, and shall be subject to removal by the Tax Court. No person who has served as an officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service shall be eligible for appointment as a commissioner until 5 years after he has ceased to be such an officer or employee.

“(3) DUTIES.—Under the supervision of the chief judge of the Division, the commissioners shall conduct all proceedings before the Division, and shall perform such other duties as the Tax Court may from time to time direct. The commissioner who conducts the proceedings on a petition filed with the Division shall render a decision thereon which shall be reviewed by a judge of the Division and which shall be final unless reversed or modified by the reviewing judge.

“SEC. 7478. DECISIONS OF SMALL TAX DIVISION.

“(a) FINALITY OF DECISIONS.—There shall be no review of, or appeal from, any decision of the Division.

“(b) TREATMENT AS DECISIONS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OR HIS DELEGATE.—A final decision of the Division shall be treated as a final decision of the Secretary or his delegate for purposes of the provisions of this title and all other laws of the United States, including (but not limited to) the provisions relating to—

“(1) redetermination of deficiencies by the Tax Court,

“(2) suits for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally collected, and

“(3) suits for recovery of taxes erroneously refunded.

“(c) FURTHER PROCEEDINGS BY THE UNITED STATES.—In any case in which—

“(1) the Division has determined the amount of any deficiency to be less than the amount determined by the Secretary or his delegate, and

“(2) the Secretary or his delegate certifies to the Tax Court that the decision of the Division involves a substantial question relating to the validity or meaning of a provision of this title or of the regulations prescribed thereunder, the Secretary or his delegate may file a petition with the Tax Court for a redetermination of such deficiency. The Tax Court shall have jurisdiction to redetermine the amount of such deficiency to the same extent and in the same manner as if such petition had been filed by the taxpayer. In any proceeding commenced by the Secretary or his delegate under this subsection and in any proceeding commenced in any court for recovery of any amount allowed as a refund by the Division, the United States shall be liable for all court costs and shall pay a reasonable fee to the person or persons representing the taxpayer in such proceeding.”

“(b) The table of parts for subchapter C of chapter 76 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

“PART IV. SMALL TAX DIVISION.”

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the 180th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that the provisions of section 7476(a), 7477(a), and 7477(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by this Act) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The memorandum presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

MEMORANDUM: TAX AUDIT & DEFICIENCY COLLECTION PROCEDURES

The initial inspection of Federal tax returns is made in the Collection Division of the District Director's office. Here, the returns are checked for mathematical accuracy, as well as execution, form, and com-

pletens. If a mathematical error is discovered which caused an understatement of tax, regardless of the amount, the District Director will send the taxpayer corrected computations and ask for full payment of the amount due. The amount of the understatement does not qualify as a deficiency which requires the formal statutory notice affording the taxpayer 90 days within which to petition the Tax Court of the United States to consider the matter. As a result, there is no right of appeal and no restrictions on the Government's right to collect at this stage.

If the mathematical error discovered results in an overpayment of tax of less than \$100,000, the District Director is authorized to refund the excess. The District Director has no authority to refund overpayments in excess of \$100,000; he will instead forward the return for action in Washington.

The function of examining all returns is performed by the Audit Division of the District Director's office. The preliminary checking of the returns for the purpose of selecting those which appear to require a more thorough examination is likewise concentrated in the Audit Division. Many of the audits that result are either “correspondence audits” carried on entirely by letter or “office audits” in which the taxpayer appears at a local district office with the records and information requested. The remaining audits are “field audits” in which the examining agent checks the taxpayer's books and records at his home or place of business. There is no way of predicting how soon—or long—after a return is filed it is likely to come up for audit. Generally speaking, the Government has 3 years from the time the return was filed within which to assess additional taxes.

If an agreement is reached with the agent during the course of the audit, the taxpayer signs a Form 870, “Waiver of Restrictions on Assessment and Collection of Deficiency in Tax and Acceptance of Proposed Overassessment.” If agreement cannot be reached with the agent, there is available to the taxpayer a series of levels at which he can have his case reviewed. After audit, the taxpayer will then receive a brief notice advising him of his right to request an “informal conference” in the District Director's office with the group chief or conference coordinator, which conference usually ensues within 10 days following his receipt of the notice.

The agent who made the original audit is supposed to be present at the conference. If agreement can be reached at the informal conference level, a Form 870 is prepared and signed. If agreement cannot be reached, the Internal Revenue Service will mail to the taxpayer notice of a proposed deficiency assessment, to which proposal he then has 30 days to file a formal protest.

If the taxpayer files a protest, his case is transferred to the Appellate Division of the regional staff, which will afford him an independent review of the issue. The regional staff members are usually accountants and sometimes lawyers. If there exists a national office position contrary to the taxpayer's position, a regional appellate staff member would not be able to decide the case in favor of the taxpayer even if he thought the national office position incorrect.

If the regional appellate staff has decided against the taxpayer, or if the taxpayer has waived his right of review by the regional appellate staff and has not filed a Form 870, the Internal Revenue Service will issue a statutory notice of deficiency. Settlement conferences continue after cases have been docketed, with the Government generally represented by both the Appellate conferee and the attorney assigned to the case for trial purposes.

Unless the taxpayer files a petition with the Tax Court of the United States within 90 days after receiving a statutory notice,

the asserted deficiency will be assessed, and the payment must be made upon notice and demand, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent from the date on which the return was due. Trial in the Tax Court is de novo.

If a taxpayer pays his tax with his return or in response to a proposed deficiency, he may file a refund claim. A refund claim is audited and reviewed within the Internal Revenue Service much as in the case of a deficiency. But assuming the claim is denied, recourse is not to the Tax Court but rather to the U.S. Court of Claims or to a U.S. District Court; trial is de novo in either case.

MORENCI, MICH.

May 9, 1966.

U.S. Senators EDWARD V. LONG and WARREN G. MAGNUSON

GENTLEMEN: This is the first sensible suggestion to help the little taxpayer—Magnuson-Long bill to authorize appointment of 20 small tax commissioners to hear appeals against income tax deficiency assessments of less than \$2,500.

In 1965 we were forced to pay \$46.95 on our 1964 income tax return. We used 12 cents per mile for business mileage and the tax office in Jackson, Mich., where they audited our records said only 10 cents was allowed for 1964. We later found out that the top in 1964 was 15 cents per mile, not 10 cents. But as you say, we threw in the towel—paid the \$46.95.

We are small, small business—net of \$3,000 per year on our business. I know of a lot of little taxpayers that were called in and did the same thing we did—pay and get it over with.

Yet, many millionaires pay less income tax than the little fellow. I'm not the only one fed up with hearing how little the big ones pay and then look at what we pay in income tax. Most little taxpayers will say "what's the use of writing to your Senators or Congressmen—the little guy will always be on the small end and do the most paying."

At least, I'm taking the time and effort to commend you two Senators for thinking about the little taxpayer. If there is anything I can do, write to other Senators, etc., I sure would be glad to take the time to do it. Here's hoping you get your bill passed before this year is ended. The whole tax bill needs overhauling to make it more simple, and with less deductions for the big income people to use. The little guy pays tax on Bank Savings Interest, but the big fellow gets a deduction on income received from stock investments. Is this equality?

Very truly yours,

ALICE SUTHERLAND.

WINSTON HIBBERT,

Brooklyn, N.Y., May 11, 1966.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have observed in the New York News that you have proposed to Congress the establishment of a "small tax division" in the U.S. Tax Court. I want you to know that I am all for it.

As a member of the Bar whose tax practice is mostly limited to serving the "little people," it has been my observation that all too frequently these people lose out in their encounter with the Internal Revenue Service simply because they have not the means to press their rights against the governmental colossus. The insistence that these people have records to prove their claims for each item of deduction they take on their tax return is all too stringent.

More often than not, these people actually spend the money they claim they spend which is a legitimate tax deduction. However, because they have no documentary proof, they are peremptorily denied the de-

duction and assessed extra tax which very often become a burden upon them over a long period.

Your proposal will open up to them an avenue of redress which at present is nonexistent to them. It should be borne in mind that the "little people," some of them, in fact most of them are illiterate and to expect them to have records of their expenses is inflicting upon them a requirement that is well nigh impossible for them to meet. Even I, an attorney, find it difficult to keep up with my personal record; what with medical bills, dental bills and so on, how often does one get a receipt from the doctor. In my experience, I find these people are fair and honest in compiling their tax returns. I believe they should be given the benefit of the doubt except in instances where it is palpable plain they are perpetrating a fraud upon the government.

Press for action on your proposal. You are on the right tract Mr. Senator.

Very truly yours,

WINSTON HIBBERT.

THE TAX OMBUDSMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, there are those who say I have been unduly harsh on the poor Internal Revenue Service. We all know that it is the duty of every American citizen to pay his taxes. In fact, I am often reminded of the old saying that the only things certain are death and taxes.

Of course, I do not quarrel with those who say we have an obligation to pay our taxes. But to this, I add one proviso: we must only pay those taxes which are properly due and owing. Recently, I read where more than 3 million income tax returns—a little over 5 percent of the total filed in fiscal 1965—were subjected to audit or examination by agents of the IRS. Deficiencies were found in 51 percent of these cases; refunds were paid by the Government in 14 percent. No change was made in 35 percent of the cases.

The most striking figure, however, was that the average deficiency was just below \$700, and the average refund just above \$100. Now I thought about these averages, Mr. President, in light of some of the cases which were heard by the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure. Often, a taxpayer must spend much valuable time, money, and effort compiling the necessary documents for presentation at the IRS conference. More often than not, a lawyer should be present to protect not only the constitutional rights of the taxpayer, but to explain the many and vast complexities in our tax laws.

But lawyers cost money, and since we are speaking of only a few hundred dollars, the net result is that in either case—whether a refund is owed or there is a deficiency—the taxpayer cannot afford to hire accountants or lawyers in the average tax case. One author, writing in the May 5, 1966, issue of the Reporter, suggests that taxpayers are thus subjected to a form of "legalized extortion."

Mr. President, I have been most interested in the concept of ombudsman, the man who fights city hall. The bill which Senator MAGNUSON and I have today introduced would create such an ombudsman, in the form of regional small tax commissioners. Taxpayers who have been assessed a deficiency less than \$2,500, or who claim a refund of less than

\$2,500 may go to the small tax commissioner for relief.

There are two features in the bill which are most significant. First, the taxpayer need not be represented by a lawyer when he appears before the tax commissioner. It is expected that the small tax commissioner will give the taxpayer a fair and understanding hearing, and will guide the taxpayer through the many mazes of the complex tax laws. To assure this fair hearing, we have incorporated the second feature into the bill. No person who has served in the Internal Revenue Service shall be eligible for appointment as a commissioner until 5 years after he has left the service. Presumably, after the 5 years have elapsed, a former IRS agent will have mellowed in his zeal to collect the last tax dollar possibly due.

Mr. President, I have great hopes for this small tax commissioner if our bill is enacted. Our taxpayers need some form of ombudsman to fight the proverbial city hall, and perhaps the new commissioners will assume that role.

I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the record, an article which appeared in the Reporter, May 5, 1966, entitled "The Tax-Appeal Ordeal," written by William R. Frye.

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

THE TAX-APPEAL ORDEAL

(By William R. Frye)

Pity the poor taxpayer. He assembles his records, studies the instructions, wrestles with the forms, pays his tax—and then sits back to await doomsday. Doomsday, for him, is the day Form 3R73 arrives with this message: "Your above-described tax return or document for the year indicated has been assigned to the above-named Agent for examination. Please communicate with the Agent."

The possibility of being audited is the third dimension of the income-tax nightmare. Substantiating that office at home, finding that Washington hotel bill, proving that lunch was a business entertainment—these could be more difficult than making out the return itself. They could even be impossible.

Some 66 million personal income-tax returns were filed in fiscal 1965; 3,092,000—1 in 20, or just over 5 percent—were examined, as the Internal Revenue Service puts it. Deficiencies, or taxes due, were found in 51 percent of the cases, producing \$1,063 million in additional revenue; refunds were paid by the government 14 percent of the time, for a total of \$47,052,000. No change was made in 35 percent of the returns. The average deficiency was just below \$700; the average refund just above \$100. Aside from gamblers and other special cases, only 1,216 of those who were examined (or .04 percent) were prosecuted for fraud.

How many of the more than 1.5 million taxpayers who were made to pay additional tax really had short-changed the government, accidentally or intentionally? How many ran afoul of an IRS overeager to maximize collections? The IRS feels sure it was practically always right (an understandable view) but many taxpayers are by no means sure.

I know how they feel. I have just been through the mill. Mine was one of the relatively rare cases—1 in 7—where the taxpayer is found to have overpaid his tax. The return had been prepared for me while I was abroad and contained several major errors

in the government's favor. I was due for a refund.

It was, nevertheless, a miserable experience. Day after day after exhausting day was taken up in minutely detailed, repetitive nit-picking. Accountants whom I told about the case said that they had never known an audit to be so detailed and prolonged. At the end of each session, I was assigned to prepare further data for the next visit—a task requiring long days and longer nights, sometimes running into weeks. (Everything involved had happened three years before.) My professional life was intermittently disrupted for more than 7 months. The lost time was worth conservatively \$4,000 to \$5,000—and since I was self-employed, I had no way to cushion the loss. Moreover, legal and other fees ate up much of the refund.

The only comic relief was that each time I was ordered to dive deeper into the records, I came up with a new accounting error in the Government's favor, and hence a larger potential refund. This was not what the agent had in mind. "How am I going to justify my time?" he asked. Finally, as a consequence of another of his probes, I discovered a \$1,500 reimbursement that had been reported both as income and as a credit against expense. Whether by coincidence or not, the roof promptly fell in.

My agent (or his supervisor) reopened the whole audit and disallowed deductions that previously had been fully substantiated. The law had not changed; the facts had not changed; nothing had, except that someone seemed to have decided that letting a taxpayer get back that much money would not look good at all on the report of such a prolonged audit.

I could appeal the ruling, first to a "coneree"—a higher official of the IRS—and then, if necessary, to a still higher one. I could even go to tax court. But in the process, the additional time lost and the new legal fees incurred could more than wipe out any tax recovered. It seemed I would have to take the licking; either way, I would lose. After considerable additional dispute, the agent reconsidered and an appeal became unnecessary. But in my bitter moments, I felt my government had subjected me to a form of legalized extortion.

THE HIGH COST OF APPEALS

A spot check of accounting firms in the New York area suggests that thousands of taxpayers every year may have similar unpleasant experiences. Similar, that is, not in the denial of refunds that are due but in the levying of additional taxes which they consider unjustified but which they cannot recover economically through the normal appeal process. By comparison with the total number of returns filed, the number of these taxpayers may be small, but to the people concerned it is a serious matter.

Mr. S., a partner in a New York accounting firm that specializes in tax work (because of his continuing dealings with the IRS, he insisted on remaining anonymous), said he used to fight, on behalf of his clients, as many as fifty appeals at a time. But in virtually every case, once the appeal was over the client was so angry at the size of the accounting bill that, whatever the results of the appeal, Mr. S would lose the account. So he made it a firm rule never to handle appeals. He now negotiates with the IRS agent as stoutly as possible the first time around, and then proposes to the client that he accept the outcome, favorable or otherwise. If the taxpayer wants to appeal, some other firm must take the case. His relationship to the client is then finished, either way.

The effect of this policy is that in cases where Mr. S's advice is accepted, the government has been allowed virtually to dictate its terms to the taxpayer on the issues in dispute. If Mr. S is right, many if not most appeals are too expensive to be practical.

Other accountants are not quite so sweeping; but they say that unless at least \$1,500 to \$2,000 in tax is involved, the taxpayer can scarcely expect to break even from an appeal to conference even if he wins. Unless he feels qualified to handle it on his own, he must pay an accountant \$50 to \$200 a day, not merely during the conference itself but throughout a period of preparation. And the taxpayer's own time is also a factor. Still higher appeals, beyond the conference stage, are not considered economical unless something in the neighborhood of \$10,000 in taxes is involved. The IRS does not release figures on how many cases went to conference; but in 1965, 21,737 disputes (less than 1 percent of the total) were handled at the appellate level, the next stage, and only 5,448 (roughly one quarter of 1 percent) were disposed of by the tax courts. The money in question, however, was in the hundreds of millions.

The man who decides to do without costly help is, in effect, throwing himself on the mercy of the IRS. Mr. C, a partner in a Connecticut consulting firm, was on the road five days a week, year round, returning home only for weekends. He naturally had a large travel and entertainment deduction. When the return was selected for audit, he could not take time off to attend personally; his "billing rate" (the rate at which clients were charged for his services) was \$250 a day, and he was fully booked. So he sent his wife to the tax auditor, armed with canceled checks and credit-card bills. The auditor contended there was no proof the travel was not personal, and disallowed the whole amount. The wife did not know how to protest persuasively. So the whole year's travel was lost.

This couple could have hired professional help, but did not. Many others cannot afford to. Few men making less than \$15,000 a year care to pay \$15 to \$50 an hour for an accountant, let alone \$25 to \$100 an hour for a lawyer. A return showing a \$4,000 income is not as likely to be examined as one showing \$400,000, but it can happen. The test, the IRS says, is not the size of the income but whether there is anything unusual about the return, anything that causes raised eyebrows. If the ax falls, the little men have no choice but to fend for themselves.

Experiences vary. If the agent is conscientious and high-principled, as is sometimes the case, they get a fair deal. If he is casehardened, callous, or young and eager to impress his superiors, taxpayers may come off badly indeed. Discouragement, dismay, fear, and ignorance all may serve to keep them from making use of the appeals machinery.

Something obviously is amiss. The IRS insists that serious injustices are very isolated cases. Agents, it is said, operate under strict instructions to collect the tax due and only the tax due. Each year, just before the Ides of April, the Bureau engages in a national advertising campaign to convince the American people of its virtue. Nice, reasonable men say soothing and high-minded things on television and radio, encouraging people to pay up and assuring them that the IRS will deal with them as gently as possible.

Somewhere between theory and practice, however, the benevolent-father image breaks down. No doubt the complexity of the tax law is in part at fault; reasonable men can and do interpret the law in differing ways. No doubt many taxpayers who believe they have a grievance have in fact been fairly treated. But the absence of a readily available appeals system creates serious doubts.

Moreover, even if the government were right fifty times for every time it does an injustice, the 3,092,000 audits that took place in fiscal 1965 would have resulted in more than 60,000 injustices. And there may have been another half million taxpayers who came out of their experiences with the

IRS believing themselves wronged, though in fact they were not. Some of them undoubtedly resolved to get the lost money back the next time they filed a return. The government thus had made dishonest taxpayers out of honest ones. Another protection of the appeals system—the easing of legitimate doubts—was therefore not fully operative.

THE AGENTS

To far too great an extent, taxpayers are forced to rely on the objectivity and competence of one man. Deny it as the IRS may, most agents find that there is a premium on getting tough with the taxpayer, on producing results for their superiors in terms of cash on the barrelhead. In private, they admit it is so. The old quota system, under which each agent had to extract a given amount in a given time, is now officially banned. But agents acknowledge that they believe their standing with their superiors and their prospects for promotion depend in part on the money they collect for the government. They must account strictly for their time, and if it is not spent productively, they fear it may be a black mark on their record. If they are inexperienced or insecure, they may be afraid to give the taxpayer the benefit of a reasonable doubt, lest they be set down as naive or even corrupt.

IRS employees are not highly paid. Salaries start at \$5,181 for trainee technicians and go up to \$11,715 for experienced field agents. Supervisors get \$10,000 to \$13,000. Opportunities being more lucrative in private accounting practice, the government cannot always get and keep high-quality personnel. Moreover, the man making \$6,000 cannot always readily believe the expenses reported by the man making \$60,000, because they are too far removed from his own experience. How could a man really spend \$20 for lunch or \$7,000 for a boat just to entertain customers? Such figures just don't make sense to him.

One accountant says that when he runs into this kind of incredulity, he asks that the item be put aside temporarily, and then, come lunchtime, takes the agent to a nearby hotel dining room. He buys him a martini, a lobster cocktail, and a steak. When the bill is presented, the accountant inquires and "discovers" what he knew in advance—that the hotel does not honor credit cards, that the meal must be paid for in cash. He hands over a \$20 bill, and the agent sees there is little or no change. A lunch can cost \$10 a person, he has learned, and it may not always be easy to obtain a written record of the expense. When the agent returns to the audit, he has had an education in business expenditures.

In addition to collecting revenue and deterring cheating, the audit system is supposed to have the function of boosting the morale of the honest taxpayer. He needs to be assured that he will not, relatively speaking, be penalized for his honesty. One of the gnawing resentments of April 15 is the feeling that Joe Twerp has been getting away with murder. The majority of taxpayers, though they wail, are willing to pay what they owe (or most of it) provided everybody else does, too. But that is the rub. Many taxpayers who have been audited are not persuaded that the law has been applied fairly to them. The IRS is the only branch of government in which the basic assumption of Anglo-American jurisprudence—that a man is innocent until proved guilty—does not fully apply. By law, a deduction is subject to disallowance until it is proved allowable.

To some extent, this attitude is understandable. Some taxpayers ask agents to believe pretty farfetched stories. A man who had canceled checks showing \$90 in contributions to his church claimed he had also given \$1,000 in cash. A man who kept receipted bills for entertainment expense down

to \$2 and \$3 claimed he also spent \$4,000 without getting receipts. It could be true, but the agent can be forgiven for being skeptical.

Sometimes the taxpayer's records may be accurate, but he is unable to prove it; or perhaps he does not have complete records and has had to estimate. This is no longer permissible in all cases. The old "Cohan rule" of reasonability—that an entertainment expense was allowable if it was reasonable under the circumstances—has been replaced by a requirement that every item over \$25 must be substantiated by a receipted bill. These new travel and expenses regulations, which went into force on December 31, 1962, have not yet been tested in the courts, but they are being strictly applied.

The taxpayer may approach the audit in a difficult frame of mind. Some panic, and prepare for disaster. Others become belligerent and self-righteous, ready to take on the Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court as well as the IRS. Still others try desperately to pull political strings, an effort that is usually highly counterproductive.

When the examination occurs, it sometimes is almost anticlimactic. The taxpayer finds he is not being summoned to court for commission of a crime; he may arrange the appointment at a convenient time. He need not go to the IRS with his papers and other records stuffed into a suitcase or a trunk. If the data involved are voluminous, the agent is willing to come to him. The agent is authorized to take into account evidence of a taxpayer's good faith, and need not check every minute detail—though some do. He has instructions to be courteous and fair.

ROUGH SAILING

If the agent is indeed reasonable and the taxpayer well prepared, the audit can be over in a few hours—a day at most. If the return is complicated, the records incomplete, and/or the agent difficult, it can drag on and on. It is then that it becomes an affliction. If in addition to being difficult, the agent misapplies the law, then the taxpayer really needs a friend.

A man who used a 23-foot sailboat for entertaining business contacts deducted half the expenses on his return. He was audited, and the agent, a man in his twenties, expressed much concern about the deduction. He inquired in detail about personal use of the boat, and was shown records in a diary indicating that such use occurred less than half of the time. He asked for, and obtained, corroborative evidence that business discussions had taken place on board. He studied a record of who went sailing, and saw proof that the entertainment had led to production of income. Nevertheless, he disallowed the deduction.

Lots of people have boats on Long Island Sound, he said, and in most cases they are strictly for personal use. The taxpayer's boat must also have been largely personal. It was too expensive to have been bought primarily for business. Did the taxpayer's wife go along on the trips? She did? Then it obviously was personal. The taxpayer argued that the presence or absence of a business discussion was the test, not the presence or absence of a spouse. The agent pulled out a copy of the Internal Revenue Service regulations (a large volume) and quoted from regulation 1.274-2(e)(4)(b): "Any use of [an entertainment] facility (of a type described in this subdivision) during one calendar day shall be considered to constitute a 'day of business use' if the primary use of the facility on such day was ordinary and necessary within the meaning of section 162 or 212 and the regulations thereunder."

"For the purposes of this subdivision, a facility shall be deemed to have been primarily used for such purposes on any one calendar day if the facility was used for the conduct of a substantial and bona fide busi-

ness discussion (as described in paragraph (d)(3)(i) of this section) notwithstanding that the facility may also have been used on the same day for personal or family use by the taxpayer or any member of the taxpayer's family not involving entertainment of others by, or under the authority of the taxpayer."

The agent repeatedly quoted the phrase "not involving the entertainment of others." Relating it to the earlier part of the paragraph, rather than the portion in which it occurred, he said it meant that if others were present at the time the business entertainment took place, the facility at that time was not being used for business purposes.

The fact that this interpretation was directly at variance with other regulations did not disturb him. No amount of argument could shake him from this extraordinary distortion of logic, of the law, and of the English language. It developed that the agent's personal philosophy was that all entertainment was a form of bribery; that business should be obtained strictly on its merits, so that the IRS really ought to disallow all entertainment expense.

It seemed that the taxpayer had no option but to bow or go to the prohibitive expense of an appeal. Then, when he was just about at the end of his tether, the agent suddenly reconsidered and allowed the expense.

THE OMBUDSMAN IDEA

The appeal procedure, spokesmen for the commissioner say, is really not very difficult or expensive. They claim that the district conference, the first step, is just an informal discussion, with a friendly, experienced official—the father image again—who does not represent either the government or the taxpayer but is seeking pure and objective justice. The taxpayer doesn't need professional advice, they contend; he is in good hands. All this, however, is somehow at variance with the experience of most taxpayers who go "to conference." They regard it as a highly formal, even quasi-judicial proceeding, requiring extensive preparation, including legal briefs and affidavits; and they have little inclination to accept at face value the conferee's detachment and objectivity. He is, after all, an employee of the IRS.

Recently there have been some proposals for the creation of tax review boards, consisting of one or more experienced, well-paid specialists, to protect taxpayers from questionable rulings by the IRS. There is a kind of precedent in the Ombudsman system in force in Scandinavian countries and in New Zealand. The Ombudsman, a widely respected individual of national stature, is appointed by Parliament to guard against infringement of established rights. Any individual or group may petition him for relief, and he has extensive power to provide it. He may be removed by Parliament but is otherwise wholly independent. In the United States, Representative HENRY REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and Senator CLAI-BORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, have proposed a not dissimilar plan for "administrative counsel," an employee of Congress who would investigate and seek to correct citizens' grievances, whether against the IRS or any other branch of government, when asked to do so by a Senator or a Representative. The bill was referred to the Rules Committee in February, 1965, and little has been heard from it since.

More recently, Senators WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, and EDWARD LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, have mapped out a plan for a nationwide system of small-claims tax commissioners, under the aegis of the tax courts, to whom citizens could bring disputes with the IRS without the expense and formality of court procedure. Two commissioners would be appointed for each of the eleven regions into which the IRS has divided the United States. People who

could not afford to hire legal help would be entitled to go to the commissioner, just as they now can go to small-claims court with other kinds of legal disputes involving amounts up to a few hundred dollars.

Commissioners or boards of this type are urgently needed. They should exist primarily to protect taxpayers' rights. The IRS could be forbidden to appeal their decisions if the taxpayer, for his part, also agreed in advance to accept the decision as binding. What would result would be analogous to binding arbitration.

No doubt there would be snags to be ironed out in practice. Safeguards might be needed against frivolous use of the boards. A taxpayer who appealed to them against the decisions of an agent and had his obligations to the Government affirmed, or even increased, might have to assume the costs of the action—the costs, however, being scaled in proportion to his income, so that the poor could afford the risk as easily as the rich.

If the taxpayer's obligations were reduced by the board, the government ought to be assessed for costs, a procedure calculated to inhibit arbitrary and ill-founded IRS rulings in the first instance. With such revenue the boards could be largely self-supporting, and they would greatly ease the case load under which many tax courts are staggering. (At the end of fiscal 1965, 10,765 cases were pending, about a 2-year backlog.)

The possibility of a simple and inexpensive appeal from a tax audit would do much to restore public confidence. Taxpayers who lost would be more likely to swallow the judgment with good grace, less haunted by the suspicion of injustice, less determined to get their money back. The effect on the attitudes and behavior of agents might also be healthy. They would be under pressure to be right, as opposed to pressure to be tough. If they were proved wrong, the government would have to pay costs. To a far greater extent than at present, prestige and advancement within the IRS would logically derive from being infrequently overruled. The balance of bargaining power between taxpayer and agent during the initial audit would be restored.

What are involved are some of the textbook precepts of American democracy—that the government is a government of laws, not of men; that no citizen is ever at the mercy of an official; that if an official exceeds his authority, there must be effective remedies available. This is the way the tax system is supposed to operate today, but a sizable number of American taxpayers doubt it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the article by Mr. William R. Frye will indicate what we are talking about in this bill. I suppose I could have found literally hundreds of cases similar to the ones I suggested which took place in Beltingham. I know that if I went through my files accumulated over the years, there would be literally hundreds of such cases there. This is true of every Senator.

This proposed legislation provides an opportunity for the small taxpayer to be heard. I do not think it will deplete any money which might otherwise go into the Treasury. These amounts represent only a small part of the revenue receipts of the country. But the main thing is to relieve the harassing of the small taxpayer who does not know where to go or what to do.

He surely has a right because the American people are probably the most responsible people in the world in paying their just taxes. No other country has

a record of tax collections as does the United States.

But we do want the taxes to be just and we do want to provide an opportunity for the little fellow to come in and set forth his case before someone who would be more appropriate than the agency which is trying to collect the tax.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for his excellent statement, and I join him in sponsoring this important piece of legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may be recognized for 2 minutes.

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

The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, the Internal Revenue Service was created to collect taxes, and this it does and well.

Our tax laws and regulations are a maze through which only the tax lawyers, accountants, and the IRS can find their way. The ordinary citizen is lost. Yet this ordinary citizen files the vast bulk of the income tax returns the IRS receives each year.

In preparing his return, this citizen is often at the mercy of the IRS for advice, the same IRS responsible for collecting as much in the way of taxes that it can.

The total amount of tax this citizen will have to pay would usually be less than \$1,500 or \$2,000. If there is a dispute over how much is owed, it is usually not too large—a few hundred dollars at the most—sometimes only \$25 or \$50, but still a significant amount to the small taxpayer.

If there is a dispute and his return is audited, it is the IRS who decides what deductions and credits to allow. If the taxpayer decides to appeal the result of his audit, he again appeals to the IRS—this time to a regional commissioner.

If his appeal fails, he has the option of taking his case to the U.S. Tax Court, where he reaches the first impartial arbiter in the whole process.

But when \$25 or \$50 is at stake—or even \$150, it does not pay to appeal an audit decision. Tax lawyers say that at least \$200 has to be involved before the taxpayer can gain anything even if his appeal is successful. His cost for a lawyer and probably an accountant, will be too great. For the same reason, unless \$1,500 or \$2,000 is involved, it does not pay to take the case on to the tax court.

So, we are left with the average taxpayer at the mercy of the IRS, which, no matter how much it maintains that it does its work carefully, still has a vested interest in the outcome of each case.

The legislation introduced here today, as the Senator from Washington explained, would allow the small taxpayer to go before an impartial arbiter, at a much lower level. Besides allowing an

impartial decision on these small cases, creation of this small Tax Division of the Tax Court would instill in the IRS the desire to win its argument before one of the new Commissioners. This would provide a much-needed check within the IRS.

Mr. President, it is high time we gave a break to the average taxpayer who can not afford to duel with the Internal Revenue Service.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for having introduced the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Kansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for his interesting suggestion.

I have one or two thoughts in regard to the suggestion of the Senator. There is great discussion in this Nation about a program that started in Sweden some years ago. It concerns what is known as the ombudsman, a man who deals with people who have small problems and difficulties, and obviates the necessity of their going into courts.

In my opinion, this proposal sounds like a tax ombudsman and it might have merit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is exactly what it is.

I do not have the figures with me. However, the deficiencies that Internal Revenue tries to collect, or for which they send a bill to the small taxpayer, are very small. Perhaps the Government is correct, but the taxpayer is honest and he says, "I want to go in and find out."

I suspect that the Commissioner may find error here and there. I do not believe it would hurt the Treasury at all.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for purposes of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 10, to strike out "\$48,755,-000" and insert "\$48,970,000".

On page 2, line 14, after the word "roads", to strike out "\$2,900,000" and insert "\$3,062,-000".

On page 6, line 1, after the word "shops", to strike out "\$114,475,000" and insert "\$115,-061,300".

On page 6, line 19, after the word "contract", to strike out "\$55,325,000" and insert "\$56,848,000", and on page 7, line 10, after the word "Reclamation", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

"Provided further, That not to exceed \$918,000 shall be for assistance to the Tularosa, New Mexico, School District No. 4 for construction of junior high and high school facilities, and to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school."

On page 7, line 19, after "section 203", to strike out "\$16,754,000" and insert "\$16,889,000".

On page 9, line 14, after the name "Oregon", to insert "and", and in the same line, after the name "Washington", to strike out "and Wyoming".

On page 10, line 14, after the word "for", to strike out "\$8,910,000" and insert "\$8,960,000".

On page 11, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$76,203,000" and insert "\$65,703,000"; in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$17,971,500" and insert "\$23,471,500", and at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "\$18,093,000" and insert "\$18,093,000".

On page 15, line 17, after the word "activities", to strike out "\$72,782,000" and insert "\$80,932,000", and in line 18, after the word "which", to strike out "\$12,350,000" and insert "\$12,250,000".

On page 17, line 10, after the word "substitutes", to strike out "\$31,540,000" and insert "\$34,940,000".

On page 17, line 18, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$4,300,000".

On page 18, line 2, after the numerals "1965", to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$7,000,000".

On page 20, line 12, after the word "law", to strike out "\$20,312,000" and insert "\$21,076,000".

On page 22, after line 5, to insert:

ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000, to remain available until expended.

On page 24, line 14, after the word "Refuge", to strike out "\$37,164,000" and insert "\$39,161,400".

On page 24, line 20, after the word "therein", to strike out "\$5,130,000" and insert "\$8,341,600".

On page 25, line 15, after the numerals "1965", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$500,000".

At the top of page 26, to insert:

ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000, to remain available until expended.

On page 26, line 9, after the word "offices", to strike out "\$1,549,000" and insert "\$1,564,000".

On page 28, line 1, after the word "Commission", to strike out "\$35,694,000" and insert "\$36,171,600".

On page 28, line 19, after the word "rights", to strike out "\$22,894,000" and insert "\$23,494,000".

On page 31, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "\$4,650,000" and insert "\$4,704,000".

On page 32, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$4,984,100" and insert "\$5,051,700".

On page 35, line 2, after the word "lands", to strike out "\$172,821,000" and insert "\$174,521,000".

On page 35, line 16, after the word "law", to strike out "\$34,955,000" and insert "\$38,578,000".

On page 40, line 14, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$73,250,000" and insert "\$73,671,000".

On page 40, line 24, after "(42 U.S.C. 2004a)", to strike out "\$13,000,000" and insert "\$13,928,000".

On page 43, line 15, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$9,000,000"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$4,000,000"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "sections 5 (c) and" and insert "section 5 (c); \$2,000,000 for carrying out section 7 (c); and \$2,000,000 for carrying out section"; and on page 44, line 5, after "1966" to insert a colon and "Provided further, That no funds appropriated pursuant to this paragraph may be used for any grant or other payment which is to be used directly or indirectly for the destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City."

On page 45, line 11, after the word "publications", to strike out "\$22,523,000" and insert "\$22,844,000".

On page 47, line 19, to strike out "\$2,694,000" and insert "\$2,718,000".

On page 48, line 2, to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$35,000".

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the committee, as indicated on page 1 of the report, considered budget estimates in the amount of \$1,340,260,500, including indefinite appropriations of receipts, for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior and for the related agencies listed on page 2 of the report. Excluded from this bill are the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The committee recommends definite appropriations of \$1,329,755,000. This is \$34,585,500 more than the House allowance; and is \$10,505,500 less than the budget estimates. Included in the amount over the House allowance is \$10,300,000 in a budget estimate sent directly to the Senate and not considered by the House. This request pertains to exploration for and development of technology for recovery of heavy metals.

The committee recommended the following major increases over the House allowances:

Bureau of Land Management, \$377,000; Bureau of Indian Affairs, \$2,244,300, which will provide a full educational construction program to get greater numbers of Indian children in more adequate schools; Geological Survey, \$8,150,000 and Bureau of Mines, \$2,700,000. All but \$250,000 of the increases for the latter two agencies are for the heavy metals program.

The amount proposed for the land and water conservation fund is \$110 million, as requested in the budget and as allowed by the House.

It is the committee's recommendation that the amount to be available for matching on an equal basis by the States should be held closely to the 60 percent

set forth in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The report states on page 10:

Because of the numerous purchases which have recently been authorized for Federal recreational facilities it appears desirable to the committee that the maximum amount possible be made available to accomplish these purchases. This is especially necessary, it is felt by the committee, in view of rapidly rising land prices.

Of the budget estimate, \$10 million was proposed for the Redwood National Park in California. Legislation to establish this Park has been introduced only recently, and no action has yet been taken. The committee recommends increasing funds for the Park Service and Forest Service by \$5 million each and would distribute these amounts to reinstate planned acquisitions from which they were taken in order to allow funds for the Redwood Park. This will make available the following increases, among other additions: \$500,000 for Assateague Island National Seashore in the State of Maryland; \$500,000 for Minute Man Historic Park; \$2,339,500 for Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area; \$1 million for Fire Island National Seashore; and \$250,000 for Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area.

The committee also has recommended increases over the House allowance of \$3,439,000 for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and \$7,399,000 for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Almost half of the total increases for these two agencies is for initiating activity under the Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries and Conservation Act which became law last October 30, and which by its terms will terminate in 1970. It was for this reason that the Senate committee added these two items to the bill as it came to us from the House of Representatives.

The remainder of the additional funds are for predatory animal control and for advancement of the commercial and sport fishery activities of the United States.

For the National Park Service there is an increase of \$1,077,600. For the Forest Service the committee proposes increases amounting to \$5,323,000, of which over 68 percent is for research.

It is recommended that the Division of Indian Health be financed at a sum \$1,349,000 greater than the amount provided by the House of Representatives. However, \$748,000 of this increase is a restoration of the House disallowance of a portion of the budget estimate for construction of sanitation facilities.

The House of Representatives declined, without prejudice, to allow any of the budget request of the National Endowment for the Humanities; and stated its "understanding that it may be taken up at a later date by the Senate." This was done, and a complete hearing was held as to the items which had not been considered or allowed by the House of Representatives. The committee proposes an appropriation of \$2 million.

It is the opinion of the committee that the changes which are recommended provide for activities helpful in the de-

velopment of the resources of our country and will broaden the base of the Nation's economy.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President—

Mr. BIBLE. May I first yield to the Senator from South Dakota? He is the ranking member of the Republican Party on the Appropriations Interior Subcommittee. He has performed yeoman service and has been extremely helpful in molding and developing the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

I congratulate the acting chairman of the subcommittee for his presentation this morning and the thoroughness with which the bill has been considered. The hearings in connection with the proposed legislation consist of 2,200 pages. This little volume of 920 pages, which I hold in my hand, is just a digest of the various items that are included. Every item has been scrutinized carefully, and I am happy to report that the bill in its present form has the unanimous approval of the minority and the majority members of the committee. Also, it received the unanimous approval of the full committee.

I am happy to report that the total amount of the items involved is still \$10,505,000 below the budget estimates for the coming fiscal year. We do not pretend that every department that had a meritorious project has received all the money it would like. That is impossible. But we do think that it is fair. I believe the committee has run a taut ship. It has scrutinized these items very carefully, and we believe that the passage of the proposed legislation in its present form will be beneficial to America.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the sentiments of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. He has been extremely helpful in developing the bill in its present form. As the Senator knows, more than 170 amendments were considered in subcommittee, which indicates the wide range of interest that was expressed by the various people who appeared before the committee.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

I notice that the bill includes an item of \$200,000 for the Fort Scott National Historic Site. I express my sincere thanks and appreciation to the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee and the members of the committee for retaining this item, which was placed in the bill in the House.

The Fort Scott National Historic Site is one of the truly historic sites in the State of Kansas. It was authorized as a park site in a prior session of Congress.

The National Park Service last year set aside \$50,000 for preliminary studies and planning, and the additional fund will enable the program to begin.

I assure the Senator from Nevada that not only the communities surrounding the Fort Scott National Park Site, but also the State of Kansas, appreciate this action.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the sentiments of the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

This is an important historic site. I am familiar with the enabling legislation. I am delighted that the Senate has concurred with the House action. This will permit the program to go forward without delay.

I yield now to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the United States will be a better and stronger Nation because of the money that will be spent under the proposed appropriation.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota was correct when he stated that every item that appears in the bill was examined with diligence and with care, after adequate testimony was heard. As a member of the subcommittee, I can attest that this is also true with reference to the many proposed amendments. They were considered, and when it was in the public interest and whenever the budgetary situation would permit, the committee moved affirmatively.

On a more local basis, perhaps, I should like to record by view that the committee acted wisely in adding to the bill \$100,000 so that a mental health team may be organized by the U.S. Public Health Service for the benefit of the native people of Alaska. The native people are the Aleuts, the Eskimos, and the Indians.

As I recall, this program was initiated in South Dakota, and it has worked very well, leading the executive department of the Government to suggest that it be extended to Alaska. The committee agreed with this.

I was made happy by the action of the committee in adding money in certain situations to the budget request for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. For example, there is a program of Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development, a legislative act that has a life of only 5 years. The legislation provides a Federal appropriation annually of \$5 million, so that all States in which they do not now exist may attempt to develop commercial fisheries, and the program can be expanded in States that now have such a program.

The budget request was only \$3,210,000. The House, in its wisdom, increased this to \$4,710,000. The latter amount was agreed to by the Senate committee, and that is the amount now in the bill.

As the acting chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Nevada, has already noted, the committee added \$2,675,000 to the budget of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for the Great Lakes Fishery and for the sports fisheries, anadromous fish.

This is in response to legislation of last year. The United States has slipped from the position of second in respect to fisheries to fifth place among the maritime nations of the world. It is behind Peru, Red China, Soviet Russia, and Japan. We do need additional assistance to build up our commercial fisheries.

In this connection I should like to note that the committee has incorporated in the bill the sum of \$100,000 for an expanded investigation of the Pacific hake fishery program off the coasts of Washington and Oregon. Hake were dis-

covered there in great numbers by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries very recently. This offers the United States a splendid opportunity, which it has not had until now, of moving out of its coastal waters and into the offshore fishery industry which is dominated now on the west coast by Japan and Soviet Russia.

It is hoped and believed that the hake and pollack, which are found in Alaska in great numbers, will provide the basis for the establishment in this country of plants to produce fish protein. If this is done, as it can be done, the United States will then move into a much higher position in the fishing industry.

The committee added funds for shrimp research in Alaskan waters. I express here the hope that part of those funds may be expended in the South where there is a vast potential source of shrimp. I have been told that enough shrimp may be found there to supply 25 percent of the U.S. domestic consumption which runs approximately 400 million pounds.

I extend my congratulations and thanks to the acting chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who cannot be with us today.

The committee has reported a splendid bill, a bill which ought to be passed without opposition.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alaska is a very important member of our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. His service has been invaluable. Particularly, in the field of anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation. The Senator from Alaska conducted most of the hearings on these two items, both for the commercial and the sports fisheries.

The committee did allow the funds, as I said earlier, because there was a time limit on the expenditures of the \$25 million. We believed that a great need was evidenced and were very happy to allow this item.

I hope that the entire amount can be held in conference.

Mr. President, on page 26, line 4 of the bill, the date of October 3, 1965, is a typographical error. It should be October 30, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that this change be made.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I rise to support strongly the recommendation of the Senate Appropriation Committee to provide an additional \$250,000 to provide additional staffing at the Southern Hardwoods Laboratory located at Stoneville, Miss.

Although this Laboratory happens to be located in my State, it is a facility which has great regional importance. Research at this Laboratory is designed to provide improved forestry management and use of 70 million acres of commercial hardwoods throughout the South. The benefits derived from this research extend far beyond the boundaries of my own State—indeed it affects approximately 60 percent of the national hardwood production.

The additional funds provided in this bill will enable the professional staff at the Laboratory to be brought up to the level originally anticipated when this Laboratory was designed and constructed. These additional staff personnel will enable the research to be greatly accelerated in the many problems affecting southern hardwoods.

An example of the need to accelerate this research is indicated by the fact that disease causes an estimated \$2 billion annual loss in southern hardwoods. Likewise, damage sustained from insects and wildlife is substantial. The small cost of accelerating research on these problems can be recovered manifold in just 1 year if substantial progress is made in eliminating some of these problems.

I repeat for emphasis, the scope of this Laboratory is regional and the work performed at the Laboratory affects the entire hardwood industry throughout the southern part of the United States. It is for these reasons that I strongly support this appropriation.

KENTUCKY TROUT HATCHERY FUNDS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President. I am pleased to note at page 20 of the report that the Committee on Appropriations has recommended among the increases over the budget estimate and the House allowances funds in the amount of \$20,000 for the "determination of suitable site for a trout hatchery in Kentucky."

I appeared on March 16 before the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department's budget and testified in support of the inclusion of these funds and also submitted a detailed statement on behalf of the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife. I note that this is the first time that any funds for a trout hatchery in Kentucky have ever been recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee. This action by the committee demonstrates clearly that it is the committee's decision that the Department of the Interior proceed with the determination of a suitable site for a trout hatchery without further delay, and on behalf of the people of Kentucky, I am very happy that the committee reached this decision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee in this connection be included in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN S. COOPER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY
ESTABLISHMENT OF TROUT HATCHERY ON CUMBERLAND RIVER, KY.

Senator BARTLETT. Senator COOPER.
Senator COOPER. Thank you Senator BARTLETT, and the committee.

I have two requests that I will make of the committee. One is to provide planning funds for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Cumberland River in Kentucky, below Wolf Creek Dam which impounds Cumberland Reservoir. To give some background of the problem, let me say that the Governor of Kentucky, the commissioner of the department of fish and wildlife, the director of the division of fisheries, the membership of the League of Kentucky Sportsmen and the congressional delegation of Kentucky, have requested the

Department of the Interior to proceed with planning for this hatchery, and I have also requested funds from this committee. Last year I came before you and, while the committee did not provide funds for planning at that time, Senator HAYDEN in a colloquy on the floor told me that he would give the utmost consideration to this request and he felt the committee would do so.

KENTUCKY PAST TROUT STOCKING

Since 1948 Kentucky has been stocking trout in its streams from hatcheries in other States, primarily from a hatchery in Virginia and one in Tennessee. The first stockings were experimental in nature, but in 1952, a trout fishery was established below Wolf Creek Dam on the Cumberland River at a point near where it is proposed that a hatchery now be constructed. It has been very successful and, from the history of this experimental work, certain conclusions can be drawn.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE STATEMENT AND SURVEY

The department of fish and wildlife in the Kentucky State government has provided a statement which I will file. Its survey shows that at least 75 streams in Kentucky can support a trout fishery of which some 515 miles of streams are suitable for stocking trout. There are 30,000 acres in reservoirs which would be suitable for trout stocking.

KENTUCKY NAVIGABLE STREAMS

I might say here that while it is not generally known—unless Alaska has now taken the lead—Kentucky has more miles of navigable streams than any State in the Union.

Senator BARTLETT. This is the first time I find myself unable to claim Alaska is first, because I do not know.

Senator COOPER. You might have more miles of streams than we have but I suppose our claim is we have more miles of navigable streams. We are fourth nationally in the number of rivers that we have in our State.

DEPARTMENT AND BUREAU OPPOSITION AND DEARTH OF HATCHERIES IN SOUTH

I do not think there is any question that the qualities that are needed for a fish hatchery have been established in Kentucky. But I might say that I think the Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has quibbled about this. However, they have said that during the next 5 years Kentucky could use about 91,500 pounds of trout annually which meets the 5-year estimate of the State of Kentucky.

The Department has suggested that trout could be furnished from Tennessee or Virginia, as in the past. But, to supply trout from Virginia for some of the streams would involve haulage up to 600 miles, the nearest point being 250 miles. Tennessee is somewhat closer, but I think any examination would show that Tennessee can use all of the trout that its hatchery produces.

The Department has also said that it will have to determine if there is a suitable site available. Yet the facts show that the Corps of Engineers has assured the State that it would make a site available. I am conscious of the problems of the Department of the Interior and its Division of Wildlife but I want to call the subcommittee's attention to the fact that if you examine the list of present trout hatcheries, you would find there are very few in the South. I notice in the report of the committee for last year that funds were made available for studies and for continued appropriations to a number of hatcheries in the North. Of course that may be because their streams are generally more suitable. But when there are streams in a Southern State which can support trout, and are appropriate for it, then an effort should be made to develop the potential in that area.

For 5 or 6 years or perhaps longer our Kentucky congressional delegation has been

meeting with representatives of the Department of the Interior on this subject. I am not one who wants to place blame, but I must say in this instance I think the Department has dragged its feet and that it has not made the investigations or completed the studies it should have made. Even now the Department's answer is that it wants to continue to make further studies of streams and related factors which data is already available.

FUNDS REQUEST

Based on this long record, I earnestly ask that the committee take this matter in hand and if it cannot supply the \$50,000 that the Department says it would need to make this study, then at least supply some funds—\$20,000 or \$25,000—so that the Department will actually make the study, report to this committee, and report to our State. It has not done it. And I ask that this be done.

Senator BARTLETT. \$50,000 seems quite a little for a study, don't you think?

Senator COOPER. I think so, but as I say in our report—

Senator BARTLETT. That is what they want. Senator COOPER. Yes; and if that is too much, I would say give them \$25,000. Because of the data which have been accumulated by the State, and the data which they say they have accumulated themselves in the past years, I believe they can make this study and make a determination.

Senator BARTLETT. The committee will give it close consideration.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the unanimous action of the Appropriations Committee in placing in the bill an unbudgeted item of \$500,000 for the acquisition of land to help round out the Everglades National Park. I think I should state in the RECORD the reasons behind our action in this matter.

For the last 6 fiscal years prior to this year the Bureau of the Budget has seen fit to include in the budget items for this purpose ranging all the way from \$450,000 some 6 years ago to \$1,125,000 last year.

On every occasion the Senate committee has inserted these items in the bill. On every occasion, in the face of rather determined opposition in the conference, these items have been eliminated in conference.

I am informed that some of the earlier opposition in the House of Representatives to this particular item has diminished and that there is a good chance of the conferees approving the item. I asked the committee, therefore, to include only \$500,000, as opposed to the \$1,125,000 requested last year, which was placed in the Senate bill, and eliminated in conference.

The reasons for my placing this item before the committee, are these: The State of Florida long ago fulfilled its commitments in this regard. It deeded to the Federal Government something like 850,000 acres of land and water for the purpose of setting up the Everglades National Park. If that land were to be valued at only \$10 an acre—and it is worth much more than that—that would be \$8.5 million.

The State of Florida later made a cash grant of \$2 million as its part toward the acquisition of inholdings. The Federal Government was expected to put up \$2 million as authorized by Public Law 85-482, July 2, 1958. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has

never been able to go ahead with its part of its contribution. It was for that reason that I requested the committee, acting upon the request of the Bureau of the Budget, after 6 straight years, to put in less than half of the requested item this year.

The reasons for my doing so are well set forth in a letter written by me to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, under date of May 10, 1966, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

MAY 10, 1966.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee, U.S.
Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Everglades National Park, Florida, was established by the Act of May 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 816; 16 U.S.C., secs. 410, 410a-410c).

Public Law 85-482, July 2, 1958, established boundaries of the park, authorized the transfer of certain lands between the Federal Government and the State of Florida and authorized to be appropriated \$2 million for acquisition of privately owned lands within the park.

Under Public Law 85-482 the Secretary of the Interior transferred to the State of Florida about 65,000 acres of federal land lying outside the revised boundaries in exchange for about 64,000 acres of State lands within the revised boundaries. These exchanges of lands were completed on February 25, 1959. In addition, some 1,290,091 acres of land have been donated by the State, local agencies and private donors some of which are acquired by a \$2 million cash grant made by the State of Florida.

Since 1961 efforts have been made through budget requests for the necessary funds to purchase privately owned lands within the park boundaries (Hole in Donut), and other inholdings.

In fiscal year 1961 and fiscal year 1962 the budgets as submitted to the Congress contained \$450,000 for this acquisition. The House denied the requests and the Senate, on both occasions, restored the monies only to lose them in Conference.

In fiscal year 1963 and fiscal year 1964 the budgets submitted to the Congress contained \$500,000 for the acquisition. The House again denied the requests and the Senate again restored the funds only to again lose them in Conference.

In fiscal year 1965 there was no budget request for the regular appropriation. However, \$452,000 was in the Supplemental bill to purchase the Iori property which contained some 4,420 acres within the park boundaries. This property was obtained by the Department of Agriculture through foreclosure of certain liens which the Department held through the Farmers Home Administration. The property was simply transferred from one Federal agency to another.

In fiscal year 1966 a budget request for \$1,125,500 was submitted to the Congress, which included \$125,500 for the acquisition of the Smallwood area, in which is located Indian mounds (shells) and an Indian camp, as well as funds for the Hole in Donut. None of these funds were appropriated though the Senate itself approved the request but later it was lost in Conference.

To date the only funds appropriated under the authority of Public Law 85-482 enacted in 1958 has been the \$452,000 previously mentioned.

The State of Florida has evidenced good faith and performed its full obligation in

the transfer of some 850,000 acres of land to the park and by expending some \$2 million for the acquisition of some of the private lands transferred to the park. Therefore, it is only right that the Federal Government show good faith by the acquisition of the Hole in Donut and other inholdings in order that the park boundaries may be rounded out. It is past time that the commitment of \$2 million for this purpose made by the Congress in 1958 be carried out.

I earnestly request favorable consideration of the inclusion of \$500,000 in the Department of the Interior Appropriation bill to enable a long sought after effort—since 1960—to start acquisition of the lands in the park which are privately owned, to which acquisition the Federal Government is fully committed.

With kind regards, I remain,

Yours faithfully,

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, while I think the matter is well set forth in this letter, I want this additional statement to appear in the RECORD at this point.

I have for several years been negotiating with a private foundation in an effort to secure its help in rounding out this park by acquiring sites of interest, as, for example, one which includes a rather sizable area of Indian mounds. Those mounds have been undisturbed. They are there as they have been for centuries.

I have run into the question repeatedly, "How can you ask us to provide this when the Federal Government is not doing its part?"

I think we are at the stage where if we can get the Federal Government to perform its part of the obligation, which it entered into many years ago, we can get substantial help from these particular private foundations, and in connection with the particular proposal which I have mentioned, I know others are interested in the park, who have negotiated with other private foundations, with the same result.

Is it not natural for people handling large sums of private funds which are available for such purposes to say, "We must see an interest in the Federal Government in carrying out its obligation before we can be active in this regard, in which we are interested"?

I have, therefore, set forth the reasons for the inclusion of the item of \$500,000 for land acquisition for the Everglades National Park. I appreciate very much the action of the Appropriations Committee to that end, and the fact that the Senate is about to act on this matter without objection to this particular item.

I hope sincerely the conferees from the other body will be able to agree on this matter, and decide to approve the item, and thus show the interest of the Federal Government in fulfilling its obligation in this important matter.

BEREA, KY., FOREST RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President. The Senator from Nevada, who is handling the bill, may recall that I appeared before the Appropriations Committee requesting funds for planning the forest research building to be constructed at the Berea, Ky., Forest Research Center. My statement supporting this request ap-

pears on pages 1848 to 1854 of the hearings, together with letters from the Commissioner of Natural Resources, Mr. Matlick, and from President Hutchins.

Last year, the Senate included funds for this purpose, but they were not allowed by the House. For that reason, I came before the committee again this year to call attention to the needs to house strip mine restoration and other research which is going forward there. The House has now allowed funds in the amount of \$40,000 for this purpose, and I am very glad that the Senate committee has also recommended that amount. If the Senate agrees to the committee recommendation, as I am sure it will, funds for planning the building at Berea will be assured.

The forest research and strip mine restoration work proceeding at the Berea Center, as it has been developed in recent years, is a credit to the leadership, initiative and perseverance of Mr. R. D. Lane. I ask unanimous consent that a letter by the Commissioner of Natural Resources of the State of Kentucky, Mr. J. O. Matlick, on his advancement to be director of the Northeastern Experiment Station with continued responsibility for the forest research program in Kentucky, be inserted in the RECORD.

I support the \$9 million recommended by the Senate Committee for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, which I supported last year.

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

MARCH 30, 1966.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A few days ago, Mr. Edward P. Cliff, Chief, U.S. Forest Service wrote to me about the reorganization of the Forest Service in eastern United States. I was greatly pleased and gratified to learn from Mr. Cliff that Mr. R. D. Lane, formerly Director of the Central States Forest Experiment Station, is now Director at the Northeastern Experiment Station and will continue to have responsibility for the Forest Service research program in Kentucky.

Under Mr. Lane's very capable and imaginative leadership, we have made in Kentucky fine progress toward a forestry research program of state and national significance. Forest Service scientists located at Berea, Kentucky, have aggressively tackled several difficult and complex research problems of major importance to us. They have undertaken their work quietly, efficiently, and without fanfare. And they have sought our advice and counsel in selection of research problems, have coordinated their work with our programs, and have consistently given us full assistance whenever we have called upon them. Moreover, with Mr. Lane's guidance, they have cooperated with and assisted others, such as the University of Kentucky, in developing a coordinated, productive forestry research program for Kentucky.

Let me give you a few examples of the excellent contributions they have made:

1. With their assistance we have established a Wood Use Demonstration and Training Center that promises to assist materially in expanding wood-based industries as well as employment opportunities in the highlands of eastern Kentucky and thus strengthen the economy of this area. The facility is operated by the University of Kentucky and located at Quicksand.

2. My Department and the Forest Service joined forces to make a thorough inventory

of our state's forests. This work, now completed, gives us the most intensive, detailed inventory ever made of our state's forest resources. We have had a flood of inquiries about timber supplies in Kentucky and I am confident that our inventory will lead to the establishment of several new wood-based industries in our state.

3. Our State Legislature just recently passed a most stringent surface mine restoration law. The research conducted by Forest Service scientists at Berea provided the basis for this new law and for regulations being developed under it. Research programs they have in progress, although quite small in relation to the total problems, will help both us and the Kentucky mining industry abide by the new laws as well as other States and the industry throughout the Appalachian coal field.

We hold in great esteem the Forest Service scientists at Berea, Kentucky, and their director, Mr. Lane. They are, in our opinion, a distinct credit to your Department and to the Forest Service.

J. O. MATLICK.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to take note of the fact that the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, which we are considering today, contains a provision of \$9 million for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. This is a matter of special interest to me since I am chairman of the Special Subcommittee on the Arts and Humanities which last year handled the authorizing legislation for this program.

I am pleased to note that although the Senate bill still represents a cut of \$4.9 or more than a third less than the budget request, it does provide \$2 million more than the House bill allowed, with all of the increase going to the National Endowment for the Humanities. This is entirely appropriate since the House committee passed over the request for the humanities endowment without prejudice, in view of the fact that the endowment's program had not been fully formulated at the time the House committee considered the bill.

However, it seems to me the record should show that the Senate bill still reflects some very substantial cuts in the basic programs envisioned under the new National Foundation. The largest is a cut of \$3 million in the amount requested for the Endowment on the Humanities. In addition, the basic grant program under the Arts Endowment has been cut \$1 million; the State grant-in-aid program has been cut \$750,000 and the administrative allowance has been cut \$180,000.

It is unfortunate indeed that these worthy programs must be held back because of the budgetary constrictions resulting from the situation in Vietnam. While none of us would assert a civilian priority under these conditions, it does seem to me that our cultural well-being as a Nation should hold a high claim under normal circumstances, and one which has long remained neglected. I therefore hope that the amounts cut from the projected programs of the foundation will be restored as soon as possible, hopefully in supplemental appropriations next year.

In the meantime, I hope that the foundation will be able to manage resourcefully with the funds allotted to it,

and that, in particular it will be able to make equitable distributions to the States on the basis of need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 14215) was passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the presiding officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada for another outstanding contribution as the floor manager of this important measure. It is rather routine to achieve success on measures supported by the articulate and able advocacy of the senior Nevada Senator, but it is unusual, indeed, in this Chamber to pass a bill of this dimension affecting so many interests and so many parts of the country, with the ease and expedition witnessed today. Such an achievement can be obtained only with the greatest of skill and ability.

I commend the senior Senator from Nevada and thank him on behalf of the country as a whole and particularly on behalf of the people of Montana.

Of course, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee as well as the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and others are to be commended for their support. But, as always, a success of this magnitude is a tribute to the entire Senate.

RESERVOIR ADMISSION FEES CONTRARY TO EARLIER PROMISE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the last few years we have grown used to what is called the credibility gap with regard to foreign affairs and defense matters in the Johnson-Humphrey regime. Now I am afraid we are experiencing a complete lack of credibility when dealing with the domestic policies of this administration.

A situation has again developed which leads me to question the credibility of this administration. Before I go into

that, however, I believe I should lay a little groundwork. Through my home State the mighty Missouri River flows. We have been able to tame, to a certain extent, the violent wanderings of this river when the spring thaw and the March and April rains used to produce enough moisture to force the river over its banks.

We did this through the Missouri River development program. In 1944 Congress passed legislation popularly called the Pick-Sloan plan. The purpose of this plan was fourfold: flood control, irrigation, production of hydroelectric power, and improvement of navigation on the lower Missouri.

These four purposes still remain as the main reasons for the existence of the dams and the reservoirs that channel that river. Certain other benefits have derived from these dams but they are secondary in nature and always will be. Among these secondary benefits are scenic beauty and recreation.

I mention this because recently the Corps of Engineers announced certain areas that would be included as "designated areas" for the year April 1, 1966, to March 31, 1967, at which admission fees would be charged. This requirement for designated areas flows from a series of legislation, Executive orders, and administrative regulations that began with the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965.

In this piece of legislation, the Congress, by amending some existing laws and initiating others, determined that it should be the will of the legislative branch that certain areas be open to assessment of admission and user fees. As I will substantiate later, the legislative history also makes it clear that certain other areas were not included in this program.

A key point in this legislation was the limitations and requirements written into the bill as to what areas could be considered applicable for the admission fee program. These requirements which must be concurrent were:

First. Areas at which either recreation user or entrance fees may be charged must be designated by the President and all such areas must be posted.

Second. Entrance and admission fees may be charged only where a Federal area is administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, recreational, or wildlife purposes.

Third. The particular area for which entrance or admission fees can be charged must be administered by a Federal agency.

Fourth. The recreational facilities or services where such fees are charged must be provided at Federal expense.

In regard to this criteria, I would like to stress two things. First of all, they must be concurrent. Second, there is a requirement that the primary purpose be for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, recreational, or wildlife reasons.

Following the enactment of this legislation into law, Public Law 88-578, the President, on March 2, 1965, issued Executive Order No. 11200, designed to implement the provisions of that law. It

specifically set out the criteria to be followed in determining the designated areas for 1965. The criteria listed were, properly enough, the same criteria enumerated in the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. The Executive order also required all subordinate units of the executive branch, including the Department of the Interior, to annually review all areas under their respective jurisdictions to determine whether any additional areas should, in accordance with the designated criteria, be designated as areas for which entrance, admission, or other recreation user fees were to be collected in future years.

On January 30 of this year, Secretary of the Interior Udall announced the sale of a new permit called the Federal Recreation Area Entrance Permit. At the same time he issued regulations spelling out the Federal Recreation Area Entrance Permit charges authorized by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. These regulations, as listed in the Federal Register of December 31, 1965, make no mention of any criteria for determining designated areas other than the fact that authority for these fees was derived from the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965 and Executive Order No. 11200. In the news release that accompanied this announcement, however, the criteria originally listed in Public Law 88-587 were described as conditions which must be met in order for fees to be charged.

Mr. President, I have set out this history behind these designated areas because I wanted to show that the authority for them started with the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. To my knowledge, this legislation still controls.

It was with a great deal of surprise, then, that I learned that the Corps of Engineers had listed four reservoirs on the Missouri River in South Dakota as designated areas. These four reservoirs are Big Bend, Fort Randall, Lewis and Clark Lake, at Gavins Point, and Oahe.

I was surprised because I had previously been informed by Edward Crafts, Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of Interior and the man who oversees this admission fee program, that these Missouri River Reservoirs would not qualify for admission charges under the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965.

In anticipation of the exact same problem we are confronted with today, in 1964, prior to the passage of Public Law 88-578, I attempted to elicit from Mr. Crafts an answer to whether or not passage of that bill would affect the Missouri River Reservoirs. At two different times he assured me that it would not.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. Crafts, answering in detail questions along this line, which I directed to him in a letter dated February 13, 1964, and also a colloquy between Mr. Crafts and myself when he appeared before the subcommittee on appropriations for the Interior Department.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1964.
Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: We have received your letter of February 13, with further reference to the proposed land and water conservation fund.

At times, after acts of Congress have been passed, unforeseen questions have subsequently arisen, in connection with the administration of their provisions, as to the intention of the Congress with respect to a given situation. Fortunately, the interest of the Congress in the proposed land and water conservation fund is so great that a record is being made that should reduce this type of problem to the minimum.

Your recital of the provision in S. 859, as modified by the House Interior Committee in reporting H.R. 8846, is entirely correct. Concerning the question you raise—its probable effect regarding charges for recreation use of Missouri River reservoirs in South Dakota—it is necessary to consider the following limitations and requirements that have been incorporated in the bill:

1. Areas at which either recreation user or entrance fees, may be charged must be designated by the President, and all such areas must be posted.

2. Entrance and admission fees may be charged only where a Federal area is administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, recreational, or wildlife purposes.

3. The particular area for which entrance or admission fees can be charged must be administered by a Federal agency.

4. The recreational facilities or services where such fees are charged must be provided at Federal expense.

These requirements, you will perceive, which presumably will remain in the bill, clearly limit the areas for which charges can be made as a source of revenue for the land and water conservation fund.

Moreover, it is clear also from these provisions of the bill as reported to the House that no Federal admission or entrance fee could be charged at Federal areas that are leased to a State or to other public or private agency for exclusive operation of the recreation resource, such as is the practice at many Federal water development projects.

The first question that arises, of course, is whether or not these particular reservoirs are administered "primarily" for recreational or other purposes, as enumerated in item 1 above. We believe this is not the case from our present knowledge of these reservoirs. The following quotation is taken from page 7 of a publication by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, entitled "Water Resources Development in South Dakota, 1963":

"COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

"The 1944 Flood Control Act approved the expansion of the general comprehensive plan for the control of floods and development of water resources in the Missouri River Basin. The basinwide plan, popularly known as the Pick-Sloan plan, was based upon two proposals, the first recommended by the Corps of Engineers in the summer of 1943, and the second by the Bureau of Reclamation in the spring of 1944. It is a multiple-purpose program designed primarily for four basic purposes: flood control, irrigation, production of hydroelectric power, and improvement of navigation on the lower Missouri. Other allied benefits to the people of the valley and to the Nation are improved municipal water supply and sanitation, soil

erosion control, conservation of fish and wildlife, and public recreational advantages."

Accordingly, I am convinced that the Missouri River Reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Engineers in South Dakota are not in fact administered primarily for recreation or other purposes that would qualify them for the making of entrance or admission charges to these areas as a whole.

As in the case of the national forests, there may be small developed areas on the Federal land bordering a reservoir where the Federal Government makes substantial expenditures for recreation purposes and for which it would be reasonable and logical to make nominal charges. This, of course, would not restrict general public use of the water area of the reservoirs without charge.

In connection with the foregoing, we note that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in House Report No. 900, on page 20, is very clear on this point: "The bill will not be applicable to areas where recreation is purely incidental to another major purpose of the area, to areas where neither Federal personnel nor Federal facilities are provided for the recreationist, or to areas which are turned over by a Federal agency to a local authority for administration."

I hope this will help to clarify some of the questions in your mind. As your secretary may have told you, I have called to ask for an appointment to see you, at which time I would like to discuss the fund bill, some of the other recent correspondence which you have sent to me, as well as certain activities of the Bureau which may be of particular interest to your State.

I appreciate very much your interest.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD C. CRAFTS, Director.

COLLOQUY BETWEEN MR. CRAFTS AND SENATOR MUNDT

MR. MUNDT. I want to ask you a couple of questions about that. What would you envision as the kind of establishment on the chain of Missouri River reservoirs out in the Midwest in connection with this program of charging user fees as admission, under the act? I have had a lot of questions about that, and I have had no answers to give.

HOUSE MODIFIED BILL

MR. CRAFTS. Senator MUNDT, under the terms of the bill, as reported by the House committee—and this, I think, is the draft of the bill that I should speak to, because the House committee substantially modified the bill from the way it was originally set up—under the terms of the bill as reported by the committee, the admission fees or entrance fees can be assessed only if certain conditions prevail.

FEES ASSESSMENT

I think they need to be listed and there are four of them.

Areas that are federally administered directly, not under lease to the State or private concessionaires. They need to be areas that are administered primarily for recreation. And this is a very key point, the word "primary." They need to be areas of which Federal facilities are provided at Federal expense, and the areas need to be posted.

Now, most of the reservoirs in the Missouri River, and I am speaking in general here—I think the same would apply to reservoirs on most of the rivers—are built either by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers.

SENATOR MUNDT. May I interrupt. The Missouri River chain of projects were authorized under special legislation. Criteria that apply there might not apply to others, so maybe we had better stick to the Missouri River.

MR. CRAFTS. As far as I know, with respect to the Missouri River, the purpose of the reservoirs was primarily not recreation.

SENATOR MUNDT. That is correct.

EXCLUSION OF FEES

MR. CRAFTS. Therefore, we have gone on record in this in response to similar questions from other Members of Congress that on the reservoirs which are not administered primarily for recreation, it would not be possible, under the terms of the House bill, to impose a general admission or entrance fee.

It would be possible to charge a specific user fee for launching facilities, for camping facilities, for this sort of thing, but not a general entrance or admission fee.

MR. MUNDT. I think it is clear, on the basis of Mr. Crafts' letter and his answers to my questions in committee that the Missouri River Reservoirs were never intended to be included in the designated areas for admission charges. I think it is also clear that the floor debate on this legislation—which can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 14, pages 19115-19117—points in this direction. At that time I made the same argument that is being made today; namely, that because the purpose of these reservoirs is not primarily for recreation, the reservoirs do not meet the requirements set forth for the levying of charges under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. This argument was not refuted on the floor by the managers of the bill. Therefore, legislative history of the act clearly supports my contention that these reserves should be exempt from the recently imposed visitors' fees.

MR. PRESIDENT, the reason we hold congressional hearings and the reason we participate in floor debate is to attempt to obtain answers to questions about specific provisions in pending legislation. This is the way legislative history is established. Once we obtain these answers and rely upon them in making our final determination on the legislation we should be secure in the knowledge that these answers will remain the same after laws have been enacted.

In this respect I have written another letter to Mr. Crafts asking him to explain why he has assured me one thing and subsequently permitted just the opposite to be done. I ask that this letter dated May 10 be made a part of these remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

MR. EDWARD C. CRAFTS,
Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation,
U.S. Department of Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAFTS: Recently the Corps of Engineers announced that pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, they were designating four reservoirs in South Dakota under their jurisdiction as "Designated Areas" at which admission fees are charged for entrance thereto. These four reservoirs are Big Bend, Fort Randall, Lewis and Clark Lake at Gavins Point, and Oahe.

As you know, this determination was to be made as a result of the aforementioned Act, Executive Order 11200, and regulations issued by your office through the Secretary of Interior.

The criteria for selecting such areas was included in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, now Public Law 88-578. These criteria included a provision that entrance and admission fees may be charged only where a Federal area is administered

primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, recreational, or wildlife purposes.

In view of this, I am at a loss, therefore, to understand why these four Missouri River Reservoirs were included in the list of "Designated Areas". These reservoirs were at the time of their construction and are still, serving the primary purpose of flood control, irrigation, production of hydroelectric power, and improvement of navigation on the lower Missouri. Recreational benefits are secondary in nature.

This point was made very clearly, I believe, at two different times preceding the passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965. In answer to a question of mine before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department you stated that it would not be possible to impose a general admission or entrance fee charge on the Missouri River reservoirs. Again under date of February 20, 1964, in answer to a letter from me regarding this question you said that because of the fact that these reservoirs are not in fact administered primarily for recreation or other purposes that would qualify them for the making of entrance or admission charges, the passage of the bill would not affect them.

I would appreciate it if you would explain why this action has been taken by the Corps of Engineers in the face of your earlier assurances to the contrary and what action you propose to take to rectify this in harmony with your earlier statement.

Hoping to hear from you shortly, I am,
Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it could be that this is another example of bureaucracy in action, in which the right hand, the Interior Department, did not know what the left hand, the Corps of Engineers, was doing. But this is not an acceptable explanation, let alone an acceptable solution.

There are only two solutions. One is for Mr. Crafts to live up to his word and retract the listing of the Missouri River Reservoirs as designated areas for admission fees. If he does not, the only other alternative is to introduce legislation prohibiting the inclusion of these areas in the Federal recreation area entrance permit program. This I stand prepared to do.

PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1119, Senate Joint Resolution 108.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S.J. Res. 108) to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments in line 4, after the word "deleting", to strike out "the phrase 'not to exceed \$50,000 annually'" and insert "\$50,000", and in line 5, after "section

(b)", to insert "and substituting '\$75,000'"; so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1008), is hereby amended by deleting "\$50,000" in section (b) and substituting "\$75,000" and adding "(c) Such additional sums as may be needed annually for the payment of all necessary expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities thereof."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously.

The main purpose of the joint resolution is to increase the ceiling of U.S. contributions to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History—PAIGH. As approved by the committee, this increase is from \$50,000 a year to \$75,000 a year. The resolution also authorizes appropriations for the expenses of U.S. participation in Institute activities. This item, which is estimated at \$3,000 a year, would provide for the expenses of an annual meeting of the members of the U.S. National Section of the Institute and for publication of the Section's reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 108) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

U.S. POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the third Chinese nuclear explosion must be a matter of serious concern. The Albanian Premier is reported as saying at a banquet in Peking that the Chinese nuclear weapons will throw their enemy "into panic."

Obviously this is not true, as was demonstrated in the firm remarks of President Johnson and the leaders of other countries of Asia.

However, this action by the Chinese must cause concern, in part, as to the course of action that other nations in Asia will follow. Newspaper reports today reveal that pressure by high Indian officials to develop nuclear weapons has increased, and that there is great concern also in Japan.

More important, there must be great concern as to the course of the Communist Chinese themselves in their relations with their neighbors, and, as Prime Minister Pearson stated yesterday, as to the increased danger of miscalculation on their part, which could lead to a major war. Therefore, it seems to me all the more necessary to open wider discussions and negotiations with the Communist Chinese.

It was stated yesterday by Chou En-lai that the Chinese had offered a pact with the United States which would outlaw the use of nuclear weapons between our two countries. He went on to say that our rejection of that treaty made it imperative for them to resume the testing.

A spokesman for the State Department has revealed that the Department did in fact reject this overture from the Chinese, on the basis that it was not sincere, and they felt that there were no adequate safeguards.

Although our position seems well founded in fact and experience, I question whether this will be well understood in the rest of the world, unless we now take further open and affirmative steps to make clear our desire to reach effective agreements for control over nuclear weapons with the Communist Chinese.

As I have said before in speaking to the Senate, I think this is the most important issue facing not only the United States, but mankind; and I think that it is extremely vital that the United States furnish the kind of leadership and the kind of direction that is essential during this critical period of time.

This problem is compounded by the fact, as the State Department spokesman also revealed, that we have not yet invited Red China to the disarmament meetings in Geneva.

The events of the last 72 hours have demonstrated quite clearly the importance of our demonstrating our readiness to reach international agreement on the control and proliferation of nuclear weapons—and the necessity of our making an effort to bring the Chinese, in an open way—and I stress, in an open way—into any discussions and negotiations regarding this matter.

It is, therefore, even more imperative that we make clear to the Chinese and to the rest of the world our deep interest in exploring openly and candidly the control of nuclear weapons.

I emphasize, as I have before, that Communist China should in fact be invited to participate in the Geneva disarmament negotiations.

It seems to me also important to make clear that we are prepared to enter into direct high-level discussions for just this purpose anywhere in the world, discussions that would be quite clear about their purpose, and it would be quite clear what our position would be in connection with the Chinese Communists. I think that the revelations in just the last few days about negotiations or discussions that took place a year ago in Warsaw have given a propaganda advantage to the Chinese Communists, and seem to indicate to the

rest of the world that they, in fact, were interested in disarmament and nuclear control, and that we were not as enthusiastic. Of course, that is not the fact, but I think that the great danger is that that is the kind of conclusion that the rest of the world might reach.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I shall yield in a moment.

Involved in these discussions must be an exploration with the Chinese of whether, as part of any agreement that might be reached, they would agree not to test in the atmosphere, as they inferred publicly they were willing to do. I have serious reservations as to whether in fact they would make such an agreement. But it is nevertheless important that their position as well as our own be clearly understood throughout the world.

I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from New York has again spoken out on this issue, as he did some months ago, because I quite agree with him that when we talk about the dangers of nuclear proliferation, particularly the proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia, we are discussing perhaps the most urgent single international problem of our time.

The time for us to act is fast running out. I think the Senator from New York will agree that if we cannot make some progress toward a nuclear proliferation agreement within the next 2 or 3 years, it will be too late. We will then have, not 5 nuclear powers, but 8, 10, 15, or 20 nuclear armed nations, with all the resulting dangers that such a situation would present to the peace of mankind—the dangers of a nuclear accident, of miscalculation, of misjudgment—any one of which might plunge the world into a nuclear catastrophe. So I am pleased that the Senator has spoken out again on this issue.

I ask the Senator from New York if he does not feel that while the Chinese have been reluctant to join in the nuclear test ban agreement, they may have a real interest, as a member of the nuclear club, in joining in some kind of nonproliferation agreement. Would there not be factors involved in a nonproliferation agreement that would interest them more now than entering into the limited nuclear test ban agreement?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think that without any question they would be interested in a nonproliferation agreement. Let me just say, on the first point that the Senator from South Dakota has made, I think it is supported by statements in the newspapers this morning by representatives of India that there will be renewed effort by certain leading Indian officials to make nuclear weapons, so that they can protect themselves against the Chinese.

So I am not certain that we have even 2 or 3 years, because this is going to have a snowball effect. If the Indians become convinced that there will not be any treaty, any arrangement whereby

they can be protected, then they will feel that their only security rests in their making nuclear weapons. Japan will have the same feeling; the same feeling will exist, obviously, in the Middle East—just as France demonstrates a capacity to make nuclear weapons, and there will be similar interest in other European countries.

So I think, as the Senator has said, the time to move is immediately. The question whether we will have sufficient time, I think, is very grave.

Mr. McGOVERN. It seems to me that the nuclear explosion which took place this week, in addition to highlighting as the Senator has said, the need for a direct approach to China, also highlights the need for the United States and the Soviet Union to be accelerating their efforts to break the bottlenecks or the stalemate, that has been holding back progress in the Geneva arms control discussions.

I should think that both powers, the Soviet Union and the United States would now have a new interest in trying to find some way to break the logjam and arrive at a settlement—especially on nuclear proliferation.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I know the Senator has spoken out in connection with this relationship with China. I should like to ask the Senator. It was revealed in the newspapers that Chou En-lai has stated the reason China had resumed testing, and the reason the bomb was tested in the atmosphere, was that the United States had refused to make an agreement with them regarding the first use of atomic weapons—that is, a mutual treaty between the Communist Chinese and the United States. In fact, State Department representatives said that this was a proposal made by Chinese. Would the Senator feel that the United States will be placed at a disadvantage throughout the rest of the world, because we refused to explore this proposal, and that others would think we are, in fact, responsible for the Chinese testing their bomb in the atmosphere?

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree with the implication in the Senator's question. I believe that we make a mistake in terms of our own position in the world when we reject initiatives from the other side. It may be that those initiatives are not in good faith, but we have nothing to lose, as I see it, in exploring them and testing their good faith. Sincerity is subject to proof. Certainly, when a nation which has been as difficult as China has been over the last few years makes an overture to the West to settle one of the outstanding issues of our day, we should be quick to seize upon it and explore all possibilities for progress.

That was the general thrust of some of the remarks I tried to make on the floor of the Senate last week with regard to our overall relationship with China. While Peking may continue to be difficult, and we may suffer some rebuffs and even insults in our relations with them, I believe that our policy should be pointed in the direction of drawing the Chinese into a more responsible position, of drawing them into a more normal relationship with the West rather than

automatically rebuffing everything they suggest in the way of new relationships.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I commend the Senator from South Dakota for bringing out some of these facts.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me and I warmly endorse his constructive suggestions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again I want to commend the distinguished Senator from New York for advancing an idea which is both meritorious and worthwhile, as well as extremely timely.

I was surprised to read in the press of the proposal by Peking referred to by the Senator from New York which, at that time, the Government did not feel worthy of consideration. I can see their viewpoint based on the conditions that existed then.

But, as the Senator from New York has indicated, conditions have changed considerably. It appears, at times, that events do outpace our thinking in this changing world—that we do lag behind when we should be ahead.

I am delighted with the Senator's suggestion that Peking should be considered for membership in the disarmament meetings now being held in Geneva. To those who raise the idea that this would, in effect, mean recognition of Peking, I would point out that we have held meetings between Chinese consuls general and our Ambassadors over 125 times. They first began in Geneva, some 11 or 12 years ago, at the time of the Geneva agreements on Indochina. Those meetings between our representatives and theirs, are still being conducted in Warsaw. So, the idea that contact with the Chinese would mean recognition loses its force in view of these contacts with the Chinese by this Government, through our regularly diplomatically accredited representatives, on policies promoted by President Eisenhower and continued by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

The fact that a nuclear device of very high potency—the third one—has been exploded indicates that Peking is advancing a great deal more rapidly than many of our experts thought she would. And, in view of her progress to date, the timeliness and urgency of the Senator from New York's proposal cannot be emphasized too greatly.

Thus, I wish to commend the Senator from New York for showing once again his leadership in advancing an idea that should and, I believe, will be taken up seriously by all parties concerned.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Montana.

SENATOR KENNEDY OF NEW YORK'S LATIN AMERICAN STATEMENT SHOULD BE REPRINTED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday, May 9, and Tuesday, May 10, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] made the most informative statement on United States-Latin American policy that I have heard in the Senate in my 9 years of service. It is probably one of the best informed statements on Latin American policy ever made in

the Senate. As one who lives in a State bordering Mexico, and as one who lived in El Paso, Tex., a border city with Mexico, for 3½ years, I have had an intense personal interest in Latin American relations.

I commend the Senator from New York for his fine statement.

Mr. President, this statement is quite lengthy and complete enough to be printed in book form. I am hopeful that the statement will be printed in book form, or in some other form more easily distributed and read than in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This would allow for widespread distribution of the Senator's statement, so that it may receive proper attention and study by the American people.

I am hopeful that that might be done.

TELEPHONE COMPANY CHARGES HIGHER DEPOSIT RATES FOR SERVICE FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL THAN FOR CIVILIANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have discovered a situation in which the telephone company practices in this country result in discrimination against servicemen, particularly those who have been transferred to Vietnam. Recently I received a letter from a constituent now stationed in Vietnam. His wife had been required to make a \$50 deposit to obtain telephone service in the State of Texas, while a civilian employee applying at the same time had been required to deposit only \$25.

The Department of the Army informed me that deposits required by the telephone company range from \$25 to \$150. The factors determining the amount of deposit required include, according to the Army:

How long the applicant has been at his present job, whether or not the applicant is subject to frequent transfers, and whether or not by virtue of a family separation long distance telephone calls are likely to be made.

I am also informed that it is "normal" for members of the military to have to make higher deposits than others who have been in the community longer.

The large number of servicemen being sent to Vietnam or being transferred elsewhere because of the Vietnam situation makes this policy grossly unfair. When one takes into account the low pay received by servicemen, the telephone company's action makes it almost impossible for them to have the telephone service without severe financial hardship when members of these families ought, more than many others, to be able to communicate with one another. It is conceivable in the case of a private's pay that deposits within the range I have mentioned could equal or exceed his monthly salary.

Mr. President, as a result of this situation in which our servicemen and their dependents are being discriminated against, I have written a letter to Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the board, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., asking that he investigate telephone company policy concerning deposits required of servicemen and their dependents and that he consider suspending all

but token deposits for them while they are defending their country, particularly through service in Vietnam or related to the Vietnam situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Mr. Kappel of May 11, 1966, a copy of the letter from the Department of the Army to me, and a copy of the letter sent me by the sergeant in Vietnam, dated April 12, 1966. I have deleted the location in Vietnam from which the letter was sent, as well as the name of the sergeant, for security reasons.

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

MAY 11, 1966.

MR. FREDERICK R. KAPPEL,
Chairman of the Board, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KAPPEL: Investigation subsequent to a complaint from a constituent has produced the information that it is normal for members of the military to have to make higher deposits to obtain telephone service than for civilians. I understand that two factors are taken into account in determining the size of the deposit required: whether the individual is subject to frequent transfers and whether the family is separated, thus bringing about a likelihood of many long-distance telephone calls. I am enclosing the correspondence.

The obvious impact of the application of these factors is that the military man will almost invariably have to pay a higher deposit than will civilians—as the enclosed correspondence shows, a much higher deposit. In view of the number of servicemen being sent to Vietnam, or being transferred about because of the Vietnam situation, it seems grossly unfair that this policy exists.

I strongly urge a reexamination of telephone company policy concerning deposits, particularly for the military, and ask consideration of suspension of all but token deposits for them during this period when they are defending the rights and property of all of us in Vietnam.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: This letter is in behalf of Sergeant McAnally who wrote concerning the deposit his wife was asked to make when she applied for telephone service in Temple, Tex.

The business office of the telephone company in Temple was contacted and Sergeant McAnally should be assured that no discrimination was meant merely because he is in the service. The deposits required by the telephone company range from as low as \$25.00 to as high as \$150.00 and depend on many factors, including the applicant's prior record of payment for telephone service received in the United States, how long the applicant has been in his present job, whether or not the applicant is subject to frequent transfers, and whether or not by virtue of a family separation long-distance telephone calls are likely to be made. It is normal for salesmen, transitory personnel, and members of the military to make higher deposits than personnel who have been in the community a long time or whose credit rating is well established.

I am further informed that such deposits are retained only for approximately one to two years and if by that time a good credit

rating is established, the deposit with 6 percent interest is refunded.

The telephone company in Temple was very cooperative in answering our questions and I suggest that Mrs. McAnally visit the business office there if she has any further questions on this matter. I am sure they will help her in any way possible.

Your interest in Sergeant McAnally is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. L. BLACKWELL,
Colonel, GS Office,
Chief of Legislative Liaison.

APRIL 12, 1966.

SIR: I have been in the Army for 10 years and I am now stationed in Viet Nam. About a week and a half ago, my wife, who now resides in Temple, Texas, went with a civilian to get a telephone placed into her residence.

The telephone office wanted to charge her \$50.00 deposit and the civilian \$25.00. Now the point is, why do they charge twice as much deposit for a telephone than they do the civilian.

What is the military nowadays, a bunch of suckers.

I would like a reply to my letter if possible.

Yours truly,

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Texas for his interest in our military personnel. He has been most assiduous in looking after our servicemen and women, particularly those now serving abroad, and their families. He has spoken out for a great many servicemen and their families from my own State, and I know that they would wish me to express their appreciation to him, along with mine.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator for expressing these kind remarks to me. The Senator exemplifies leadership in so many fields in the Senate. I thank him for the support he gave me on the GI bill which will enable 3 million servicemen already discharged to enter school on June the 1st, if they apply and qualify.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Texas.

MARY MCGRORY WRITES HOW VISTA VOLUNTEERS PROVE THEIR WORTH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most imaginative innovations of the war on poverty is the VISTA program.

VISTA volunteers live under the conditions they are trying to remedy.

Their pay consists of a mere subsistence allowance and \$40 per month when they conclude their service.

In the short period of their existence, they have made significant contributions to the lives of the people with whom they have been working.

I ask unanimous consent that a well written article published in the Washington, D.C., Star, written by Mary McGrory entitled "Life Among VISTA Folk" be printed in the RECORD.

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

LIFE AMONG VISTA FOLK—NOT RICH AND FAT
(By Mary McGrory)

Charges that the government's antipoverty warriors are too rich and fat stop short of the

VISTA volunteers, so-called "Silent Service" of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

VISTA volunteers, the domestic counterparts of the Peace Corps, are as indifferently housed, clad and fed as the people they are helping.

The big difference between them and the handsomely paid professionals who run the controversial Community Action Program of the OEO is that they live under the conditions they are trying to remedy.

Some of the volunteers were poor to begin with; they will certainly never get rich out of the antipoverty program.

They receive a subsistence allowance scaled to the minimum cost of living in the area where they serve. In addition, a \$50 stipend is put away for them each month of their year's service.

NUMBER ARE DROPOUTS

A number of them are high-school dropouts, who have high-school equivalency diplomas. In Harlem no one is more eloquent in persuading would-be dropouts to continue in school than the neighborhood boy who is now a VISTA worker.

Right now, 1,720 VISTAs are laboring cheerfully among the rural and city poor, the migrant workers, the Indians, the mentally ill or mentally retarded and the Job Corps. The worst complaint made against them so far is that there is not enough of them.

Three-quarters of them are between the ages of 18 and 25.

They do not have the glamour of Americans abroad that is one of the dividends of Peace Corps service. But like their brothers and sisters overseas they have succumbed to the widespread youthful mania to serve which has so startled and reassured their elders.

This admission that they would like to do something for somebody else is considered by sociologists a phenomenon of the 1960s, evoked and nurtured by President Kennedy.

PROVE WORTH

In the first year of their existence, the volunteers have proved that with a little training and good supervision, willing spirit can provide social service of the highest order.

One government psychiatrist, getting reports on the work of some 95 volunteers in eight mental health projects in eight States, says they could revolutionize the care of the mentally ill.

"They are providing in many cases the warm relationships that are so desperately needed by disturbed persons," he said.

They have also moved into the field of mental retardation, where their involvement and their round-the-clock availability are obtaining remarkable results.

Wrote a 20-year-old volunteer who works in a center for the mentally retarded in San Francisco.

"Maybe I'm not serving the world, but when I see a child who's been working at a puzzle for 4 months put the final piece in place, I know I've given him something. And he's giving me much more."

PLEAS FOR VOLUNTEERS

This setting of and contentment with small goals may be one of the reasons that the OEO receives daily pleas for more volunteers.

They work with what is available, and they do what is necessary, with no organization tables or plans or forms to fill out. They simply pitch in.

Two young girls, on a reservation where Indians of the Harvasupias tribe practically starved during the winter months, taught the Indians how to make use of the wild chicken and wild celery available in the area.

In a depressed area in Clay County, Ky., two girls put themselves to the task of providing a garbage dump.

In Florida, a 19-year-old taught a 40-year-old woman to read and a whole family to tell time.

Among the rural poor and migrant workers, the volunteers met with initial suspicion and even hostility.

But the fact that they lived in shacks like everybody else and asked for nothing but the chance to help won them a place in their communities.

Many of the volunteers spent Christmas with their "families."

Sargent Shriver, director of OEO hopes there will be at least twice as many of them by next year at this time.

REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate Calendar No. 1120, H.R. 11487, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill [H.R. 11487] to provide revenue for the District of Columbia and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on the bill today, but it is the pending business.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock Monday next.

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

TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, one of the perplexing problems of many corporations doing business in several States has been the definition of their income with respect to paying State income taxes. This problem has become aggravated by the fact that there is no uniform definition of the factors for allocating income to the various States. Legislation has been introduced to clear up this difficulty by mandatory requirements which would force a State, desiring to adopt a State income tax on corporations, to use uniform factors.

In my State of Iowa, the only factor in allocating income to Iowa, is the percentage of sales made in Iowa to the total sales made in all States, resulting in the allocation made to Iowa for income tax purposes.

Under the pending legislation, Iowa would have no choice except to allocate a considerably larger portion of the in-

come in the State for tax purposes, because it would have to use property and payroll as well.

It seems to me that the State legislatures should have something to say in this regard.

I have no objection, and I believe it is desirable to require them to use a uniform definition of factors. But I believe the States should be permitted to say how much of the income that would be allocated to them would be taxable. Otherwise the States will not be able to use relatively low income taxes as an incentive for industrial growth. My State is in that category.

There is a lead editorial on this subject in the Wall Street Journal of May 4, 1966, which points out the failure of the States to get together on a uniform definition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "State Bungling and Federal Force," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 4, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATE BUNGLING AND FEDERAL FORCE

State governments now are deeply concerned because Congress is considering a measure to take away some of their taxing powers. The states have every reason to be bothered, but they certainly can't blame all their trouble on Washington's omnipresent eagerness to expand its authority.

As happened when many states for years failed to fairly reapportion their own legislatures, the Federal Government now is moving toward clearing up a mess the states created with regard to taxing interstate corporations. The states have bungled the job.

Sales and income taxes are imposed in a bewildering variety of ways; many activities are taxed by some states but not by others, so that it may be difficult if not impossible for a firm to determine what tax it owes where. The confusion has been compounded over the years as more and more corporations, modest-sized as well as large, have spread their operations into more areas of the nation.

If every company carefully complied with the income tax laws of all states, many would wind up paying tax on more than 100 percent of their income. The fact that this unjust outcome is generally avoided by the simple process of ignoring some of the laws, scarcely makes the states' "system" praiseworthy.

To give credit where some is due, the states in recent years have made a little progress toward more uniformity. By the end of last year, 11 legislatures had adopted a model statute, endorsed by the American Bar Association, providing rules for apportioning corporate income for state tax purposes. But 11 states is a far cry from 50, and thus it's not surprising to find impatience in Congress.

The product of the impatience is the proposed Interstate Taxation Act, which is based on the findings of a 4-year study by a special House subcommittee. The consequences of measure, if it's enacted, could be pretty drastic.

To begin with, it would forbid any state to tax the income of most corporations unless they had a business location in the state. State officials argue, and we think with some justice, that a company can reap large profits from a state without having anything or anyone permanently located there—by sending in salesmen, for example. Exempting such a company, state tax men contend, would be unfair to its competitors which

are more firmly based in the state and pay taxes there.

In determining the portion of a company's income that's subject to tax in any state, moreover, the state could consider only the portion of the firm's property and payroll within its boundaries. This differs from the model law adopted by the 11 states, which apportions income not only on the basis of property and payroll but on the share of a firm's sales that are made within a given state.

To take a hypothetical example, suppose a company has its factory and most of its employees in Kentucky and yet makes most of its sales in neighboring Tennessee. Under the pending bill Kentucky could tax all or almost all of the company's income while Tennessee could touch little or none of it. Though the hypothesis is exaggerated, it seems clear that the formula could produce results that would be unfair to some states.

While concerned about such a possibility, what worries the states more is the heavy hand the Federal Government would have in their tax affairs. Tax disputes between states and companies would go to a new board in the Treasury Department. The Treasury also would run a "cooperative" Federal-state system for collecting sales taxes on interstate transactions. States which did not cooperate would have their right to collect the taxes sharply curtailed.

Whatever the shortcomings of the pending measure or the extent of Federal encroachment, however, nothing can justify the present confusion. Barring swift moves by the states toward more tax uniformity, which appear unlikely, the current bill or something like it may well wend its way into law.

In that event, there's sure to be angry talk of yet another diminution of the rights of states. It's tempting to forget a major reason those rights are shrinking: Too often the states neglect their own responsibilities.

PROBLEMS OF INFLATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, worsening inflation is one of the most serious problems facing the people of the United States.

There are always a few who profit from inflation. Investments and speculation can reap substantial profits; and special capital gains tax treatment is afforded these profits.

But most people are hurt by inflation, and the tragic fact is that those hurt the most are the ones least able to afford it—our younger people, who are trying to pay for an education, purchase a home, maintain a young and growing family, and raise the capital needed to get into a business or farming; and the older people, whose earning power is ended or greatly diminished and who rely on fixed pensions, insurance, annuities, and savings for a livelihood.

The Employment Act of 1946 declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government "to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seek-

ing to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

Inflation does not promote purchasing power. It takes away purchasing power by increasing the cost of living and of other goods and services, which means that the purchasing power of the dollar goes down.

In 1939, our dollar had a purchasing power of 100 cents. By 1960 the purchasing power of the dollar had fallen to 46.9 cents. By 1965 it had fallen to 44 cents. As of March of this year, it was down to 43.2 cents. I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the yearly decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, along with the budget deficit—or surplus—for each year.

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

TABLE I.—*Purchasing power of dollar in relation to budget deficits*

Calendar year	Purchasing power	Budget deficits	
		Cents	Millions
1939	100.0	\$3,967	
1940	99.2	3,823	
1941	94.4	11,762	
1942	85.3	41,461	
1943	80.3	55,691	
1944	79.0	53,650	
1945	77.2	43,595	
1946	71.2	2,512	
1947	62.2	(+2,434)	
1948	1,57.8	(+5,241)	
1949	1,58.3	3,592	
1950	57.8	422	
1951	53.5	3,358	
1952	52.3	5,842	
1953	51.9	9,157	
1954	1,51.7	3,683	
1955	1,51.9	2,771	
1956	51.1	(+3,779)	
1957	49.4	(+592)	
1958	48.1	7,088	
1959	47.7	7,040	
1960	46.9	(+1,953)	
1961	46.4	6,306	
1962	45.9	7,199	
1963	45.3	6,672	
1964	44.7	8,248	
1965	44.0	4,699	
1966 (March)	43.2		

¹ Years in which fiscal years ended which were under budget control of a Republican Congress.

Mr. MILLER. It is noteworthy that of the drop of 56.8 cents in the purchasing power of the dollar, 52.9 cents occurred during those years when the Democrats were in control of the Congress for the budgeting which ended during those years; and only 3.9 cents occurred while Republicans had control. Also, in the only 2 years—1949 and 1955—in which the purchasing power of the dollar increased, Republicans were in control of the Congress for the budgeting which ended during those years.

It has been well said that the declaration of policy set forth in the Employment Act of 1946 means both full employment and maintenance of the purchasing power of the dollar; and that it is contrary to this policy to pursue courses which constitute a trade-off of one of these goals against the other.

One can easily find statements opposed to inflation. For example, the report of the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee in 1960 on "Employment, Growth, and Price Levels" makes this comment:

—The acceptance of continuing increases, even though quite modest, in the general

level of prices may result in acceleration of the inflationary pressures and lead to economic instability. Inflation is unjust. This is true whether it creeps or gallops. It redistributes income and wealth according to the ability of people to protect themselves against its effects. Because of this it benefits the strong at the expense of the weak. The avoidance of inflation is an important goal of economic policy.

In his Economic Report to the Congress, presented in January of this year, President Johnson referred to inflation as "the most unjust and capricious form of taxation."

The trouble is that words are not matched by deeds. And the deeds required to do something about inflation are reductions in Federal Government spending to avoid running our Government billions of dollars deeper into debt, year after year. One may blame the President of the United States for his economic policies, but the people should understand that the real responsibility rests with the Congress; and that the foundation for inflation is laid when a majority of the Members of Congress vote to spend billions of dollars more than our Federal Government takes in, year after year. Such action permits an excessive increase in the quantity of money and bank credit—beyond our production of goods and services.

Purchasing power can be taken from the people by taxes or by inflation. In either case, the people end up with less purchasing power.

For the school year 1960-61, the average cost of education in public college was \$1,400. It is \$200 per year more now. For the school year 1960-61, the average cost of education in private colleges was \$2,090. It is \$400 per year more now.

A home costing \$12,000 in 1960 cost \$13,300 in 1965. Moreover, with the increase in interest rates which has accompanied the inflation, a person taking out a 20-year 80-percent mortgage loan will pay \$1,700 more in interest, for a combined increased cost of \$3,000 on the \$12,000 home, over 1960.

The average cost for a family consisting of husband, wife, and two children was \$6,200 in 1960. It was \$433 more last year. And a family in this income bracket simply cannot afford such an increase.

Last year the Congress increased social security pensions by 7 percent. Even with this increase, the purchasing power of our pensioners was below what it was in 1954 and 1958, the last 2 years when pensions were increased, as the following table indicates which I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

TABLE II.—*Showing increases in social security pensions legislated by Congress in order to enable pensioners to maintain their purchasing power in view of decline in value of the dollar*

(Note.—The example is a worker having a \$3,000 annual income base, single at retirement and "fully covered." The 1940 year figure is for a worker retired under the 1935 act. Other figures are for a worker retired under successive acts for years indicated.)

Year	Annual pension	Purchasing power of dollar compared to 1939 dollar worth 100 cents	Real value of pension
Cents			
1940	\$499.20	99.2	\$495.20
1950	870.00	57.8	502.86
1952	930.00	52.3	486.39
1954	1,062.00	51.7	549.05
1958	1,140.00	48.1	548.34
1965	1,220.00	44.0	537.00

Mr. MILLER. Of course, with the purchasing power of the dollar continuing to go down, the value of the pensions today is even less than it was in 1965. One can conclude that hundreds of millions of dollars in purchasing power has been taken away from our social security pensioners by the economic pol-

icies of those in control of the Democratic Party.

Perhaps the best way to drive home to the average person what inflation has been costing him is to use a sales tax equivalent. A sales tax operates the same as inflation, because it strikes at every man, woman, and child; and it is regressive in that it bears most heavily on the low income, large family groups. Just since the Democratic administration, with its controlled Congress, took over in 1961, there has been an average annual inflation in this country of over \$10 billion. With the exception of the Federal income tax, inflation has taken more purchasing power away from our people than any other item. It has been the equivalent of a 3 to 5 percent sales tax on the citizens of most of our States. Worse yet, the problem has been growing more serious.

Inflation amounted to \$16 billion for 1965, with a sales tax equivalent of from 4 to 8 percent on the citizens of most of the States. Three years ago, 20 percent of our increased gross national product consisted of inflation. Last year one-third of our increased gross national product consisted of inflation.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks two tables—one showing the average yearly loss of purchasing power due to inflation from 1961 through 1965 allocated among the various States, with the amount so allocated measured in sales tax equivalent; the other showing the same figures with respect to the inflation for 1965, along with explanatory notes.

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

TABLE III

State	Average yearly loss from inflation, 1961-65	Loss of purchasing power measured in sales tax equivalent	State	Average yearly loss from inflation, 1961-65	Loss of purchasing power measured in sales tax equivalent
Alabama	\$125,300,000	3.6 percent retail sales and use.	Montana	\$32,200,000	3.3 percent retail sales.*
Alaska	16,200,000	5.7 percent retail sales.*	Nebraska	72,000,000	3.4 percent retail sales.*
Arizona	70,400,000	2.5 percent general sales and use.	Nevada	27,400,000	2.2 percent retail sales and use.
Arkansas	66,100,000	2.7 percent retail sales and use.	New Hampshire	32,600,000	3.7 percent retail sales.*
California	1,126,700,000	3.8 percent retail sales and use.	New Jersey	416,100,000	4.6 percent retail sales.
Colorado	100,900,000	3.3 percent retail sales and use.	New Mexico	43,400,000	2.2 percent gross receipts and use.
Connecticut	181,900,000	5.8 percent retail sales and use.	New York	1,110,000,000	4.6 percent retail sales.*
Delaware	31,900,000	4.5 percent retail sales.*	North Carolina	188,800,000	3.6 percent retail sales and use.
Florida	266,100,000	3.5 percent retail sales and use.	North Dakota	28,500,000	3.1 percent retail sales and use.
Georgia	178,000,000	2.9 percent retail sales and use.	Ohio	546,600,000	5.5 percent retail sales and use.
Hawaii	38,200,000	1.9 percent gross receipts and use.	Oklahoma	105,200,000	3.2 percent retail sales and use.
Idaho	30,700,000	3.2 percent retail sales.*	Oregon	100,600,000	3.8 percent retail sales.*
Illinois	654,500,000	4.1 percent retail sales and use.	Pennsylvania	595,500,000	5.9 percent selective sales and use.
Indiana	261,700,000	2.2 percent retail sales and use.	Rhode Island	47,500,000	5.5 percent retail sales and use.
Iowa	135,700,000	3.1 percent retail sales and use.	South Carolina	88,500,000	3.1 percent retail sales and use.
Kansas	113,900,000	3.3 percent retail sales and use.	South Dakota	27,400,000	3.0 percent retail sales and use.
Kentucky	123,000,000	3.4 percent retail sales and use.	Tennessee	145,200,000	Do.
Louisiana	138,000,000	2.6 percent retail sales and use.	Texas	468,900,000	4.6 percent retail sales and use.
Maine	42,200,000	4.1 percent retail sales and use.	Utah	43,900,000	2.7 percent retail sales and use.
Maryland	201,000,000	5.8 percent retail sales and use.	Vermont	17,600,000	3.3 percent retail sales.*
Massachusetts	306,300,000	4.1 percent retail sales.*	Virginia	201,900,000	4.2 percent retail sales.*
Michigan	468,600,000	3.4 percent retail sales and use.	Washington	162,200,000	2.1 percent retail sales and use.
Minnesota	176,800,000	3.9 percent retail sales.*	West Virginia	68,900,000	1.3 percent retail sales and use.
Mississippi	68,900,000	2.7 percent gross receipts and use.	Wisconsin	210,500,000	7.9 percent selective gross receipts, use.
Missouri	223,900,000	3.9 percent retail sales and use.	Wyoming	16,000,000	2.5 percent retail sales and use.

*See explanatory notes.

TABLE IV

State	1965 loss from inflation	Loss of purchasing power measured in sales tax equivalent	State	1965 loss from inflation	Loss of purchasing power measured in sales tax equivalent
Alabama	\$195,468,000	5.5 percent retail sales and use.	Montana	\$50,232,000	5.2 percent retail sales.*
Alaska	25,272,000	8.9 percent retail sales.*	Nebraska	112,320,000	5.4 percent retail sales.*
Arizona	109,824,000	3.9 percent general sales and use.	Nevada	42,744,000	3.4 percent retail sales and use.
Arkansas	103,116,000	4.2 percent retail sales and use.	New Hampshire	50,856,000	5.8 percent retail sales.*
California	1,757,652,000	6 percent retail sales and use.	New Jersey	649,116,000	7.2 percent retail sales.*
Colorado	157,404,000	5.2 percent retail sales and use.	New Mexico	67,704,000	3.5 percent gross receipts and use.
Connecticut	283,764,000	9 percent retail sales and use.	New York	1,731,600,000	7.2 percent retail sales.*
Delaware	49,764,000	7 percent retail sales.*	North Carolina	294,528,000	5.6 percent retail sales and use.
Florida	415,116,000	5.5 percent retail sales and use.	North Dakota	44,460,000	4.7 percent retail sales and use.
Georgia	277,680,000	4.5 percent retail sales and use.	Ohio	852,696,000	8.6 percent retail sales and use.
Hawaii	59,592,000	2.9 percent gross receipts and use.	Oklahoma	164,112,000	5 percent retail sales and use.
Idaho	47,892,000	5.1 percent retail sales.*	Oregon	156,936,000	5.9 percent retail sales.*
Illinois	1,021,020,000	6.4 percent retail sales and use.	Pennsylvania	928,980,000	9.1 percent selective sales and use.
Indiana	408,252,000	3.5 percent retail sales and use.	Rhode Island	74,100,000	8.6 percent retail sales and use.
Iowa	211,692,000	4.8 percent retail sales and use.	South Carolina	138,060,000	4.9 percent retail sales and use.
Kansas	177,684,000	5.2 percent retail sales and use.	South Dakota	42,744,000	4.7 percent retail sales and use.
Kentucky	191,880,000	5.3 percent retail sales and use.	Tennessee	226,512,000	4.6 percent retail sales and use.
Louisiana	215,280,000	4.1 percent retail sales and use.	Texas	731,484,000	7.1 percent retail sales and use.
Maine	65,832,000	6.4 percent retail sales and use.	Utah	68,484,000	4.3 percent retail sales and use.
Maryland	313,560,000	9 percent retail sales and use.	Vermont	27,456,000	5.1 percent retail sales.*
Massachusetts	477,828,000	6.4 percent retail sales.*	Virginia	314,964,000	6.6 percent retail sales.*
Michigan	731,016,000	5.4 percent retail sales and use.	Washington	253,032,000	3.3 percent retail sales and use.
Minnesota	275,808,000	6.1 percent retail sales.*	West Virginia	107,484,000	2 percent retail sales and use.
Mississippi	107,484,000	4.2 percent gross receipts and use.	Wisconsin	328,380,000	12.3 percent gross receipts and use.
Missouri	349,284,000	6 percent retail sales and use.	Wyoming	24,960,000	3.8 percent retail sales and use.

*See explanatory notes.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. AVERAGE YEARLY INFLATION, 1961-1965
This was obtained from the Joint Economic Committee publication, Economic Indicators. "Total Gross National Product in 1958 Prices" for 1960 was subtracted from "Total Gross National Product in 1958 Prices" for

1961. This remainder, in turn, was subtracted from the difference between "Total Gross National Product" for 1960 and "Total Gross National Product" for 1961. This remainder, \$6.8 billion, represents inflation for the United States for the year 1961 expressed in dollar terms. Similar remainders on non-

inflated GNP growth statistics, that is GNP figures all measured in 1958 prices, were subtracted from GNP growth figures in current, inflated, dollars for the years 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965. The yearly dollar value of inflation thus calculated was: \$6.8 billion for 1961, \$7.5 billion for 1962, \$8.9 billion for

1963, \$11.9 billion for 1964, and \$15.6 billion for 1965.

Thus the total amount of inflation expressed in dollars for the period 1961 to 1965 was \$50.7 billion, an average of slightly over \$10 billion per year. To assign each of the 50 States its appropriate share of this inflation, The Survey of Current Business, April 1966, was used. Page 10, Table 2, contains "Total Personal Income, by States and Regions, 1948-1965." Personal income for the United States for 1965 was divided into each State total which gave each State a percentage, in several cases of 3 significant figures, which represents State share of total National Personal Income. This State percentage, multiplied by average yearly inflation 1961-1965 expressed in dollars, appears beside that State in the column Average Yearly Inflation 1961-1965 in the attached chart.

The State percentages of National Personal Income are:

Rhode Island .475 percent, Connecticut 1.819 percent, New York 11.100 percent, New Jersey 4.161 percent, Pennsylvania 5.955 percent, Delaware .319 percent, Maryland 2.010 percent, District of Columbia .557 percent, Michigan 4.686 percent, Ohio 5.466 percent, Indiana 2.617 percent, Illinois 6.545 percent, Wisconsin 2.105 percent, Minnesota 1.768 percent, Iowa 1.357 percent, Missouri 2.239 percent, North Dakota .285 percent, South Dakota .274 percent, Nebraska .720 percent, Kansas 1.139 percent, Virginia 2.019 percent, West Virginia .689 percent, Kentucky 1.230 percent, Tennessee 1.452 percent, North Carolina 1.888 percent, South Carolina .885 percent, Georgia 1.780 percent, Florida 2.661 percent, Alabama 1.253 percent, Mississippi .689 percent, Louisiana 1.380 percent, Arkansas .661 percent, Oklahoma 1.052 percent, Texas 4.689 percent, New Mexico .434 percent, Arizona .704 percent, Montana .322 percent, Idaho .307 percent, Wyoming .160 percent, Colorado 1.009 percent, Utah .439 percent, Washington 1.622 percent, Oregon 1.006 percent, Nevada .274 percent, California 11.267 percent, Alaska .162 percent, Hawaii .382 percent, Maine .422 percent, New Hampshire .326 percent, Vermont .176 percent, Massachusetts 3.063 percent.

2. LOSS OF PURCHASING POWER MEASURED IN SALES TAX EQUIVALENT, 1961-1966

This was obtained, in cases where State sales and use taxes are in existence, from Facts and Figures on Government Finance, 13th Edition, Tax Foundation, Inc. Section V, pages 187 and 188 contain "State General Sales Tax Collections By State" and "State General Sales Tax Rates" respectively. Loss of purchasing power in sales tax equivalent since the Democratic Administration took office in 1961 was determined as follows: "State General Sales Tax Rate" multiplied by "Yearly Inflation Since 1961" was divided by "State General Sales Tax Collections for 1964" for each of the 50 States which had, as of September 1, 1964, a State General Sales Tax in existence.

For the 13 States which had no Sales, Selective Sales, Gross Receipts, or Use Taxes as of September 1, 1964, a generalization was made based on the information from "The Statistical Abstract for 1965." Pages 828 and 829 of "The Abstract" list sales for "Retail Trade Establishments and Sales By Kind of Business by States: 1963."

*Percentages for the 13 States having no sales taxes as of September 1, 1964, were based on assumption of a simple retail sales tax on lumber, building materials, hardware, farm equipment dealers; general merchandise group stores; food stores; automotive dealers; gasoline service stations; apparel accessory stores; furniture, home furnishings equipment stores; eating, drinking places; drug stores, proprietary stores; other retail stores; and nonstore retailers. Dividing

average yearly inflation since 1961 for each State by retail sales for the 11 groups of retail trades utilized, gave the percentage tax rate which would be necessary, if imposed on retail sales, to raise the dollar amount of inflation incurred by that State since 1961 for each year.

3. LOSS OF PURCHASING POWER MEASURED IN SALES TAX EQUIVALENT FOR 1965

1965 inflation by State was determined, as above, by multiplying State share of total National Personal Income, by 1965 inflation for the United States expressed in dollars, \$15.6 billion. Again, as above, sales tax equivalent was determined by multiplying State General Sales Tax Rate by State share of inflation for 1965 and dividing the product by State General Sales Tax Collections. Likewise, an assumption of a simple retail sales tax was made for States with no sales tax in existence as of September 1, 1964. 1965 inflation for each of those States was divided by retail sales within the 11 categories previously utilized to give a percentage tax rate which would be necessary, if imposed on retail sales, to raise the dollar amount of inflation incurred by that State during calendar year 1965.

4. ACCURACY

Unfortunately, a certain amount of internal error is possible due to the law of significant figures. Retail trade statistics vary from a high of 6 significant figures to a low of 4 significant figures, whereas personal income statistics vary from 5 significant figures to 3 significant figures. Since inflation for the United States, both 1961-1965 average and that of 1965 alone, are in excess of \$10 billion—11 significant figures—these statistics are useful only as a general guide illustrating simply and easily the awesome scope of inflation, State by State, across the Nation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I hope that, in light of these figures obtained from Federal Government statistics, the voting public will understand that when administration spokesmen speak of "the danger of inflation," they ought to be speaking of "the danger of more serious inflation," and that we have been having inflation which, while not galloping in recent years, is deadly serious.

The people should know that, by its deeds, the consensus of the Democratic Party believes in having the Federal Government spend billions of dollars more than our revenue; and that, whether those in control of the Congress like it or not, this lays the foundation for inflation. I do not say there is a precise correlation between deficit spending and inflation; but the table showing the drop in the purchasing power of our dollar and the budget deficits clearly show there is a correlation. For example, during the last 5 years, while the Democratic Congress was running our country \$31 billion deeper into debt, we had \$51 billion of inflation.

Inflation will, assuredly, be an issue in the elections this year. It should be. And if the voters awaken to who is responsible for it, there will be an end to one-party rule in Washington. Our country will be better off for it. And millions of young people, who are not yet of voting age, will bless the voters for their good judgment.

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

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

AUTHORITY TO SIGN BILLS, RECEIVE MESSAGES, AND FILE REPORTS

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate from today until noon on Monday next, the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills; the Secretary of the Senate to receive messages from the President and from the House of Representatives; and committees to file reports.

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

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

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

CALIFORNIA ASPARAGUS LABOR CRISIS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on many occasions since I have been a Member of this distinguished body, I have taken the floor to call attention to the urgent need of our farmers—both in California and in many States throughout the Nation—to obtain qualified and willing harvest workers when needed to supplement their year-round supply.

Historically, we in California have had to call upon our good neighbors in Mexico to supply this supplemental harvest labor needs. Last year, as the result of Secretary of Labor Wirtz' insistence that farmers should be denied the use of emergency supplemental workers from Mexico, our farmers were forced to endure a costly and unsuccessful bureaucratic experiment.

This unnecessary harassment from the Secretary of Labor resulted in losses of crops in the field, higher production costs, and higher grocery prices for the housewives of our Nation. It also resulted in the realization by anyone who studied the facts thoroughly that there will always be occasions when the domestic force is insufficient to handle urgent peak harvest demands. When this situation arises, and farmers are desperately pleading for assistance to avoid crop losses, we can either ignore their request or permit them to save their livelihood. We have this decision today in California in the asparagus harvest.

Secretary Wirtz can either ignore or deny their request—or permit them the needed help in order to avoid further loss.

The stake is \$6 million and 15,000 acres of white asparagus which must be harvested immediately. Every effort has been made by my farmers to recruit domestic labor. The asparagus farmers assured me they have put to work every available, qualified, and willing domestic worker they can find. The crisis is now acute—and they have asked for 2,500 workers immediately. Otherwise their crops and investment will be lost.

Last week, I solicited the personal assistance of President Johnson, pointing out that asparagus was one of the commodities which last year suffered the most serious losses. The resulting burden on our housewives is evident from the wholesale delivery prices of loose large California asparagus on the Chicago market. On April 28, 1964, pyramid crates were selling for \$6. Last year this was up to \$6.75, and this year, I regret to report, on April 26 the price was \$9. The housewives of our Nation are feeling these higher food prices every day in the marketplace.

Mr. President, there is no question that asparagus growers have been paying wage rates which average far more than the \$1.40 minimum imposed on California by Secretary Wirtz. Last November, Secretary Wirtz saw fit to allow the Florida citrus industry to use an average wage system instead of a guaranteed minimum system, and it seems to me only fair that our California growers be permitted a similar arrangement.

Mr. President, let me comment on the growers' continued and relentless—but unsuccessful—efforts at interstate recruiting. Their efforts this year have been just as unproductive as they were last year, and the cost just as high. When Mr. Glen Brockway, regional director of the Bureau of Employment Security, San Francisco, announced his decision last week turning down the asparagus growers' request for 2,500 supplemental workers, he leveled a number of charges at the growers. However, his main criticism, and apparently the main reason for the denial of this request, was that they had not engaged in interstate recruitment through the facilities of the Department of Labor. The facts simply do not agree with Mr. Brockway's contentions.

That they are reluctant to submit interstate clearance orders through the Department of Labor is very understandable in view of their past experience. The growers made clear in their telegram to the Secretary of Labor requesting supplemental labor, that they could not afford the expense of such recruitment and the high level of worker attrition which they experienced in 1965. These experiences were also summarized by Mr. Nat Scatena, president of the Stockton Growers Group, when he testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor on March 11 of this year.

I ask unanimous consent to have two telegrams by Mr. A. R. Duarte, manager of the San Joaquin Farm Production Association, discussing wages and the association's recruiting efforts included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
May 10, 1966.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:
(Copy of message sent to Glenn Brockway,
Regional Administrator, Bureau of Employment
Security, San Francisco, Calif.)

In answer to your telegram, May 4, 1966. The asparagus industry put on a real effective recruitment program to obtain domestic workers in 1966. \$85,000 has been spent in recruitment efforts to date for transportation and subsistence and recruitment costs intra-State and interstate Texas and Hawaii.

Workers recruited did not stay long enough on the job to recover transportation and subsistence advances. As per secretary's criteria \$1.40 per hour paid to all asparagus cutters since harvest operation started and remained on hourly rate until qualified. To attract American asparagus cutters piece rates were greatly increased. Qualified cutters earning \$18 to \$48 per day more and better food furnished to attract and retain workers. Board charges had to be increased.

Two of our members have offered free transportation and refund on board deduction from April 24, if workers remain to end of asparagus season. Both members short of workers.

The intensive crash recruitment program being conducted Los Angeles, San Francisco and Oakland East Bay has produced 81 workers from May 2 through May 9 only 32 remain.

The Department of Employment Personnel claim no cooperation or assistance from welfare and poverty offices. We feel that we more than complied with the suggestion your letter of February 11, 1966 except for some increase in board charges and maybe an isolated case or two of improper transportation deductions. For first time in several years shortages now getting acute for all thinning operations long and short handle hoe work and also cherry harvest.

Any assistance that you can offer will be greatly appreciated.

A. R. DUARTE,
Manager, San Joaquin Farm Production
Association.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
May 2, 1966.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Copy of following wire sent to Honorable Secretary of Labor Wirtz:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The San Joaquin farm production has been recruiting for 2 months intrastate and also recruited interstate Texas. Hundreds of workers recruited to date. Growers also have attempted their own recruitment. Not sufficient workers to harvest asparagus clearance order placed with State department of employment April 14, 1966 for 500 workers. On April 25 order increased to 1,500. Increasing order with department of employment today for an additional 1,000 total 2,500.

Four asparagus growers, directors and myself met with Director, department of employment Albert Tieburg, Friday, regarding certification for Mexican nationals. Director said he could not certify because we were not on your criteria. We stated that our job offer to the worker exceeded criteria of 1965. Piece work rates were producing \$2 to \$3.50 per hour for inexperienced workers.

In addition to our recruitment efforts department employment claims to be using sound trucks, hand bill, TV and radio and newspaper advertisement. Results to date has produced 35 workers, 3 still working.

Crash recruitment program now being conducted by department of employment in Oakland area. Don't expect many workers out of that area. Crash recruitment program Los Angeles area today resulted in 8 workers for asparagus.

Our clearance order with Department of Employment now includes criteria for all recruitment intra-state.

At asparagus growers meeting held Thursday night growers stated that they could comply with criteria for intrastate recruitment but due to poor retention of workers recruited interstate 1965 and at great expense would appreciate your waiver of interstate recruitment as part of criteria 1966.

Mexico has been contacted and states it could have workers ready in 15 days after certification received from your office.

We have done everything possible to recruit and retain workers, increased wages average \$2 to \$3.50 per hour, better housing, better food. Combined efforts of Department of Employment and Labor Department has not produced sufficient number of workers to complete our asparagus harvest.

We respectfully ask for your immediate consideration to our request.

With best personal regards.

A. R. DUARTE,
Manager, San Joaquin Farm Production
Association.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the sad plight of asparagus growers was discussed fully by me last year. On September 13, 1965, I included in the RECORD during my remarks on the agricultural labor situation, an article from the September 1965 issue of the California Farm Bureau Monthly concerning asparagus losses. That article will be found beginning on page 23519, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 17. I also submitted for the RECORD on June 30, 1965, a report of the San Joaquin Farm Production Association detailing its recruitment efforts and results. Interested Members will find those facts beginning on page 15427, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 11.

What were the results of the policies of the Secretary of Labor on California's asparagus growers in 1965?

A report prepared for the California State Board of Agriculture and presented in Sacramento on January 24, 1966, provides a documented account of 1965's experiences. According to that report:

Asparagus acreage available for harvest totalled 54,900 acres in 1965, compared with 65,400 acres in 1964 and an average of 67,480 acres for the period 1960-64.

The acreage reduction "was attributed to an abnormally high plow-out in late 1964 and during the 1965 harvest."

In the words of the report:

It is not possible to determine precisely why growers plowed out the unusually large number of acres during 1964 and the 1965 harvest season. Generally, growers may plow out more than a normal number of acres when (1) the weather is poor, (2) market prices are low, or (3) labor is in short supply.

Weather, markets, availability or harvest labor, and cost of production contribute to changes in volume produced. In 1965, the weather was good and the domestic and export market outlooks were excellent; harvest labor costs increased approximately 46 percent.

Comparing projected normal production of asparagus in 1965 with the actual

production, the study shows the latter to be almost 41 million pounds below the projected normal production.

Gross income to asparagus growers in 1965 was \$1.2 million above 1964, but \$2 million below the 5-year average. However, data based on a sample of growers show grower's production and harvest costs rose 17 percent in 1965 over 1964. Harvest labor costs, excluding increased recruitment costs rose 46 percent. Thus, the effect of increased costs was to reduce growers' net income about \$2.4 million below 1964 and \$5.6 million below the 5-year average.

There were, of course, other results of the disastrous policies followed last year which are obviously being repeated in 1966.

The 1965 pack of asparagus—green and white—was just over 2 million cases, a drop of 35 percent from 1964. The pack of white asparagus declined 1.3 million cases. Processors spent \$2.4 million less on labor and materials than if the volume of 1964 had been packed in 1965.

These are the results of the labor policies imposed on asparagus growers in 1965. Is it any wonder that growers are unwilling to enter into an interstate recruitment program which the Secretary's own California Farm Labor Panel called "a dismal failure"?

This year, asparagus growers have increased their rates of pay. Earnings are averaging above \$2 per hour. Housing has been improved. Menus have been revised at an increase of only 25 cents per day in board charges.

Asparagus growers have engaged in interstate recruitment on their own. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the report of Mr. Nat Scatena on those activities.

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

STOCKTON GROWERS GROUP, INC.,
Stockton, Calif., April 24, 1966.
Hon. GEORGE MURPHY,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: I am offering for your information a copy of a report pertaining to our 1966 asparagus harvest to date. The report was prepared for Mr. Glenn E. Brockway, Regional Director, U.S. Department of Labor, B.E.S. Mr. Albert Tieburg, California Department of Employment, has also been furnished a copy.

Our delta asparagus industry is faced with essentially the same problem that confronted us at this time last year: A lack of workers willing to cut asparagus.

We have already found, as the report shows, that a substantial increase in wages, an exceptionally high yielding season and numerous concessions to the worker in the way of food, management, living conditions, and various ways of computing units that the worker himself can see and compute, is not enough to induce him to do the job. The growers, at this point, have no additional inducements to offer; no means of holding the worker in asparagus.

In 1965 we got some relief; enough to perform a salvage operation only. The Japanese Nationals allowed to work in asparagus were too few in number, their quality and quantity of work was poor and their habit of taking extended vacations is not compatible to asparagus cutting that must be performed every day. We also received a

few Mexican Nationals; they were too few and too late to allow completion of a full harvest.

At this time growers can only hope that others in positions outside agriculture will be able to devise some method of relief.

Respectfully yours,
STOCKTON GROWERS GROUP, INC.,
NAT R. SCATENA, President.

STOCKTON GROWERS GROUP, INC.,
Stockton, Calif., April 23, 1966.
Mr. GLENN E. BROCKWAY,
Regional Administrator, U.S. Department of
Labor, B.E.S. Post Office Box 36017, San
Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. BROCKWAY: I thought you may be interested in some information concerning our 1966 asparagus harvest to date.

These statistics have been compiled for growers representing 3,600 acres of asparagus on which 2,600 acres are on peat soils. These peat soil growers must convert to white asparagus production. During the last few days attrition of workers from our camps and nonavailability of sufficient workers for our day haul and gate hire operations has become acute. It is going to become more difficult to hold these workers for cutting white asparagus as each day passes. Wages, as indicated in this report, is not the factor.

These growers have expended thousands of dollars and have, through combined recruiting efforts, canvassed Texas, Mexican Green Card workers from within Mexico, and every area within California where we thought workers may be available for cutting asparagus in the delta area. Positive recruitment is continuing but, because of attrition, will have to be halted soon for economic reasons.

An order was placed with the California Department of Employment on April 13 for 125 asparagus cutters. This order was sent to all State Farm Labor offices. To date one worker has been referred. He was hired and departed his employment on April 22.

New activities are commencing. We must assume, and past experience has shown, that more asparagus cutters are going to pursue these other activities.

If the industry is to accomplish any more than a salvage operation, as was done in 1965, something must be done immediately. We are certain that everything possible is being done to motivate a desirous worker and costs are mounting daily to this end. However, the harvest is not being accomplished. It is safe to assume that the white asparagus industry in the delta area is doomed. Perhaps at some later date, when machinery is available to replace man, the white asparagus grower can hope to regain markets that are being absorbed by growers in areas outside the United States.

The only growers that can partially complete their harvests, say to June 10, are those that have Filipino workers. The Filipino is no longer desirous of cutting white asparagus. Too, he is getting old and each year many disappear from the scene.

In summary this report reflects a picture of dire predicament. We know of other growers who are, and have been, in more serious trouble than the eleven growers reflected herein. They do not appear in this report simply because this organization has not been able to field the manpower to serve them.

There are some exceptions as I stated above: the few growers who have sufficient numbers of the old standby Filipino worker. However, these workers are not able to harvest all the green, nor an appreciable amount of the white asparagus. Are we to repeat 1965?

Respectfully yours,
STOCKTON GROWERS GROUP, INC.,
NAT R. SCATENA, President.

STOCKTON GROWERS GROUP, INC.,
Stockton, Calif., April 22, 1966.

THE 1966 ASPARAGUS HARVEST

(NOTE.—The attached analysis (pages 1 through 6) were compiled from the payroll and production records of Stockton Growers Group, Inc. Request their dissemination be limited to persons having a direct interest in the subject material.)

Eleven Growers are represented in these statistics. Soil conditions and physical locations are varied. Workers were housed in six different camps located in various parts of San Joaquin and Contra Costa Counties. Camps were serviced by more than one caterer. Attrition has been constant, without enough variance to attribute it to any single Grower, Camp or Ranch. (We naturally assume, however, that the predominance of peat soil is a continuing contributing factor to attrition in the asparagus industry.)

At the beginning of the asparagus cutting season (mid March) workers averaged \$1.46 hourly earnings. On April 1 average hourly earnings for all crews was \$2.35. On April 21 average hourly earnings for all crews was \$2.71. Lowest earnings for any single crew on April 21 was \$2.03 per hour. Highest earnings for any single crew on April 21 was \$3.42 per hour. (These dates were selected in order to show earnings at the beginning of the season, at an advanced date in the season when beds could be expected to yield full production and the last date for which earnings have been calculated prior to preparation of this report.) It will be noted that attrition is as great, if not greater, during the higher earnings periods. This would tend to indicate that earnings, regardless of their amounts, will not detain the worker from his migratory habits.

Attrition shown herein is at a time of green asparagus harvest and cool, comparatively comfortable working conditions. With the heat of early summer and the harvest of white asparagus, which is a more difficult task, attrition can be expected to increase considerably. Day haul and Gate hire operations can be discounted from white asparagus harvest. In addition to uncomfortable working conditions, weeding, hoeing, thinning and fruit harvests will absorb all local labor available, and more.

THE 1966 ASPARAGUS HARVEST—WORKER RECRUITMENT AND UTILIZATION, APRIL 22, 1966

Chronology of Inter-state Recruitment conducted by Stockton Growers Group, Inc.:

March 18: 56 workers arrived from El Paso, Tex., at a cost of \$47 each: 3 workers departed without working, 3 workers departed after working 1 day, 2 workers departed after working 2 days, 4 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 28 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 50 percent.

March 23: 44 workers arrived from El Paso, Tex., at a cost of \$47 each: 4 workers departed after working 1 day, 4 workers departed after working 2 days, 5 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 15 workers are present and still working. Attrition has been 66 percent.

March 26: 38 workers arrived from El Paso, Tex., at a cost of \$47 each: 5 workers refused employment and departed immediately, 20 workers departed after working 1 day, 2 workers departed after working 2 days, 1 worker departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 6 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 85 percent.

March 31: 38 workers arrived from El Paso, Tex., at a cost of \$47 each: 11 workers departed during their first night's stay without working, 3 workers departed after working 1 day, 1 worker departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 11 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 72 percent.

Chronology of Inter-state Recruitment conducted by San Joaquin Farm Production Association for Growers Serviced by Stockton Growers Group, Inc.:

April 16: 25 workers arrived from El Paso, Tex., at a cost of \$48 each: 3 workers departed without working, 3 workers departed after working 1 day, 7 workers departed after working 2 days, 10 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 2 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 92 percent.

April 20: 32 workers arrived from El Paso, Tex., at a cost of \$48 each: 1 worker departed without working, 7 workers departed after working 2 days. The remaining workers worked 2 days; in the morning of their third day's work they sat down, refused to work, demanding higher wages. Following an offer by the grower to pay either by piece work or by the hour, as the worker desired, 6 workers remained having selected and being granted piece work rates. The remaining 18 workers declared they would not cut asparagus at any price and departed. On April 23, 6 workers are still present; have worked 2 days. Attrition has been 82 percent.

Chronology of Intra-state Recruitment Conducted by Stockton Growers Group, Inc.:

April 7: 15 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of \$40 each: 6 workers jumped from the bus and departed at the first boulevard stop en-route to camp. On April 22, 1 worker is still present and working. Attrition has been 94 percent.

April 12: 16 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of \$40 each: 1 worker departed without working, 6 workers departed after working 1 day, 1 worker departed after working 2 days, 1 worker departed after working 4 days, 4 workers departed after working 5 days. On April 22, 2 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 88 percent.

April 14: 26 workers and a Foreman who had supervised these workers in the Imperial Valley arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of \$40 each. These workers rested in camp on their day of arrival, having arrived in the early A.M. after an overnight ride. On the morning of April 15, Foreman and all workers had disappeared.

April 16: 19 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of \$40 each: 1 worker departed without working, 1 worker departed after working 1 day, 1 worker departed after working 2 days, 2 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 14 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 27 percent.

April 19: 19 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of \$40 each: 12 workers slept overnight and departed without working. On April 22, 7 workers are still present and have worked 3 days. Attrition has been 64 percent.

April 21: 16 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of \$40 each: 15 workers departed during the night after arrival without working. On April 23, 1 worker is still present and has worked 1 day. Attrition has been 94 percent.

Chronology of Intra-state Recruitment conducted by San Joaquin Farm Production Association for Growers serviced by Stockton Growers Group:

March 29: 16 workers arrived from San Diego, Calif., at a cost of \$20 each: 5 workers departed after working 1 day, 8 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22 no workers remain. Attrition has been 100 percent.

April 1: 10 workers arrived from San Diego, Calif., at a cost of \$20 each: 2 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 1 worker is still present and working. Attrition has been 90 percent.

April 2: 17 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of \$20 each: 3 workers de-

parted after working 2 days, 2 workers departed after working 3 days. On April 22, 5 workers are still present and working. Attrition has been 71 percent.

April 13: 8 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of \$30 each: 7 workers departed after 2 days work. On April 22, 1 worker is still present and working. Attrition has been 88 percent.

April 18: 25 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of \$30 each: 7 workers departed without working, 1 worker departed after working 1 day. On April 22, 17 workers are still present and have worked 3 days. Attrition has been 32 percent in 3 days.

April 19: 4 workers arrived from Calexico, Calif., at a cost of \$35 each: All 4 workers slept overnight and departed without working.

(Workers recruited by Stockton Growers Group were recruited only for Growers being serviced by Stockton Growers.)

(Workers recruited by San Joaquin Farm Production Association were recruited for Growers being serviced by Stockton Growers Group.)

Local Recruiting Conducted by Stockton Growers Group, Inc.: During the 1966 Asparagus Harvest Season to date 52 workers have been locally recruited for camp dormitory type living: 410 man-work-days have been realized from this group, for an average of 7 man-days per worker. On April 22nd, 6 of this group are still present and working. Attrition has been 89 percent.

Day Haul and Gate Hire Operations conducted by Stockton Growers Group, Inc.: During the current Asparagus Harvest Season to date, 3,093 man-days have been realized from this labor source. Seven hundred eighty-three workers have been hired, for an average of 4 man-work-days per worker.

(On the day of this report, an average day, day haul hiring was 153 workers short of the number required to complete the day's harvest.)

Recruitment and utilization summary, 1966 asparagus harvest season through April 22

	Inter-state recruited	Intra-state recruited	Aggregate
Number of workers recruited	233	191	424
Recruiting costs	\$11,008	\$6,430	\$17,438
Number of man-work days realized	2,257	627	2,884
Average number of work days realized per worker recruited	9	3	6
Recruiting costs per man-work day realized	\$4.87	\$10.25	\$6.04
Number of workers still present and working	68	49	117
Attrition rate (percent)	71	75	73

NOTE.—Although man-work days realized and costs are computed to date only, there is no reason to believe that, with continued recruiting, attrition will be less. In fact, as discussed elsewhere in this report, attrition is expected to rise. Considering this, the above reflects true utilization and costs.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Wirtz' refusal to permit the employment of this needed supplemental labor will mean, according to the manager of the California Asparagus Growers Association, that some 15,000 acres of asparagus worth \$6 million are doomed unless 2,500 additional workers are found almost immediately.

With all the urgency at my command, I call on the Secretary to reconsider his decision and permit the supplemental labor so badly needed to be admitted to this country.

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

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

ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE IN THE CANADIAN AUTO AGREEMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the adjustment assistance provided in the automotive agreement and treaty entered into with the Canadian Government last year.

Last September this body passed legislation implementing the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement after considerable debate and a narrow defeat of the recommitment motion.

Let me review some of the major points of that debate:

First. A selling factor for the implementing legislation was that Prime Minister Lester Pearson and our President had already signed an agreement for duty free treatment of new automobiles and parts, and that, therefore, we in the Congress must pass this bill rather than embarrass the administration. Several Senators and Representatives felt that this should have been a treaty and should not have been handled in such high-handed fashion.

Second. The agreement required a waiver from the most-favored-nation clause of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, even though at the time we were pushing for multilateral rather than bilateral agreements.

Third. The agreement substantially lessened our favorable balance-of-payments situation with regard to Canada. At the same time, the Departments involved in negotiating the agreements—State, Commerce, and Treasury—were working out all types of voluntary and mandatory controls to keep the U.S. dollar sound.

Fourth. The agreement and the legislation legalized an illegal scheme by which the Canadians were rebating our tariffs in violation of the Tariff Act of 1930, which stipulated that countervailing duties were applicable.

Fifth. The agreement had all manner of assurances to Canadian industry—including the 60-percent content requirement but none for U.S. small parts manufacturers.

Sixth. The legislation contained preferential adjustment assistance treatment for only one industry, at a time when we desperately needed a major overhaul of all adjustment assistance criteria.

Seventh. The agreement required a series of letters of undertaking to assure the Canadians that U.S. companies would continue production and augment their investment in Canada. That in itself was embarrassing to our U.S. automotive companies. The letters were remarkably similar.

It was a bad law, Mr. President, and even those who voted for it thought there were many parts which were not good

for our economy. Administration spokesmen said in essence, "Bear with us, believe us, in the long run we will all profit."

Such assurances do not erase the objectionable points of the agreement. Now we see just how a questionable law can be administered poorly and without regard for the letter of that law.

The administration, through the President's special 3-man committee, has determined that 200 workers, fired by the Ford Motor Co. from their jobs in Pennsauken, N.J., are to receive the very generous unemployment compensation benefits Congress authorized last year when we approved legislation implementing the United States-Canadian Automobile Agreement.

We can sympathize with these workers, and their families. We can sympathize also with unemployed workers elsewhere in this country who have lost—and are losing—their jobs because the automobile companies prefer to expand their Canadian operations to the detriment of U.S. labor. But sympathy should not motivate the administration of an act of Congress.

Many of us objected last year that the Canadian Automobile Agreement legislation was rushed through the Senate so fast that we could not know the full impact of what we were doing. I have enumerated some of the points called in question. By ruling that these 200 employees lost their jobs by virtue of the "operation of the agreement" the President's special 3-man committee has proven how right we were.

These workers packaged "knocked-down" vehicles and parts for export. That is all they did. They did not manufacture automotive products. In some instances the parts they packaged for export were not even made by Ford—they were made by subcontractors and sold to Ford for export. The Ford Motor Co. made a private decision that it would package these "knocked-downs" in Canada rather than in this country. This was a private decision, which created the unemployment and despair for 200 workers and their families.

It may be argued that the private decision was in no way related to the agreement. If that is the case, the decision to pay the adjustment assistance is wrong. On the other hand, if because those letters of undertaking were a part of the agreement, the Federal Government is forced to pay the tab on company decisions similar to this one, our fears at the time of the legislation are proven valid, and the Government is in effect subsidizing the manufacturers in their private decisions for their own benefit.

Let us look at this April 14 Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board ruling that these 200 employees lost their jobs by virtue of the "operation of the agreement."

The Board, composed of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, Chairman, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, and Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, was unable to determine that imports of automotive products had increased appreciably or that exports had decreased appreciably because of the agreement. The Tariff Commission's

report to that committee has not been made public. Nevertheless, the decision was made that the loss of jobs was, in fact, a result of operation of the agreement. Although the Ford Motor Co. workers had applied for the aid, the company was as surprised as I was that this petition was granted.

The real facts concerning this case are being kept secret, or so it seems. They are not available. I believe that it would be in the national interest to make the facts known. If the operation of the agreement truly was the cause of their unemployment, there should be nothing to hide, because we were made to understand by the Secretary of Labor that there would be dislocation. Only the size and nature of such dislocation was open to speculation. But, if Ford's private decision was the cause, then Ford Motor Co., not the taxpayers of this Nation, should be made to pay for the adjustment assistance. If the agreement and those letters of undertaking can be so stretched "outside the letter of the law," perhaps we ought to take another look at the enabling legislation we allowed to pass earlier in this Congress, H.R. 9042.

This question of special adjustment assistance under the Canadian auto bill was of great concern to many Senators, including some of us on the Finance Committee. Last year, during our hearings on the implementing bill, Secretary of Labor Wirtz responded to an inquiry by Senator CARLSON as to the breadth of the adjustment assistance section, as follows:

I think it is a fair point, Senator CARLSON, that what it is done here is to try to identify as many different situations as could conceivably cause dislocation to a firm or to a group of workers, and to open that door very wide and then to make provisions for a procedure which will be sure to separate out the cases of propriety from impropriety.

At another point in the hearings, on the same day, the Secretary of Labor informed us:

Under the statute or the bill as proposed there is a most orderly procedure, a carefully drawn procedure, in fact a conservative procedure, for the fullest possible reasonable advice to the President of the United States in making that determination.

I think the bill adequately protects every interest which is involved, and does not result in the conferring of what would, by the implication of your question—

Senator GORE's—
be undue discretionary authority.

From this advice we received at the hearing, a reasonable interpretation of the adjustment assistance feature of the bill would be that it was drawn so as to extend adjustment assistance in every conceivable case under which workers engaged in producing automotive products might lose their jobs. Having thus been drafted in the broadest terms imaginable, the provisions in question should not now be loosely interpreted in a manner which would increase the Federal deficit by extending Federal benefits to workers who lose their jobs solely by virtue of a private business decision.

Now, Mr. President, let me demonstrate why it is extremely questionable

whether these workers are eligible for adjustment assistance under the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965. Section 302(a) of this act provides that a petition for a determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance may be filed with the President by a group of workers in a firm which produces an "automotive product." An "automotive product" is defined in the act to mean a motor vehicle or a fabricated component to be used as original equipment in the manufacture of motor vehicles. It does not include replacement parts.

After this petition is filed, the act requires the President to determine whether—and at this point I am quoting the statute—"production in the United States of the automotive product concerned produced by the firm or an appropriate subdivision thereof" has decreased appreciably. This statute, as I read it, makes it clear that the unemployed workers must have been engaged in the production of some specific "automotive product" if the Federal benefit is to be available.

But this group of workers in Pennsauken, N.J., was not engaged in producing any product. They performed a mere stevedoring operation. They packaged "knocked down" autos and parts for export. They did nothing more. And some of the parts, as I have stated, might not have been produced by Ford at all.

They did not lose their jobs because of any increase in imports. They were not unemployed because of any decrease in exports from the United States to Canada as the act by its specific terms contemplates. Their unemployment was not predicated upon any reduction in production in the United States of automotive products. The primary cause of their unemployment was, so the President's committee says, "by operation of the agreement."

But what does "operation of the agreement" mean? The statute defines this term to include governmental or private actions in the United States or Canada directly related to the conclusion or implementation of the agreement. The agreement refers only to a limited form of free trade in automotive products between the United States and Canada. This limited free trade is accorded only with respect to, one, vehicles imported into Canada by a manufacturer of automobiles, and two, parts and accessories imported into Canada for use as original equipment in vehicles to be produced in Canada.

Suppose the vehicles or parts involved are imported into Canada for the sole purpose of packaging them for export—and this is what the New Jersey workers alleged in their petition for adjustment assistance. Are they accorded free entry under the Canadian agreement? I think not. The "operation of the agreement" has nothing to do with it—unless, as I stated previously, the agreement is so loose that the private agreements between the U.S. automotive companies and the Canadian Government carry a lot more weight than the State Department admitted during the hearings.

Suppose then that the vehicles or parts involved are produced in Canada for export to a third country, replacing former U.S. exports. Is this an operation of the agreement sufficient to qualify these workers for Federal benefits? I think not. Nowhere is it suggested that U.S. exports to a third country might be decreased by virtue of the agreement. To the contrary, we were told in terms certain that increased Canadian production under the agreement was going to go toward satisfying the market for automobiles in Canada. But now we find that the Adjustment Assistance Board will allow Ford to cut its U.S. exports and expand its Canadian exports while changing the bill for adjustment assistance for its laid-off workers to the American taxpayer.

Mr. President, Congress made a serious mistake when it approved implementation of the United States-Canadian Automobile Agreement. The administration is now making a more serious mistake in passing out potentially vast Federal benefits to workers who have lost their jobs because the Ford Motor Co. prefers to package its unassembled parts and components in Canada rather than in the United States. The evidence, sketchy as it is, indicates that the United States-Canadian Automobile Agreement had little or nothing to do with the unfortunate plight of these workers. If full disclosure and closer examination of the facts in this case shows that the agreement is not at fault, then providing adjustment assistance to these workers is contrary to the terms of the statute and violates the intent of the Congress.

There will be other petitions for adjustment assistance under the Canadian automobile legislation. Indeed, the Tariff Commission announced on April 20, that it was investigating a petition by a group of unemployed workers from the Fisher Body Plant at Grand Rapids, Mich. These workers laid off by General Motors, like those fired by Ford in New Jersey, allege that their jobs were lost, not by increase in imports or decrease in exports but by a company decision to move the work of that plant to Canada. They allege this is an "operation of the agreement."

I do not propose to prejudge the cause of the Michigan firings but I do point out that this phrase "operation of the agreement" is not a loose term which can be stretched at administrators' whim or fancy to pass out Federal benefits as they or the auto companies choose. To the contrary, it is a term carefully defined in the law to cover situations—and again I quote from the statute—"directly related to the conclusion or implementation of the agreement." It is a term which must be construed in the framework of the whole bill. It is a term which must be interpreted in the light of congressional intent. The congressional intent, as developed in our hearings and in the proceedings on the floor, was that this liberally phrased statute should not be loosely interpreted but should be conservatively construed. The actions of the President's special committee belie this construction and as I have already shown is contrary both to the statute and to the intent of Congress.

Now, Mr. President, before concluding my remarks let me express my deep sympathy to the unfortunate American families whose husbands and fathers have been mercilessly sacrificed to the end that Canadian labor and Canadian industry might prosper. Had the Senate exercised the caution many of us urged, these Americans would be working today. Unemployment compensation would not be needed. Legal questions regarding eligibility such as I have discussed today would not have been raised.

I am not unmindful of the need for generous unemployment benefits for our workers thrown out of jobs by reason of imports. Indeed, for years I have urged that the Trade Expansion Act be amended to relax the test of eligibility for these benefits. Last year the administration finally agreed with my objective and I am hopeful we can now join forces to get a law which will make these benefits available when unemployment is triggered by our trade policies. It can be done by law. It should be done by law. It should not be done haphazardly by whim, caprice, or exercise of undue discretion. I fear that has happened in the New Jersey case. I fear that by granting this petition, the Adjustment Assistance Board points up just how badly a poor law can be administered. I call upon them to make all the facts known and to tell us just how loosely we can expect the letter of this law to be interpreted in the future and to what extent private decision can be charged to the public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of documents pertinent to adjustment assistance under the Canadian auto bill and to the operation of the agreement. These are:

First. Petition for eligibility for adjustment assistance filed with the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board for the workers fired from the Ford Motor Co., Delaware Valley Parts Depot, Pennsauken, N.J.

Second. Summary of final determination and notice of certification by the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board of their eligibility.

Third. Petition for eligibility for adjustment assistance filed with the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board for the workers fired from the Fisher Body Plant No. 2, General Motors Corp., Grand Rapids, Mich.

Fourth. Excerpt from the Wall Street Journal of April 14, 1966, showing Canadian exports of automotive products to the United States increased 90 percent in 1965 over 1964.

Fifth. Excerpt from the Canadian Financial Post of April 2, 1966, showing the tremendous stimulation given Canadian automotive products manufacturers by the agreement and their contemplated expansion of exports to the United States.

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

FIRST U.S. WORKERS RECEIVE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE UNDER INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW

For the first time in U.S. history, a group of workers has been certified eligible to ap-

ply for adjustment assistance under the Nation's international trade laws.

Almost 200 employees of a Pennsauken, New Jersey automotive parts depot, who had lost their jobs when their export packing operation was transferred to Canada, may now apply for assistance under the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965.

The Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board today made the determinations regarding workers at the Ford Motor Company's Delaware Valley Parts Depot in Pennsauken who have become jobless since November 19, 1965.

The Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board is composed of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz (Chairman), Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, and Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler.

The Board's action came after the United Automobile Workers International Union filed a petition for eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance on behalf of a group of workers employed at the depot.

The Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board found that the U.S.-Canadian Automotive Products Agreement, signed on January 16, 1965, was a primary factor in causing dislocation of workers at the New Jersey depot.

The Board determined that as a result of the operation of the agreement the Ford Co. transferred its export packing operation from Pennsauken to Tillsonburg, Canada.

The Board based its certification on a report from the U.S. Tariff Commission and advice from the Departments of Commerce, Treasury, Labor, and the Small Business Administration.

Certified workers who meet the required standards may receive trade readjustment allowances, counseling and training (including training allowances), and relocation assistance.

[From the Financial Post, Apr. 2, 1966]
MOST AUTO-PARTS MAKERS ARE RUBBING HANDS IN GLEE AT HUGE MARKET PROSPECTS—SHOCK-ABSORBER COMPANY WILL QUADRUPLE BUSINESS IN 1967, ZINC DIECASTERS EXPECT TO BOOST EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES AND OPPORTUNITIES BECKON FOR MOST

(By David Crane)

With orders flowing out from the automakers for 1967 models, most Canadian auto parts manufacturers are forecasting unlimited opportunity for anyone who will get out and sell.

And big chunks of the sales for this first full model year of the automotive pact will be in the United States.

Scores of new factories are under construction or in the planning stage.

One discordant note: the stampers and firms which make products the automakers themselves produce in the United States may be hit hard.

Not everyone will do as well as Van Der Hout Associates, Ltd., of Toronto which, through its subsidiary, Gabriel of Canada, Ltd., will quadruple its business in 1967, selling \$10 million worth of shock absorbers, compared with \$2.8 million in the 1966 model year.

"Close to 75 percent of production in the 1967 model year will go to the United States," President J. B. Van Der Hout told FP.

Nor will many do as badly as National Auto Radiator Manufacturing Co., a Windsor stamping company, which will lose 80 percent of its business in 1967—a loss of \$3 million of orders. Its work force, once 370, is down to 200 and will soon drop to 160.

Most companies are somewhere in between, with many more gaining than losing sales.

One branch of the parts industry that is really scoring with the auto pact is the zinc diecasting business.

An official of National Hardware Specialties, Ltd., a subsidiary of Consolidated Mining & Smelting Co. of Canada, told FP: "Orders for 1967 are up considerably. It's really quite an increase over last year's business, in fact close to three times."

"A good proportion of the increase comes from increased exports to the United States. As far as we are concerned, a good deal of this is due to the auto agreement."

In Oshawa, Coulter Manufacturing Co., a diecaster acquired by Noranda Mines Ltd. last year, has a \$1 million expansion well under way which will make it one of the largest diecasting and electroplating plants in operation in Canada when finished in late 1966.

"A considerable portion of the 1967 model year orders are now in and there's a considerable increase in business with the U.S.," President A. Graham Coulter told FP.

"We shipped very little to the U.S. in 1966. In the 1967 model year 15 to 20 percent of our output will go to the U.S. At the same time, we don't seem to have lost any business in Canada."

In Bramalea, Ont., Hudson Bay Diecastings Ltd.'s \$2.2 million zinc plant is now getting ready for production. The company, which is a subsidiary of Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., will start operating a one-shift run in mid-June.

"In the 1967 model year we will operate at one-third capacity with 75 percent of our production going to the U.S.," general manager G. F. Clarke said.

In iron castings, Galt Malleable Iron Ltd. and its new \$2 million plant operated by Galt Brantford Malleable Iron Ltd. will ship about one third of output to the U.S. in 1967.

"Our new plant is geared for North American production," president H. C. MacKay said. "Although we had participated in the U.S. market before the pact, it has certainly helped."

"And we expect better sales to the U.S. with the new plant. The market is there, the orders can be had. It's just a matter of producing."

Here are more companies, which say the pact has been good for them:

S.K.D. Manufacturing Co., Amherstburg, Ont. President Gordon Knight said: "The 1967 model year is all booked up. It won't be our first year of shipping to the U.S., but shipments to the U.S. in the 1967 model year will total 30 percent of output compared with almost none two to three years ago and not much last year either."

The company will complete an \$850,000 expansion in July, increasing capacity by 20 percent.

Philco Corp., a division of Ford Motor Co., will ship close to 200,000 auto radios to the U.S. from its Toronto plant in 1967. In 1966 model year its shipments are likely to be a little over half that amount.

Canadian Acme Screw & Gear Ltd., subsidiary of Levy Industries Ltd., has a sizable order from Ford U.S. for transmissions and differentials for the M151 jeep. Company says it "has other irons in the fire."

Kralinator Filters Ltd., Preston, Ont. President C. N. Fouse said, "It looks very bright for us. We just started shipping into the U.S. in late fall, 1965, and now we expect these orders to really accelerate. We expect the 1968 model year will really show the greatest increase—and we are now working on plans for a plant expansion that we will probably announce in two months."

Wallace Barnes Co., Hamilton, is now starting a \$300,000 additional auto valve spring line and is looking at plans for new plant space.

President W. A. Campbell told FP: "We have started to ship to the U.S. and are now shipping 5 to 7 percent of our output there after starting our export program last year. The auto pact has worked out very well for our company. We realize it's a rough game

but we're used to the disciplines of the automotive market and are able to match or better U.S. competition."

Dominion Rubber Co., Montreal, is now receiving the first of its 1967 model orders. While tires are not included under the pact, the company also manufactures interior trim and estimates that 40 percent of its trim production is now going into the U.S. "Certainly since the auto pact we have picked up an increase in shipments to the U.S.," company president E. A. Martin told FP. "We picked up more business in 1966 and our initial orders indicate that we can expect even more in 1967."

Eaton Automotive Canada Ltd., London, is obtaining an increase in orders. Next month its Wallaceburg plant goes into limited production and a new plant in Chatham goes into limited production in the third quarter.

Hayes Steel Products Ltd., Thorold. President G. B. Mitchell said: "Our orders show a fairly substantial increase for the 1967 model year."

By early December the company's auto frame plant will be finished. Production should start in spring of 1967. "We will produce 200,000 to 300,000 frames for the 1968 model year, with 75 percent of production headed for the U.S."

Ontario Steel Products Co., Toronto, expects exports to increase in 1967. Vice-president E. B. Cranston said: "We will probably export quite a bit. Right now we are exporting about 25 percent of our production to the U.S., whereas three years ago we really were just Canadian suppliers."

Kelsey Wheel Co., Windsor. President W. A. Harrison said: "The outlook is pretty good. We've got something in the making that, if it clicks, will really be something."

"Right now we have one good order we didn't have for 1966. And since the auto pact about 50 percent of our production goes to the U.S."

Kelsey may announce a new plant soon. Bendix-Westinghouse Automotive Air Brake Co., Ohio, is expected to announce plans for a new plant in Ontario soon. It will produce heavy duty truck brake parts.

Borg-Warner Corp., a major automotive parts manufacturer in the U.S., recently formed a new company, Borg-Warner Canada Ltd. "to prepare for future growth." Present company operations in Canada include Long Manufacturing Co., Marbon Chemicals, Morse Chain of Canada Ltd.

Chrysler Canada Ltd. is also planning an expansion of its parts-making subsidiaries—altogether the company will spend \$2.6 million to double the size of its trim plant at Ajax, Ont.

For the stampers, the auto pact is another story altogether. More vulnerable than many partsmakers, since they represent a duplication of a very expensive tooling operation already in existence in the U.S., some see their industry as the sacrifice in the auto agreement.

"The question for many of the stampers," Donald Wood, executive vice-president of the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association (Canada), told FP, "is whether they will have enough work in 1967 to keep them going until they will see what they can get in 1968."

"1968 is the year of the major model change. This is where we will find out if the agreement will work. Will we tool up in Canada? This will have to be decided soon."

National Radiator, which is Canada's largest jobber stamping plant, is not a captive firm with all its orders tied to one company. Its business is almost equally divided among the Big Three auto makers—but the Big Three also own vast stamping operations of their own in the U.S. which can easily absorb the work National Radiator and other Canadian companies like it have been doing under tariff protection.

Two months ago the stampers appealed to Industry Minister C. N. Drury for help. He

arranged a meeting with the presidents of the auto companies—and this seems to have at least opened up some contacts between Canadian stampers and U.S. auto company buyers.

The president of another Windsor stamping company, who says, his business will drop by a third in 1967, told FP that "when Karl Scott (president of Ford Motor Co. of Canada) phoned across the river to Detroit, it at least got us into company offices."

What the stampers are waiting to see now is whether they will get any orders after all these meetings—although most concede that it's too late to pick up 1967 business, though they have some hopes for 1968.

Thomas Eansor, president of Fabricated Steel Products (Windsor) Ltd. and chairman of the subcommittee of the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association that looks after the stamping industry's problems, told FP:

"Some stampers are going to suffer, but it will be their own fault. When the government opened the doors a few weeks ago, half of them didn't take advantage of it."

"The meeting produced results for those who were interested. It's not going to be easy, but the stampers can get the business."

Even for Fabricated Steel Products, Eansor said, "It's a struggle. But we will survive."

"There was a possibility at one time, though, of not surviving since we could not quote on parts. But with the chance to quote we may get orders. And the job will become easier because we will be making 30 to 40 parts, instead of 250."

Not all the parts stampers share Eansor's optimism. One Toronto firm told FP: "The pact still isn't doing anything for us. Two or three months ago there was considerable scurrying around and a session with Drury. This led to a pickup in the tempo of enquiries from the auto industry—but no new orders."

Another Toronto stamper said: "We are satisfied with the orders we have, but there could be a problem since the auto makers are trying to eliminate duplicate toolings and stampers aren't getting the U.S. business."

In Windsor, Johnstel Metal Products Ltd. has closed down because of the combined effects of a lengthy strike and a loss in U.S. orders. FP understands there are several other companies that may close down if discussions over the 1968 outlook are not promising.

Elsewhere in the auto parts industry, some highly specialized companies fear that they, too, may close up as a result of U.S. competition.

Ingersoll Machine & Tool Co. General Manager J. D. Loveridge told FP the company is losing \$2 million of business in 1967 on steering box orders. Orders from Chrysler Canada will be less than \$500,000, compared with \$2 million two years ago.

"I don't know where we will end up, but we will produce steering boxes in 1967 to fill orders from our other customers," Loveridge said.

To compensate for lost auto business, Ingersoll Machine has won a \$2 million contract from Ford in the U.S. for machined rocket warheads, under the Canada-U.S. defense-sharing program.

One company which, in the past three years, has established a reputation for aggressiveness, may wind up its operations soon. Reason: it makes a product that all of the Big Three manufacture in their own plants in the U.S.

A bearing company told FP: "We should know this week where we stand." It believes its bearing sales will be hurt by imports from Japan for manufacture into transmissions assembled in Canada for the U.S.

Then there are companies like Auto Specialties Manufacturing Co., Windsor, which saw the U.S. potential even before the auto pact. "The auto pact hasn't had much

effect on us," President R. M. Foote said. "We started exporting in 1959-1960 and have grown ever since. Today 35 to 40 percent of our business is going to the U.S.—but the pact hasn't brought us a single new customer."

MAJOR CONGRESSIONAL BATTLE MAY ERUPT OVER LABOR WHICH IS DISPLACED BY PARTS DEAL

WASHINGTON.—First major test of federal aid for displaced labor under the Canada-U.S. automobile trade agreement is underway.

The U.S. Tariff Commission is investigating layoffs at a New Jersey Ford Motor Co. plant. The United Auto Workers Union says workers are losing their jobs because Ford is transferring to Canada work that had been done at its Delaware Valley parts depot in Pennsauken, N.J. UAW says the Canada-U.S. agreement is the primary reason.

If the commission decides no aid should be given it could spark a major battle in Congress over the agreement.

Under the terms of the U.S. legislation, workers who are displaced because of the Canada-U.S. deal can get special help from the federal government for retraining, resettlement or extra unemployment compensation. The language providing for this assistance is far more liberal than that in the overall U.S. trade law. It was made more liberal at the insistence of UAW leaders and it was only on this basis that UAW officials agreed to support the trade agreement.

About 100 workers could be affected at the Ford plant. If the commission finds they are losing their jobs because of the Canada-U.S. agreement, it will so advise a Cabinet-level committee which almost certainly would agree and provide the aid.

Until now, no such aid has ever been given by Washington. Several applications were made under the general U.S. trade law, but all were rejected, primarily because of the strictness of the provisions.

No public hearing is planned as yet by the Tariff Commission on this first major test of the new provisions, but a hearing can be held if requested by UAW. It likely will take several weeks before the commission submits its recommendations on adjustment assistance to the workers in the New Jersey plant.

The U.S. government anticipates there will be some awards this year to American auto workers thrown out of work because of the Canada-U.S. automobile deal—there is provision for such awards in the new U.S. budget.

ONTARIO ABSORBING DEAL'S MAIN IMPACT

The greatest impact of the Canada-U.S. auto pact is being felt in Ontario, where the bulk of the auto and auto parts manufacturing is carried out.

Looking ahead, Ontario Economics & Development Minister Stanley Randall gave this growth forecast for the next two years at the opening of Ford Motor Co. of Canada's \$25 million truck plant at Oakville:

Create at least another 20,000-30,000 new jobs in the province.

Stimulate another several hundred million dollars of investment in plant and equipment.

Add at least 5 million sq. ft. of new factory space.

Bring in at least 20 new plants to Ontario—and lead to expansions in 20-30 others.

"Of all the Ontario companies expanding their plants last year, 75 were involved in, or with, the automotive industry. They added over 8,000 employees, over 3 million sq. ft. of new space, and spent over \$100 million on capital equipment," Randall said.

And, he added, "of all the new manufacturing establishments that located in Ontario last year, 35 companies were affected by, or resulted from, the new automotive pact. These companies added 5,000 employees, built over 2 million sq. ft. of space and invested over \$50 million."

[From the Financial Post (Canada) Apr. 2, 1966]

INVESTMENT OPTIMISM ABOUT AUTO-PARTS PACT

Optimism about the auto-parts industry is the predominant mood among investment analysts and manufacturers now that the Canada-U.S. auto pact is starting to pay off for many of the country's parts makers.

But as far as stock prices are concerned, the market is cautious, with many investors still maintaining a wait-and-see attitude.

For the auto-parts industry, this is the first full model year under the pact in which

they have been able to take advantage of the conditions of free trade between Canada and the U.S.

But if the waiting period has been nerve-wracking, it appears to have been worth it for many of the producers, with 1967 model year orders now rolling in:

A Toronto shock-absorber manufacturer will nearly quadruple his sales in the 1967 model year and export 75 percent of his output to the U.S.

A Dresden, Ont., zinc-die caster will nearly triple his sales and also register a sharp increase in exports to the U.S.

A Windsor wheel manufacturer may build a new plant if the orders he expects to sign in the near future materialize. He exports 50 percent of his production to the U.S.

But there is another side of the story, too.

Some companies, especially stampers, are getting mainly bad news. Canada's largest jobbing stamper, a Windsor company with more than 150 presses, says it will lose 80 percent of its business in 1967 and is already laying off men.

Other companies surveyed by FP say they just don't know whether they can wait out 1967 with the slim orders they have to see what they will get for the 1968 model year.

The 1968 model year is the crucial one for many companies. Major model changes are expected then, and this is when Canadian companies will discover whether they will get any of the tooling work.

It is also the deadline year for the auto-makers to achieve what amounts to about a \$500-million increase in Canadian content.

One problem that has bothered many Canadian parts producers: getting to meet the parts buyers in the U.S. auto companies.

Major purchasing decisions lie largely with the head offices of the auto companies now—and this means a lot of selling has to be done in Detroit.

Canadian parts producers had complained of difficulties in getting through the doors of U.S. purchasing departments. But a meeting two months ago between Industry Minister C. M. Drury and the presidents of the auto companies seems to have cleared up this problem.

For the complete picture of what the 1967 orders mean for Canadian parts producers, see pp. 25, 41.

How auto parts firms have fared

Recent price	Percent change since—		Earnings per share		Capital expenditures		Yield (percent)	Price-earnings ratio
	Year ago	1961 ¹	Latest fiscal year	1961	1966 ²	1965		
Hayes Steel Products, Ltd.	27 1/4	+68	¹ +627	\$1.47	¹ \$0.02	\$2,000,000	2.8	18.5
Ontario Steel Products Co.	39	+8	+271	2.86	1.20	1,700,000	2.7	13.6
Kelsey Wheel Co.	17 1/4	+11		1.04	.33	4,500,000	2.9	16.5
Ingersoll Machine & Tool Co.	9 1/2	+12	+19	² 1.85	.88	250,000	5.3	5.1
S.K.D. Manufacturing Co.	8 3/4	+46	+94	1.13	.10	850,000	2.3	7.7
Van Der Hout Associates, Ltd.	2.80	+124	.08			592,000		35.0

¹ Allowing for stock splits.

² Estimated.

³ Deficit.

WHY THEY'RE MOVING—AUTO PARTS FIRMS FORCE AHEAD, MARKET CAUTIOUS

(By Martin Sinclair)

Auto-parts manufacturers most likely to succeed in the new free trade environment are those which have been expanding plant, streamlining equipment and have U.S. affiliations, industry observers say.

The major auto builders are currently handing down orders for the 1967 models. The bulk of the companies in which there is investor interest appear to have done well.

Apprehension has been expressed by some investment men about some of the smaller auto parts companies, especially those with a fairly extensive product range.

One analyst says: "The companies that didn't start ploughing earnings back into plant and equipment after the Bladen report

came out 5 years ago are the ones to be wary of.

"Although optimism predominates, there are some investors who think it wiser to wait until after the shakedown period before making commitments in the group."

Stock prices sustain this view. They have been stronger during the past year, but have shown no inclination to break records. The optimism of a year ago now comes tinged with more caution.

Hayes Steel Products, Ltd., manufactures clutches, axles, universal joints, etc. It will spend about \$2 million on capital projects in the current year.

A \$16 million auto-frame plant is being built adjacent to the existing plant at Thorold, Ont., which will be in production next year.

Hayes, 55 percent-owned by Dana Corp., Toledo, expects to export the bulk of the frames. The parent has three frame plants and an auto research facility in Detroit.

Stock prices reflect the general belief that Hayes is in a strong position to take advantage of the Canada-United States agreement. A year ago a share could be bought for \$16 1/4; the current price is \$27 1/4. The 1965-66 high-low is \$28 1/2-\$15 1/2.

Ontario Steel Products Co. manufactures a wide range of products for the automotive industry. It is controlled in the United States by Rockwell-Standard Corp.

Investment interest in the company has been consistent for some time although there has not been the same appreciation in stock value. Prices have been in a see-saw mood since the beginning of the year, trending

lower from a 1966 high of \$41 in January to \$39 recently. The 1965-66 high-low, \$41 to \$28.

The company spent about \$2 million last year, part of which included the building and equipping of a coil spring factory near the new General Motors of Canada, Ltd., plant at Ste. Thérèse.

Outlook for Ontario Steel under the agreement is said to be favorable. About 25 percent of production is being exported now. Three years ago all production was consumed domestically.

Kelsey Wheel Co. has been a favorite with analysts for some time. It spent more than \$6 million on capital projects in 1965. A new plant at Windsor was completed and further expansion of wheelmaking capacity is planned.

Net earnings for 6 months to February 28, 1966, were released this week. The results—\$254,174 (23 cents per common share) compared with \$472,332 (43 cents) in the same period of 1965—were poor.

However, the company warned some time ago that earnings for the period would be adversely affected by abnormal preproduction, startup and development costs on new equipment.

Kelsey is thought to be negotiating a deal that if successful could have major implications. About 50 percent of production is entering the United States at the moment.

Since the beginning of 1965 the high-low range has been \$19 1/4-\$10 1/4. A high of \$19 1/2 was reached in February this year. The price has weakened to \$17 1/4 recently.

S.K.D. Manufacturing Co., Amherstburg, Ont., is one of the few companies in the industry that is not a U.S. subsidiary. Consequently no helping hand can be expected. The second point is that the company manufacturers stampings and these are not expected to be in such demand since the major automakers in the U.S. do much of their own stamping.

However, S.K.D. is showing no misgivings. The company will complete a \$850,000 expansion in July which will provide a 20-percent increase in stamped steel capacity. Three new presses are to be added to existing plant. Shipments to the United States in the 1967 model year are expected to total 30 percent of capacity.

Prices have been a little weaker recently, moving down on low volume to \$8 3/4 this week from a 1966 high of \$10 last January. The 1965-66 high-low, \$10-\$5 1/2.

Ingersoll Machine & Tool Co. suffered an immediate setback. Steering box cutbacks will mean a loss of \$2 million. Although an order worth \$2 million for machined rocket warheads has since been received, it cannot be considered a continuing order.

The company's A shares rarely trade and have been at \$9 1/2 since the beginning of the year. The 1965-66 high-low is \$12-\$8.

Van Der Hout Associates, Ltd., Toronto, is making the most dramatic forecast of all—sales quadrupled by 1967.

The Toronto company is a distributor of automotive and electronic products. Consolidated sales for fiscal year ended August 31, 1965, were \$1.7 million; net profit was \$62,870, equivalent to 8 cents per common share. The company has a 49-percent interest in Gabriel of Canada Ltd., manufacturer of shock absorbers.

The stock, at a current price of \$2.80 sold at a 1966 high of \$3.50 last February. The 1965-66 high-low is \$1.10-\$3.50.

Toronto Iron Works, Ltd., annual report will be released shortly. Shareholders will probably be told of some fairly extensive expansion plans at that time.

But it's doubtful if such a prospect is behind the strength in the A stock.

When Wimco Industries (Eastern) Ltd., which owned 30 percent of Toronto Iron common shares, made an offer of \$50 per

share for the remainder last December, the Class A nonvoting stock—valued pari passu with the common for the past 20 years—seemed almost to have been cast into limbo.

The A shares were selling at \$24 3/4 last January. Since then there has been a steady appreciation. A high of \$34 1/2 was reached recently; midweek price was \$34.

The common was delisted earlier this month and A is now the only public means of participating in the company.

There was some speculation that Wimco eventually would have to make an offer for the A shares.

[Form AAB-2 (1-66)—Form Approved:
Budget Bureau No. 126 R-001]

AUTOMOTIVE AGREEMENT ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BOARD—PETITION FOR DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY TO APPLY FOR ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BY GROUP OF WORKERS (UNDER THE AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS TRADE ACT OF 1965)

For Government use only.

Date filed _____

Petition No. 6001.

General instructions: Each petition shall contain such information as will assist the U.S. Tariff Commission in its investigations and the Board in making the determinations required under the Automotive Act, relating to (a) whether the product which is the basis for the petition is an automotive product within the meaning of the act, (b) whether there is dislocation of a significant number or proportion of the workers, or a threat thereof, and (c) the role of the operation of the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement in causing such dislocation or threat thereof.

The regulations of the Board apply to this form. Copies of the regulations are available at the local State employment security

agency offices or may be obtained from the Board.

Return an original and three copies to: Chairman, Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board, in care of U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Section I. All questions in this section must be answered. (For additional instructions see last page.)

1. Petitioner (name and address):

(a) Person filing: Ken Bannon, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, telephone 926-5391.

(b) If petition filed by a union give name and address of union: International Union, UAW, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, telephone 926-5216. Affected local is No. 918; President Thomas Quinn, 922 Hunt Road, Newton Square, Pa. EL 6-3187.

(c) If petition is filed by a group of workers, other than a union, describe the group briefly and give the names and addresses of three members of the group.

2. Employer (name and address): Ford Motor Company, Delaware Valley Parts Depot, Post Office Box 816, Pennsauken, N.J., Route No. 130.

3. Automotive product: Name or describe the automotive product—i.e. the motor vehicle or fabricated component to be used as original equipment in the manufacture of motor vehicles—forming the basis for the petition. If the product is a part or component and if known, give the manufacturer's part number and indicate the make of the vehicle in which it is used. Packing and shipping for export of knocked down Ford cars and trucks.

4. Dislocation. If there were or are scheduled concentrations of dislocation on specific dates, indicate dates, and number of workers affected. If actual data are not available, make estimates and indicate the basis of each estimate.

Type	Date dislocation began or is threatened	Number of workers affected in establishment			
		Producing named article	Unemployed	Underemployed or working short weeks	Workers in other subdivisions unemployed because of lack of work in the affected subdivision
Actual dislocation	Dislocation will begin Jan. 28, 1966, and will be completed in February 1966.	Upon completion of dislocation 111 employees will be laid off from export operations.			Although only the export operations are being discontinued, seniority is plantwide so that employees from all parts of the depot will be laid off. Approximately 20 employees will be laid off from operations other than export.

(b) If the dislocation noted in 4a involves a layoff, indicate the type of layoff: Permanent ; indefinite ; or definite for a duration of — weeks.

5. Basis of petition: Describe fully the basis for your belief that the operation of the U.S.-Canadian Automotive Agreement has been a factor in causing, or threatening to cause, the dislocation. Include or attach all available evidence.

In a memorandum of November 19, 1965 (copy attached) the Company announced that it was discontinuing the export operations (packaging knocked down cars and trucks for export) at its Delaware Valley Parts Depot. At a meeting on December 6, 1965, in Detroit, Company representatives advised the Union that the export operations were being transferred to Ford of Canada, Ltd., from where they would be contracted out to a firm located in Tilsonburg, Ontario. The Company subsequently advised the Union that the knocked down cars and trucks will continue to be manufactured in the United States, but will be shipped to Tilsonburg for export packing and shipping. This arrangement was made eco-

nominally advantageous by the Automotive Trade Act's elimination of the tariff which previously would have to have been paid on the parts going into Canada.

Section II. The information requested in this section will be helpful in processing the petition. If the answers are not known, write "Do not know" in the appropriate space.

6. Firm name and address: Name and address of principal office of firm: Ford Motor Company, the American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

7. Competing products: To the extent known, name or describe any other automotive products directly competitive with the product described in Question 3. Knocked down cars and trucks produced by other automobile manufacturers.

8. Employment: Enter the average number of employees in the establishment, or appropriate subdivision, for each year since 1963 and for the most recent 6 months. If the annual data do not cover a calendar year, indicate the period actually covered. If the estimates are used in place of actual data, indicate the basis for each estimate.

Products involved	Number of workers				
	Annual				
	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
All products.....		350	325	-----	276
Named automotive product.....		308	283	-----	234

¹ We do not have monthly figures for past 6 months.

NOTE.—If more detail is available indicating employment devoted to production of the automotive product as original equipment as compared with employment devoted to production of the same product for use other than as original equipment (including replacement) supply this data below or as an attachment. Except for the named Automotive Product (parts for export), some of the parts handled in the Delaware Valley Parts Depot are for replacement and some are for original equipment. The named Automotive Parts are all for use as original equipment.

Section III. This section must be filled in and the original signed.

9. Public hearing: Do you desire a public hearing before the U.S. Tariff Commission as part of its factual investigation? Yes [] no [X].

I certify that I have read this petition, that to the best of my knowledge and belief the statements contained herein are correct and complete, and that I am authorized by and on behalf of the group of workers, to file and sign this petition.

KEN BANNON,
Board Member-at-Large and Director,
National Ford Department, Interna-
tional Union, UAW.

JANUARY 27, 1966.

INTRA-COMPANY COMMUNICATION
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,
FORD DIVISION,
November 19, 1965.

To the Hourly Employees of the Delaware Valley Parts Depot.

After long and careful study the management of the Company has decided to discontinue its CKD packaging operations at the Delaware Valley Parts Depot. This will not affect the service stock functions at the Depot which will continue.

Unfortunately it will be necessary in connection with the CKD discontinuance to lay off a number of hourly employees at the Depot. No layoffs resulting from this partial discontinuance of operations will take place until sometime after the first of the year, however.

The Company will offer employment opportunities to affected hourly employees at other Ford Motor Company locations, and will be discussing such opportunities with your collective bargaining representatives. In addition, the application to eligible hourly employees of various Company benefit plans will be reviewed with you and your Union representatives at an early date.

The transitional period ending with the final discontinuance of the CKD operations will be difficult for Depot employees and management alike. I know that all of you will continue to provide the high degree of cooperation of which the Depot has been justly proud since its inception eight years ago.

R. W. LEMMER.

AUTOMOTIVE AGREEMENT ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BOARD—SUMMARY OF FINAL DETERMINATIONS AND NOTICE OF CERTIFICATION—PETITION FOR ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BY CERTAIN WORKERS OF THE FORD MOTOR COMPANY, PENNSAUKEN, N.J.

DETERMINATIONS OF THE BOARD

On the basis of the information available to it, the Automotive Agreement Adjustment

Assistance Board determines pursuant to the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 that—

Dislocation of workers in the Delaware Valley Parts Depot of the Ford Motor Company has occurred or threatens to occur since, beginning November 19, 1965, a significant number or proportion of the workers have become or will become unemployed.

The operation of the United States-Canadian Automotive Products Agreement has been the primary factor in causing, or threatening to cause, such dislocation (Section 302, Act; Section 501.9, Board Regulations).

CERTIFICATION

The Board hereby certifies that the workers of the Delaware Valley Parts Depot at Pennsauken, N.J., who became, or who will become, unemployed or underemployed, on or after November 19, 1965, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

BACKGROUND

A petition for a determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance was filed with the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board on February 4, 1966, by the United Automobile Workers International Union, on behalf of Local 918, a group of workers of the Ford Motor Company at the Delaware Valley Parts Depot in Pennsauken, N.J. This petition was filed under the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965. The petition alleged, in effect, that the group of workers was threatened with unemployment as a result of a decision of the Ford Motor Company to transfer the packaging and shipping for export of knocked-down Ford cars and trucks from its Pennsauken Depot to Canada, and that the operation of the United States-Canadian automotive agreement was the primary factor threatening to cause such unemployment.

On February 8, 1966, the Automotive Assistance Committee of the Board requested the United States Tariff Commission to conduct an investigation with respect to the facts relating to this petition. On February 10, 1966, the Commission issued public notice of receipt of the request and institution of the investigation (31 F.R. 2741, February 15, 1966). The Commission did not order a public hearing in conjunction with the investigation; the petitioners did not request such a hearing, nor did any other interested party.

The Commission submitted its report on this investigation on March 30, 1966 (APTA-W-1). As stated by the Commission in its public announcement with respect to this report, virtually all of the information in the report consists of material received in confidence, and, therefore, the report would not be made public (31 F.R. 5337, April 2, 1966).

In addition to the information obtained from the Tariff Commission report, the Board also obtained advice from the Departments of the Treasury, Commerce, Labor, and the Small Business Administration under Section 302 (f) (1) of the Act.

No interested persons, nor any others, made written submissions to the Board or requested opportunity to present their views orally, subsequent to the date the Tariff Commission made its public announcement of the completion of the investigation and

the submission of the report to the Board (Section 501.11, Board Regulations).

CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 the Board considered the following:

Automotive product

The workers must be in a firm which produces an automotive product as defined by the Act. The petitioners are or were employees of the Ford Motor Company, which produces such automotive products. The majority of the petitioners worked preparing certain "knocked-down" cars and trucks for export. "Knocked-down" vehicles (KD) consist of a group of original equipment parts comprising components for a motor vehicle and which are shipped together to another location for final assembly into a motor vehicle. Accordingly, the requirements of Sections 302 (a) (2) and 302 (1) (1) are satisfied.

Actual or threatened dislocation

Unemployment or underemployment, or threatened unemployment or underemployment, must affect a significant number or proportion of the workers of a firm or appropriate subdivision thereof. Significant number or proportion of workers means in most cases 5 percent of the workers or 50 workers in a firm (or appropriate subdivision thereof), whichever is less (Sections 302 (b) (1) and 302 (1) (2) (B), Act; Section 501.2 (1) (2), Board Regulations). On November 19, 1965 the Ford Motor Company announced that it had decided to discontinue the export packing activity at the Delaware Valley Parts Depot. As the Commission points out, export packaging, previously done at the Depot, would henceforth be performed in Canada. This transfer has resulted in the dislocation of a significant number and proportion of workers from the Depot. Between November 19, 1965, when the threat of dislocation occurred, and March 8, 1966, the number of hourly employees at the Delaware Valley Parts Depot declined by more than 50 percent and almost 200 workers.

The Tariff Commission report states that the majority of the petitioning group of workers had been employed by the Ford Motor Company at the Pennsauken Depot in the distinct activity of export packaging (KD) automotive components to be assembled into vehicles in various overseas locations. This Depot also had responsibility for supplying parts for some domestic Ford customers. The Board is of the opinion that "bumping" of employees among the activities of the Depot makes the entire Depot the appropriate subdivision of the Ford Motor Company for considering dislocation and certification. Accordingly, the requirements with respect to dislocation are met.

Role of the operation of the agreement

The Board was unable to determine whether the economic criteria specified in Section 302(b) of the Act were met. The Commission found it impractical, due to the multiplicity of products involved, to obtain data appropriate for such purpose within the time for this investigation. In this case, therefore, the Board considered whether the operation of the Agreement has nevertheless been the primary factor in causing or threatening to cause the dislocation (Section 302(d), Act). Primary factor means a factor which is greater in importance than any other single factor present in a given case, but which does not have to be greater than any combination of other factors (Section 501.2(j), Board Regulations).

The Act (Section 302(1)(4)) defines "operation of the Agreement" to include governmental or private actions in the United States or Canada directly related to the conclusion or implementation of the Agreement. This definition is intended to permit consideration of the economic effects of the

arrangements concluded between the Canadian Government and automotive vehicle manufacturers in Canada.¹

The Ford Motor Company of Canada entered into such an arrangement by a series of letters in January 1965.² One of the more important commitments is an undertaking by Ford to increase its expenditures for Canadian material, services, labor, and capital by Can. \$74 million by the 1968 model year. The Board notes that the expenditures for operating the KD activity in Canada will constitute a significant portion of the Ford commitment. In addition, the transfer may provide the opportunity to Ford for some savings in operating costs.

The Board concludes that the opportunity to meet a significant portion of the commitment to the Government of Canada was the compelling circumstance in the Ford Company's final decision to transfer the export packing operation from the Delaware Valley Parts Depot in New Jersey to Canada. The Board, therefore, determines that the operation of the Agreement has been the primary factor in causing or threatening to cause the dislocation of workers at the Depot.

(Section 302, Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965, 79 Stat. 1018, E. O. 11254, 30 F.R. 13569, the Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board Regulations, 48 CFR, Part 501; 31 F.R. 827; and Board Order No. 1, 31 F.R. 853.)

APRIL 14, 1966.

[Form AAB-2 (1-66)—Form Approved:
Budget Bureau No. 126 R-001]

AUTOMOTIVE AGREEMENT ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BOARD—PETITION FOR DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY TO APPLY FOR ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BY GROUP OF WORKERS (UNDER THE AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS TRADE ACT OF 1965)

For Government use only.

Date filed _____

Petition No. 6-002.

General instructions: Each petition shall contain such information as will assist the U.S. Tariff Commission in its investigations and the Board in making the determinations required under the Automotive Act, relating to (a) whether the product which is the basis for the petition is an automotive product within the meaning of the act, (b) whether there is this dislocation of a significant number or proportion of the workers, or a threat thereof, and (c) the role of the operation of the United States-Canadian Automotive Agreement in causing such dislocation or threat thereof:

The regulations of the Board apply to this form. Copies of the regulations are available at the local State employment security agency offices or may be obtained from the Board.

Return an original and three copies to: Chairman, Automotive Agreement Adjustment Assistance Board, in care of U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Section I. All questions in this section must be answered. (For additional instructions see last page.)

1. Petitioner (name and address):

(a) Person filing: Leonard Woodcock, 8000 East Jefferson, Detroit, Mich., Telephone 926-5301.

(b) If petition filed by a union give name and address of union: International Union, UAW (same address and telephone number as in (a)). The affected Local Union is No. 1231-215 Sheldon SE, Grand Rapids, Mich., President, Frank Mills, Telephones GL8-2919; GL8-9903.

¹ House Report No. 537 (Committee on Ways and Means), 89th Congress, 1st session, on H.R. 9042, p. 26.

² Copies appear among other places in Appendix C of House Report No. 537.

(c) If petition is filed by a group of workers, other than a union, describe the group briefly and give the names and addresses of three members of the group _____

2. Employer (name and address): General Motors Corporation, Fisher Body Plant No. 2, 2060 Vorhees NW, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

3. Automotive product: Name or describe the automotive product—i.e. the motor vehicle or fabricated component to be used as original equipment in the manufacture of motor vehicles—forming the basis for the

petition. If the product is a part of component and if known, give the manufacturer's part number and indicate the make of the vehicle in which it is used. Interior soft trim for Chevy II and Chevelle.

4. Dislocation: If there were or are scheduled concentrations of dislocation on specific dates, indicate dates, and number of workers affected. If actual data are not available, make estimates and indicate the basis of each estimate.

Type	Date dislocation began or is threatened	Number of workers affected in establishment		
		Producing named article		Workers in other subdivisions unemployed because of lack of work in the affected subdivision
		Unemployed	Underemployed or working short weeks	
Actual dislocation	August to December 1965	770	-----	330 (inspectors, checker-trim, material control, and maintenance).

(b) If the dislocation noted in 4a involves a layoff, indicate the type of layoff: Permanent ; indefinite ; or definite for a duration of _____ weeks.

5. Basis of petition: Describe fully the basis for your belief that the operation of the U.S.-Canadian Automotive Agreement has been a factor in causing, or threatening to cause, the dislocation. Include or attach all available evidence.

Prior to the coming into effect of the Agreement, GM supplied its assembly plants, American and Canadian, with interior soft trim for all Chevrolet models from the Fisher Body Plant No. 2 in Grand Rapids. Since the Agreement the production of interior soft trim for Chevy II and Chevelle models have been moved from Fisher Body Plant No. 2 to a new cut and sew plant in Windsor, Ontario. From the new Windsor plant GM now supplies all Chevy II and Chevelle interior soft trim formerly produced at Plant No. 2 to the American and Canadian plants that assemble these two lines of cars. This move was made because GM finds it cheaper to manufacture the soft trim in Canada, at the lower wage rates that prevail there, and ship it to assembly plants in the United States, now that it can cross the border duty free.

Section II. The information requested in this section will be helpful in processing the petition. If the answers are not known, write "Do Not Know" in the appropriate space.

6. Firm name and address: Name and address of principal office of firm: General Motors Corporation, General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.

7. Competing products: To the extent known, name or describe any other automotive products directly competitive with the product described in Question 3. Interior soft trim manufactured by the other automobile manufacturers.

8. Employment: Enter the average number of employees in the establishment, or appropriate subdivision, for each year since 1963 and for the most recent 6 months. If the annual data do not cover a calendar year, indicate the period actually covered. If the estimates are used in place of actual data, indicate the basis for each estimate.

Products involved	Number of workers (annual)				
	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
All products	1,785	1,952	2,425	-----	-----
Named automotive product	892	976	1,212	-----	-----

NOTE.—If more detail is available indicating employment devoted to production of the

automotive product as original equipment as compared with employment devoted to production of the same product for use other than as original equipment (including replacement) supply this data below or as an attachment. Some of the production of the Automotive Product noted above is for replacement, but we do not know how much.

Section III. This section must be filled in and the original signed.

9. Public hearing: Do you desire a public hearing before the U.S. Tariff Commission as part of its factual investigation? Yes No .

I certify that I have read this petition, that to the best of my knowledge and belief the statements contained herein are correct and complete, and that I am authorized by and on behalf of the group of workers to file and sign this petition.

LEONARD WOODCOCK,
Vice President and Director,
General Motors Department.

APRIL 12, 1966.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 14, 1966]

MONTREAL.—Canada's growth outpaces the U.S. rate as trade deals bear fruit.

Canada's gross national product expanded 6½ percent in real terms last year, compared with a 5½ percent U.S. gain. Capital spending climbs at a 20 percent annual rate, outstripping the robust 16 percent U.S. rise. A smaller percentage of Canadian than American workers are jobless and wages grow three times as fast. Canadian exports have risen 45 percent in 5 years; the U.S. gain was 35 percent.

Trade with both cold war camps promotes Canadian prosperity. Big wheat contracts with Red China, Russia, and East European nations promise prairie province farmers good times until at least 1968, barring crop failure. Canadian auto output runs 13 percent above last year, while U.S. production lags 6 percent, as more Canadian-built cars are shipped to the United States under last year's U.S.-Canadian automotive "free trade" deal. A 90 percent gain in automotive shipments to the United States in 1965 over 1964 helped make manufactured goods Canada's fastest growing export.

Although the United States has 10 times the population of Canada and nearly 15 times the GNP, it is only three to four times larger in foreign trade.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if no further business remains, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate stand adjourned until noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 16, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 12, 1966:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Bertrand M. Harding, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

U.S. MARSHAL

Roland S. Mosher, of Arizona, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Arizona for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

James E. McGlamery, Elmore, Ala., in place of R. H. Reid, retired.

Relfe S. Pruitt, Seale, Ala., in place of L. V. Burch, retired.

James L. Shurett, Shawmut, Ala., in place of L. D. Strother, retired.

ALASKA

Eldor R. Lee, Petersburg, Alaska, in place of R. F. Brennan, retired.

ARIZONA

Joe E. Babcock, Fort Huachuca, Ariz., in place of N. I. Freihage, retired.

Norman G. Massey, Lakeside, Ariz., in place of F. A. Johnson, retired.

E. J. Foutz, Teec Nos Pos, Ariz., in place of K. E. Bradshaw, resigned.

Arnold R. Elias, Tucson, Ariz., in place of H. B. Collins, retired.

ARKANSAS

Charles T. Bryan, Gurdon, Ark., in place of L. E. Pruitt, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Wilbur S. Gram, El Cerrito, Calif., in place of C. F. Malling, deceased.

J. Edmund Culver, King City, Calif., in place of R. J. Briggs, retired.

William J. Askew, Lower Lake, Calif., in place of E. L. Layton, retired.

Edward F. Harrington, San Luis Obispo, Calif., in place of W. C. O'Donnell, retired.

COLORADO

Harold D. Jackson, Rye, Colo., in place of J. G. Bell, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Richard J. Marks, Norwich, Conn., in place of W. P. Moran, retired.

FLORIDA

Ray A. Hilliard, Geneva, Fla., in place of J. L. Brown, retired.

GEORGIA

James B. Young, Clermont, Ga., in place of M. H. Reynolds, retired.

Thomas L. Exley, Springfield, Ga., in place of L. D. Morgan, deceased.

IDAHO

Joseph W. Ebberts, Challis, Idaho, in place of E. I. Clark, retired.

ILLINOIS

William L. Sinnott, Adair, Ill., in place of R. L. Douglass, retired.

Bernie J. Cassidy, Cabery, Ill., in place of R. M. Miller, retired.

James N. Carner, Carriers Mills, Ill., in place of Elbert McDonald, retired.

Richard E. Dixon, Monticello, Ill., in place of F. H. Pembroke, retired.

Marjorie E. Scott, Olympia Fields, Ill., in place of W. S. Stamper, retired.

INDIANA

Jack E. Sprague, Angola, Ind., in place of R. L. Ridenour, retired.

Ruth M. Sutton, Hemlock, Ind., in place of H. S. Duncan, retired.

John E. Lansinger, Knightstown, Ind., in place of R. R. Morgan, retired.

Donald H. Owens, Mexico, Ind., in place of B. W. Postill, retired.

Harold D. Bowman, Roann, Ind., in place of R. B. Flinn, retired.

Charles H. Martindale, Solsberry, Ind., in place of D. F. McGuire, resigned.

IOWA

Raymond F. Weber, Fairbank, Iowa, in place of J. F. Rechkemmer, deceased.

William J. Dohrer, Rudd, Iowa, in place of L. F. Clay, deceased.

Lars C. Larson, Woden, Iowa, in place of P. L. Smith, transferred.

KANSAS

Francis J. O'Leary, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., in place of W. J. Lyons, Jr., retired.

Morris T. Bowker, Ogden, Kans., in place of K. A. Blasing, retired.

Robert Shove, Onaga, Kans., in place of L. C. Irwin, retired.

Marie E. Vickers, Pratt, Kans., in place of H. R. Brickel, retired.

KENTUCKY

Clarence F. Jones, Grand River, Ky., in place of N. B. Jones, retired.

Robert O. Lanier, Kevil, Ky., in place of M. E. Johnson, retired.

LOUISIANA

Robert O. McClung, Homer, La., in place of V. M. Robert, retired.

MAINE

Delbert H. Spinney, Eliot, Maine, in place of C. G. Davis, deceased.

Claude A. Cyr, Fort Kent, Maine, in place of E. G. Labbee, retired.

MARYLAND

C. Alvin Sanger, Cordova, Md., in place of P. M. Roe, deceased.

William C. Norris, Jr., Forest Hill, Md., in place of W. S. Nagle, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Dorothy L. Connolly, Dunstable, Mass., in place of E. L. Naylor, deceased.

Philip E. Sullivan, East Pepperell, Mass., in place of I. S. Leary, retired.

Robert Connell, Forge Village, Mass., in place of J. M. Connell, retired.

P. Joseph Murphy, Hudson, Mass., in place of M. L. Hunt, retired.

Antone L. Silva, New Bedford, Mass., in place of J. J. Gobell, deceased.

Martin T. Ready, Winchendon, Mass., in place of J. J. Hunt, Jr., retired.

MICHIGAN

Frank P. Luta, Bridgeport, Mich., in place of K. E. Warner, deceased.

Robert P. Fritz, Gaylord, Mich., in place of H. J. Lynch, retired.

Laverne F. Cole, Grant, Mich., in place of E. M. Grille, deceased.

Elmer A. Ellis, L'Anse, Mich., in place of J. B. Harrington, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Frank E. Biniek, Bowlus, Minn., in place of T. S. Barton, retired.

Joseph E. Frankovich, Chisholm, Minn., in place of J. W. Kangas, retired.

Richard E. Reiland, Rollingstone, Minn., in place of L. J. Reiland, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Hugh J. McGraw, Yazoo City, Miss., in place of J. C. Lamkin, retired.

MISSOURI

Harold R. Warren, Climax Springs, Mo., in place of O. L. Warren, retired.

NEBRASKA

Leonard H. Pelo, Johnstown, Nebr., in place of R. C. Olson, retired.

Cecil G. Hutt, Lexington, Nebr., in place of G. W. Lincoln, retired.

Mildred M. Green, McCool Junction, Nebr., in place of L. L. Valentine, retired.

Opal K. Reese, Pleasanton, Nebr., in place of B. A. Reese, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

George S. Downer, Hampton, N.H., in place of S. A. Towle, retired.

Wallace A. Putnam, New Ipswich, N.H., in place of G. G. Helsberg, retired.

Raymond B. Brooks, Ossipee, N.H., in place of N. E. Vittum, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Rachel B. Hill, Cape May Point, N.J., in place of R. N. Gerew, retired.

Howard F. Haas, Cherry Hill, N.J. Office established May 21, 1965.

NEW MEXICO

John H. Phillips, Truth or Consequences, N. Mex., in place of J. D. Tafoya, retired.

NEW YORK

Blake F. Winter, Cicero, N.Y., in place of D. G. Mooney, resigned.

Harold T. Zwick, Crompond, N.Y., in place of M. A. Davis, deceased.

Kerlin R. Farwell, Cuba, N.Y., in place of G. L. Dye, retired.

Shirley A. Marshall, Hemlock, N.Y., in place of D. D. Smith, resigned.

Leo J. Soricelli, Peekskill, N.Y., in place of James Boylan, retired.

Edward S. Nowicki, Warsaw, N.Y., in place of T. J. Reilly, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Iva E. Hampton, Coinjock, N.C., in place of P. T. Woodard, retired.

W. Marvin Worrell, Jr., Como, N.C., in place of M. B. Railey, retired.

Nancy C. Blue, Jackson Springs, N.C., in place of L. A. Carter, retired.

Joe D. Thompson, Mooresville, N.C., in place of B. A. Houston, retired.

Thomas W. Galloway, Rosman, N.C., in place of W. J. Moore, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Donald R. Holler, Drayton, N. Dak., in place of V. H. Carlson, retired.

Vesta M. Schultz, Glen Ullin, N. Dak., in place of P. V. Hermes, retired.

OHIO

John D. Woosley, Camden, Ohio, in place of H. Q. Overholser, retired.

Lillian H. Harbaugh, Clinton, Ohio, in place of H. G. Caseniser, retired.

Herman A. Clarke, Crown City, Ohio, in place of Julia Garlic, retired.

William E. Smith, Deshler, Ohio, in place of J. W. Watson, deceased.

Francis E. Szollosi, Toledo, Ohio, in place of J. M. Tertel, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Herman D. Jones, Burlington, Okla., in place of P. M. Alder, retired.

Homer H. Wyssmann, Fairmont, Okla., in place of D. E. Harris, transferred.

J. Freeman Parker, Ochelata, Okla., in place of E. M. Morrison, retired.

Billy R. Robertson, Sand Springs, Okla., in place of J. H. Bryant, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

George W. Shuman, Elizabethtown, Pa., in place of B. L. Ream, retired.
 Joseph J. Drake, Hawley, Pa., in place of R. J. Drake, deceased.
 Ubaldo V. Pambianco, Peckville, Pa., in place of Benjamin Shaute, retired.
 Jennie S. Workman, Six Mile Run, Pa., in place of M. W. Workman, deceased.

PUERTO RICO

Luis I. Lugo-Mercado, San Antonio, P.R., in place of Angel Vargas, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Alvia Sanders, Clearwater, S.C., in place of W. H. Faddis, retired.
 John W. McDill, Due West, S.C., in place of R. E. Young, retired.
 Eddie L. Moore, Rembert, S.C., in place of L. R. McLeod, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Signe K. Loseth, Roslyn, S. Dak., in place of H. M. Baukol, retired.

TENNESSEE

Lucile M. Rowland, Del Rio, Tenn., in place of R. L. Ford, retired.

TEXAS

William M. Johnson, Jr., Alta Loma, Tex., in place of J. C. Rush, retired.
 Jack G. Hunt, Kosse, Tex., in place of B. O. Jones, transferred.
 Billie M. Wight, Somerville, Tex., in place of C. V. Welch, retired.

UTAH

Marjorie A. Predovich, Dragerton, Utah, in place of A. E. Scow, retired.

VERMONT

Donald R. Devarney, Milton, Vt., in place of I. M. Barrett, retired.
 Doris C. Kendall, Reading, Vt., in place of E. B. Wilkins, retired.

VIRGINIA

Ralph P. Hawkins, Tazewell, Va., in place of H. L. Buston, Jr., retired.

WASHINGTON

Betty J. Hages, Easton, Wash., in place of Ruby Grandstaff, retired.
 Charles H. Nash, Friday Harbor, Wash., in place of W. A. Arend, retired.

John C. Hafstad, Oakesdale, Wash., in place of L. A. Winn, deceased.

Melvin W. Schauerman, Odessa, Wash., in place of H. F. Ottestad, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Etta M. Aulabaugh, Hancock, W. Va., in place of E. P. Clark, retired.

WISCONSIN

Joseph C. Forgie, Oconto, Wis., in place of W. L. Chesley, resigned.

WYOMING

Edward D. Storrs, Alcova, Wyo., in place of W. C. Cardwell, retired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following Air Force officers for appointment as permanent professors, U.S. Air Force Academy, under the provisions of section 9333 (b), title 10, United States Code:

Alfred F. Hurley, XXXXXXX.

Jesse C. Gatlin, Jr., XXXXXXX.

Anthony J. Mione, XXXXXXX.

The following cadets, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment to the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Ahern, John Joseph, Jr.

Ainsworth, James Sterling IV

Albertson, Fred Woodward, Jr.

Allen, Jerrold Park.

Allen, John Joseph.

Almand, Larry Madison.

Amels, Bernard John
 Anderson, Parker John
 Andrade, Martin Glen
 Andrews, Franklin Joe
 Andrews, Victor Charles
 Anthony, Ron Alan
 Apgar, Robert Colin
 Arnold, Colin Boone
 Ashton, William Bradford
 Akyroyd, Geoffrey Barr
 Bagley, Larry Carl
 Bailey, Edward Par, Jr.
 Baker, Carl Laverne
 Barnard, Milton Carlton III
 Bauer, John Evans
 Beatty, Jerry Lee
 Becker, Gerald Ernst
 Bennett, Martin Patrick
 Berkley, Howard Dutcher III
 Berls, George Otto
 Bernstein, Alfred Michael, Jr.
 Berry, William Geary, Jr.
 Bethurem, Richard C.
 Bevacqua, Michael Edmond
 Bielo, Edward Julius
 Bingham, Price Tompkins
 Blaess, Edward Meredith
 Blair, Michael Irwin
 Blake, Ronald Lee
 Blitt, William J.
 Blumberg, Andrey Imants
 Boatright, Ronald Lee
 Boehringer, Kenneth Fred
 Boney, James Stokes
 Boone, Robert Kenneth
 Borowski, Richard Alan
 Botts, Mason Saunders
 Bove, Anthony Joseph, Jr.
 Bowen, William Garland
 Bowers, Robert Joseph
 Boyd, Stanley Eugene
 Bracy, Ronald Layne
 Bradley, Paul Fisher
 Brandon, Thomas Scott
 Brooks, Ronald Scott
 Brost, Robert Nathaniel
 Brown, Timothy Dean
 Bruce, Philip Warren
 Brunner, Gary Edward
 Buck, Walter Herbert
 Bulkeley, Michael Clare
 Burroughs, Paul Norman
 Bush, John Robert
 Callahan, Jerry Bairn
 Cannon, George Edward, Jr.
 Caplick, Paul Joseph
 Carlson, Kent Richard
 Carlson, Randal David
 Carr, Thomas Eames II
 Carroll, Joel Allen III
 Carson, James Matthew
 Casper, John Howard
 Cecil, Daniel Byron
 Charles, Michael
 Cheeseman, Alan Browne
 Christian, Charles Britton, Jr.
 Clements, Manen Oscio
 Cloar, Robert Ross
 Closson, Luke Eldridge, Jr.
 Cogley, Jesse William III
 Connors, Michael John
 Conrad, John Cosley, Jr.
 Conver, Stephen Kay
 Cook, Ivy Dewey, Jr.
 Cook, Richard Paul
 Cook, Wendell L.
 Craigie, Donald Field
 Cree, Richard Wiley, Jr.
 Crist, Kenneth Roy
 Crist, Neil Barry
 Cross, Stephen Dennis
 Crotteau, David Arthur
 Culpepper, Donnie Dale
 D'Benedetto, Carl A.
 Daack, Martin Thomas
 Dakins, James Michael
 Daniels, Henry Spencer
 Darrell, Wesley Kenneth
 Daskevich, Joseph Ronald
 Davis, Joseph Ronald
 DeMatte, Eugene Mario
 Denny, Gerald Ryan II
 Detwiler, Ross Craig
 DiBello, Edward George
 Dibb, Phillip Allen
 Dixon, Cornelius Warren III
 Dopler, Bruce Allan
 Doyle, Thomas Hankins
 Dozier, James Kenneth, Jr.
 Dudley, Lynton Charles
 Dunham, Robert Lanson, Jr.
 Dunn, Ben Garvin
 Dunne, William Edward
 Dunshee, Robert Burdette
 Dyer, John Curtis
 Earley, William Hugh
 Eddy, Lucian Bruce, Jr.
 Egge, Arthur Geoffrey
 Eglington, Gary Scott
 Eisler, Steven Lee
 Elliott, Dale Stanley
 Estrada, Carlos Alberto, Jr.
 Estus, Robert Carlisle, Jr.
 Eubank, William Emanuel III
 Evans, Robert Michael, Jr.
 Faix, Joseph Lee
 Fal, John William
 Fales, David Patrick
 Fegan, James Robert
 Figueroa, Edmund Lyle
 Finan, George Keith II
 Finch, Louis Charles
 Flink, Dennis Edwin
 Foley, Robert Edward
 Fornal, Andrew Robert
 Fowler, Raymond Dale
 Fritzsch, Ralph Burry
 Fuller, Charles Thomas
 Funkhouser, Kenneth V.
 Gaffney, Michael Woodward
 Galas, David John
 Galer, Robert Tipton
 Gardner, Phillip Duane
 Gardner, Richard Ernest
 Garland, James Edward, Jr.
 Gault, Richard Stanley
 Gideon, Francis Clare, Jr.
 Godfrey, William Randall
 Golas, Michael Terry
 Golbitz, William Charles
 Gommel, Hugh Eugene, Jr.
 Gooden, Tobe Dean
 Gough, Jamie III
 Gourley, Laurent Lee
 Govett, William Roger
 Grabe, Ronald John
 Graham, John David
 Gravelle, Robert Michael
 Grozier, John Lyman
 Gubser, Burlyn Ross, Jr.
 Guckert, Thomas Grover
 Guenther, Thomas George
 Guido, Richard Lawrence
 Guido, Robert Vincent
 Gundy, Ronald Lee
 Hacker, Kenneth John
 Hallenbeck, Don Michael
 Hamernick, James Leonard
 Hamm, William James
 Harold, Francis Bernard
 Harris, James Durley
 Hatchett, Ronald Lester
 Hauge, Robert Steven
 Hausam, Donald Leroy
 Heenan, Michael Edward
 Heitman, William Harry
 Heitz, Daniel Lee
 Hernandez, James Frank
 Hess, Frederick William, Jr.
 Hess, James Lawrence
 Hetrick, Robert Charles
 Higgins, Clark Worthen, Jr.
 Higgins, Terry Bruce
 Higham, James Lowry
 Hilker, Richard Peter
 Hnat, James Gabriel
 Hoffman, Gary Carr
 Hogan, William Walter, Jr.
 Hogle, Guy Otis, Jr.
 Hoh, Robert Henry
 Hohwiesner, William Henry
 Hollinger, William Boykin, Jr.

Holmes, Douglas Irving, Jr.
 Hoogerland, David Lee
 Houghtaling, Michael Allen
 Housel, Herschel Charles
 Howard, William Harrison Furlong
 Howard, William James Robert
 Hudspeth, William Edmond
 Hurst, Joseph Charles
 Icke, Harold James
 Iversen, Judd Casey
 Jaeger, Jan Bruce
 Jahnke, Robert Ernst
 Jamrosy, Thomas Edward
 Janco, Robert Lewis
 Janecky, John Franklin
 Jarvis, Jefferson James
 Jarvis, Joe Howard
 Jayne, Edward Randolph II
 Johnson, Gary Michael
 Johnson, Howard Conwell, Jr.
 Johnson, P. W., Jr.
 Johnston, Peter Anthony
 Jones, William Hoke
 Kasparian, A. Frank
 Keeley, David Michael
 Kehoe, Nicholas Bernard III
 Keiser, Thomas Wesley
 Kelley, Wayne, Jr.
 Kelly, Michael Kenneth
 Kennedy, Charles Arthur
 Kennedy, Michael Prentiss
 Kincaid, Thomas Edward
 King, Walter Raymond
 Koen, Lyle Dorsey
 Kollner, Charles Michael
 Kontrick, Alvin Andrew
 Kopf, Christopher Robert
 Koster, Charles Richard
 Kramer, Earl Bain
 Krug, Kurt Maurice
 Kunz, John Walter
 Kuzniak, George
 Lacy, Louis
 Lantz, Paul L.
 Lanzlotta, Nicholas Mark
 Larson, Daniel Francis
 Lauger, Larry Michael
 Law, James Edward
 Le Van, Jay Edwin, Jr.
 Ledbetter, Lamar Edward, Jr.
 Lee, Richard William
 Leek, Warren John
 Leib, Thomas Lee, Jr.
 Lelipe, David Lee
 Lewis, James Franklin, Jr.
 Leydorf, William Francis, Jr.
 Lichtenwalter, Homer Otis III
 Lindberg, Eric Kent
 Liona, Walter Joseph
 Loeffler, Murray William, Jr.
 Lord, Kenneth Charles
 Lowe, Buford Lee III
 Lundholm, Larry Alden
 Lupini, Robert Glenn
 Lyle, William Franklin, Jr.
 Macherione, Daniel
 Maier, Dennis Allan
 Maiorca, John Patrick
 Manning, Henry William
 Marcrander, David Bryce
 Marcucci, Michael Guido
 Markham, Thomas Orr
 Maron, John Michael
 Marshall, John Calhoun
 Martin, Michael
 Maybee, John Dallas
 McBride, Gerald Bruce
 McBroome, John Joseph
 McClannan, Herbert
 McClure, Alan Robert
 McConn, Richard Dean
 McCord, Marland Irwin, Jr.
 McCormick, Larry Don
 McCormick, William James
 McDougall, Fritz Joseph
 McElvain, Kevin Lawrence
 McGfalls, John Olin III
 McGarrity, Raymond Hilton
 McLean, Daniel Paul
 McMahon, Joseph Patrick, Jr.
 McNamara, Robert Andrew, Jr.

Meadows, James Edgar
 Mestemaker, Robert Joseph II
 Meyer, Alfred Michael
 Michels, William Lee
 Milberg, Raymond Fredrick
 Monogan, Stephen Jay
 Moncrief, Rehn Matthe
 Moon, Jesse Morris III
 Moore, Lewis Ten Eyck
 Morey, Ronald Leonard
 Morgan, Howard William, Jr.
 Morelli, Peter Edward
 Morrison, Russell Cowan, Jr.
 Mosley, Ronald Arthur, Jr.
 Mossbrook, David William
 Mravak, Thomas Anthony
 Mrozek, Jerry Lee
 Mueh, Hans Juergen
 Mullen, James Harry
 Munch, Thomas Christopher
 Murphy, James Mannion
 Myers, Wayne Arthur
 Nader, Alfred Harris, Jr.
 Nangle, James Thomas
 Narsavage, Joseph Martin, Jr.
 Nash, Peter Robert
 Nenninger, William Paul
 Newton, James Allen, Jr.
 Nichols, James Richard
 Nielsen, Reese Robert
 O'Brien, Patrick William
 O'Connor, Lawrence Joseph
 O'Donnell, Terrence
 O'Leary, Patrick Francis
 Oakes, David
 Oliver, Richard James
 Ollila, John Lyle
 Olschner, Clarence Edmond, III
 Orlowski, Joseph Michael
 Ostrozny, Norbert Joseph
 Paine, George Francis
 Palmer, Gary Thomas
 Parmentier, Michael Anthony
 Parsons, James Henry
 Parsons, Rick N.
 Patrick, Daniel Kaye
 Patterson, James, III
 Perry, Glenn Myers, II
 Peshut, Samuel
 Petersen, Edward Alfred, III
 Potter, Gary Cleveland
 Powell, John Micheal
 Price, Dorsey Dean
 Prigge, Roger Allen
 Purinton, Richard Anthony
 Quiros, Evan James
 Radtke, Danny Lee
 Rankin, William Benford
 Rathje, Norman Franklin
 Reavey, William Anthony, III
 Redman, Charles Edgar
 Reed, Albert Thomas
 Reston, Russell Turrelief
 Rhame, Robert Lynn
 Rhynard, Wayne Edgar, Jr.
 Rich, Claude Addison, Jr.
 Richardson, Albee McLam
 Richardson, Mercer Burk
 Rickard, Damon Woodrow, Jr.
 Riley, William James
 Roberts, James Emry
 Roberts, James Nelson
 Rockefeller, Gary Russell
 Rodrigues, Gary Ernest
 Roman, Robert John
 Rose, Charles Millard, Jr.
 Ross, Donald Hamilton
 Ross, Joseph Shaw
 Rottiers, Robert Bernard
 Rudner, Myron Alfred
 Ryan, William John, III
 Salat, Frank Emil
 Salsbury, Leonard Donald
 Sanders, Milton Richard
 Sanderson, John Nathaniel
 Sanford, John Joseph
 Sarff, Charles Michael
 Saunders, Walter Stanley
 Schillerer, Ronald Leroy
 Schmidle, George J., Jr.
 Schmidt, Terry Allen

Schmiesing, Dale Cletus
 Schock, Daniel Roland, III
 Schrecker, Walter Norris
 Scott, Roger Duncan
 Scribner, Charles Reverdan
 Seibel, Michael Wayne
 Seelmann, Thomas Henry, Jr.
 Setterquist, Francis Leslie
 Sharer, Bruce Warren
 Shepard, William Kent
 Shepler, Thomas Roberts
 Sheridan, Paul Richard
 Shirley, Graham Edward
 Shultz, Donald Charles, Jr.
 Sidwell, Larry Wayne
 Simmons, Mark Owen
 Simmons, Michael Wayne
 Simpson, James Michael
 Skagen, James Henry
 Skora, Wayne Philip
 Smith, Harvey Morris
 Smith, Lee Thomas
 Sollenberger, Stephen Shockey
 Sowa, John Mathew
 Spencer, Paul Cash
 Spitz, George Ross
 Steele, John Richard
 Stein, Paul Eugene
 Steward, Donald Emmet
 Stierle, James Edwin
 Stirrat, Thomas Merrill
 Stith, John Andrew
 Strong, Frederick Webster, III
 Strzemieczny, Alan Lee
 Stuart, Bryan James
 Stuart, William Oswald, III
 Sugg, Joseph Philip
 Sullivan, Edwin Paulson
 Suro, George Arthur
 Sutherland, Mont Edward
 Sutherland, Robert Blair
 Svoboda, Joseph Gary
 Swanson, John Gregg
 Swartz, Steven Lee
 Talcott, Ronald Taylor
 Tanner, Morris Adams, Jr.
 Taylor, Michael Leon
 Teetz, Connie Otto
 Thames, James Dennis
 Thompson, Donald Yates
 Thompson, James Donald
 Thompson, Richard Gloster, Jr.
 Thompson, Tommy Gordon
 Tilley, James William II
 Toney, Virgil Jackson, Jr.
 Tooley, Edward Stephen
 Toro, Bruce Robert
 Towne, Geoffrey Wainwright
 Traudt, Larry William
 Turpen, Louis Alan
 Tway, Duane Converse, Jr.
 Urner, Ronald Mark
 Van Duy, John Edgar, Jr.
 Van Valin, Gary Alan
 Vaughan, Donald Reid
 Veach, Charles Lacy
 Vincent, Halton Ramsey
 Viotti, Paul Richard
 Vogel, Carl Joseph
 Volin, David Ross
 Voll, Richard Allen
 Wacker, William Leslie
 Walker, Donald Robert
 Wallace, William Carl, Jr.
 Walsh, John Anthony, Jr.
 Ward, James Matthew
 Watson, Charles Dennis
 Watson, Richard Bruce
 Webster, James Charles
 Weed, Harold Vincent, Jr.
 Weihe, Tyson Eugene
 Weinman, Arnold Lee
 Wetzel, Kenneth Richard
 Wheeler, Michael Orvan
 White, William Roy, Jr.
 Wilkinson, Charles Davis
 Willett, David Anthony
 Wise, Sidney Jay
 Withycombe, Frederick Keith
 Witton, Richard Thomas, Jr.
 Womack, Carl Lavan

Woody, James Robert
Work, Terrell William
Wormington, John Robert
Wright, John Robert, Jr.
Wroblewski, Robert Anthony
Zambelli, Anthony Carmen
Zent, Llewellyn II
Zomni, Paul Andrew

The following cadets, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment to the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Bashant, Ronald Wayne
Coonan, Daniel Joseph, III
Dodd, Daniel Ayler
Drury, Deane Charles
Engelman, Frederick Charles, Jr.
Fairchild, Frederic Peter
Foster, Henry Sessam, Jr.
Gibson, James Wesley
Glassford, James Churchill
Guerrero, Willard Charles
Lewandowski, William Joseph
Payne, William Ashley
Ramsay, Robert Benjamin
Seith, William Frederick G., Jr.
Stone, William McCarthy
Wiser, Gordon James
Wynne, Michael Walter

The following midshipmen, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment to the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Daly, Michael Jon
Hale, Russell Dean II
Smith, Michael Danny
Williford, James Vance
Wood, Kenneth Cecil, Jr.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Ganns, Ralph R., ██████████

To be major, Army Nurse Corps

Gustafson, Pauline A. C., ██████████

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3292, and 3294:

To be major

McGlade, Joseph G. (MSC), ██████████

To be first lieutenant

Beinhacker, Neal D. (MSC), ██████████

To be major, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Malone, Albert C., Jr. (AIS), ██████████

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Lasseter, Earle F. (Armor), ██████████

Reinert, John E. (OrdC), ██████████

Russell, George G., Jr. (AGC), ██████████

Weisler, Julian E., II (Inf.), ██████████

To be captains, Medical Corps

Bell, Randall W. (MSC), ██████████

MacDonald, Bruce S. (Arty), ██████████

Noga, Gerald W. (CE), ██████████

Price, Herman L. (AGC), ██████████

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Bagley, Philip J., III (Arty), ██████████

Balady, Salim J. (Inf.), ██████████

Bartee, William F., Jr. (OrdC), ██████████

Brown, Gerald M. (OrdC), ██████████

Cady, Donald F. (Arty), ██████████

Carroll, Bartlett J., Jr. (Arty), ██████████
Cook, Alan W. (Arty), ██████████
Ecclestone, John S., II (QmC), ██████████
Eckhardt, William G. (Inf.), ██████████
Franklin, William W. (QmC), ██████████
Franks, Mitchell D. (Inf.), ██████████
Freck, William B. (QmC), ██████████
Graham, Thomas A., III (CE), ██████████
Green, Fred K. (MPC), ██████████
Herkenhoff, Walter E. (TC), ██████████
Ippolito, Peter J. (Inf.), ██████████
Kessel, Mark (Arty), ██████████
Lane, John T., III (OrdC), ██████████
Maher, Thomas R. (SicG), ██████████
Naughton, John F. (CE), ██████████
Sessums, Robert B. (Inf.), ██████████
Steinberg, Barry P. (SigC), ██████████
Thalken, Thomas B. (QMC), ██████████
Thomas, Michael T. (TC), ██████████
Torres, Juan H. (Inf.), ██████████
Wager, Joseph S. (AGC), ██████████
Watz, James H. (AGC), ██████████

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Arends, Robert C. (MSC), ██████████
McAllister, Hugh A., Jr. (MSC), ██████████
Starke, William R. (MSC), ██████████
Whitmore, Paul V. (MSC), ██████████
Zimmerly, James G., ██████████

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be lieutenant colonel

Shaddy, Mershon G., ██████████

To be majors

Case, Onore E., ██████████
Fish, Roy E., ██████████
Hanchett, William A., ██████████
Hodges, Harry A., ██████████
Hood, William P., ██████████
Killen, Frederick S., ██████████
Lawrence, Norman R., ██████████
Lewis, William E., ██████████
Michels, Daniel L., ██████████
Mundy, Frederic L., ██████████
Paige, Emmett, Jr., ██████████
Primis, Nick J., ██████████
Randolph, John P., ██████████
Rogers, Ernest P., ██████████
Selby, Norman D., ██████████
Thompson, Jack H., ██████████
Wakefield, Jack E., ██████████

To be captains

Allen, Sydna B., Jr., ██████████
Barron, James B., ██████████
Bellamy, Bruce M., ██████████
Boren, Charles M., ██████████
Borum, William D., ██████████
Brem, Homer L., Jr., ██████████
Brien, John H., ██████████
Brook, Howard F., Jr., ██████████
Brown, James H., Jr., ██████████
Burbules, John G., ██████████
Butler, Joe C., ██████████
Cotrupi, Francis J., ██████████
Daniels, Jiles P., ██████████
Davis, Ronnie C., ██████████
Davis, Thomas J., ██████████
Doyle, Noel J., Jr., ██████████
Duerson, Virgil D., ██████████
Dunfield, Edward P., ██████████
Durham, James A., ██████████
Eddie, Robert G., ██████████
Erkelens, Henri F., ██████████
Ferguson, Norman N., ██████████
Fraser, Robert D., ██████████
Garcia, Rafael G., ██████████
Gonzales, Ralph V., ██████████
Hoagland, David O., ██████████
Humphries, George D., ██████████
Isenberg, William C., ██████████
Jeo, Herbert, ██████████
Johnson, Richard D., ██████████
Kendrick, Floyd R., ██████████
Kilgore, James A., ██████████
Landry, Stephen D., ██████████
Livingston, Allen C., ██████████

Lopez, Manuel, ██████████
Lumpkins, William J., Jr., ██████████
Madden, Charles D., ██████████
Matassarin, Leon C., ██████████
Munson, Harvard R., ██████████
Naclerio, Nicholas J., ██████████
Ondarza, Fred, Jr., ██████████
Pack, Tommy R., ██████████
Pawlak, Stephen R., ██████████
Pelham, Wendall L., ██████████
Perkins, Albert R., Jr., ██████████
Quedens, Bernard B., ██████████
Reese, Kenneth D., ██████████
Rodriguez-Fernandez, Jose G., ██████████
Runnion, John E., ██████████
Schnoor, Jack E., ██████████
Sevilla, Ezequiel R., Jr., ██████████
Sharp, Richard H., ██████████
Siner, Wallace K., ██████████
Singer, Warren H., ██████████
Smith, Blair E., ██████████
Steinhilper, Edgar M., ██████████
Straeb, Robert G., ██████████
Tademy, Dudley L., ██████████
Van Wert, John F., Jr., ██████████
Vogel, Glenn A., ██████████
Wilkinson, Ralph C., ██████████
Yoxtheimer, Donald D., ██████████

To be first lieutenants

Austin, Samuel F., ██████████
Ballantyne, Nathaniel B., ██████████
Barringer, Ronald W. L., ██████████
Berhens, Robert W., ██████████
Benson, Frederick W., ██████████
Bertocci, David I., ██████████
Black, Richard A., ██████████
Bradley, Larry E., ██████████
Brantner, Carter H., ██████████
Brown, Raymond A., ██████████
Brunson, Jackie L., ██████████
Buczek, Henry F., ██████████
Chesney, Ralph M., ██████████
Coll, Thomas J., ██████████
Cone, Billy J., ██████████
Coonelly, Thomas F., Jr., ██████████
Czerw, Theodore J., ██████████
Cunningham, Richard W., ██████████
Dean, Edwin B., ██████████
Dillard, Leonard A., Jr., ██████████
Doff, Lawrence D., ██████████
Donovan, Timothy H., Jr., ██████████
Doyle, Edward J., ██████████
Edge, James G., ██████████
Fallin, James E., ██████████
Fincher, Jerry W., ██████████
Fisher, David M., Jr., ██████████
Foscue, Stanley M., ██████████
Gaddis, Joseph T., ██████████
Geisewite, Charles W., ██████████
Gilmour, Adam S., ██████████
Gleisner, James W., ██████████
Goolsby, James R., ██████████
Grossman, Robert F., ██████████
Hammond, William R., ██████████
Hansen, Michael H., ██████████
Henderson, Donnie W., ██████████
Higdon, Thomas E., ██████████
Hobson, Alan D., ██████████
Holland, Kenneth J., ██████████
Huntsberry, Henry C., ██████████
Innis, Joseph F., ██████████
Jenkins, Oscar L., ██████████
Jinks, James H., Jr., ██████████
Johnson, Paul H., ██████████
Karjala, Lawrence, ██████████
Kelleher, Edward P., Jr., ██████████
Kiger, David C., ██████████
King, Donald H., ██████████
Klausner, John T., Jr., ██████████
Krawczyk, Joseph E., ██████████
Lord, Fred E., ██████████
Loveless, Kenneth D., ██████████
Mann, Marion E., Jr., ██████████
Marsh, Caryl G., ██████████
Martin, James H., ██████████
Mauk, George R., ██████████
McAleer, Michael E., ██████████
McDonald, Ted A., ██████████
Morrell, Robert H., ██████████
Murphy, Richard E., ██████████

Nealon, Edgar L., ██████████.
 Neitzke, Robert A., ██████████.
 Nichols, Willard L., ██████████.
 O'Brien, James J., ██████████.
 Oliver, Ralph H., Jr., ██████████.
 Overby, Glen A., ██████████.
 Partin, Tommy M., ██████████.
 Pate, Reuben M., ██████████.
 Pattison, William C., ██████████.
 Phillips, David M., ██████████.
 Polk, Robert H., ██████████.
 Quickmire, Carl R., ██████████.
 Regelski, Joseph R., ██████████.
 Rosbeck, Richard A., ██████████.
 Schechtel, Lawrence P., ██████████.
 Seely, John B., ██████████.
 Seligman, Norman L., ██████████.
 Sheetz, Michael L., ██████████.
 Sheffield, Roger V., ██████████.
 Silverman, Joel I., ██████████.
 Singsank, James J., ██████████.
 Smith, William A., ██████████.
 Stewart, Peter, ██████████.
 Swift, William D., ██████████.
 Tassi, Gordon R., ██████████.
 Turley, James M., ██████████.
 Turner, Vance L., ██████████.
 Vamvakias, Nicholas P., ██████████.
 Wambeganis, Richard E., ██████████.
 Winton, George C., Jr., ██████████.
 Wolfgram, Richard E., ██████████.
 Young, Luther D., III, ██████████.
 Zielski, Peter T., ██████████.

To be second lieutenants

Anderson, Martin S., ██████████.
 Barnhart, Robert N., ██████████.
 Bartholomew, Mark A., ██████████.
 Barton, Jay W., ██████████.
 Bender, Michael J., ██████████.
 Brazeel, Frederick E., ██████████.
 Brazelton, John E., ██████████.
 Bryson, Thomas E., ██████████.
 Clare, Joseph F., Jr.
 Costich, Kenneth J., II, ██████████.
 Devine, William S., ██████████.
 Donohue, Jeremiah F., ██████████.
 Draper, Jerry Y., ██████████.
 Drexler, Arthur J., Jr., ██████████.
 Floca, Samuel W., Jr., ██████████.
 Frame, Bruce C., ██████████.
 Graves, Lawrence D., ██████████.
 Gray, Robert W., Jr., ██████████.
 Greenberg, Harold S., ██████████.
 Hauck, John R., ██████████.
 Hill, Roylance W., ██████████.
 Hogan, Charles J., Jr., ██████████.
 Hussong, William A., Jr., ██████████.
 Jermyn, Bobby R., ██████████.
 Judge, John R., ██████████.
 Keating, Charles F., ██████████.
 Koppler, Doit L., ██████████.
 Lavezzi, George B., ██████████.
 Manuel, Robert J., ██████████.
 Martinez, Jose, ██████████.
 McKeen, Robert W., ██████████.
 McMinn, Robert K., ██████████.
 Metherall, Paul E., ██████████.
 Moore, John, ██████████.
 Moss, Jackson C., III, ██████████.
 Moyer, Richard D., ██████████.
 Nowakowski, Richard C., ██████████.
 Paris, Howard S., ██████████.
 Rerecich, John A., ██████████.
 Ricci, William L., ██████████.
 Rowe, Michael A., ██████████.
 Simpkins, Dale L., ██████████.
 Smith, Cecil C., ██████████.
 Sowell, Norman E., ██████████.
 Stilwell, Richard G., Jr., ██████████.
 Taylor, Kenneth A., ██████████.
 Williford, Sherman H., ██████████.
 Woods, Leroy, ██████████.
 Zehnder, Joseph L., Jr., ██████████.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and branches specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311.

To be majors, Medical Corps
 Anderson, Jack R., ██████████.
 Svagintsev, Juerl J., ██████████.
To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Gronley, Jo Anne K., ██████████.
To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Aragones, Blanca A., ██████████.
 Boyersmith, Evelyn L., ██████████.
 Kelley, Joan M., ██████████.

To be captains, Chaplain

Gasquet, Mark C., ██████████.
 Hopkins, Paul D., ██████████.
 Peterman, James A., ██████████.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Balserak, Robert J., ██████████.
 Braman, Denison B., ██████████.
 Brown, George O., ██████████.
 Carter, Richard L., ██████████.
 Carter, Willard H., ██████████.
 Edington, Ernest M., ██████████.
 Hammer, Henry S., ██████████.
 Kay, Michael M., ██████████.
 Larson, Wayne J., ██████████.
 McDonald, Frederick L., II, ██████████.
 Merten, Robert L., ██████████.
 Moyer, John H., ██████████.
 O'Connor, Randolph P., Jr., ██████████.
 Perez, Bienvenido, ██████████.
 Roth, Neal A., ██████████.
 Trawick, Jack S., ██████████.
 Vitor, Robert A., ██████████.
 Woody, Ronald D., ██████████.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Chalekian, Suran J., ██████████.
 Tracy, Curtis L., ██████████.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Antony, Joseph G., ██████████.
 Boatright, Charles F., ██████████.
 Breza, George M., ██████████.
 Cardell, Jose E., ██████████.
 De La Perriere, Armand A., ██████████.
 Eberhard, Edward J., ██████████.
 Everett, Elwood D., ██████████.
 Garfield, Herbert I., ██████████.
 Gernon, William H., ██████████.
 Greene, Francis T., ██████████.
 Gum, Ronald A., ██████████.
 Guyton, William F., ██████████.
 Hart, Clarence R., ██████████.
 Haskell, Richard D., ██████████.
 Houston, John B., ██████████.
 Humbert, Paul V., Jr., ██████████.
 Johnson, Lawrence F., ██████████.
 Kaplan, Jerrold M., ██████████.
 Lafontant, Robert R., ██████████.
 Lefton, Theodore E., ██████████.
 Magen, Walter H., ██████████.
 Nelson, Donald E., ██████████.
 Newstead, Robert R., ██████████.
 Paulius, Charles D., III, ██████████.
 Porzio, Raymond J., ██████████.
 Reed, Robert L., ██████████.
 Roycroft, David W., ██████████.
 Sawhill, David L., ██████████.
 Schweers, Carl A., Jr., ██████████.
 Shock, John P., Jr., ██████████.
 Siegal, David L., ██████████.
 Skinner, William E., ██████████.
 Soufright-Velez, Wilfredo, ██████████.
 Stabler, Carey V., ██████████.
 Stansell, William J., ██████████.
 Strum, Donald H., ██████████.
 Suderth, Jerry F., ██████████.
 Taper, David O., ██████████.
 Ten Eyck, James R., ██████████.
 Tomlinson, Jerry A., ██████████.
 Turner, Lewis M., Jr., ██████████.
 Walker, Olyn M., ██████████.
 Zients, Alan B., ██████████.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Green, Grant E., ██████████.
 Heraly, Elroy P., ██████████.
 Korte, Thomas H., ██████████.

To be captains, Veterinary Corps

Ebertz, Peter E., ██████████.
 Manus, Allan G., ██████████.

McSweeney, Richard D., ██████████.

To be first lieutenants, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Laubscher, Sonya R., ██████████.
 Putnam, Joyce M., ██████████.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Abbott, Edith J., ██████████.

Foster, Imogene, ██████████.

Krisov, Althea E., ██████████.

Wise, Mary J., ██████████.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Malouf, Carl E., ██████████.

Sherwood, John T., Jr., ██████████.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Branch, Leslie B., ██████████.

Chamberlain, Terry J., ██████████.

Coville, Frederick V., ██████████.

Craig, David E., ██████████.

Culton, John W., ██████████.

Frostad, Alvin L., ██████████.

Garrettson, James A., ██████████.

Grannemann, Harry N., ██████████.

Gunther, John S., ██████████.

Harner, Stephen G., ██████████.

Harvey, John E., ██████████.

Haskins, Ronald C., ██████████.

Holton, Don B., ██████████.

Kichler, Jack, ██████████.

Klef, John J., ██████████.

King, John W., ██████████.

Malone, Edward M., Jr., ██████████.

Marais, David V., ██████████.

Sapoznikoff, John B., ██████████.

Shaw, James W., Jr., ██████████.

Smith, Davis S., ██████████.

Von Ruden, Dale A., ██████████.

Whitcomb, Michael E., ██████████.

Ziegler, Herman F., ██████████.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Amos, Oscar D., ██████████.

Bambery, Thomas W., ██████████.

Bell, Sterling W., ██████████.

Rose, Walter C., ██████████.

Sorbera, Salvatore, ██████████.

To be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps

Strimple, Earl O., ██████████.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Murphy, Joanne, ██████████.

To be second lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Tomlan, Jolene K., ██████████.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Coulter, Sharon E., ██████████.

Herrington, Joyce, ██████████.

Wicki, Carol A., ██████████.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Durand, William B., ██████████.

Smith, David D., ██████████.

To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Brajkovich, Catherine A., ██████████.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Aaron, Moses E., ██████████.

Archer, Chris H., ██████████.

Asiello, Robert M., ██████████.

Asimakopoulos, Peter L.

Acton, James E.

Adams, Brian R.

Aiston, Virnal J.

Amstutz, Richard E.

Anderson, James W.

Anderson, Quinton D.

Barich, Jerald J.

Jr.

Barnes, Richard H., Jr.

Applehans, Robert B.

Barnhill, Jerry R.

Barry, William A., III

Baxter, Larry J.	David, Benjamin K.	Grimsley, Lee E.	Kelley, Edward L.	Monk, Robert W., IV	Romines, Ronald F.
Beach, Lawrence A.	Davis, Glenn R.	Groat, Gary L.	Kelly, John P.	Monroe, Eric G.	Ronay, James C.
Beckroge, John H., Jr.	Davis, James H.	Grosch, David L.	Kelly, Needham N., Jr.	Montgomery, James M.	Roper, James R.
Bengton, Richard L.	Davis, William M.	Guarneri, Domenick	Kemble, Raymond E.	M., XXXXXXXX	Rose, Howard E.
Benoit, James A.	Deines, John M.	Guidry, Richard C.	Kennett, Michael B.	Moody, James L.	Rothlisberger, Daniel L.
Benton, William E.	Delo, Lew E.	Guy, Earl P., III	Kenyon, Norbert L.	Moore, Robert S., Jr.	Roudebush, Robert A.
Bergson, Henry P.	Deming, Michael D.	Haeme, Raymond A.	Kerr, John A.	Moore, William F.	Rush, Michael C.
Bergson, Paul C.	Dempsey, Daniel J.	Hagstrom, Carl C. G.	King, Eugene C.	Mordue, Norman A., XXXXXXXX	Russell, Donald R.
Bernard, Joseph P.	Denison, Gordon R.	Hall, Anthony W., Jr.	King, Kerrith H.	Morris, Robert E.	Saliny, Dennis E.
Berry, Earl T.	Denniston, LeRoy W.	Hall, Jack L.	King, Ladd M.	Morrison, Richard E.	Sallenback, Murray D., XXXXXXXX
Bertelsen, Mark A.	Deters, Robert H., Jr.	Hall, Roger W.	King, Robert D.	Morsch, Ronald L.	Salvatore, Ronald A.
Bishop, Jerry D.	Hammon, John B., XXXXXXXX	Hampton, Marvin E., Jr.	Kingham, Thomas B.	Mostella, Kenneth E.	Sanderlin, Allen P.
Blackshire, Benny W.	Dockery, Patrick H.	Harada, Michael A.	Kirchoffner, Donald P.	Moster, Stephen A.	Sanders, Edward B.
Blaine, Jerome M., Jr., XXXXXXXX	Donah, Paul A.	Harley, George E.	Kirkpatrick, Raymond L., Jr.	Mountain, Keith E.	Sands, Charles F.
Boad, Roy E.	Dort, Dean R., II	Harmon, Larry G.	Klaver, Robert P.	Moushegian, Richard H.	Satterwhite, Neil E.
Boaldin, Bobbie R.	Dowgielewicz, John P.	Harr, Gerry A.	Klock, John H., XXXXXXXX	Mueller, Mark A.	Saunders, Mark B.
Bogue, Ronald A.	Drake, Stephen M.	Harris, James M.	Konigsmark, Henry III	Mulford, Ralph K., III	Sawyer, Kenneth R., XXXXXXXX
Boles, Edward A.	Droke, Willard B.	Harris, William R.	Korkalo, Roy E.	Mullins, Daniel L.	Schaefier, Gerard F.
Borgatti, Edward M.	Dunbar, James D., Jr.	Hartman, David A.	Kothen, Richard B.	Munsey, Robert O.	Schafer, John R., II
Bowdoin, William R., Jr.	Duncan, William M.	Hauck, David G.	Kramer, Peter M.	Murphy, James M.	Schaeley, Glen H.
Bower, Count L., Jr.	Easton, James N., XXXXXXXX	Hauser, John R., Jr.	Kromer, Robert A.	Myers, David R.	Schmidt, Richard W., XXXXXXXX
Boysen, Stuart W., III	Ebert, Steven R.	Head, Allan B.	Kropp, Richard E.	Neumann, Hans J.	Schmitt, Joseph A.
Bridgewater, Irvin L., III	Edmunds, Bobby A.	Henderson, Aubrey E.	Krueger, Gerald P.	Nevares, Henry, Jr.	Schneikert, Harold W., Nottingham, Donald
Brittingham, Michael L.	Edmundson, Daniel C.	Henry, Sam S., Jr.	Kudra, Ronald N.	Novakovic, William E., Jr.	Schopp, Steven M.
Brockway, Bruce E.	Elder, Robin L.	Hensley, Allan L.	Kuehn, Robert J.	Novotney, Laurence C.	Schultz, Warren S.
Brooks, Kenneth N.	Ellis, Charles F.	Hepler, John F., III	Kwock, Johnson C. S.	Officer, Alvin D.	Schwartz, James F.
Broome, Wallace S.	Ellis, John D.	Herion, George C.	Labasan, Joseph F.	Ogles, Thomas M., Jr.	Scott, Lowell K.
Brown, Bobby G.	Eltrich, Martin C., Jr.	Hermoyian, Edward J.	Lahr, Charles D.	Ogley, Gary A.	Sevene, Robert
Brown, David J.	Emens, John A.	Herndon, Robert L.	Lain, William K.	Ohl, William C., II	Severino, Angelo A.
Brown, Michael J.	Epps, Jones N., Jr.	Hetherington, Carl E.	Lang, Robert E.	Olney, Roger P.	Sharp, Marvin W.
Brown, Phillips L.	Erickson, Scott R.	Hetzner, Werner, Jr.	Lauderdale, Charles W., III	O'Meara, John M.	Shelton, William R.
Brown, Robert J.	Estes, John R.	Heuwinkel, Richard J.	Laws, Jerry L.	O'Neill, Thomas J.	Shepard, Ronald W.
Brumfield, Wetzel D.	Fanning, Steven E.	Higgins, James O.	Leach, William G.	O'Reilly, Patrick A.	Shriner, Robert M.
Buchwald, Clarence R., Jr.	Farrally-Plourde, Yana D.	Hill, Carl D., XXXXXXXX	Lee, John C.	Orth, Walter H., Jr.	Sither, Charles R.
Buckingham, Patrick W.	Farrell, Michael V.	Hill, Howard W.	Leekley, Edward H.	Osterhout, Michael L.	Skelley, Richard B.
Burchill, Richard P.	Farris, Karl	Ho, Kenneth O. P.	Lefevre, Boyd H., II	Overturf, Arthur G.	Skoglund, Emil E., Jr.
Burghart, Frank G., III	Farris, Robert J.	Hoffman, Richard W.	Liggett, Lawrence G.	Owen, David W.	Skripka, Frederick J.
Burk, William H., Jr., XXXXXXXX	Fee, Warren M.	Holder, Leonard D., Jr.	Livingston, Charles H.	Palmer, John A.	Slater, Howard F., Jr.
Burnor, Paul J., Jr.	Feich, John E., Jr.	Hollandsworth, James G., Jr.	Loop, Curtis A.	Paraska, Harry J.	Slater, Terry J.
Bush, James G.	Felts, Thomas G.	Hoodenpyle, James C.	Lovett, Henry B.	Pardew, James W., Jr.	Smith, Edgar A. P., Jr.
Cahill, John M.	Fergusson, Robert C. L.	Hoover, Thomas L.	Lowe, Ronald L.	Parrish, David J.	Smith, Eugene D.
Cain, Paul F.	Fitzgerald, Arnold E., Jr.	Horstmann, Richard A.	Lucas, Steven W.	Parsons, William X.	Smith, James H.
Calhoun, Ernest L.	Franke, Stephen H.	House, Jonathan W.	Lurik, Richard A.	Paulus, Jeffrey A.	Smith, Otis H., Jr.
Cameron, Tom O.	Franz, Richard L.	Howard, Frederick M.	Lynch, Richard J., III	Payne, Brown W.	Smith, Raymond M.
Canup, Claude R., Jr.	Frazar, Gautier B.	Howe, Robert L.	MacLachlan, James G.	Penrose, Clifford E., II	Smith, Richard C., III
Caputo, Carlo B.	Freas, Richard F.	Howlett, John P.	Mahon, Thomas J., Jr.	Peters, Garry C., XXXXXXXX	Smith, William D.
Carr, Thomas D., III	Fredericks, Michael F.	Hoza, Philip J.	Maini, Paul B.	Pezzano, Frank J., Jr.	Smith, William G., III
Carver, William G.	Freeman, Dennis C. B. Jr.	Huckabay, Warren T.	March, Charles E.	Pfeifle, William G.	Soares, John F.
Carvill, Richard A.	Freeman, Elrie A.	Hudgings, James G.	Marrapese, Richard L.	Pfrimmer, Robert J.	Somers, Richard E.
Casalese, Joseph S.	Fronzaglia, Stanley N.	Hugus, David K., XXXXXXXX	Martin, Russell M.	Phillips, Phil G., Jr.	Sovie, Donald E.
Casey, Francis W.	Frye, Robert F., III	Humphrey, Richard S.	Massey, Albert P., III	Plequet, Philip G., XXXXXXXX	Sparks, Earl C., III
Caughron, Raymond D.	Fuehrer, John C.	Hunt, Daniel D.	Massey, Ronald E.	Pierce, David W.	Sparks, Gene D.
Chaffin, Charles M.	Galbraith, Milton A., Jr.	Ingalls, Allan S., Jr.	Mathias, Anthony E.	Pilcher, David W.	Stamouli, Angelo A.
Chartier, Everett E.	Gandy, Charles V., Jr.	Isom, Dennis R.	Matlosz, Henry S., Jr.	Pilkington, Edgar L.	Stanfield, Morton D.
Cheatam, James H., Jr.	Garcia, Dennis P.	Jackson, James H.	Mattes, David J.	Pitman, James M.	Stankovich, Peter
Chimenti, Ronald C.	Gardner, Roy	Jacobs, Jack H.	Matthess, William D.	Plavan, John C.	Stark, Michael E.
Clark, Thomas E.	Garme, George	Jacobsen, Gary A.	Matthews, Robert J.	Pleasnick, Walter E.	Stark, William W.
Clarke, Robert A. A.	Gaudette, John J., Jr.	James, Richard J., XXXXXXXX	Maxwell, Calvin W.	Plumlee, Gordon K., XXXXXXXX	Stauffacher, Thomas J.
Clendenin, Joseph A.	Gibertson, Michael E.	James, Wayne E., Jr.	May, William J., XXXXXXXX	Prisk, Gary R.	Steelman, Robert C., Jr.
Cleveland, David A.	Gilmour, Joseph E., Jr.	Jarvis, Michael J.	Maybee, Richard G.	Probart, Lewis D.	Stein, Alfred G.
Cochrane, Daniel P.	Giordono, Matthew J.	Jeansonne, Paul D.	McArdle, John C., Jr.	Pujals, Jaime	Steiner, Charles R., Jr.
Cole, Daniel J., Jr.	Gipe, George W.	Jefferis, James L.	McBride, Ellis A., Jr.	Quintin, Paul E., Jr.	Steman, Earl C.
Coleman, Bruce S., Jr.	Girardi, Ralph R.	Jenkins, James D.	McCall, George E.	Radinger, William, Jr.	Stempski, Frank
Combs, Robert H.	Glass, John D.	Jochem, Donald C.	McCalla, John H.	Rauscher, Raymond C.	Stevenson, Donald J.
Comer, Edward L.	Glenn, Richard J.	Johnson, Arnold R., Jr.	McConkey, Robert B.	Rawson, James P.	Stevenson, Harry C.
Conderman, John D.	Gold, William A.	Johnson, Dale H.	McGough, Gerard E.	Reft, Chester S.	Stewart, Charles L.
Cooper, William E., Jr.	Golightly, Douglas V.	Johnson, Jeffrey P.	McGregor, Peter J.	Reichle, Paul T.	Stewart, Clyde F.
Coradini, William J.	Gorang, Thomas D.	Johnson, Spencer C.	McKenzie, Myron K.	Reid, Gerald E., Jr.	Stewart, James B.
Corbin, James E.	Gordon, Richard R.	Johnston, Charles A.	McNeil, Dennis J., XXXXXXXX	Renaldi, Juette O., III	Stewart, Larry N.
Cornwell, Michael C.	Gorton, Ashton E.	Jolly, Michael S.	McRae, Ralph D., Jr.	Ressler, John T.	Stock, Clifford J.
Coughlin, John F.	Goss, Robert I.	Jones, Allan R.	McWilliams, Brian M.	Rhome, Robert C.	Stock, Michael L.
Cowan, James A.	Graf, Rudolph L.	Jones, David H.	Meacham, Christopher L.	Rickert, Wayne F.	Strassburg, Thomas M.
Coyne, Patrick I.	Graham, Raymond F.	Jones, Gary A.	Meath, Donald G.	Riedy, John M.	Strawn, Marvin I.
Crawford, Dereld G.	Grandel, Ronald D.	Jones, Hugh J. M., III	Meikle, James G.	Ritchart, Peter J.	Striebler, Thomas L.
Cretella, Joseph, Jr.	Gray, Kenneth D.	Jones, Richard P.	Melton, James C.	Rittinger, John P., Jr.	Stuart, Kenneth K.
Crittssinger, Clifford A.	Green, Robert A.	Jones, Robert E.	Mendonca, Thomas G.	Rivello, Robert N.	Stuart, Richard J.
Cunningham, John M.	Greene, Joseph T., Jr.	Joseph, John K.	Merritt, Weldon L.	Robinson, Bruce D.	Sugden, Barry K., Jr., XXXXXXXX
Dalfonzo, Joseph A.	Greenwood, Robert M.	Jue, Jin K.	Mesarch, Victor P.	Robinson, Randal M.	Sullivan, Lee J.
Darden, Mercer G.	Griffin, Edwin N.	Kale, William H.	Midtun, Leroy L.	Rogers, Jack A., Jr.	Swayze, Gerald C.
Darnell, Ronald H.	Griffin, James C., Jr.	Kazenski, Robert W.	Miller, Edward A., Jr.	Rogers, Jerry T.	Swenson, Swante A., II
	Griffin, James G.	Kearns, Ronald F.	Mills, Gregory F.	Rogers, Robert E.	
		Keenan, Edward J., Jr.	Mills, Michael R.		
		Mirra, Ronald T.	Minnich, Tim I.		
			Minton, Marcus D.		

Szymanski, James G. Walther, Alan E.
 Tanner, Richard B. [REDACTED]
 Tarpley, Thomas J., Jr. Warga, Russell M.
 Taylor, Robert H. Wark, Richard W.
 Tees, Hans Washburn, Dennis A.
 Teverbaugh, John R. Watson, Don R.
 Thacker, Wallace F. Webster, Daniel B.
 Tharp, Thomas R. Webster, George K.
 Theroux, Thomas R. Weinstein, Leonard H.
 Thomas, Bernard P. Weis, Gerhard W.
 Thomas, Michael A. [REDACTED]
 Thompson, James E. Weller, Rexford E.
 Thompson, John A., Jr. West, Oliver I., Jr.
 Thompson, John L., Jr. Westling, Jerry M.
 Wheat, Pryor L. B.
 Wheeler, William L., Jr.
 Thompson, Joseph A. White, Jerry D.
 Timbore, Arthur R. White, Jonathan W.
 Todd, James M. White, Leslie M.
 Toledo, Richard B. V., Jr. White, Richard J. J.
 Tomik, John P. White, Robert G.
 Toohey, James P. Wiggins, Theron L.
 Tracy, Stephen A. Wilcox, Duane W.,
 Tyson, Tony [REDACTED]
 Unkefer, John W. Williams, James W., Jr.
 Valenti, Philip A. Williams, Jerald A.
 Valentine, William R. Williams, Robert H.
 Valle, Laurence F. M. Williams, Robert J., Jr.
 Vandenburg, Mercer O.
 Van Wert, Ronald K. Wilson, Douglas N., III
 Vaughan, Ronald B. Wilson, Gerald R., Jr.
 Vavrek, George M. Wilson, John W., Jr.
 Vilsack, Harry L. Wilson, Thomas W.
 Virusky, Edmund J., Jr.
 Vivilo, Anthony R. Winterling, Grayson F.
 Waddle, Harry I., Jr. Wright, Nelson B., Jr.
 Wade, Michael R. Wright, Walter G. B.
 Wagner, Anthony L. Yamaoka, Curtis A.
 Walden, Charles C. Yukimura, Paul K.
 Walder, David A. Zanca, Peter A.
 Walker, Jerry W. Zimmer, Lewis P.
 Walker, Stanley L. Zimmerman, Thomas E.
 Wallace, Charles E. Zimmerman, Charles W.
 Walley, Bryan J. Zuckor, Jesse F.
 Walsh, James D., Jr. Zurcher, Thomas D.
 Walsh, Richard

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the Dental Corps, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, and 3294:

Arroyo, Francisco, [REDACTED].
 Caruth, Lawrence G., [REDACTED].

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

Anderson, Wolfgang R., [REDACTED].
 Burch, John T., Jr., [REDACTED].
 Buhrman, Richard W., [REDACTED].
 Carlotti, Stephen J., [REDACTED].
 Cowan, Walter G., Jr.
 Deal, John N., [REDACTED].
 Dittmer, Charles W., Jr., [REDACTED].
 Flippo, Dean D., [REDACTED].
 Fowler, Charles N., Jr., [REDACTED].
 Gill, Vernon S., [REDACTED].
 Helmers, John H., [REDACTED].
 Higgins, James E., [REDACTED].
 Howe, Kenneth A., Jr., [REDACTED].
 Kramer, Kenneth B., [REDACTED].
 McNulty, Anthony J., [REDACTED].
 Moore, William C., [REDACTED].
 Ruff, Rex R., [REDACTED].
 Seamans, Richard C., [REDACTED].
 Sills, Kenneth F., [REDACTED].
 Smith, William B., III, [REDACTED].
 Stumpf, James J., [REDACTED].
 Torgerson, Kenneth A., [REDACTED].
 Toro, Frank, [REDACTED].
 Traylor, Jerry C., [REDACTED].
 Vaughn, James C., Jr., [REDACTED].
 Zanoni, Ronald A., [REDACTED].

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Anderson, Robert M., Kaisershot, Gordon E.
 Aurbach, Frederick E. Langhorne, Webster L.
 Baylor, Ross G. Lavind, Johnny L.
 Bell, Michael M. Lewis, Chester
 Berliner, Daniel S. Meyer, Dennis E.
 Broadnax, Gary B. Nikolic, Francis M.
 Burnley, David G. Ramsey, Jack B., Jr.
 Caraway, William C., Jr. Rector, Clyde W.
 Champion, Charles H., Jr. Rice, Louis H.
 Cornett, Jesse R. Slayton, Jack R.
 Costigan, William D., Jr. Stripling, Verlon
 Dickey, James R. Talman, William T., Jr.
 Fields, Richard S. Taylor, Marshall C.
 Grant, Columbus, Jr. Thompson, Jerry F.
 Hardman, James R. Valdés, Victor M.
 Head, Harold D. Wainwright, David B.
 Hilt, Martin J. Washington, Curtis L.
 Johnson, Thomas F. Williams, James N.
 Young, Eddie L. Winstead, Glenn C.

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1966, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10 United States Code, sections 3284 and 4353:

Agnew, Eugene W., Jr. Braun, Peter E.
 Albrecht, Warren H. R., Jr. Brennan, Michael W.
 Warren, Robert H. Brinker, Walter E., Jr.
 Albright, Robert H. Britain, David W., III
 Alexander, George M. Britton, James C.
 Almojuela, Thomas N. Brodka, Stanley A.
 Amatulli, Richard P. Brown, David C.
 Anderson, Dale R. Brown, Donald F.
 Anderson, David M., III Brown, Michael H.
 Anderson, Edward G., III Brown, Michael J.
 Andrews, Edward L. Brown, Steven N.
 Andrise, Daniel B. Bruegger, Robert D.
 Arnone, Robert N. Brunnhoeffer, Gilbert C. F.
 Arrants, William M. Bryan, Lawrence D., III
 Arthur, David W. Bubriski, Joseph A.
 Ashbaugh, Brian W. Buch, Kenneth D.
 Atkinson, Eugene D. Buczakli, John B.
 Audibert, Reginald L. Buetti, Anthony J., III
 Auer, Bruce P. Burger, John E.
 Backlin, Charles R. Caldwell, Ronald G.
 Backlin, James P. Calek, Joseph R.
 Bailey, Mark B. Callahan, Francis R.
 Baker, Robert M. Campbell, Donald, III
 Barksdale, Rhesa H. Campbell, Elmer
 Barnes, Fred W. Campbell, Michael T.
 Barry, William F. Canavan, Gene R.
 Bartek, Ronald J. Canning, William R.
 Bartholomew, Samuel Carber, John B.
 W., Jr. Carhart, Thomas M., III
 Basham, William D., Jr. Carlson, Kenneth G.
 Beasley, Thomas W. Carlson, Kenneth R.
 Behan, William E., Jr. Carpenter, Ronald B.
 Behnke, Douglas J. Carrow, John C.
 Benham, Philip O., Jr. Case, Robert E.
 Bergman, William K. Berkman, David S., Jr.
 Berkman, David S., Jr. Casillo, Vincent L.
 Berry, Steven D. Catlin, Robert W., Jr.
 Bertolino, Fred G. Catron, Edward P.
 Biamon, Niels P. Cavolick, Joseph D.
 Bishop, William E. Cecere, Peter M.
 Blackwell, Stephen C. Cecil, Gerald T.
 Blades, Jon W., III Champi, Samuel F., Jr.
 Bludau, Colin E. Chatfield, Richard A.
 Blumenfeld, Charles H., Jr. Chitty, Charles B.
 Bohuslar, John W. Christie, John G.
 Bonifas, Arthur G. Clainos, Deme M.
 Booth, William D. Clark, Richard N.
 Borek, Theodore B. Clark, Wesley K.
 Bowen, Ronald D. Coates, Charles F., Jr.
 Boyd, John H., III Coats, Robert C., Jr.
 Coggins, Gary M.

Cole, Bryan R. Fullerton, LeRoy R., Jr.
 Collmeyer, Michael K. Jr.
 Connell, James P. Gagnon, Robert L.
 Cook, Shannon C. Galligan, Francis B., Jr.
 Cooney, Norman R. Correia, William H., Jr. Gang, William G.
 Cosentino, Frank C. Gardner, James R.
 Cox, George T. Garrett, Thom P.
 Cox, Ronald E. Gartenberg, Joel M.
 Crabtree, Jack D., Jr. Gatesy, John T.
 Crants, Doctor R., Jr. Gaynor, Kevin C.
 Crawford, Danny L. Geiger, John W.
 Cresci, Robert J. Gibson, Emmitt E.
 Crocker, David R., Jr. Gillenwater, Paul G.
 Crocker, George A. Gimian, Allan D.
 Crooks, Daniel R. Glassen, Richard L.
 Crowell, David V. Gleason, James C.
 Cruikshank, Ralph H., Gorski, Richard V.
 Grabow, Thomas W.
 Culhane, Floyd C., Jr. Grandison, Wilfred G.
 Cullem, James M. Grant, Arthur V., Jr.
 Culpepper, Allen R. Grant, Russell P., Jr.
 Cunningham, James W. Grice, Kenneth R.
 Daly, Timothy E. Grisafe, Michael F., Jr.
 Darby, Richard W., Jr. Groves, George H.
 Davis, Thomas B., III Grugie, Roger A.
 DeBoit, Barry M. Guerriero, Robert A.
 Dean, Alvin B., III Gunderson, Norman E., Jr.
 de Jonckheere, Terrell M. Hackett, James K.
 Delp, Larry E. Haines, David I.
 Denney, Robert G. Hall, Gordon L.
 Deponai, John M., III Hallums, James D.
 DiFiore, Matthew F. Hammond, Robert M., Jr.
 Dickens, James A. Dickey, David L.
 Dixon, Gerald E. Hanaberry, John A.
 Dobise, John J., Jr. Hanau, Steven L.
 Dock, William E. Haneke, William G.
 Donahey, Thomas M. Hansen, Laurence N.
 Donnell, Peter F. Hargett, Charles W., Jr.
 Donnithorne, Larry R. Harnden, Glen M.
 Donovan, John C. Harper, Richard T.
 Doogan, James P., Jr. Harper, Walter G.
 Doty, Richard D. Harris, Boyd M.
 Doyle, James T. Harris, Charles T.
 Drewes, Carl E., Jr. Harrison, Matthew C., Jr.
 Driscoll, Eugene J. Droubay, Juel G.
 Dubia, John A. Hart, Noble E., Jr.
 Dunavan, Robert C. Hartley, Shird B.
 Dunn, Carroll H., Jr. Hartline, Franklin Y.
 Durbin, Terrence E. Harvey, William T.
 Dusel, Thomas B. Hathaway, Edward N., II
 Dutkiewicz, Henry E. Hayes, James M.
 Dyer, Gaines S. Hayes, John R., Jr.
 Eason, Thomas W. Hayes, Thomas F., III
 Eberle, John C. Hayes, Thomas J., IV
 Eckert, John H. Heikle, William L.
 Edwards, Jerome G. Hicks, Robert R., Jr.
 Eichenberger, David G. Higgins, Michael C.
 Eisenberg, Stephen A. Higgins, Michael J.
 J. Eklund, Richard A. Hill, Emery F.
 Ekstrom, Paul J. Hill, Theodore P.
 Ely, Cameron A. Hiller, Charles B.
 Ernst, Frederick G. Hines, Charles A. W.
 Ewart, Thomas W. Hinkle, Lawrence R.
 Faber, Morris R. Hixon, William F., II
 Fantelli, Paul F. Hlista, Richard J.
 Farewell, Thomas E. Hock, Frank M., Jr.
 Farrell, Henry R. Hoffman, Charles F.
 Faust, Edmond L., III Hoffman, John G.
 Fazen, Robert P. Hood, Richard E., Jr.
 Fellenz, Michael P. Horst, Kelso W.
 Fera, John A. Hoskins, John T.
 Ferguson, William E. Howell, Richard V., Jr.
 Fields, Timothy G. Hoyman, William W.
 Figgins, Charles E. Hughes, William F.
 Fish, Kenneth W. Hunt, Lynn J.
 Fisher, Herbert W. Hunt, William C.
 Fix, Donald J. Hunter, Marion M.
 Flynn, Billy W. Hustead, Michael W.
 Ford, John A., Jr. Huston, Robert E.
 Ford, John K. Huyck, Jere I.
 Foret, Kenneth A. Isenhour, John P.
 Fox, Jerry G. Israelson, Gary L.
 Frazier, Billy W. Jackson, Gary D.
 Fretwell, Norman E. James, Lewis H.
 Fry, Michael D. Jeffrey, Timothy B.
 Fuller, Michael B. Jenkins, James E.

Jenkins, John M.
Jenna, Russell W., Jr.
Johnson, Charles F., Jr.
Johnson, Edgar C., Jr.
Johnson, Warren A.
Jones, Richard L.
Judd, Donald R.
Kakel, William W.
Kane, Edward P.
Keating, Patrick H.
Keener, Randall J.
Kehres, John K.
Keith, Chester E., Jr.
Kelley, David J.
Kelley, Kevin C.
Kelsey, John S.
Keravouri, Jouni
Kesmodel, Robert H.
Klevit, Donald J., Jr.
Kimbrell, Gordon T., Jr.
Kimed, Michael H.
Kinane, Thomas J.
Kirk, Howard C., III
Kirtley, William M., Jr.
Kline, Richard D.
Kobes, Frank J., IV
Kone, Wilson V.
Kopecky, Kenneth W.
Kozak, John B., Jr.
Kriebel, James
Kronberg, Peter M.
Kushkowski, John
LaRoche, John J., Jr.
Laipple, Douglas K.
Langendorf, Henry S.
Lantz, Peter J.
Larson, Richard C.
Lawrence, Gerald R.
Lawson, Douglas B., Jr.
LeCuyer, Jack A.
Leach, Lanse M.
Lee, James H., Jr.
Lester, John H.
Ligon, Peyton F., III
Lincoln, Arthur F., Jr.
Linder, David L.
Lindner, Curtiss M.
Lindseth, Alfred A., Jr.
Lingle, Ted R.
Liss, Melvin O.
Loftheim, Dennis D.
Loftheim, Jon W.
Loftin, Joseph R., Jr.
Lowry, Robert D.
Loyses, Garry J.
Luecke, Robert W.
Magee, Darryl D.
Manlove, Richard W.
Markey, Keith L.
Marshall, John W.
Martin, David F.
Marvin, Ronald E.
Mazzarella, Anthony R.
McCallum, James S.
McCullough, Theodore V., Jr.
McDonnell, John J., III
McFarren, Freddy E.
McGoogan, Franklin A., Jr.
McGuire, John S.
McKay, Michael V., Jr.
McKearn, Chauncy F.
McKibbin, Hugh R., Jr.
McKinney, William R.
McKnight, John T., Jr.
McLaughlin, Thomas R., Jr.
McNaughton, Thomas J.
Meccia, Robert M.
Medlock, Randall B.
Meier, Ronald P.
Mentell, Robert A.
Meszar, Frank, 3d
Meurer, Frederick E.
Mewhinney, Michael C.

Saharan, Robert F.
Miller, Herbert G., Jr.
Miller, Thomas R.
Mlakar, Paul F.
Moffett, Donald L.
Moll, Jeremiah C.
Moore, Charles L.
Moore, Donald R., Jr.
Morgan, Kermit M.
Morrison, James L.
Morrow, Boyce C., Jr.
Morton, Berry E., II
Mosley, Arthur C., Jr.
Mulligan, Arthur G.
Murphy, Donald T.
Murray, Richard N., Jr.
Musiol, Joseph J.
Nason, Alan B.
Nelson, Phillip A.
Nemecek, Henry A.
Nesmith, Vardell E., Jr.
Newell, William J., III
Newhouse, Nelson H.
Nibbelink, James C.
Nichols, Rex A.
Niskanen, Martin K.
Noble, Wright E., Jr.
Norris, Jack K., II
Norton, George E., III
O'Connell, Courtenay P.
O'Connor, William G.
Ogle, James T.
Ohotnický, Stephen T.
Oj, John
Olkoski, Jan W.
Ophus, James B.
Oshel, Michael E.
Otto, William S.
Palles, Jan V.
Pappas, John G.
Parker, Arthur M., III
Parker, Earle L., Jr.
Parker, James D.
Peake, James B.
Pearce, David C., III
Peery, George G., III
Pelletier, Donald L.
Penning, Michael N.
Perey, Lynn J.
Perkins, Dennis L.
Petersberger, John J., II
Phillips, John H.
Pickens, William E., Jr.
Pier, William S.
Piskun, Walter S.
Pleasant, Justin K.
Poage, Wayne L.
Pontuck, Howard S.
Poole, William M.
Potter, Mark W.
Pratt, Frank G., Jr.
Prem, Donald J.
Proctor, James H., Jr.
Rantala, John W., Jr.
Ray, James D., Jr.
Redmond, John, III
Rees, Raymond F.
Reilly, Bernard J., Jr.
Rennagel, William C.
Renneker, Dewey J., Jr.
Rizzo, Samuel A.
Robbins, Robert D.
Roggenkamp, Paul H.
Root, Paul M.
Rose, Donald E., Jr.
Roseborough, Morgan G., Jr.
Roshong, Bryon E.
Ruderman, Gill H.
Rybicki, Frank A., Jr.
Hathorn, Fred C.

Salander, James M.
Salt, Terrence C.
Salz, Louis
Sandell, George N.
Sands, Gerald A.
Satter, Robert A.
Scales, Robert H., Jr.
Schap, Frank J., Jr.
Schofield, David M.
Schremp, Bruce H.
Schroeder, Kenneth P.
Schroeder, Thomas M.
Schulcz, Arthur A.
Scoggin, Donald H.
Scott, Troy C.
Sureman, Mark A.
Seger, Robert E.
Seibel, David E.
Seigle, Robert N.
Seith, William F.
Selisor, James L.
Sendak, Theodore T.
Sepeta, Raymond G.
Shepherd, Arthur R.
Sherrard, Roger D.
Shurtliff, Jeffrey C.
Silliman, Michael B.
Simon, Henry F.
Sims, Billy D.
Sims, Douglas A.
Singer, Stephen L.
Sirutis, Alfred J., Jr.
Skowronski, Walter E.
Smith, Abney A., Jr.
Smith, Daniel M.
Smith, Gerald G.
Smith, Jeffrey H.
Smith, John W.
Smith, Lawrence M.
Snell, Robert M.
Snyder, Karl S.
Sonstelle, Richard R.
Sparling, Frederick W., Jr.
St. John, Richard L.
Stalker, William H., II
Steel, Jon L.
Steenlage, John R., Jr.
Stenstrom, Ronald L.
Stepp, James M.
Stevens, Bryan R.
Stewart, Gary M.
Stowers, Charles T., Jr.
Strapac, John J.
Strickland, Walter M.
Striegel, Richard R.
Strokin, Victor J.
Stull, Terry G.
Suhay, James W., Jr.
Sullivan, William K.
Sustersic, Louis R.
Swain, Richard M., II
Swain, Thomas E.
Swanson, Francis L., III

The following-named midshipmen, graduating class of 1966, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284 and 3287:

Akers, Frank H., Jr.
Anderson, Ben L., Jr.
Bryan, Peter K.
Giles, Tommy H., III

The following-named cadet, graduating class of 1966, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284 and 3287:

Hathorn, Fred C.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 12, 1966:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning Roderick M. White, to be commander, and ending Cassius Lisk, to be lieutenant (jg.) which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 5, 1966.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Dr. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who built his house upon a rock.—Matthew 7: 24.

O God, our Father, who in the midst of the shifting sands of trying times stands steadfast and sure, make Thyself real to us we pray. We are weary of the littleness of little people and would escape from the limitations of their listless living. We are concerned about the state of our world and the direction in which our country seems to be going. We look about us and at times we are discouraged. Help us, we pray Thee, to look up and to keep on looking up that our eyes may be on Thee, our faith in Thee and from Thy hand we may take strength and courage for every day.

Steady us, our Father, steady us as we in spirit bow before the altar of Thy Presence that our faith may be renewed, our hope strengthened and our courage confirmed. In our hospitality to the highest may there come hope for this day and the days to come: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution which would create a Committee of Grievances in the House.

The committee would be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, four from the majority party and three from the minority party. The Speaker would designate one of the committee as chairman.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of any complaint concerning the conduct of a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. The