



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia.

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

Dear God of all creation, we thank Thee for this season of the year that we see the appearing of new life from the old.

We feel our need of new life in this day when we find old ideas and challenges inadequate. Create from the breath and life within us, new concepts, ideals, and understanding we need to find the way to new life for this hour.

Bless these elected leaders of the people with insight and wisdom. May they always feel the presence of God and the support of the people.

Be with our President and international men of authority in finding peace for a world in a time where there is no peace. Awaken these, and all men, to the possibilities of life led by Thy spirit. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 17, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1966, received a mes-

sage from the House which announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1748. An act for the relief of Virgilio Acosta-Martinez; and

S. 2696. An act for the relief of Abraham Ezekiel Cohen.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Secretary of the Senate also, on May 18, 1966, received a message from the House of Representatives, which announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 1098. An act to amend section I(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes;

S. 1748. An act for the relief of Virgilio Acosta-Martinez; and

S. 2696. An act for the relief of Abraham Ezekiel Cohen.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of May 17, 1966,

The following reports of committees were submitted on May 18, 1966:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 8376. An act to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment for certain corkboard insulation (Rept. No. 1170);

H.R. 10998. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid (Rept. No. 1171);

H.R. 11653. An act to make permanent the existing suspension of duty on certain natural graphite (Rept. No. 1172);

H.R. 12262. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes (Rept. No. 1173);

H.R. 12463. An act to extend until June 30, 1969, the suspension of duty on crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory (Rept. No. 1174);

H.R. 12657. An act to continue the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite (Rept. No. 1175);

H.R. 12864. An act to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders (Rept. No. 1176); and

H.R. 12997. An act to extend until July 15, 1968, the suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum (Rept. No. 1177).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Govern-

ments—Second Supplement, January 10, 1966" (Rept. No. 1167);

S. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Joint Economic Committee of additional copies of its hearings entitled "Twentieth Anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946, an Economic Symposium" (Rept. No. 1166);

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution to authorize printing of additional copies of hearings (Rept. No. 1165);

S. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "U.S. Policy With Respect to Mainland China" (Rept. No. 1164);

S. Res. 259. Resolution for additional funds for the Committee on the District of Columbia;

S. Res. 260. Resolution to print a study entitled "Policy Planning for Aeronautical Research and Development" (Rept. No. 1162); and

S. Res. 263. Resolution to print additional copies of a Senate report filed by the Special Committee on Aging (Rept. No. 1163).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 251. Resolution to investigate the Trading With the Enemy Act (Rept. No. 1169).

RESOLUTIONS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1966,

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolutions, which were placed on the calendar:

S. Res. 264. Resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the "Election Law Guidebook" as a Senate document (Rept. No. 1168);

S. Res. 265. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Helene L. Macpherson; and

S. Res. 266. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Julia L. Conway and Mary C. Downey.

PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1168)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1966, the following report of a committee was submitted on May 18, 1966:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 264. An original resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the "Election Law Guidebook" as a Senate document (Rept. No. 1168); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

"Resolved, That a revised edition of Senate Document Numbered 67 of the Eighty-eighth Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook", be printed as a Senate document and that

there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration."

HELENE L. MACPHERSON

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1966, the following report of a committee was submitted on May 18, 1966:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration: S. Res. 265. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Helene L. Macpherson; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Helene L. Macpherson, widow of Gregor Macpherson, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances."

JULIA L. CONWAY AND MARY C. DOWNEY

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1966, the following report of a committee was submitted on May 18, 1966:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 266. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Julia L. Conway and Mary C. Downey; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Julia L. Conway and Mary C. Downey, aunts of Louisa R. Pearson, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to six months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances."

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section I, Public Law 86-42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. KEE, of West Virginia, and Mr. DUNCAN, of Oregon, as members of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, on the part of the House, vice Mr. GIALMO, of Connecticut, and Mr. TUPPER, of Maine, excused.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, 89th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, as a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3283) to

promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H.R. 1275. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jadwiga (Ita) Lapides;

H.R. 1483. An act for the relief of the John V. Boland Construction Co.;

H.R. 3631. An act for the relief of John Sinclair;

H.R. 4083. An act for the relief of Mr. Leonardo Tusa;

H.R. 7026. An act for the relief of Nathan Levine;

H.R. 9643. An act for the relief of Haider Raza and his wife, Irene Raza, and their children, Afzal Anthony and Haider Raymond Raza;

H.R. 10220. An act for the relief of Abdul Wohabe;

H.R. 11253. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Pennsylvania;

H.R. 11718. An act for the relief of Jack L. Philippot;

H.R. 11940. An act for the relief of Fred M. Osteen;

H.R. 12315. An act for the relief of Anthony A. Calloway;

H.R. 12664. An act to retrocede to the State of Colorado exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over the real property comprising the Fort Lyon veterans hospital reservation;

H.R. 12884. An act for the relief of John R. Sylvia;

H.R. 13366. An act to authorize the disposal of aluminum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13768. An act to authorize the disposal of celestite from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13769. An act to authorize the disposal of cordage fiber (sisal) from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13770. An act to authorize the disposal of crocidolite asbestos (harsh) from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13772. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 13773. An act to authorize the disposal of opium from the national stockpile.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 587) officially recognizing Waterloo, N.Y., as the birthplace of Memorial Day and authorizing the President to issue an appropriate proclamation relating to the centennial anniversary of the first celebration of Memorial Day, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 1275. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jadwiga (Ita) Lapides;

H.R. 1483. An act for the relief of the John V. Boland Construction Co.;

H.R. 3631. An act for the relief of John Sinclair;

H.R. 4083. An act for the relief of Mr. Leonardo Tusa;

H.R. 7026. An act for the relief of Nathan Levine;

H.R. 9643. An act for the relief of Haider Raza and his wife, Irene Raza, and their children, Afzal Anthony and Haider Raymond Raza;

H.R. 10220. An act for the relief of Abdul Wohabe;

H.R. 11253. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Pennsylvania;

H.R. 11718. An act for the relief of Jack L. Philippot;

H.R. 11940. An act for the relief of Fred M. Osteen;

H.R. 12315. An act for the relief of Anthony A. Calloway; and

H.R. 12884. An act for the relief of John R. Sylvia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12664. An act to retrocede to the State of Colorado exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over the real property comprising the Fort Lyon Veterans Hospital reservation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 13366. An act to authorize the disposal of aluminum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13768. An act to authorize the disposal of celestite from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13769. An act to authorize the disposal of cordage fiber (sisal) from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13770. An act to authorize the disposal of crocidolite asbestos (harsh) from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13772. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 13773. An act to authorize the disposal of opium from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, May 19, 1966, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1098. An act to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes;

S. 1748. An act for the relief of Virgilio Acosta-Martinez; and

S. 2696. An act for the relief of Abraham Ezekiel Cohen.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

The Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works.

The Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the transaction of routine morning business, with the exception of that of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], be limited to 3 minutes. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is my sorrowful errand to notify the Senate of the passing of a former colleague who here served his State of Rhode Island and his country for 24 devoted years.

Theodore Francis Green died this morning in his Providence home close to his beloved Brown University which has gratefully and continually honored its loyal son.

His was a wealth of 99 years which enriched his community, his country, and the world. The biographer has woven the century of his living into the century of sacrificing service for his native State to which his forebears had themselves given public service since its earliest colonial days.

But Theodore Francis Green was more than a man of history. He was a man of warm friendships—an idealist who could inspire to ideals—and made every path the better because he passed that way.

In the passing of Senator Theodore Francis Green, a dear friend has gone from my life. Between us was a bond of affection—the wisdom of the older statesman and the appreciation of the younger who so valued his counsel and guidance.

His was a dedicated career of public service in the personal character of the patriot. He was an inspiration to prepare for responsibility and to accept and discharge that responsibility not for personal glory but in the deep love of country that was his very nature.

Time and again his colleagues in the Senate, without distinction of party, have testified to the stature of Theodore Francis Green as a great American. I could repeat them all—with the added gratitude of one who felt close to the eager heart, the brilliant mind, and the earnest soul of a sincere friend.

America—and each of us—suffer a loss. But we see beyond that loss a rich legacy in the life, labors, and loyalty, the high ideals of one who was always our humble neighbor.

Mr. President, for myself and my colleague [Mr. PELL], I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 267), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and extreme regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Theodore Francis Green, who served in the U.S. Senate from the State of Rhode Island from 1936 until 1961.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased, together with a transcript of remarks made in the Senate in praise of his distinguished service to the Nation.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn until Monday next.

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

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, before moving the adoption of the resolution, I yield to my colleague [Mr. PELL].

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I mourn the death, this morning, of Senator Theodore Francis Green, in the 99th year of his life. In him I lost a good and close friend whose advice and guidance I have always respected and one who has been an inspiration to me since I was a boy.

People of the world, our country, and especially of our State of Rhode Island mourn the death of Senator Green. His long life of public service, beginning before the time of most of us, is without equal in the history of our Nation. His public life started when he raised and outfitted his own company in the Spanish-American War.

By heritage and a sense of duty Theodore Francis Green was a man of all our people. He was a unique gentleman—scholar, athlete, statesman, politician, and custodian of family and community values. He was a statesman in the complete sense of the word. To recite his achievements is to call a very real role of honor.

Educated at Brown, Harvard, Bonn, and Berlin Universities, he was admitted to the bar in Rhode Island in 1892, when he commenced the practice of law. His interest in public service, politics, and business continued from then until the day of his death.

He was a life trustee of Brown University and of the Rhode Island School of Design. Five of his forebears were Members of Congress and he was president general of the Society of the Cincinnati.

Thus, for more than half a century he championed his party, and his ideals of government in Rhode Island and in the Nation with courage and determination. He took both defeat and victory in his stride. As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he left such a mark that, when he retired from that post, he was named its first chairman emeritus.

Many times in my life I have been in debt of Theodore Francis Green. I recall how I have benefited by his wise advice and counsel, how I have gained by following his example—beyond, I would hope, the accident of heritage whereby

we both had five forebears each who served in the Congress; and by our gratitude to him when he kindly served as chairman of my Senate campaign committee in 1960.

Theodore Francis Green's entire lifetime was spent serving his fellow man. His legend and renown will be remembered long in the hearts of the people of our State, which he served so long and so well. Most of us in Rhode Island today have been in one way or another touched by his gentle and wise counsel. He truly was a great gentleman and a statesman of the world as well as of our State and Nation.

I extend my condolences to his nephews Ronald, Arnold, Burges, Conrad, and Ellis Green and share their grief.

Mr. PASTORE. It is a privilege to yield to the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, with the death of Theodore Francis Green, I lose a friend of over 30 years' standing. Senator Green was a remarkable man, who lived a long, busy, and useful life.

He was first elected to the Senate when he was 70 years old—a remarkable achievement. He went on to become chairman of two committees, first the Committee on Rules and Administration and then the Committee on Foreign Relations, where he was both active and effective. In an unusual move, he voluntarily relinquished his chairmanship of the latter at the age of 92, because he felt that that important committee needed younger leadership. He remained on the committee, however, and participated fully in its deliberations until he left the Senate.

Mr. President, I knew Theodore Green when he was Governor of Rhode Island and I was speaker of the house in Massachusetts. At that time, we conferred on a number of matters that concerned our two States, and a friendship developed between us which lasted through his career as a Member of the U.S. Senate and into his retirement. I shall always remember him as a man with a great sense of humor and very quick repartee. I always felt that when I cast a remark at Theodore Green, I would get back a better reply, and I was ready for it. But at the same time that he was quick and facetious, he was hard working and conscientious and recognized his obligations as a Senator and as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I believe he knew more ambassadors and visited more countries than any other Senator of his time.

We shall all miss him and remember him as a distinguished public servant.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that I heard the announcement by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] of the death of our former colleague, Senator Theodore Francis Green. Senator Green was a dear friend. He was a dedicated public servant. He was a wonderful man.

He was a great American. His life will ever be an inspiration and a challenge to those of us who were privileged to serve with him and to know him. He will live on in the history of our country.

I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senators from Rhode Island and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in the beautiful and richly deserved tributes which they have paid to Senator Green.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the acting majority leader.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I, too, was saddened to learn of the passing of Theodore Francis Green.

It was my privilege to serve with him and under his leadership on the Committee on Rules and Administration and subsequently on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Senator Green was always most courteous, considerate, and polite to all of us in helping us discharge our responsibility. He was an architect of this Nation's foreign policy. Notwithstanding his advanced years, there was no task too burdensome for Senator Green to carry out in his Nation's interest.

It was an inspiration for younger Senators to serve under his leadership.

I deeply grieve to learn that he has been lost from the scene of American life today.

I join the Senators from Rhode Island in their deep feeling of sadness at his passing.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the late senior Senator from Rhode Island, Theodore Francis Green, was a kindly, humble person, exuding culture and great wisdom. His was a lifetime of dedication and service to the people of his State and his Nation.

On two occasions I accompanied the late Theodore Francis Green to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference. I learned to respect him, as did all of his colleagues in the Senate who sat with him on committees or who traveled with him overseas. He was indeed a remarkable man.

I share the sentiments which my very dear friend, the incumbent senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and his colleague and others have expressed here today.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks made this morning regarding former Senator Green of Rhode Island.

It was my privilege to have served on the Committee on Foreign Relations during some of the time that he was chairman. He was always a perfect gentleman and an outstanding chairman, interested in the welfare of those much younger and newer on the committee than he was in years of service.

I wish to mention one matter with respect to Senator Green. He was a deeply religious man. He had a strong

religious faith and great religious conviction. He was a very active Baptist layman. It was my privilege to attend the same church, the First Baptist Church of Washington, at the same time that he attended. It was always an inspiration to me to see him come down the aisle and occupy his pew in this church on a Sunday morning.

He was truly a great citizen who rendered great and outstanding service to his State and to the Nation.

I wish to extend sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I join in the expression of the feeling of personal loss in the death of a former patriarch of the Senate, Hon. Francis Green.

He was a man of great talent and ability. He had a sense of humor that surpassed that of almost anyone I have ever known.

If he had had time to write his memoirs of the span of history in which he participated and helped to make, it would have added great new light on the history of the United States.

I can well remember his describing his experiences at the convention in Baltimore at the time of the nomination of Woodrow Wilson. He was the "kid" member, he said, of the Rhode Island delegation.

Throughout his service here he had a fresh viewpoint that added much to our deliberations and to the Senate as a body.

We shall miss him, and we are grateful to the State of Rhode Island for having given us his presence for so many years.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I am personally grieved at the passing of Theodore Francis Green. It was my pleasure to serve with him in the U.S. Senate for several years. He was literally not only a foremost tradition of the beloved Rhode Island that he represented but, as well, one of the fine traditions of our Nation. He will be sorely missed.

Theodore Francis Green was a statesman and a gentleman. He was a superb chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He had a very keen mind and a very delightful sense of humor. Surely among the most delightful stories of Washington are those with respect to the late Senator Green.

He and I were of opposing political parties. But we were good friends of many years—starting back in the days when the late Louis J. Brann, a prominent Democrat, was Governor of Maine and a very good friend of my husband and myself.

Although Theodore Francis Green was the vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, he refused to go into Maine to campaign against me. I shall never forget his friendship for me that transcended political party lines. I shall miss him.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 267) was agreed to.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE CANADIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, we are most fortunate to have with us today some of the outstanding Members of the Parliament of Canada, our good neighbor to the north.

While I have never had the opportunity to be the guest of those who are visiting the U.S. Senate, I have long recognized that Canada is one of our best friends, and I so regard that great nation and great and wonderful neighbor with whom we share a common border.

I now ask the Chair to call upon the Senator from Vermont to present the Canadian delegation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, lest there be undue alarm on the other side of the aisle, I may say that the appearance in the Chamber this morning is not intended as a preview of the 90th Congress—although, one can never tell. But we are glad to have our Canadian friends sitting on the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. President, the Senate is honored to have in the Chamber a distinguished delegation of Members of the Canadian Parliament who are attending the Ninth Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference. We are also pleased to have as guests the lovely wives of many members of the delegation.

This morning the two delegations participated in an exchange of views on matters of common interest to our countries. We will hold additional meetings this afternoon and tomorrow.

I have no doubt that this ninth regular meeting of Members from our respective legislative bodies will bind even closer the strong ties between the United States and our good friend, ally, and neighbor to the north.

It is my pleasure to present to the Senate the Members of Parliament from Canada:

From the Senate: The Honorable Sydney J. Smith, Speaker of the Senate and Cochairman of the delegation. He has attended every parliamentary session between Canada and the United States.

The Honorable Sarto Fournier.
The Honorable M. Grattan O'Leary.
The Honorable Nelson Rattenbury.
The Honorable Dr. Orville Howard Phillips.

The Honorable John B. Aird.
Now we come to the House of Commons, which in Canada, unlike as in the United States, is not referred to as the lower House. It is a very important House up there. It has perhaps more power than our House of Representatives.

First, Mr. Herman M. Batten, Deputy Speaker of the House, and cochairman of the delegation.

The Honorable Francis Alvin George Hamilton.

The Honorable J. H. Theogene Ricard.
Mr. Donald S. Macdonald.
Mr. Wallace B. Nesbitt.
Mr. Robert C. Coates.

Mr. Robert Simpson.
 Mr. Alexander Bell Patterson.
 Mr. F. Andrew Brewin.
 Mr. Viateur Ethier.
 Mr. Allan M. A. McLean.
 Mr. Reid Scott.
 Mr. David Walter Groos.
 Mr. Paul Langlois.
 Rev. David S. H MacDonald.
 Mr. Robert John Orange.
 Mr. Gerard Pelletier.
 Mr. Alcide Simard.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes so that Senators may greet the Canadian parliamentarians.

RECESS

Thereupon, at 12:23 o'clock p.m., the Senate took a recess until 12:28 o'clock p.m.

During the recess, Members of the Canadian Parliament were greeted by Members of the Senate.

On expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD of Virginia).

APPOINTMENT BY THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senate will suspend, the Chair will make an announcement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On behalf of the Vice President, the Chair announces the appointment of Senator WALTER F. MONDALE to attend the United Nations' Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, in place of Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, resigned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PROGRAM

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, the National Oceanographic Program for fiscal year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committees on Public Works and Rules and Administration.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the transfer of acreage allotments, base acreages, and sugar proportionate shares established under any Federal statute, and to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the selection of review committees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON TITLE AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of April, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide authority to the Secretary of Defense to acquire properties and provide other relief for certain homeowners whose properties are situated at or near military installations which have been ordered to be closed (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations of the Department of Commerce to be available until expended or for periods in excess of one year (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

USE BY POLICYHOLDERS OF CASH SURRENDER VALUE OF CERTAIN LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use by policyholders of the cash surrender value or the proceeds of a matured endowment policy of U.S. Government or national service life insurance to purchase annuities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, the American Legion, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the financial condition of that organization, as of December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE U.S. GOVERNMENT IN THE RHODESIAN SITUATION

A letter from the Secretary of State, informing the Senate of certain actions taken by the U.S. Government in the Rhodesian situation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on U.S. participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Mountain Park project, Oklahoma (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONTRACTS FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to

authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts for scientific and technological research, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONTINUANCE OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT IN CRATER LAKE NATIONAL PARK

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract in Crater Lake National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS RELATING TO PETITIONS FOR THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

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

REPORT OF ELEANOR ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

A letter from the chairman, Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Foundation, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1310 OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

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

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 Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

- "State of Arizona
- "Senate
- "Twenty-seventh Legislature
- "Second Regular Session

"SENATE MEMORIAL No. 6

"A memorial urging the Congress of the United States to defeat bills pending in the House of Representatives of the United States which provide for the enlargement of the boundaries of the Grand Canyon National Park

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas, there have been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States H.R. 14176 by Mr. JOHN SAYLOR, H.R. 14177 by Mr. DINGELL, and H.R. 14211 by Mr. REUSS, all being identical Bills to enlarge the boundaries of the Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona; and

"Whereas, these Bills are designed to forestall any further development of the water resources of Arizona and the Pacific Southwest by prohibiting construction of the Marble and Bridge Canyon Dams which are needed to provide power to pump water and revenue to finance water importation projects; and

"Whereas, these Bills also would take out of productive use valuable timber resources, grazing lands, and, probably most disastrous of all, place the famed North Kaibab Wildlife Refuge with its great deer herd under the National Park Service, which prohibits cropping wildlife surplusage on a year-to-year basis; and

"Whereas, this deer herd is an outstanding recreation resource for thousands of hunters, camera fans, and sightseers each year; and

"Whereas, past experience has demonstrated that unless it is carefully managed this herd will multiply so rapidly during favorable climatic periods that it will destroy the forage plants on which it is dependent during dry periods, and thereby destroy itself; and

"Whereas, these bills are not in the best interests of the State of Arizona, the West and the Nation.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States defeat the proposed enactment of H.R. 14176, H.R. 14177 and H.R. 14211.

"2. That the Secretary of State of Arizona transmit a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Arizona Congressional delegation."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 17

"Joint resolution relative to the federal 'Water Supply Act of 1958'

"Whereas, The federal 'Water Supply Act of 1958' (P.L. 85-500, Title III, Section 301) provides, incident to the construction of federal reservoir projects, for the inclusion of storage of water for present or anticipated needs for municipal or industrial purposes; and

"Whereas, It is highly desirable that such act be amended to also authorize the inclusion of such storage of water in federal reservoir projects for agricultural purposes, in order that full utilization may be made of federal multipurpose reservoir projects; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to amend the 'Water Supply Act of 1958' (P.L. 85-500, Title III, Section 301) to authorize the inclusion of storage of water in federal reservoir projects for present or anticipated needs for agricultural purposes, as well as municipal or industrial purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be 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, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 16

"Joint resolution relative to the Interstate Highway System in California

"Whereas, The federal government has deleted certain mileage from the Interstate Highway System in the City and County of San Francisco because of the failure of that city to agree upon the location of routes; and

"Whereas, This action in cutting back the Interstate Highway System in California, rather than revising it, will have a very serious effect on the highway program in this state; and

"Whereas, This substantial reduction of federal highway aid to California will mean that highway projects in every area of the state will be delayed; and

"Whereas, California already contributes substantially more toward the construction of the Interstate Highway System than it receives; and

"Whereas, The Century Freeway (State Highway Route 42) would make an excellent segment of the Interstate Highway System and would diminish the serious impact of this loss for California; and

"Whereas, On April 4, 1966, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors strongly urged that the Interstate Highway funds heretofore earmarked for expenditure in San Francisco be expended on the Century Freeway in the Los Angeles 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 respectfully memorializes the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads to place the Century Freeway (State Highway Route 42) in the Interstate Highway System 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 Secretary of Commerce, to the Administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads, and to each Senator and Representative of California in the Congress of the United States."

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 14

"Joint resolution relative to the national forests

"Whereas, The State of California, in recent years suffered irreparable damage from forest fires to the natural resources upon which its future depends; and

"Whereas, The United States Forest Service has plans for improvements in fire prevention and fire preparedness to meet the challenge of increasing use of our national forests; and

"Whereas, The need for increased fire prevention and fire preparedness, improved access, and facilities for meeting the recreational needs of an expanding population is recognized in the Program for the National Forests which was presented to the 86th Congress of the United States, and is currently being considered by the present Congress; and

"Whereas, It is clearly in the interest of all the people of the United States and of the State of California that forest fire losses and firefighting costs be reduced through improved management, prevention, and preparedness programs; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the

Congress of the United States to fully and promptly redeem the responsibility of the United States for the protection and management of the national forests in California as provided for in the Program for the National Forests which is now before the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be 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 each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Forests, House Committee on Agriculture, for introduction into the record of its hearing on April 15, 1966, to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Chairman of the House Public Works Committee for introduction into the record of its hearings on April 13, 20, 21, 1966, on Forest Development Roads in the Federal Aid Highway bill, and to the Chairman of the Public Works Committee, United States Senate, for introduction into its hearing on the Forest Development Plan."

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

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION No. 16

"Joint resolution relative to the impact upon local public school operations resulting from the curtailment of the employment of foreign nationals in agriculture

"Whereas, The Congress of the United States has determined that the admission of Mexican nationals for performance of agricultural work in the United States under Public Law 78 of the 82nd Congress, as amended, shall be discontinued; and

"Whereas, The admission of foreign nationals for the performance of agricultural work in the United States under the general immigration laws has thereby been curtailed; and

"Whereas, The ensuing recruitment and employment of domestic workers has created many problems for agricultural communities in California in that such workers are, in the majority of instances, accompanied by families for whom special housing and a multitude of governmental and social services must be provided; and

"Whereas, The impact of this influx of families into California communities is especially great in connection with the maintenance of the already overcrowded public schools, and entails major expenditures for capital expansion and for instructional and other educational services without correlative increases in local fiscal resources for the school districts and other agencies maintaining the public schools; and

"Whereas, Since these burdens placed upon the public school systems in numerous communities in California justify the immediate development of a federal program of subventions to enable affected school districts and other local agencies maintaining public schools to accommodate the great increases in enrollments; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to formulate and enact appropriate legislation to provide for a program of federal subventions for school districts and other local governmental agencies maintaining public schools which are affected by the impact of increased enrollments and related difficulties arising from the curtailment of programs for the recruitment and employment of foreign nationals in agriculture; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly 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, 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 Post Office and Civil Service:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 24

"Joint resolution relative to mailed sample ballots

"Whereas, The Post Office Department has recently ruled that mailed sample ballots that are prepared with the use of electronic (I.B.M.) equipment must be sent as first class mail; and

"Whereas, The effect of this ruling on registrars of voters, county and city clerks, and other public officers who are authorized by law to mail sample ballots will be to almost double mailing costs to the taxpayers, since sample ballots not electronically prepared may be sent by cheaper third class mail; and

"Whereas, These increased election costs to the public will necessitate additional budgetary augmentations by local governmental bodies, since their budgets have already been adopted on the basis of lower mail rates for electronically prepared sample ballots; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Post Office Department to change its ruling with respect to registrars of voters, county and city clerks, and other public officers who are authorized by law to mail sample ballots, so that the rate for electronically prepared sample ballots for such officials will be no more than that for third class mail; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to Lawrence F. O'Brien, Postmaster General."

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 15

"Joint resolution relative to the Marysville Dam and Reservoir project

"Whereas, There is urgent need for flood control on the Yuba River, California, as evidenced by past flood damages and Corps of Engineers studies of future potential damage; and

"Whereas, No flood control storage presently exists on Yuba River, and although the Bullards Bar Project, proposed by the Yuba County Water Agency, will provide substantial flood control benefits, it will only partially control the stream; and

"Whereas, The proposed Marysville Dam and Reservoir Project in conjunction with the Bullards Bar Project will provide full flood control on Yuba River as well as water conservation, power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement; and

"Whereas, A report of the Corps of Engineers proposing construction of the Marysville Project is presently in Washington but has not yet been submitted to the Congress of the United States; now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to take the necessary steps to authorize construction and operation of the Marysville Dam and Reservoir Project by the United States and to appropriate funds for early completion of necessary fish and wildlife studies to be conducted cooperatively by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and

the California Department of Fish and Game to determine appropriate measures for maintaining the fish and wildlife resources affected by the proposed project, and subject to favorable findings of this study to thereafter take such steps and to lend such support as may be required to accomplish construction of this urgently needed project at the earliest practicable date; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to transmit a copy 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 Army, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"State of Arizona

"Senate

"Twenty-seventh Legislature

"Second Regular Session

"SENATE MEMORIAL NO. 5

"A memorial urging the United States to act favorably on Senator DIRKSEN'S proposal to amend the Constitution for the purpose of permitting geography and political subdivisions to be taken into account in the apportionment of one house of a State legislature if the people of the State approve in a referendum

"To the United States Senate:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas, reapportionment of State Legislatures based on the United States Supreme Court Decree has caused chaos and disruption of State Government in many States; and

"Whereas, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN of Illinois, with the support of Senator PAUL FANNIN of Arizona, has pressed for the United States Senate to pass a Constitutional amendment which would permit geography and political subdivisions to be taken into account in the apportionment of one House of a State Legislature if the people of a State approve in a Referendum; and

"Whereas, an agreement has been reached to vote in the United States Senate on DIRKSEN'S Proposal on Wednesday, April 20, 1966.

"Whereas your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Senate of the State of Arizona hereby pledges its full support and hopes that Senator DIRKSEN'S Proposal passes the United States Senate by the required two-thirds majority vote.

"2. That the Secretary of State of Arizona transmit a copy of this Memorial to Senator DIRKSEN, to the President of the United States Senate and to each member of the Arizona Congressional delegation.

"Unanimously adopted by the Senate—April 14, 1966.

"Filed in the Office of the Secretary of State—April 14, 1966."

Resolutions adopted at the Seventy-fifth Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE SEVENTY-FIFTH CONTINENTAL CONGRESS, NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, APRIL 18-22, 1966

"REDEDICATION

"Where the spirit of the Lord is—there is liberty."

"Whereas educational programs of the Daughters of the American Revolution, have recognized and emphasized the value of character building and the development of spiritual fortitude; and

"Whereas the precepts set forth in the Holy Bible have influenced indelibly the lives and thinking of free men throughout the cen-

turies and especially gave inspiration to the framers of the Constitution of the United States of America;

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, extend sincere congratulations to the American Bible Society on its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary, with appreciation for the immeasurable values contributed to the spiritual development of mankind by making available, through distribution of the Holy Bible, knowledge of the 'spirit of the Lord';

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, emphasize rededication to the development of individual spiritual fortitude and to continuing service to Home and Country—a Nation under God with liberty and justice for all.

"THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Whereas the Flag of the United States of America is the emblem of the Nation and a symbol of liberty wherever displayed; and

"Whereas apathy, indifference and lack of respect for the Flag are becoming increasingly evident by incidents of desecration and sometimes violent destruction; and

"Whereas Public Law 829 (Flag Code) does not provide penalties for desecration and misuse of the Flag;

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, support legislation which would make desecration of the Flag of the United States of America a Federal offense with penalties of fines and/or imprisonment.

"SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ARMED FORCES

"Whereas testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee and public statements by high Government officials cause grave concern that the armed forces of the United States of America are being sacrificed in wars without adequate military support and equipment or declared goals of military victory; and

"Whereas American military strength has been weakened by crucial shortages; by unilateral United States Disarmament Agency cutbacks of major new weaponry, as well as by serious depletion of American maritime and air strength; by elimination of key foreign bases; reduced nuclear research; and by lack of anti-missile defenses; and

"Whereas our armed forces are further undermined by allies plying enemy ports with trade, and now increased American trade and aid to the communist bloc are advocated; and

"Whereas important sources advocate coalition goals with communist representatives, when coalition historically achieves enemy take-over, dishonors our pledges, and make senseless the sacrifices of American youth;

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express its whole-hearted support and gratitude to the men serving in our armed forces; assert there should be no continuing commitments of our troops without well-defined national objectives; urge an end to disarmament programs and trade with the enemy; and urge that no American soldier be asked to serve without full military support to assure victory.

"EXTENSION OF OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

"Whereas research in oceanography, which leads to knowledge of the geological, chemical and biological resources in ocean space, is vital to the existence of this Nation; and

"Whereas oceanography includes the study of the motions in and internal stresses of ocean space—and the exploration of the ocean floor, important in underwater communications—particularly in the area of national defense; and

"Whereas there are bills before Congress to provide for sea-grant colleges to train personnel for the needed expansion of our scientific interest in oceanographic research;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, commend Congress, industry and scientific institutions for the development in this field and encourage even more concerted effort to train the scientists and technicians necessary for the expansion of an educational program of oceanography, marine mining, aqua culture and related fields.

"PANAMA CANAL

"Whereas the United States Senate has the power to block proposed new treaties revoking America's perpetual treaty rights over the Panama Canal by surrender of Canal Zone sovereignty and shared administrative responsibility to the Panama Republic, under terms which could deny to the United States access and defense rights; and

"Whereas the Canal Zone is a territorial possession of the United States of America, constitutionally acquired by treaty with Panama and purchased from individual property owners, and the Panama Canal was built at the sole cost of the United States of America and has been efficiently maintained and operated to the great benefit of Panama and the world; and

"Whereas loss of this vital artery for peaceful or military transport, essential to national and hemispheric economy and defense, would gravely weaken America; would give away billions of American tax-paid Canal Zone investments; would cause a major loss of our world prestige and power; and would hand a triumph to our enemies, who are now entrenched in the Caribbean;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, favor no United States surrender or further abrogation to Panama of the United States of America's absolute treaty rights over this strategic Canal Zone.

"CONSULAR CONVENTION (TREATY)

"Whereas the United States Senate Internal Security Subcommittee warns that ratification by the United States Senate of the proposed Consular Convention (treaty) with Soviet Russia would sanction centers of espionage and subversion by allowing establishment of Soviet consulates in our major cities, granting unlimited exemption from criminal jurisdiction for all Soviet consular officials and employees; and

"Whereas the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation points out that the great majority of the 800 communist-bloc official personnel, already stationed in the United States, protected by immunity from prosecution, have engaged in intelligence assignments; and

"Whereas it has been charged that the agreement contains unprecedented concessions to the communists, while, with the increasingly precarious political situation in Latin America, ratification would, by example, lead to further communist diplomatic establishments throughout this hemisphere; and

"Whereas five members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee also charged that ratification will result in unlimited immunity for the consular personnel of 27 other countries with which we have consular conventions, including Communist Romania and Yugoslavia;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, oppose this self-defeating agreement and urge rejection of the proposed Consular Convention as an unwarranted risk to hemispheric defense and national security.

"ATLANTIC UNION

"Whereas after a long and bitter war, the United States won independence and has

endured as a free and sovereign Nation for almost 200 years, an example and hope for all mankind; and

"Whereas powerful political forces have launched a new drive for an 'Atlantic Union,' which in their own words would modify 'our ancient idea of sovereignty,' would destroy our independence and control our economy; and

"Whereas the United States would have to surrender its right and power to coin money, to levy taxes and tariffs, to regulate immigration, to enact citizenship laws, to declare war and to maintain standing armies, and would be subject to the jurisdiction of world courts in which American citizens could be tried and convicted; and

"Whereas plans for Atlantic Union which are intended to lead to world government are already far advanced, as enunciated in the Declaration of Paris, and these plans envisage a Federal Union within the framework of the United Nations in which the Soviet Union has potential majorities and enormous powers;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, alert its members to these attempts to destroy the national sovereignty of the United States of America through the participation in any Atlantic or Federal Union.

"PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE

"Whereas the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice, organized under the Army by Act of Congress 1903, is successfully fulfilling its assigned mission of training civilians of military age in the safe, efficient and responsible use of military-type rifles; and

"Whereas the National Rifle Association of America is working in cooperation with the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice by organizing adult and junior clubs, furnishing trained instructors, conducting marksmanship tournaments throughout the Country; and

"Whereas actual experience has proven that men entering military service with previous rifle training are more capable in combat, thus improving their chances for survival;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, commend the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice and the National Rifle Association of America for their work in training civilians of military age and the youth of America as riflemen, so that they may better serve their Country in time of need, and encourage the continuance and expansion of these training programs.

"SENATE CONFIRMATION OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION DIRECTOR

"Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover has served with distinction and effectiveness since 1924; and

"Whereas it becomes urgent upon his possible retirement that a competent and qualified man be appointed to succeed him;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, approve the proposal that this appointment be subject to the 'advice and consent' of the Senate as stated in a current bill before the Congress of the United States of America; the said bill containing the following requirements: 'Each Director of the F.B.I. shall be appointed only from those individuals who (1) are serving as Associate Director, Assistant to the Director, Assistant Directors, Inspectors and Agents of the F.B.I. at the time of such appointment, and (2) who have served as a full-time officer or employee of the F.B.I. for a period or periods aggregating not less than seven years during the ten-year period immediately preceding the date of such appointment.'

"MONETARY POLICIES

"Whereas the American economy, strained by dollar-deficit trade problems, uncurbed

domestic and foreign spending, and a rapidly increasing war effort, is suffering an inflation which continues to reduce the purchasing power of the dollar, threaten all life savings, insurance, annuities, bonds and fixed incomes, and raise living costs to a new high; and

"Whereas the United States Congress recently authorized the participation of the United States in a new multi-billion dollar Asian Development Bank to aid all Asian countries, 'regardless of ideology,' which this Country, principally, will be expected to fund; and

"Whereas an International or World Monetary System, now proposed, would further encroach on our national sovereignty, block national disciplines necessary to a sound currency, and increase distrust of the American dollar;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, advocate the separation of foreign aid programs from international credit agencies, the restraint of domestic and foreign spending, and oppose participation in international currency systems as a threat to the sovereignty of the Nation.

"COMMENDATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

"Whereas lawlessness and mass disobedience are increasing in volume and violence, leaving citizens in fear for life and property; and

"Whereas recent decisions of the courts have added to the problems of law enforcement and tended to increase crime; and

"Whereas the police are not only under constant harassment which is demoralizing, but also their morale is being lowered by the interference of Civilian Review Boards, resulting in increased police resignation and difficulty in recruiting men of the right caliber;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, commend law enforcement officers in their efforts to maintain the basic principles of just and durable government;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge positive programs designed to teach respect for law and order.

"INTERSTATE COMPACT ON EDUCATION

"Whereas an 'International Compact on Education' between all states and territories, initiated in 1965 to 'promote and encourage local and state initiative in the development . . . and improvement of education,' proposes a membership of state governors, state legislators, politically appointed commissioners, and federal appointees; and

"Whereas, if ratified by states,* this political approach would add to federal educational political controls, which already supersede America's guaranteed constitutional rights to state and local educational controls; and

"Whereas this Compact has the following disadvantages or added educational costs:

"(1) It would require state education commissions, which are not now mandatory in all states.

"(2) It stresses new research programs, when research programs are now criticized by educational associations as often duplicative or over-extensive.

"(3) It would override state referendums against the cost or potential propaganda misuse of state educational TV networks.

* The Virgin Islands and the following 15 states have ratified this Interstate Compact either by legislative or executive action as of April 1966: Arkansas, Hawaii, Minnesota, New Jersey, Texas, Illinois, New Hampshire, Idaho, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, and Ohio.

"(4) The Compact would be free from further legislative review of salaries or personnel control, would be self-amending in its purposes and bylaws, and could add immeasurably to present \$24 billion state educational costs.

"(5) It duplicates three existing smaller regional compacts and on a national scale could outweigh state governments in dealing with Congress or the United States Office of Education, and might become a vehicle for imposing international control of education;

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, oppose state ratification of membership in the 'Interstate Compact on Education' because of uncontrolled costs and purposes and because its political orientation makes unlikely the Compact's desirable stated goal of restored state and local educational control and improvement.

"EDUCATIONAL DILEMMAS

"Whereas public education in the United States of America was established for the acquisition of general knowledge—not for the promotion of political or social ideologies; and

"Whereas understanding of the Present is based upon objective knowledge of the Past, with a growing comprehension of the individual's responsibility under the Constitution of the United States of America, and with his acceptance of these responsibilities as coequal with his rights; and

"Whereas there are increasing evidences of a slanting or rewriting of textbooks to support a point of view; of the addition to libraries of new books recommended on slanted, professional reading lists, while at the same time the withdrawal of standard works is accomplished; of the inclusion in English classes of books verging upon the obscene—with the result that there is a breakdown of discipline, a deterioration in the student's religious, moral and ethical convictions and less sense of personal pride and dignity;

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, work to insure that our schools present unbiased American history; that our children understand the classic meaning of freedom in a constitutional republic; and that our children be educated with a renewed sense of self-discipline and moral obligation.

"APPRECIATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Resolved, That grateful appreciation is hereby expressed by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, to the President of the United States of America for his message to the Seventy-fifth Continental Congress.

"APPRECIATION TO THE PRESIDENT GENERAL

"Resolved, That the Seventy-fifth Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express sincere appreciation to the President General, Mrs. William H. Sullivan, Jr., for her untiring efforts in making this, the Diamond Jubilee year of the Society, an outstanding one; for her able conduct of this Congress; and for her dedicated devotion to the principles and ideals of our beloved organization.

"APPRECIATION TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express to Mrs. Stanley T. Manlove its sincere appreciation for her gracious and capable direction as the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee.

"COURTESY RESOLUTION

"Whereas the Seventy-fifth Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters

of the American Revolution, has been inspiring, educational and beneficial; and

"Whereas this has been possible through the concerted efforts of those who planned the program, as well as those who took part;

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express deep appreciation to the Officers, the Chairmen, the Pages, to all who had a part on the program, and especially to:

"The entire personnel of the staff for their loyal service throughout the year and during this Congress,

"The United States Service Bands for the concerts,

"The artists who shared generously of their talents.

"The speakers for enlightening and inspiring messages,

"The police and firemen for their courteous attention and protection,

"The press, radio and television for coverage of these meetings, and

"The large number of individual members who contributed to the success of the Seventy-fifth Continental Congress."

A resolution adopted by the Missouri River States Committee, at Omaha, Nebraska, reaffirming its support for the integrated development of the beneficial uses of the waters of the Missouri River basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of S. 3096, a bill of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], which would extend Federal aid to the airport program, which is now due to expire on June 30, 1967, for 3 more years.

A recent National Airport Survey shows a requirement of approximately \$500 million by 1970. This is less than 1 percent of the money scheduled for the Interstate Highway System, for an industry that is doubling in size every 3½ years.

New York State will require \$17 million in each of the next 4 years. It is estimated that 36 New York communities will require FAA funds in the next 4 years.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] be added as a cosponsor of S. 2619, the tax-sharing plan.

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as a cosponsor to the bill S. 3332, introduced by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the name of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] as a cosponsor of the Laboratory Animals Act, S. 3332 at its next printing.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], be added as a cosponsor to S. 3035, a bill to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and that when the bill is printed again his name be listed as a cosponsor.

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

RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, for myself and the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I present for appropriate reference a resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to pay survivors' benefits to widows who have no children and who are unable to obtain gainful employment. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

RESOLUTION H. 1780 MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO PAY SURVIVORS' BENEFITS TO WIDOWS WHO HAVE NO CHILDREN AND WHO ARE UNABLE TO OBTAIN GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT

(State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, in General Assembly, January Session, A.D. 1966)

Whereas it is unfortunate occurrence when someone is widowed and left without a mainstay of support: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the state of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations through its general assembly, requests the congress of the United States to enact legislation which would extend payment of survivor's benefits to widows who have no children and who are unable to obtain gainful employment; and be it further

Resolved, That the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said congress be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use concerted effort to enact legislation which would extend said benefits; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 14266. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1178).

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

H.R. 7371. An act to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (Rept. No. 1179).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 2264. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept a cash equalization of exchanges for lands under his jurisdiction, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1181); and

H.R. 10366. An act to establish the Mount Rogers National Recreation Area in the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1182).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 902. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other non-agricultural use areas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1180).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 2769. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1183).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably 1,625 appointments in the Regular Army in the grade of colonel and below, which includes 1,261 Academy graduates for appointment as 2d lieutenants.

I also report the appointment of 3 permanent professors at the Air Force Academy and the appointment of 490 Academy graduates as 2d lieutenants in the Regular Air Force.

Since all of 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 are as follows:

Alfred F. Hurley, and sundry other Air Force officers, for appointment as permanent professors, U.S. Air Force Academy;

John J. Ahern, Jr., and sundry other cadets, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment to the Regular Air Force;

Ralph R. Ganns, and Pauline A. C. Gustafson, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States; and

Joseph G. McGlade, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3373. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to require that, in the administration of titles II and XVIII of such act, certain evidentiary value be accorded certain birth certificates in determining the benefit rights of individuals thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3374. A bill for the relief of Joseph (Yoseph) Ollie Schuman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 3375. A bill to incorporate the Association of American Law Schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3376. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Steel Improvement & Forge Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 3377. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States; to provide standards for the issuance, denial, and revocation of passports by the Secretary of State; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 3378. A bill for the relief of Arlene W. Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3379. A bill in relation to rates of toll and disposition of income by the city of East St. Louis, Ill., and the city of Chester, Ill., covering the bridges constructed by said cities across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 3380. A bill to incorporate Recovery, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. HART):

S. 3381. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. BASS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. COOPER):

S. 3382. A bill to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949, as amended, to permit the planting of soybeans in lieu of cotton in certain disaster areas in 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 3383. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 20 to 10 the number of years a divorced woman must have been married to her former husband in order to be treated as his wife or widow for purposes of eligibility for wife's or widow's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

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

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

S. 3384. A bill to limit Federal financial assistance otherwise available for the construction or operation of nursing homes to nursing homes in States which have in effect a program which provides for the licensing of the operators of such homes and which meets certain requirements; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. GRUENING:

S. 3385. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 3386. A bill for the relief of Wanda Radlinska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 3387. A bill for the relief of Richard Vigil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. DODD, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 3388. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the performance of certain investigative functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, and Mr. COOPER):

S. 3389. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. BURDICK):

S.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S.J. Res. 163. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for the direct election of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of National Halibut Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTIONS

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. PELL) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 267) relative to the death of former Senator Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, which was considered and agreed to.

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

APPOINTMENT OF A COMMISSION TO STUDY THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. NELSON submitted a resolution (S. Res. 268) relative to appointment of a commission to study the Selective Service System and make recommendations thereon, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

ACCEPTANCE OF BIRTH CERTIFICATE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to accept State-issued birth certificates as evi-

dence of age of persons applying for social security cash benefits and health insurance—medicare—for the aged.

In such programs as social security retirement and medicare, age is a key factor in determining eligibility of individuals. But many Americans past 60 were not issued certificates at time of birth.

Some have been able to verify their birth date by such evidence as family Bibles, school records, baptismal certificates, and sworn statements of attending physicians.

Some have been able to obtain delayed birth certificates; that is certificates issued years after birth which attest to the birth date. These may have been issued by a State agency or by a city, town, county, or other local government body or official.

I have learned that in administering the social security retirement program and the health insurance program the Social Security Administration does not always accept a delayed birth certificate as conclusive evidence of age of the applicant.

This was brought to my attention by the cases of two residents of Hawaii. In one instance, the Social Security Administration accepted a delayed birth certificate issued in Wisconsin as documentary evidence that the applicant was old enough to qualify for social security retirement benefits. The application was approved and payments were made to him for 3 months. Later, a check of the 1910 and 1920 censuses indicated he was born a year later than the delayed birth certificate indicated, although subsequent censuses and other documents of record indicated he was born in the earlier year.

The consequence is that the Social Security Administration ruled the applicant ineligible for further payments. He was requested to return the payments for the 3 months. I understand he then was instructed to try to find out who gave the information to census takers in 1910 and 1920, showing him to be born 1 year later than his delayed birth certificate shows. This may well prove an impossible task.

A second case brought to my attention involves refusal of the Social Security Administration to accept a delayed certificate of Hawaiian birth as proof of age. Additional convincing evidence is required.

Under Social Security ruling 60-10—

In determining whether or not such evidence is convincing, it is necessary to consider the type and age of the document, the purpose for which it was established, and the information which was the basis for the particular date of birth stated therein.

Such certificates have been issued since the early 1900's in Hawaii, by the secretary of state pursuant to Federal regulations while Hawaii was a Territory and by the Lieutenant Governor after Hawaii became a State.

In the case of persons not possessing a certificate issued at time of birth, a full legal investigation was made, testimony was taken, and the claim of date of birth closely examined. Only after exhausting all means of verification did

the Territory and the State issue a so-called delayed certificate of Hawaiian birth.

Nevertheless, the Social Security Administration does not regard the delayed certificate of Hawaiian birth as conclusive on its face, but insists that the evidence upon which the certificate was issued be furnished. I understand efforts are underway to have such evidence included on the certificate issued in Hawaii.

I realize that the Social Security Administration has the responsibility for passing on the qualifications of applicants. I realize that Social Security officials have the duty to comply with the law which sets up qualifications for social security benefits, including age requirements. I commend them for their diligence in carrying out the law and trying to make certain that only those who qualify receive benefits.

On the other hand, it must be recognized that many persons now in their 60's or older have a difficult if not impossible task of establishing conclusive evidence of birth. In the years when they were born, many jurisdictions did not require official birth certificates. Other documentary evidence, such as baptismal certificates, has been lost and is irreplaceable.

When, therefore, an individual attempts to document his date of birth and succeeds in having a State, or other official entity under State law, issue a delayed certificate of birth, it would seem that this could be accepted as prima facie evidence of age.

This is what my bill seeks to do.

The bill provides that when age is of significance in determining the rights of a person for social security benefits or health insurance for the aged, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall accept as evidence of the person's age a certificate of birth issued at any time by the State—or political subdivision pursuant to State law—in which the person was born.

Further, the bill provides that, in the absence of clear and convincing evidence to the contrary, the birth of such person shall be deemed to have occurred at the time indicated on the certificate.

Instead of denying an application solely on grounds that a valid delayed certificate of birth is not conclusive evidence, the Social Security Administration would have to accept the valid certificate as proof of age in the absence of "clear and convincing evidence to the contrary."

Of course, should clear and convincing evidence disclose that the information on the certificate regarding age was erroneous or that the certificate was obtained by fraud, appropriate steps could be taken as at present to deny, to terminate, or to adjust benefits.

Proof of birth is a problem that will long be with us. I hope this proposed legislation will simplify this aspect of administration of these important social security and health programs for our senior citizens.

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

The bill (S. 3373) to amend the Social Security Act to require that, in the administration of titles II and XVIII of such act, certain evidentiary value be accorded certain birth certificates in determining the benefit rights of individuals thereunder, introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

U.S. PASSPORT ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States; to provide standards for the issuance, denial, and revocation of passports by the Secretary of State; and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State dated May 4, 1966, to the Vice President in regard to it.

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

The bill (S. 3377) to promote the foreign policy of the United States; to provide standards for the issuance, denial, and revocation of passports by the Secretary of State; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3377

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United States Passport Act".

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "national" means a citizen of the United States or other person owing permanent allegiance to the United States.

(b) The term "passport" means the document issued by or on behalf of the Secretary of State to a national which identifies the national as such to the representatives of any foreign state and which requests that he be permitted to pass without delay or hindrance and, in case of need, be given such help as would be extended to nationals of the foreign state traveling in the United States.

(c) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of State.

(d) The term "United States" means the States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and all other territory and water, continental and insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(e) The term "travel abroad" includes departure from the United States, travel to any

other country or area, or travel or residence in any other country or area.

TITLE II—ISSUANCE, DENIAL AND REVOCATION OF PASSPORTS

SEC. 201. (a) Passports may be issued only to nationals.

(b) Subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe, the Secretary and any persons duly authorized by him, but no other person, may accept passport applications, may administer oaths in connection with such applications, and may issue, renew, amend, limit, deny, or revoke passports.

(c) Subject to such general exceptions as the President may authorize and prescribe and subject to subsection (d) of this section, it shall be unlawful for any national to travel abroad without a valid passport.

(d) The Secretary may in a specific case waive the requirement of a passport for a national's travel abroad, if he considers such action advisable in the national interest or if he considers that there are extenuating circumstances of an emergency nature. The Secretary may limit and condition any such waiver both as to duration and as to country or area.

SEC. 202. (a) Before a passport is issued, the applicant therefor shall complete and subscribe to a written application in the form prescribed by the Secretary, duly verified by the applicant's oath or affirmation.

(b) Upon receipt by a person authorized to issue passports of a completed application and required information relating to the application, a passport shall promptly be issued or renewed or the applicant informed in writing of a denial.

SEC. 203. (a) Passports shall be valid for a period of five years from the date of issue and, except in the case where the bearer was under the age of eighteen at date of issue, may be renewed for an additional period not to exceed five years, but the final date of expiration shall be not more than ten years from the date of issue: *Provided*, That the Secretary may limit the validity of a passport to a period less than five years from the date of issue and the renewal of a passport to a period less than five years.

(b) The Secretary shall prescribe the period of validity of passports issued to officers or employees of the United States proceeding abroad in the discharge of their official duties, or to members of their immediate families.

(c) Passports outstanding as of the effective date of this Act shall continue to be governed by the laws under which they were issued with respect to the original period of validity and, if they have been renewed as of the effective date of this Act, with respect to the period of renewal. Passports that have not been renewed as of the effective date of this Act may be renewed under regulations prescribed by the Secretary for a period not to exceed seven years, but the final date of expiration shall not be more than ten years from the date of issue.

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe from time to time the fees to be collected for executing each application for a passport and for the issuance and renewal of a passport, and such fees shall be collected and paid into the Treasury of the United States, except that the Secretary may authorize officials of the several States to collect and retain fees for executing applications for passports. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe classes of persons from whom no fee shall be collected for applications for passports or for the issuance or renewal of passports.

(b) Whenever a fee is erroneously charged and paid for the issuance or renewal of a passport, or whenever a foreign country refuses a visa and the unused passport is promptly returned, such fee shall be refunded.

SEC. 205. A passport, except for direct return to the United States, shall not be issued or renewed in any case in which:

(a) the applicant is the subject of an outstanding Federal warrant of arrest for a felony, including a warrant issued under the Federal Fugitive Felon Act (18 U.S.C. 1073); or

(b) the applicant is subject to a court order, or conditions of parole, or conditions of probation forbidding his departure from the United States; or

(c) the applicant is subject to a court order committing him to a mental institution.

SEC. 206. A passport or renewal of a passport may be refused in any case in which:

(a) the applicant has not repaid a loan received from the United States to effectuate his return from a foreign country in the course of travel abroad; or

(b) the applicant has been legally declared incompetent, unless he is accompanied on his travel abroad by the guardian or other person responsible for his custody and well being; or

(c) the applicant is under the age of 18, unmarried and not in the military service of the United States unless a person having legal custody of such national authorizes issuance or renewal of the passport and agrees to reimburse the United States for any moneys advanced by the United States to enable the applicant to return to the United States; or

(d) the national has violated the provisions of Section 302; or

(e) the Secretary determines that the applicant's activities abroad as causing or are likely to cause serious damage to the national security or the foreign policy of the United States; or

(f) the applicant has been the subject of a prior adverse action with respect to his right to receive or use a passport under this section, Section 205 or Section 207 and has not shown that a change in circumstances since that adverse action warrants issuance or renewal of a passport.

SEC. 207. A passport may be revoked, restricted or limited where:

(a) the national would not be entitled to issuance of a new passport under Section 205 or 206; or

(b) the passport has been obtained by fraud or has been fraudulently altered, or has been fraudulently misused; or,

(c) the national's activities abroad are in violation of the laws of the United States.

SEC. 208. (a) Upon denial of an application for the issuance or renewal of a passport, or upon any other adverse action taken on an individual basis with respect to the person's right to receive or use a passport, the person shall be informed in writing of the specific reasons for the adverse action and of his right to administrative review of such action.

(b) The Secretary shall establish and make public the procedures governing administrative review of an adverse action. These rules shall accord to the person requesting administrative review the following rights:

(1) To appear in person and to be represented by counsel;

(2) To testify in his own behalf, present witnesses and offer other evidence;

(3) To be informed of the evidence on which the adverse action is based and the source of such evidence;

(4) To confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses.

TITLE III—GEOGRAPHICAL LIMITATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY

SEC. 301. (a) Subject to the approval of the President, the Secretary may by public notice restrict the travel of nationals and limit the validity of passports with respect to travel to the following places:

(1) Countries with which the United States is at war;

(2) Countries or areas where armed hostilities are in progress;

(3) Countries or areas to which the Secretary determines that travel must be restricted in the national interest because such travel would seriously impair the conduct of United States foreign affairs.

(b) Such public notice shall be published along with the reasons therefor. Notice of such restrictions shall also be stamped on each passport issued, renewed, or amended thereafter.

(c) Such restrictions shall expire at the end of one year from the date of publication, unless extended by public notice issued by the Secretary with the approval of the President.

(d) The Secretary may make exceptions to any such general geographical restriction for particular persons or categories of persons if he considers such exceptions to be in the national interest.

SEC. 302. Except as authorized pursuant to section 301(d), it shall be unlawful for any national to travel to, in, or through any country or area as to which there is in effect a restriction imposed pursuant to section 301.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. A passport issued under this Act shall at all times remain the property of the United States. It shall be unlawful for any holder of a passport which has been revoked to refuse to surrender it upon demand by the Secretary or his authorized agent.

SEC. 402. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe regulations consistent with this Act.

TITLE V—PENALTIES

SEC. 501. Any person who willfully violates the provisions of section 201, 302, or 401 of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for a period not exceeding one year or by a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or both.

TITLE VI—REPEAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. (a) The following Acts or parts of Acts and all amendments thereto are repealed:

(1) Section 4076 of the Revised Statutes (22 U.S.C. 212);

(2) Section 4077 of the Revised Statutes (22 U.S.C. 218);

(3) Section 1 of title II of the Act of June 15, 1917 (22 U.S.C. 213);

(4) Sections 1 and 4 of the Act of June 4, 1920 (22 U.S.C. 214, 216);

(5) Sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act of July 3, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 211a, 217a, 214a);

(6) Section 215(b) of the Act of June 27, 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1185(b)).

TITLE VII—SEPARABILITY

SEC. 701. If any particular provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE VIII—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 801. This Act shall take effect on the thirtieth day immediately following the date of its enactment.

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

MAY 4, 1966.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
The President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is submitted herewith a proposed bill designed to be a comprehensive passport law. The bill would combine in one act a number of provisions relating to passports now appearing in several different statutes as well as amending some of those provisions. It would also set forth in statutory form provisions and procedures relating to passports which at

present appear in the form of administrative regulation or practice.

The principal features of the bill are provisions: (1) to increase the period of validity of United States passports from the present three years renewable for two years, to five years renewable for five years; (2) to authorize the Secretary of State to prescribe passport fees; (3) to specify the grounds on which a passport may be denied or revoked; (4) to provide for administrative review of a denial or revocation of a passport; and (5) to provide for area travel restrictions.

As under existing law, under the proposed bill only the Secretary of State and persons designated by him would be authorized to issue or to deny or revoke a passport (Sec. 201(b)). United States nationals would continue to be required to have a passport to depart the United States and to travel abroad (Sec. 201(c)). However, unlike the present law this passport requirement would not, in view of the definition of travel abroad (Sec. 101(e)), extend to entry by a United States national into the United States. Section 201(d) would continue the authority of the Secretary of State to waive the passport requirement in special circumstances.

Existing law (22 U.S.C. 217(a)) provides that a passport shall be valid for a period of three years and may be renewed for a further period of two years. Section 203 of the bill would provide for a passport initially valid for five years which could be renewed for an additional five years. A five-year passport renewable for five years would conform with the recommendation of the 1963 United Nations Conference on Travel and Tourism. Such a period of validity would result in greater convenience to the traveling public. Section 203 would also authorize the Secretary to prescribe the period of validity of diplomatic and official passports. Such passports would continue to be issued valid for the period for which the bearer maintains the official status for which the passport was issued.

Under existing law the amount of the fees to be collected for an application for a passport, for issuance of a passport and for renewal of a passport are prescribed by statute (22 U.S.C. 214). Section 204(a) of the bill would enable the Secretary of State to adjust these fees as the cost of passport services changes. Pending completion of a current study of these costs, the existing fees of \$1 for application, \$9 for a passport and \$5 for a renewal would be retained.

Sections 205, 206 and 207 would specify those instances in which a passport may be denied or revoked. No such provisions appear in existing laws although the proposed sections reflect the practice of the Department and describe those instances in which it is considered specific statutory authority for denial or revocation of a passport is desirable.

Section 208 would specifically provide for administrative review of action of the Department in denying or revoking a passport and guarantee to the person adversely affected by that action certain basic rights in connection with that review. The administrative review would extend to action denying or revoking a passport on the grounds of noncitizenship as well as the other grounds specified in Sections 205, 206 and 207. The present review procedures of the Department, set forth in the Department's regulations, conform to the requirements of Section 208.

Section 301 would provide express statutory authority for the Secretary, with the approval of the President, to impose restrictions on the travel of United States nationals to certain countries or areas. At the same time, the provisions of this section would authorize such restrictions only in those instances where restriction of travel is

absolutely necessary. Public notice of the restrictions and of the reasons for the restrictions would be required. Restrictions imposed would expire one year from date of imposition unless extended by public notice. As is now the case, exceptions to the restrictions could be made when warranted in the national interest.

Under Section 302 it would be unlawful for a national to travel to, in, or through a restricted area unless authorized to do so under Section 301. Unlike the present law, the proposed bill would make unlawful the actual travel to and in the proscribed area rather than the departure from the United States for the purpose of travel to the area.

Section 401 is intended to facilitate the recovery of passports that have been revoked. In our view, enactment of this proposed bill would provide much needed modernization and clarification of the law relating to passports and at the same time ensure that the United States citizen's right to travel is inhibited only when required by compelling national interest.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this legislation would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

Enclosure: Proposed passport bill.

INCORPORATION OF RECOVERY, INC.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Recovery, Inc., was founded in Chicago, Ill., in the year 1937, by the late Dr. Abraham A. Low, who was then assistant director of the Illinois Psychiatric Association and was deeply engrossed in the problems of the recovered mental patient, mainly from the standpoint of preventing relapses. Recovery, Inc., is a self-help aftercare method developed by Dr. Low to prevent relapses among former mental patients and chronicity in nervous patients.

From its humble beginnings it has, almost 30 years later, grown into a large, voluntary nonprofit and self-sustaining effort to enable those formerly afflicted with mental and nervous diseases to maintain their good health, thus contributing enormously to the overall good health of the Nation. The Recovery method consists of constant study of Dr. Low's book: "Mental Health Through Will Training," attendance at Recovery meetings and the practice of Recovery principles in one's daily life. Meetings are conducted in 548 groups in 34 States of the Nation, and are headed by trained leaders who are former patients and who are able to teach the self-help method. Leaders are ordinary citizens, not doctors, and the method of Recovery is thus passed on by persons themselves familiar with its benefits.

Recovery is presently incorporated under the laws of Illinois as a voluntary nonprofit organization. However, because the needs of the people of the United States for these services are so great and increasing rapidly, Recovery desires to make its self-help method available to all those who need it. In

order to do so with a minimum of difficulty, and to facilitate its beneficial work in the realm of mental health, I am pleased to introduce the accompanying bill which would grant Recovery a Federal charter.

While Recovery presently has corporate protection in the larger States, it has had to qualify individually under the voluntary nonprofit statutes of 10 separate States. Recovery desires to secure corporate nonprofit protection in all of the States so that it may expand its work. It presently does not have this protection in 38 States. Individual registrations to do business in these States are costly, impractical, and involve this worthy organization in the use of time better put to expansion of the substantive program itself.

Accordingly, Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to enable Recovery to become a truly national project with the stature of Federal incorporation to assist it in its benevolent works. A project more worthy of Federal incorporation can hardly be imagined. I am sure that anyone who knows of the organization or who can take the time to consider its work over the past 29 years, will agree with me that the bill I introduce today is worthy of prompt Senate action.

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

The bill (S. 3380) to incorporate Recovery, Inc., introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948, TO PROVIDE COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN ADDITIONAL LOSSES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have introduced a bill to amend the War Claims Act to provide compensation for persons who at the date of enactment of this bill are American citizens and who while serving in the military, allied, or air forces of any government allied or associated with the United States during World War II, were taken and held as prisoners of war by any government with which the United States was at war during World War II, and who while nationals of the United States or of any government allied or associated with the United States during World War II, were imprisoned contrary to the standards established by international law in any jail, prison, or concentration camp during World War II by any government with which the United States was at war during World War II.

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

The bill (S. 3381) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO BENEFITS TO CERTAIN DIVORCEES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to reduce to 10 years the amount of time a divorced woman must have been married to be considered a wife or widow for social security purposes.

Our social security laws still work a hardship—an unfair discrimination—on divorced American women. Under the social security system, a man's retirement benefits are based on his wage record built up during his working years. His wife is also covered on his wage record because her work has been in the home. Her job has been raising the children and caring for the family home. She was covered by her husband's work out of simple fairness and recognition of these important responsibilities.

However, until 1965, a divorced woman was not entitled to any benefits from her former husband's social security. No matter how long the marriage lasted, or why it broke up, a divorced woman could receive nothing. Unless she remarried or had insured employment of her own, she was not eligible for social security benefits. In 1965, Congress moved in the right direction, but not far enough. It provided that a woman who had been married 20 years was eligible for social security benefits as a wife or widow on her former husband's wage record.

The report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women stated:

A divorced wife, if she is not remarried and if her marriage continued for a substantial period, such as 10 years, or a divorced widow, should become eligible at age 62 to a wife's benefit based on her former husband's wage record.

My bill would carry out this recommendation. Twenty years is still too long. Particularly if a woman married late, she will have difficulty establishing a wage record of her own. This proposal is designed for women who are divorced too late in life to be able to work long enough to qualify for adequate old age insurance benefits based on their own earnings.

Although the number of women involved is so few that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates the cost to be of no significance, the recommendation of the President's Commission should be followed out of fairness to those to whom it means so much.

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

The bill (S. 3383) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 20 to 10 the number of years a divorced woman must have been married to her former husband in order to be treated as his wife or widow for purposes of eligibility for wife's or widow's insurance benefits, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DENIAL OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE OF CONSTRUCTION OR OPERATION OF NURSING HOMES BY CERTAIN STATES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to deny Federal financial assistance for the construction or operation of nursing homes to States which do not provide for the licensing of operators of these homes. I ask that the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

This bill is a product of an important series of hearings conducted last year by the Long-Term Care Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Aging. These hearings, held throughout the country on nursing homes and other long-term health care services, produced information which is educational to Congress and the public, and which can bring real improvements in the care of our elderly citizens. I look forward to the full proposals on long-term care problems that Senator Moss will introduce, and I hope that other Members of the Senate will support his efforts.

There can be no doubt that the administrative policies set up in each nursing home, and the way they are carried out, relate directly to the quality of care received by the older person in the home. During our hearings we heard from many witnesses who assured us that the operators of these nursing homes are in large part conscientious persons who provide the best possible care for those who are in their charge. But that is surely not always the case. Not all nursing homes are run by the responsible, the professionally interested administrator, whose training and experience certifies his ability to provide the best kind of care.

Often the administrator of a nursing home is not responsible, does not have the training which his task demands, and is not interested in those who are under his care.

Concern about the competency of those who administer nursing homes occupies the medical profession as well as many members of the Senate. Dr. Samuel Levy recently conducted a survey of nursing and rest home administrators in Massachusetts. Only 41 percent of the administrators responded to the questionnaire—a total of 428 persons. One percent of these had no formal education, 20 percent of them had dropped out of school. Only 18 percent had completed college, and of those who had not completed college only 18 percent could cite some special training in their profession. It seems likely that, had the remaining 59 percent of the State's administrators responded to the questionnaire, these figures would be even less encouraging. And I have been informed, that the statistics for nursing homes alone would not be significantly different if separated out.

An ill-prepared administrator too often means a neglected patient. Inadequate care of nursing home patients, as the Aging Committee's investigation last year showed, can frequently be traced directly to the way a nursing home is directed and managed.

The hearings held in my own State, for example, uncovered the presence of persons and organizations in the nursing home field so questionable that my staff, and the staff of the committee, felt compelled to seek information from the Department of Justice and other Government agencies on current and past activities of these individuals. Information from this staff investigation was given some time ago to the attorney general of the State of Massachusetts, and I hope that it will help him in rapidly pursuing his own investigation.

Neither the study nor the specific case I mentioned has convinced me that all those without special training are unable to provide or uninterested in administering high quality care. I visited some nursing homes in Massachusetts recently and found many administrators that I would judge competent, regardless of their training, simply because of the way their homes were kept up and the comments of their patients.

These administrators make up in devotion and experience what they lack in formal training. And they do a fine job. But despite these examples we can no longer rest our hopes for good nursing home care on chance or faith in human nature. For as we have moved in Congress to provide for the medical needs of the elderly, we must meet our additional responsibilities to see that the quality of care provided under law is maintained.

The bill I offer today relies heavily on the States and the professional societies to correct now and eliminate in the future the vices which have arisen in the nursing home profession. It states that, after July 1, 1968, no Federal funds either direct or indirect for the construction and operation of nursing homes will be available to States which have not established a program of licensing operators of nursing homes. It is contemplated that the State licensing boards will include representatives of the professions, occupations and institutions involved in the care of chronically ill or infirm aged persons, as well as representatives of the public. The board could both issue and withdraw licenses. Furthermore, the bill calls upon the States to establish training programs to assist those nursing home operators who fail to meet the federally approved State criteria for licensing, and provides Federal aid to this end. Such training, however, would not be made available to those operators whom the State has found ineligible for a license on the basis of background and character.

Mr. President, I believe that nursing homes, whether proprietary or nonprofit in nature, are community health facilities that must meet the sternest test of community responsibility. I am pleased to note that a recent poll conducted by the periodical Nursing Home Administrator shows that a majority of respondents approve of the licensing of administrators. This indicates to me that the profession wants to rid itself of the unprofessional administrators who, though they reflect a distinct minority, cast a shadow on the hard work and achievements of the industry. I have the high-

est regard for those who have made every effort to provide proper care for the elderly in our Nation's nursing homes, and I seek their support for this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The bill (S. 3384) to limit Federal financial assistance otherwise available for the construction or operation of nursing homes to nursing homes in States which have in effect a program which provides for the licensing of the operators of such homes and which meets certain requirements introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3384

DECLARATION OF FINDINGS

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

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds and declares that (a) nursing homes are properly regarded as being community health facilities the major purpose of which is to render nursing and other health care services, (b) the public interest requires that the kind and quality of the services provided by nursing homes be adequate to meet the needs of the patients thereof, and (c) of major importance to the assurance that such services will be adequate to meet such needs are the personal character, qualifications and the administrative competence of the operators of such homes.

LICENSING OF NURSING HOME OPERATORS

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal financial assistance shall not, after July 1, 1968, be provided directly or indirectly, in any state with respect to the construction or operation of any nursing home if there is not in effect, in such State, a State program providing for the licensing, in accordance with the requirements of this Act, of all operators of nursing homes located within such State.

STATE STANDARD

SEC. 3. (a) A State program referred to in section 2 must provide that no nursing home within the State may operate except under the supervision of an operator licensed in the manner provided in this Act and for the establishment or designation of a State Board which has the duty and authority to administer such program. Such Board must be so composed that the members will be representative of the professions, occupations, and institutions directly concerned with the care and treatment of chronically ill or infirm aged individuals, and will be representative of the public.

(b) It shall be the function and duty of such Board to—

(1) develop and impose standards which must be met by individuals in order to receive a license as a nursing home operator, which standards shall be designed to insure that nursing home operators will be individuals who are of good character, who, by temperament and disposition, are suitable, and who, by training or experience in the field of institutional administration, are qualified to serve as nursing home operators;

(2) develop and apply appropriate techniques, including examinations and investi-

gations, for determining whether any individual meets such standards;

(3) issue licenses to individuals determined, after the application of such techniques, to meet such standards, and revoke or suspend licenses previously issued by the Board in any case where the individual holding any such license is determined substantially to have failed to conform to the requirements of such standards;

(4) establish and carry out procedures designed to insure that individuals licensed as nursing home operators will, during any period that they serve as such, comply with the requirements of such standards;

(5) receive, investigate, and take appropriate action with respect to, any charge or complaint filed with the Board to the effect that any individual licensed as a nursing home operator has failed to comply with the requirements of such standards;

(6) conduct a continuing study and investigation of nursing homes and operators of nursing homes within the State with a view to the improvement of the standards imposed for the licensing of such operators and of procedures and methods for the enforcement of such standards with respect to operators of nursing homes who have been licensed as such.

TEMPORARY WAIVER OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 4. No State shall be considered to have failed to comply with the provisions of section 2 of this Act because the Board of such State (established pursuant to section 3) shall have granted any waiver, with respect to any individual who during all of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, has served as a nursing home operator, of any of the standards developed and imposed by such Board pursuant to section 3(b)(1) other than such standards as relate to good character or suitability if—

(1) such waiver is for a period which ends prior to July 1, 1970, and

(2) there is provided by the Board or there is otherwise available in the State (during all of the period for which waiver is in effect), a program of training and instruction designed to enable all individuals, with respect to whom any such waiver is granted, to attain the qualifications necessary in order to meet such standards.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to make grants to States for the purpose of assisting them in instituting and conducting programs of training and instruction of the type referred to in section 4(2).

(b) No grant with respect to any such program shall exceed 75 per centum of the reasonable and necessary cost, as determined by the Secretary, of instituting and conducting such program.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 6. As used in this Act, the term—

(a) "nursing home" means any institution or facility defined as such for licensing purposes under State law; and

(b) "nursing home operator" means any individual who is charged with the general administration of a nursing home whether or not such individual has an ownership interest in such home and whether or not his functions and duties are shared with one or more other individuals.

ENFORCEMENT AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") to determine when Federal financial assistance (otherwise available in any State) should be denied or withheld because of the failure of such State to comply with the requirements of this Act. Whenever the

Secretary has made a final determination that such assistance should be denied or withheld in any State by reasons of the provisions of this Act, he shall so notify all Federal agencies having the duty or authority to provide any such assistance and all such agencies shall deny all such assistance in such State until such time as they have been notified by the Secretary that such assistance should no longer be withheld or denied.

(b) The Secretary shall promulgate appropriate regulations prescribing the procedures to be employed in determining whether a State has complied with the requirements of this Act, and such other regulations as may be appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Secretary shall not make a final determination that Federal financial assistance should be denied or withheld pursuant to the provisions of this Act in any State until he shall have held a public hearing on the matter, have provided reasonable advance notice to the State of such hearing, the time and place it is to be held, the issues to be considered, and have invited such State to appear, and have otherwise afforded the State a reasonable opportunity to appear and make its views known in such hearing.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. (a) Any State which is dissatisfied with a final determination of the Secretary under section 6 may, within 60 days after it has been notified of such determination, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of such determination. A copy of the petition shall forthwith be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his determination as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

REFORMS NEEDED IN THE MAMMOTH SURPLUS DISPOSAL PROGRAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the last 3 weeks the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Government Operations Committee has held a series of hearings on the surplus property disposal practices of the Department of Defense. These hearings were based on the findings disclosed by an extensive study undertaken by the subcommittee staff at numerous installations of the military services in Europe and the Far East.

In its investigation, the subcommittee was greatly aided by trained investigators from the General Accounting Office and wishes to express its appreciation to the Comptroller General for his action in making the services of the following men

available to the subcommittee: Robert C. Boyer, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Adolph Brudzinski, of Washington, D.C.; John P. Compitello, of Denver, Colo.; Peter V. Femia, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Thomas Harryman, of Seattle, Wash.; Dean Martin, of Chicago, Ill.; David E. Overman, Jr., of Kansas City, Kans.; Orvis R. Payne, of Portland, Oreg.; David Retzinger, of Kansas City, Kans.; Robert S. Rosenberger, of Washington, D.C.; Albert C. Smith, of San Francisco, Calif.; John A. Stanley, of Schenectady, N.Y.; Joseph A. Stanziale, of Cleveland, Ohio; and Larry W. White, of San Antonio, Tex.

This is exactly the way in which the General Accounting Office can be of the greatest assistance to the Congress.

The hearings produced considerable evidence that over the years tremendous quantities of useful and usable equipment had been disposed of by the Department of Defense on the grounds that such equipment was not economical to repair. However, the subcommittee hearings brought out the fact that unrealistic estimates of cost were used to determine whether it was economical or not to repair equipment. For example, a \$5 hourly labor rate was used in repair cost estimates when actual repairs were being made for as low as \$0.40 per labor hour; transportation costs to the United States were included in repair cost estimates when the items could have been repaired overseas; the cost of new components, such as engines, and transmissions, were included in estimates of repair costs when in fact new components are not used but rebuilt and overhauled engines and transmissions are used.

The result of these practices has been the disposal of great quantities of equipment as "uneconomically repairable" when in fact the equipment could have been repaired at modest cost. Many of these items were needed by our forces in Vietnam. Many of these items could have been used to avoid expenditures for current procurement of the same items.

A key point disclosed in the subcommittee hearings related to the lack of uniformity within the Department of Defense of repair criteria. One military service will estimate repair costs on the basis of factors which another service will exclude. One military service will dispose of a piece of equipment after a given number of years while another service will retain the identical type of equipment for many more years. One service will repair a truck or a bulldozer under criteria which permit the expenditure of as much as 65 percent of the acquisition cost for repairs while another service will dispose of the identical type of equipment because its criteria permit the expenditure of only 10 percent of acquisition cost.

On May 18, 1966 the subcommittee heard Mr. Paul Ignatius, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations, and Logistics. Mr. Ignatius conceded the lack of uniformity and the need for a detailed review of this situation. He said:

With respect to the question you have raised as to whether our directives provide for sufficient uniformity in determining whether to rebuild or to dispose of equip-

ment, we will undertake a detailed review of the situation with the objective of determining whether further uniformity is feasible. We appreciate your bringing this matter to our attention.

In his testimony Mr. Ignatius also indicated that swift action would be taken to ensure the use of realistic costs in estimating repairs on equipment before it is determined whether to repair or to dispose of the equipment.

The action promised by the Assistant Secretary of Defense is gratifying and fully demonstrates the value of the investigation undertaken by the subcommittee into the surplus property disposal programs of the Department of Defense.

However, there is one ancillary matter which requires attention. This involves the unlimited authority currently available to the Agency for International Development to acquire surplus property from military surplus disposals overseas.

Since 1960 the Agency for International Development has obtained about \$300 million in surplus property. About \$100 million of this amount was obtained from surplus disposals by the military services overseas.

The acquisition of surplus property by AID is authorized by section 608 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. This section permits AID to acquire surplus property in advance of known requirements. That is, AID can obtain surplus property excess to the needs of the military services and hold it until such time as it is required by a foreign government. Several limitations have been placed on this program by the legislation but they have been made applicable only to surplus materiel acquired by AID in the United States.

Thus, under section 608 the amount of surplus materiel acquired in the United States and held by AID at any one time is limited to \$15 million in original acquisition cost; such materiel delivered to foreign governments under the economic assistance program is limited in any one year to \$45 million in total original acquisition cost. No limitation of this kind exists for materiel obtained by AID from military surpluses overseas.

Section 608 also establishes a \$5 million revolving fund to pay costs of acquisition, storage, renovation, and rehabilitation, packing, crating, handling, transportation, and related costs.

In practice the revolving fund works as follows: AID acquires surplus property from the military services free of charge. Generally these items need some repair and funds from the \$5 million fund are used to pay for the needed repairs. These funds are also used to pay transportation costs to a port and for packing and crating. All of these expenditures are reimbursed to the revolving fund by charging economic aid funds allocated to the country receiving the surplus equipment. The economic aid funds allocated for a country by AID is also used to pay for the necessary ocean transportation.

There is obviously no reason why the acquisition overseas of surplus property in advance of known requirements should not be subject to the same limita-

tions as exist for the Agency's acquisition or surplus property in the United States. The unlimited acquisition abroad of surplus property represents a means by which additional economic assistance is being given to foreign countries over and above the amounts which are provided in the annual appropriations. This is another one of the many spigots through which U.S. economic assistance is poured abroad.

The absence of any limitation on acquisition of surplus property by AID overseas represents a further abrogation of congressional control over the economic assistance program.

The absence of any limitation on acquisition of surplus property by AID overseas removes any incentive for that Agency to consider carefully actual needs for the surplus property by the countries receiving such materiel. Nor is there any incentive for AID to evaluate carefully the ability of the country to maintain properly the surplus equipment. It serves little purpose to send surplus property to foreign governments under an economic aid program if such equipment and supplies cannot be used because the country does not have the required capability to maintain it.

Finally, much of the equipment acquired by AID overseas in advance of known requirements could be used in the United States by health, education, and civil defense agencies of the States. I know from personal experience of the great need for this type of materiel acquired by AID by numerous agencies and Indian villages in the United States.

I am, therefore, introducing an amendment to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, giving States agencies first choice on excess property at home and abroad being held for donation abroad. I ask unanimous consent that this amendment lie on the desk until the close of May 27, so that those who may wish to cosponsor may have an opportunity to do so. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The bill (S. 3385) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3385

A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 203(j)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his

discretion to donate without cost (except for costs of special care and handling and, with respect to excess property described herein, costs of transportation and repair) for use in any States for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose, any equipment, materials, books, or other supplies (including those capitalized in a working capital or similar fund) under the control of any executive agency which:

"(i) shall have been determined to be surplus property;

"(ii) shall have been determined to be excess property and is being held under section 608 of Public Law 87-195 (75 Stat. 424), approved September 4, 1961, as amended, which property shall be offered to designated State agencies, as herein defined, before being offered to any other eligible donee; and

"(iii) shall have been determined under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection to be usable and necessary for such purpose."

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT, RELATING TO PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTIONS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Internal Security Subcommittee has almost completed the task of editing and publishing the more than 1 million words of testimony taken in its hearings on security in the Department of State. Twenty-four volumes have been published. Only one, or at the most two, remain to be published.

Many situations requiring correction, from a security standpoint, were disclosed by these hearings. I do not propose to deal with these matters now. My remarks up to this point have been a preface to introduction of a bill which strikes at a few security problems which are close to the core of the Otepka case, as we have documented it.

In the introduction of this bill, I am joined by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], all of whom are ranking members of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

At an appropriate time, I hope to discuss this bill in detail here in this Chamber. Today I wish to do no more than call the attention of my colleagues to this proposal, and to outline very succinctly what the bill will accomplish.

It will do these things:

First. Guarantee continued existence of the Passport Office and Visa Office, and provide against abolition of the position of Director of either Office.

Second. Assure the Office of Security will be staffed by professional security officers, under civil service. Foreign Service officers will not investigate or evaluate each other for security purpose.

Third. Guarantee that all evaluative functions in personnel security will be performed by professional security officers trained in evaluations, within Evaluations Division of the Office of Security.

Fourth. Require that a copy of any document transmitted to the State Department by the FBI or CIA and marked for the attention of the Secretary, must be transmitted immediately and directly

to the Secretary's office, flagged for his personal attention.

Fifth. Provide that no Foreign Service officer or other employee of the State Department having any responsibility to, or subject to any orders or instructions from, any other agency of Government may be concerned in any way with (a) policymaking, or (b) administration of any function of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs or the Office of Security, or any other security function of the Department of State.

Sixth. Direct that all field investigations in State Department personnel security cases are to be conducted by an agency other than State—except that interrogations may continue to be made by State Department officers abroad.

Seventh. Assure that no State Department employee shall be prohibited from communicating directly or indirectly, orally or in writing, with Members or committees of the Congress.

Eighth. Establish legal requirement for security clearances of all U.S. nationals for employment with international organizations.

Ninth. Write into law the present provision of State Department Security Regulations prohibiting reinstatement or reemployment of a Foreign Service officer or other officer or employee of the Department discharged for security reasons.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mr. DODD, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. HRUSKA, I send this bill forward and ask that it be received and appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 3388) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the performance of certain investigative functions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTABLISHMENT OF HIRSHHORN MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for the establishment of Joseph Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes.

Since the subject matter of the bill encompasses the jurisdiction of two standing committees, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be first referred to the Committee on Public Works, and after that committee has reported the bill that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for its consideration of that portion of the bill with which it is concerned.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, likewise, I ask unanimous consent that the communication from the President on this subject be jointly referred to the Committees on Public Works and Rules and Administration. I am joined in the bill's introduction by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and

Grounds, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the ranking minority member of the Public Works Committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3389) to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, rarely does an opportunity come to the Nation to be presented with a significant gift which will bring great joy and pleasure to our people today and will enrich our culture for countless future generations. Such an opportunity is now before us. Following in the tradition established by such noteworthy persons as James Smithson, William Corcoran, Charles Freer, and Andrew Mellon, another magnificent donation has been offered to the United States.

Mr. Joseph Hirshhorn of New York City has devoted a lifetime to assembling a collection of contemporary painting and sculpture which is without equal in its field. Mr. Hirshhorn has most generously offered this collection as a gift to the people of the United States. His gift, consisting of nearly 1,500 pieces of sculpture and approximately 5,000 paintings, far exceeds its assigned monetary value of \$25 million. It is an affirmation by one American citizen of his faith in the humane values inspired by works of the creative imagination. Mr. Hirshhorn's generosity in providing a million dollars for the purchase of additional outstanding works will help to continue the important work which he has begun.

In accepting this generous offer, the Nation must make a fitting response. Such a magnificent collection will require a new museum in an appropriate setting. Legislation which has just been introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], would set aside a permanent site in the District of Columbia bounded by Seventh Street, Independence Avenue, Ninth Street, and Madison Drive, for the construction of a suitable gallery of art and garden of sculpture, as the permanent home for this collection. This Mall site would be known as the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution would administer the removal of existing structures and selection of the architectural design for the museum and garden, as well as be authorized to operate the new building as a free public museum.

The Board of Trustees, composed of eight members, four of whom would be selected from nominations presented to the President by Mr. Hirshhorn and four others selected from among nominations presented to the President by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution would serve with two ex officio members, the Chief Justice of the United

States and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. The term of one member would expire each year. Successive general members—who may be elected from among members whose terms have expired—would enjoy 6-year terms, except that a successor chosen to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor would be selected only for the remainder of that term.

Responsibilities of the Board of Trustees for the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden would include extending advice and assistance to the Board of Regents on all matters concerning administration, operation, maintenance and preservation of the Museum and Garden as well as authority to purchase works of art, loan, exchange, sell, or dispose of works and make decisions on methods of display.

As a measure of the national commitment to preserve and continue this magnificent collection, the faith of the United States would be pledged to guarantee that such funds as may be necessary for the upkeep, operation, and administration of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden will be provided.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my statement the remarks made by President Johnson on May 17 when he accepted Mr. Hirshhorn's splendid gift be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE HIRSHHORN CEREMONY

This is a magnificent day for the nation's Capital, and for millions of Americans who will visit Washington in the years to come.

It is also an inspiring climax to a career devoted to art.

From the days of his youth in Brooklyn—when he first began collecting reproductions of art work—until this hour, Joseph Hirshhorn has been driven by a passion for painting and sculpture. Throughout the world he has sought the great art of our time—those expressions of man's will to make sense of his experience on earth, to find order and meaning in the physical world about him, to render what is familiar in a new way.

I know that Joseph Hirshhorn will go on seeking out the best in modern painting and sculpture for years to come. But he will never have a finer hour than this: for today he offers the fruit of a lifetime in the service of art to the citizens of a grateful Nation. Few men have been privileged to make such a gift to their generation and to those that will come after.

Several months ago Mrs. Johnson journeyed to Joseph Hirshhorn's home in Connecticut. She came back filled with awe and admiration for the great works collected there. She came back, too, with a sense of affection and respect for their owner. She has told me many times since then of her hope that Mr. Hirshhorn would make his collection available to the Nation.

Many suggestions were made to Mr. Hirshhorn about the disposition of his collection, as well there might be—for among private collections it is virtually without parallel in its field. That he has chosen the Nation's Capital is a cause for celebration, pride and deep gratitude.

Now we must build a museum worthy of the collection, and worthy of our highest aspirations for this beautiful city.

Washington is a city of powerful institutions—the seat of government for the strongest Nation on earth, the place where democratic ideals are translated into reality. It must also be a place of beauty and learning. Its buildings and thoroughfares, its schools, concert halls, and museums should reflect a people whose commitment is to the best that is within them to dream.

In the National Gallery collection, in the Freer and the Corcoran Galleries, in the museums of the Smithsonian, in the Kennedy Center that is to come, in the Pennsylvania Avenue plan,—and now, in the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden—we have the elements of a great capital of beauty and learning, no less impressive than its power.

Mr. Hirshhorn, we accept your splendid gift to the American people. We shall treasure it and use it well—in giving pleasure and enlightenment to men and women of every age, from every walk of life.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on Tuesday the Nation had some remarkably good news concerning the decision by Joseph Hirshhorn to present one of the world's finest collections of paintings and sculpture to the public. This magnificent collection will be available here in Washington, and I am sure that millions will be able to appreciate this gift over the years.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, from the inception of our Nation, controversy and complexity has surrounded the question of how to choose the President of the United States.

Indeed, one of the framers of the Constitution, James Wilson, described this problem as the most difficult of all to resolve at the Convention.

The framers discussed, debated, and discarded a number of ideas, including plans for the Governors to choose a President and the Virginia plan whereby the Congress would do the choosing.

The direct popular vote was rejected for several reasons. First, the States had widely diverse qualifications for the franchise—in fact, only an extremely small percentage of the adult population were qualified to vote in most of the original States. Second, there was no radio, television, or mass circulation magazines or rapid means of transportation. Thus, the people could be expected to vote parochially and without sophisticated understanding of the issues. Third, there were no political parties—hence, little chance for any candidate to win a significant number of votes.

But the idea of direct popular election of a President was not forgotten. As early as 1826, a constitutional amendment was introduced in Congress proposing the direct popular election. Similar plans have been studied and discussed time and again throughout our history. Several of our present and former colleagues—Senator HUMPHREY, Senator BURDICK, Senator SMITH, Senator MANSFIELD, Senator KEATING, Senator AIKEN, just to name a few—have made similar proposals, and I trust that their long experience in this area of legislation

will prove invaluable to the subcommittee in its current deliberations.

Most often, they have been discarded with similar complaints. "It may be a fine idea, but it will never pass."

Today, Mr. President, the situation is different. Today, for the first time in our history, we have achieved the goal of universal suffrage regardless of race, religion, or station in life. Today we are witnessing a political development in our States where for the first time in decades, legislatures fully represent people.

Today, the next logical outgrowth of the persistent and inevitable movement toward the democratic ideal is the popular election of our national officers—an election in which each person has the right to vote for President without an artificial barrier separating him from the choice of his Chief Executive.

Now is the time, Mr. President. It can be done.

Therefore, I introduce a proposed amendment to the Constitution providing for direct popular election of the President. In the hearings on electoral reform being conducted by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, this proposal among others will be carefully considered.

The subcommittee previously has examined proposed amendments, including one which I offered, suggesting various changes in the electoral college system. All proposals will receive serious and thorough consideration. We must bear in mind, however, that proposals for direct popular election of the President have not received adequate study. It may well be that mere procedural changes in the present system would be like shifting around the parts of a creaky and dangerous automobile engine, making it no less creaky and no less dangerous. What we may need is a new engine, Mr. President, because we are in a new age.

Simply stated, the amendment provides that any presidential-vice-presidential ticket receiving the greatest number of popular votes is declared elected, providing the ticket receives at least 40 percent of the total popular vote cast. If no ticket gets 40 percent of the vote, the Congress would meet in joint session to choose from the two tickets receiving the most votes. A majority of the combined membership of the House and Senate would be required to elect the President and Vice President.

Some may say this proposal is too new, too radical a break with tradition. In all honesty, Mr. President, I was among that number only a few short months ago. Then, we began hearings on the problem. I consulted with scholars in the field. I did a great deal of study and reflection. I came to the conclusion that this idea was not truly a break with tradition at all. It was, in fact, a logical, realistic and proper continuation of this Nation's tradition and history—a tradition of continuous expansion of the franchise and equality in voting.

Today, we would not think of barring Catholics or Jews from voting. Yet some of our colonial governments did so.

Today, we would not think that a man must own property in order to exercise

his right to vote. Yet it was 1851 before all States had dropped property requirements as a requisite to voting.

Today, we would not tolerate the idea of U.S. Senators being appointed by the State legislature. Yet it was 1914 when the first Senators were elected by the people.

Today, we take for granted the enormous role played by women in our elections. Yet women did not have the vote until 1920.

Today, we have removed the poll tax as a financial barrier to the right to vote.

Today, we have witnessed the climax of the long struggle to guarantee Negroes the right to exercise the franchise—the 14th, 15th and 24th amendments; the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960 and 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

And today, we guarantee that all people in a State shall have a vote equal to all other people within a State so that they may be represented nearly equally in the State lawmaking bodies.

In fact, we have only one election remaining, Mr. President, wherein some votes are not equal to others and wherein millions of votes do not count in the final result—and that is in the election of the most powerful political officer in the world, the President of the United States.

It is not radical to suggest that we abolish the electoral college and elect our President by direct popular vote—no more so than if we suggested the advantages of grounding an open-cockpit biplane in favor of a supersonic jet.

A major criticism of extending the direct vote to all Americans in electing their President has been that it somehow would be inconsistent with our Federal system. Again, I wish to state that this was my own impression—but it was an impression that careful thought and study swept away.

The electoral college was not created so that States might act as units in electing a President. As I suggested earlier, the unit system grew out of the development of political parties and the need, therefore, to change the original system. It was never contemplated that electors from any given State would vote automatically and unanimously for the same candidate—quite the opposite; it was believed that the people, lacking communications and transportation, might be so inclined. The electors were to be the wisest of persons in each of the States and they would choose the national executives, free from popular passions. Needless to say, it did not work out that way. By 1800, the system created by the framers had foundered, necessitating adoption of the 12th amendment which resulted eventually in the use of the winner take all, State-unit method of electing Presidents.

It was not necessary to dwell on the inequities of the present system. All of us know how the system can operate to elect men receiving fewer votes than their opponents—all agree it happened in 1888, and many suggest it happened also in two other elections.

We all know how a shift of some 29,000 votes in three States in 1948 would have

resulted in Governor Dewey's election, even though President Truman received a plurality of more than 2 million votes.

In 1960, we all are familiar with the problem in Alabama, where a voter was unable to express clear support for Senator Kennedy. To this day, there is no way of knowing for certain how the Alabama vote went or whether it would have affected the total popular vote cast for each candidate.

And we are familiar with the practice of concentrating the quest for votes in national elections in a handful of large States—for it is a fact of the present electoral system that a candidate winning by the slimmest of margins in 12 States has been elected President, no matter what the people in the remaining 38 States may decide.

Must we wait for another election of 1800, before we are moved to correct a glaring wrong in our system? Must it come to a situation so bitter that political rivals would become as irreconcilable as a Hamilton and a Burr? It would not end today in a duel to the death—but in this day and age, we cannot risk wounds so deep that they might make the Nation a divided camp where vengeance would triumph over reason. If it comes to a time when a President is again elected despite receiving fewer votes than his opponent, such wounds would be inflicted widely among the American people.

We hold out an alternative—an alternative that clearly is in keeping with American tradition and which does no violence to the Federal concept.

Direct election of the President would make that office truly national. We elect our local official locally; our Congressmen by districts to protect district interests; our Governors and Senators statewide. Why should we not elect the President and Vice President nationally? The President has no authority over State government. He cannot veto a bill enacted by a State legislature. Why then should he be elected by State-chosen electors? He should be elected directly by the people, for it is the people of the United States to whom he is responsible. It seems to me that from township trustee, to county clerk, to Members of Congress, to Governors of our States, each person has the right to cast his vote directly for the candidate of his choice—except in the election of the President of the United States.

Direct election, contrary to the beliefs of many, would strengthen the role of smaller States in the national election. It would truly nationalize the election and the campaign preceding it. Candidates would have to go where the votes are, and that is everywhere. Today, the small States are virtually ignored. But under direct election, candidates would not only be concerned with winning good majorities where they are strong, but with winning respectable minorities as well in areas where they are not so strong.

Direct election would greatly encourage voter participation. Today, if a State votes traditionally in the column of one party, voters of the other party correctly assume that their vote will

count for naught. Under direct election, these votes will be as important as votes cast anywhere else.

Direct election will strengthen the two-party system. No longer will the traditionally minority party in any State be without the incentive to bring out as many votes as possible for the candidate leading the national ticket of his party. Nor will a small third party, by carrying two or three States in a close contest for electoral votes, be able to force the choice into the House of Representatives where it could exert disproportionate power.

In sum, direct popular election brings with it many virtues and no vices; it would substitute clarity for confusion, decisiveness for danger, popular choice for political chance.

James Madison, the father of our Constitution, knew that the President had to be independent of the Congress. He knew, also, that in deciding upon a means of choosing a President some compromise would be reached. But he had his own ideas as to how the President would best be elected.

Madison said that "the people at large was the fittest in itself."

We are at long last arriving at the place and time in our history where meaning has been brought to the preamble of our Constitution, "We, the people of the United States." Today we are, indeed, "We, the people."

If there was doubt about it in the early years of the Republic, there can be no doubt today. Let us echo Madison. Let us put our trust in the people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a detailed explanation of the amendment, together with an article entitled "Big Majority of Americans Wants President Elected by Popular Vote," published in the Washington Post of May 19, 1966.

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

DETAILED EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

SECTION 1

The present system of electing the President and Vice President by state chosen electors would be replaced by direct popular election.

The electorate of each state and of the District of Columbia would vote, at a time fixed by Congress, for a slate of two candidates for these offices. Each voter would cast a single ballot for the two candidates of his choice for President and Vice President, both of whom must have agreed previously to the joining of their names on the ballot for this purpose. A voter would not be allowed to vote for candidates of different parties for the two offices, nor to vote for one office and not the other, since a single ballot would be cast for the two candidates for President and Vice President who were joined on the same ticket.

Each State would retain its present power of prescribing the places and manner of holding presidential elections. However, as it may now do for elections to members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, Congress would be authorized to make or alter such regulations by law.

All persons eligible to vote for members of Congress would be eligible to vote for the offices of President and Vice President. Constitutional provisions, statutes, executive orders and judicial findings on qualifications

for voting for members of the House of Representatives and the Senate would apply equally to persons voting for President and Vice President.

States would be empowered, however, to adopt less restrictive residence requirements for presidential electors than for those electors voting for Members of Congress. This would enable a state to permit new citizens who have recently become residents of that state to vote for President and Vice President although they were denied the privilege of voting for Members of Congress because of their limited residency. A state also might extend the right of voting in presidential elections to servicemen or others abroad who might not meet its regular residence requirement.

Likewise, Congress would be authorized to adopt uniform residence as well as age requirements for voting in elections for President and Vice President. The basic power to fix these qualifications would still be retained by the states, but uniform national standards for these purposes could be imposed by law if at some future time such action became necessary in the judgment of Congress. There might be circumstances, especially during time of war or other emergency, when Congress would deem it advisable to establish a uniform residence requirement for casting ballots in elections for President and Vice President which might be at variance with basic state voting qualifications.

Fear has been expressed that direct election of the President might result in competition between states to lower the voting age in order to increase their relative voting strength. This supposition does not appear to be warranted, particularly in view of the fact that by terms of the amendment such a reduction would apply automatically also to qualifications for voting for Members of Congress. Any state lowering the voting age to enlarge its share of the national total cast for President would be confronted by the fact that its Congressmen and Senators would have to be selected by the same electorate. Nevertheless, in order to guard against the deleterious effects of any such possible development, Congress would be vested with the authority to establish a uniform minimum age in a presidential election.

Voting qualifications and the places and manner of holding elections in the District of Columbia would be prescribed by act of Congress. This would permit, of course, some delegation of election administration authority by Congress to any local government in the District established by law under its constitutional power to govern the seat of government.

Official election returns, prepared and certified by the proper state officials, would have to be sent to the President of the Senate within forty-five days after the election. Because of the final tabulation of the results scheduled in early January, this period could not be greatly lengthened unless the date of the present November election were advanced. Ordinarily this would provide sufficient time to settle any disputes about voting irregularities or canvass of the ballots which might develop, but Congress could extend the time if necessary.

The official certificate of election from each state would list all persons for whom votes were cast for President and Vice President and the total number of votes cast in that state for each of the two candidates joined for those two offices.

SECTION 2

The official voting certificates would be opened and the votes tallied by the President of the Senate in a joint session of both houses of Congress on January 6 following the election, unless Congress by law should designate a different day between January 4 and January 10. Because under the Constitution the terms of the incumbent President

and Vice President end at noon on the 20th day of January, it is essential that the task of determining which candidates have been elected should be completed as soon as possible after the new Congress assembles early in January. Although January 6 would be fixed as the day for this purpose, this provision would allow Congress to appoint a day as much as two days earlier or four days later.

The President of the Senate would declare elected the two persons joined as candidates for President and Vice President who received the greatest number of certified votes if their total equals at least forty per centum of the total number of certified votes. To require a higher percentage of the direct popular vote as the plurality necessary for winning would increase the possibility that no candidate would receive a sufficient plurality to be declared elected forthwith. If the required plurality were higher, it might encourage small minority groups to wage active presidential campaigns in the hope of attracting sufficient votes to prevent one group of candidates from being declared elected. It is very unlikely that third party candidates could amass a combined total vote of more than twenty per centum which would be necessary to keep one of the major party slates from being elected.

If no two candidates receive at least forty per centum of the total certified vote, then in a joint session the members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate would proceed immediately to make the final choice. They would cast individual votes in a publicly recorded ballot on one of the two pairs of persons joined as candidates for President and Vice President who received the highest number of certified votes. A vote equal to an absolute majority of the total membership of both Houses combined, or one more than half of all members elected and in office, would be needed for a final choice.

By stipulating that successful candidates must receive at least forty per centum of the popular vote to be declared elected without the choice being made by a joint session of Congress, voters will, much as now, be induced to rally round major parties and candidates during presidential elections. The forty per centum minimum will serve to lessen any divisive forces which might split parties into factions. In only one or two presidential elections in our history have the successful candidates received less than forty per cent of the popular vote, and there is no reason to anticipate that the proposed amendment would disturb this tradition. Party leaders would tend to submerge their differences and coalesce their efforts in order to pool their strength and avoid the uncertainties of having the final choice made by Congress.

SECTION 3

This section would provide for various contingencies which might happen in the event of the death or the withdrawal of candidates for President or Vice President before the official declaration of their election has been officially completed under the regular constitutional procedure.

If a candidate for President who receives more than 40 per centum of the popular vote for President should die before the time fixed for counting the certified vote totals, then the candidate for Vice President, who is joined with him on the ballot and would be entitled to be elected Vice President, would be declared elected President. In effect, this would merely extend backward one step the present provision of the Twentieth Amendment which provides that, if the President-elect shall have died by the time of the beginning of the term of the President, the Vice President-elect shall become President. It would beyond any doubt settle the question of who should become President if a successful candidate should die between the time of the direct election in November and the certification of the total vote by Congress.

Congress would be authorized to provide by law for three other possibilities: where a candidate for either President or Vice President should die or withdraw from the election after his nomination but prior to the popular election; where both candidates for President and Vice President who have received a forty per centum plurality of the popular vote and who are entitled to become President and Vice President should die before the votes can be certified officially according to the regular constitutional procedure; and where either or both of the candidates for President and Vice President should die after a popular election in which no candidates have received a forty per centum plurality and before the members of the Senate and House of Representatives have made the choice which has devolved upon them. Although it is not probable that such contingencies will occur very frequently, the Constitution should eliminate as far as possible these uncertainties which might at some future election cause major difficulty.

SECTION 4

Congress would be empowered to adopt appropriate legislation to enforce the amendment. This is the standard authorization which would enable the enactment of laws needed to implement and make effective the direct election of the President and Vice President.

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1966]
THE GALLUP POLL: BIG MAJORITY OF AMERICANS WANTS PRESIDENT ELECTED BY POPULAR VOTE

PRINCETON, N.J.—The American public would like to see an amendment to the Constitution that would base the election of the President on the total popular vote cast, thus doing away with the electoral college.

This question was asked:
"Would you approve or disapprove of an amendment to the Constitution which would do away with the electoral college and base the election of a President on the total popular vote cast throughout the Nation?"

The results:	Percent
Approve.....	63
Disapprove.....	20
No opinion.....	17

Republicans and Independents are somewhat more inclined to favor the change than are Democrats. Education is also a factor, with more of the better educated in favor than those of lesser education.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 163) to amend the Constitution to provide for the direct election of the President and the Vice President of the United States, introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MUSKIE subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] introduced earlier on behalf of himself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] a joint resolution and I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the desk for cosponsors until Wednesday, June 1, 1966.

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

NATIONAL HALIBUT WEEK

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, one of the great fishery resources of the Pacific Northwest and Alaska is that of

the Pacific halibut. In the State of Washington alone, some 16 million pounds of this prime, succulent seafood is marketed annually.

The search for halibut takes our fishermen long distances—from Seattle, for example, to the Bering Sea, above the Aleutian Island chain. As these men are busy a good part of the year, not only in fishing but in readying their fishing gear, the wives have formed the Halibut Fishermen's Wives' Association, an active sort of auxiliary to the fishermen's efforts. For some 12 years now, these women have sponsored an annual Halibut Week—a time set aside for appreciation of this great resource, and for the encouragement of its marketing that more may know of its goodness. The cooperation established between the United States and Canada under the provisions of the International Pacific Halibut Treaty is world renowned, and their record in rebuilding this great resource through scientific conservation practices is virtually unrivaled.

I am honored today, to present a joint resolution to provide for the designation of "National Halibut Week."

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 164) to provide for the designation of National Halibut Week, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE DRAFT AND SELECTIVE SERVICE POLICIES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for myself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. MCGOVERN, a resolution requesting that the President set up a special bipartisan committee of distinguished citizens to review the selective service policies of our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the desk for 1 week for the addition of cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will lie on the desk as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 268) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Whereas the Nation is currently engaged in armed conflict in southeast Asia; and

Whereas no comprehensive review of the draft has been made by the Congress for eighteen years; and

Whereas many inconsistencies and inequities have evolved in our present draft system; and

Whereas the report of the Department of Defense on the draft, due June 1, 1965, has not been made available; and

Whereas the Secretary of Defense has recently made revolutionary recommendations regarding universal national service; and

Whereas public confidence in the equity of the draft system has been shaken: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should appoint a special

bipartisan commission, of eminent Americans, to conduct a thorough review of the Selective Service System, and to make recommendations by February 1, 1967, concerning all alternative means available for meeting the Nation's manpower needs.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it is my hope that this resolution will find wide support among the Senators and that indeed such a Commission will be established to give us clear recommendations and alternative policies in time for consideration before the present draft law expires July 1, 1967.

Public confidence in the draft is, I believe, at an alltime low. The system is shot through with inequities. The clumsy attempt to select some young men now holding student deferments for military duty is only the most recent unfortunate example of a system that long ago needed drastic overhaul.

Surely the use of achievement tests to help determine who shall study and who shall fight is flagrantly unjust.

It is a standard without merit. It smacks of a caste system. It degrades the whole concept of honorable service to our country.

The use of written tests work to the advantage of middle-class youngsters. It discriminates against the poor and deprived student. It is unfair to the conscientious student of average ability.

The use of rank listing is no more satisfactory. It is a perversion of the grading system.

Nearly all boys from middle-class homes now have a chance for higher education. The use of rank lists and achievement testing reminds us unpleasantly of Civil War days when a moderately wealthy man could buy himself a substitute for the draft.

To set up an elite category of young men who need not serve because of the advantages in education, innate ability or wealth violates the very concept of equality which has been our sustaining strength from the beginning.

Surely in time of war, when induction no longer means only the inconvenience of serving in a peacetime Army base, but carries with it the risk of sacrificing one's life, we should not settle an issue of such gravity by criteria favoring the wealthy and the academically gifted.

Defense Department figures already indicate that Negroes—who represent only about 10 percent of the Nation's population—make up 22 percent of those killed in Vietnam.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. NELSON. Congress does not stand free from blame for this situation. For 18 years it has fumbled away opportunities to scrutinize the draft. The last time the law came before this body it received a scant 10 minutes of attention.

But at any rate the draft is being vigorously debated across the Nation as it has not been in the recent past.

Into the midst of these discussions the Secretary of Defense now injects a dramatic new proposal for what apparently amounts to universal service, military or otherwise.

Whether this is a serious proposal or a trial balloon, whether the idea has full administration backing or is only an idea of Mr. McNamara's is not clear.

The situation is even further muddled by the fact that the Department of Defense has been sitting for almost a year now on a thorough study of the draft that was supposed to be ready last June.

In reply to repeated inquiry we have only been told that the study is not yet available.

What is the meaning of McNamara's suggestion?

Is it aimed at Saigon?

Coming as it does smack in the middle of a rapidly deteriorating situation in that forlorn country may be taken overseas as more American saber rattling, a call to universal military training to demonstrate how "firm" is our "resolve" to use military force to gain our objectives.

I do not suggest that this was Mr. McNamara's intention. His speech is in fact a welcome statement from a high administration official of the importance of finding other than military paths to world stability, of finding ways to draw China into the circle of nations.

But under the circumstances it is all the more important that a Commission be established to clear the air and to make a sober assessment of the possibilities for a revamped selective service system.

Such a commission should include experts on education, military needs, manpower and voluntary service. It should have at its disposal automatic data processing equipment so that the costs and the benefits of alternative structures for supplying our military manpower needs could be explored in detail. These alternatives and the background information about them should be submitted to the Congress for consideration.

Almost 2 years ago I proposed to the Senate a plan to abolish the peacetime draft entirely. At that time I pointed out that the incredibly low pay of enlisted men in the lowest ranks contribute materially to a situation where nearly 90 percent of the enlisted personnel leave the Army after only 2 years of service. The inefficiency of training men for only 2 years of service is obvious. Adequate inducements could retain enough of these men in my judgment, to make it possible to eliminate the draft by 1968.

The situation is now drastically changed. But the need now for a complete review of the draft is just as urgent—perhaps more so.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts and Mr. GRUENING addressed the Chair.

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NELSON. I ask that I may have an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I highly commend the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin for his constructive proposal. My only suggestion for improvement of his excellent resolution would be that the operation of the draft be halted until the proposed commission has come into being and made its findings.

Of course, it is well known that I wholly disapprove of our drafting any boys to go to Vietnam, especially in view of the fact that last year there were 96,000 desertions from the South Vietnamese Army. In other words, we are sending our boys to fight and die for people who do not want to fight for themselves and now seem to be engaged in fighting each other. I do not particularly blame those South Vietnamese for deserting, because they have no enthusiasm to support a corrupt and unpopular self-imposed regime. Perhaps that is why they deserted.

But why should our boys be sent down there to fight and die for a cause in which those whose cause it is have little interest, to fight and kill people against whom they have no grievance, and against whom the United States has no legitimate grievance?

Therefore, while I should like to see the Senator's resolution adopted, I should like to see it amended to read that there be no further draft until the report of the Commission is made.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the proposal he is making today. I think it is a sound proposal on a matter of deep concern to many Senators.

I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, does not the Senator believe that such a resolution would be appropriate, even if we were not engaged in armed conflict today?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, I do. It has been 18 years since there has been a congressional review of the draft. I believe everyone recognizes there are inequities in its operation. We may have to continue the Selective Service System, but I think it should be reviewed by a commission and by Congress, to make sure that it is the best possible system.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I note that the Senator pointed out, in one of his whereas clauses, that the Secretary of Defense has recently made several recommendations regarding universal national service. The Secretary of Defense, in the speech he made yesterday, made a number of the same points which the Senator has stated in his brief remarks; that there are inequities which do exist; and certainly he pointed out something—that we all recognize—that there are 2 million young people who turn 18 every year and become eligible for the draft, and he recommends that perhaps some of these young people might be given an opportunity to serve

either in the Peace Corps or in a National Service Corps.

We know, of course, that to train someone for the Peace Corps or the National Service Corps, or VISTA, for example, costs some \$10,000 per year. Even if we took a small percentage of those 2 million and trained them for such service, the cost would reach astronomical figures. But even aside from the obvious financial implications which must be fully explored the Secretary of Defense, as one of the principal spokesmen for the administration, has raised significant questions, and I was delighted to see that the Senator has pointed that out.

The other point which concerns me—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The other point which concerns me, as I am sure it probably concerns the Senator from Wisconsin, is that it was not clear from the remarks of the Secretary of Defense whether the individuals who would serve in the Peace Corps or National Service Corps would or should be excluded from the draft. This raises, I think, some fundamental questions for the proposed commission to consider.

Mr. President, I have been interested in this problem, and I have suggested that the Armed Services Committee consider the lottery approach to the draft, which has been tried successfully in a number of Western European countries. I think the proposed commission could consider the merits of that proposal, as well as several others. I, for one, have an open mind on the subject. But I am concerned about the injustice and inequities that we are experiencing under the present draft system. Our watchword must be "equality and fairness of treatment," and we must explore every possible alternative approach, in order to arrive at a system which meets the standards.

I commend the Senator from Wisconsin. I think his suggestion is sound and constructive. Of course, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate would have the prime responsibility for this review, but I do feel, as I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin feels, that the proposed commission could make recommendations which would be valuable to the Armed Services Committee, and that bringing to bear the expertise, the knowledge and understanding, and the great interest of the kinds of people who would serve on such a commission would be extremely beneficial to the Armed Services Committee as well as to the Senate.

For those reasons, I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for his most constructive proposal.

Mr. NELSON. The intent is to bring experts from outside the Congress to devote their attention and creativity to the problem, and then report back to Congress with an analysis of the service man-

power needs; and several alternative proposals to meet this need along with a cost analysis of each proposal. Then the matter would go to the Armed Services Committee, which is the appropriate place, and then this distinguished committee would review the report of the commission, conduct hearings, and make its recommendations to Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator has been, I think, extremely responsible in his approach, and has made a very useful and constructive suggestion. I certainly hope it will find support in the Senate, because I think it would really open a window to the subject, which does need all the air and the clear thinking which this kind of commission would provide.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I merely wish to join the Senator in condemning these tests. I have been out to Vietnam myself; and I have seen the tests in operation in my State. I think the theory that the educated young man should not run the same risks as the chap who, for economic reasons or otherwise, cannot go to school and must work at a gas station, for example, is completely outside the spirit of the Selective Service System, and does violence to the traditions of our country. I hope very much we will end it as promptly as possible.

I like the idea of a commission, but I think that the main thing the Senator pointed out, and which I wish to announce my complete concurrence, is that we could junk this testing, which is inimical, in my judgment, to the morale of the young people and the tradition of our Nation.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator. One of the several things that is offensive to me about the college testing programs is that it rewards the indolent able student and penalizes the conscientious average student. One's innate mental capacity should not be the measure of his obligation to serve.

AMENDMENT OF RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 567

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3066) to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

COORDINATED NATIONAL SAFETY PROGRAM AND ESTABLISHMENT OF SAFETY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLES IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

AMENDMENT NO. 568

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

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

AMENDMENT OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936, AS AMENDED

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have today joined as a cosponsor of S. 3337, a bill "to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to facilitate the extension and improvement of rural electric and telephone service, and to strengthen and stabilize rural electrification and telephone systems by supplementation of the existing sources of Federal financing as provided by titles I and II of the Rural Electrification Act, to furnish additional sources of capital funds, and for other purposes."

It is my understanding that the administration bill, which was introduced in the House as H.R. 14837 by Mr. COOLEY, of North Carolina, will not be introduced in the Senate. The administration bill is designed to meet the same objectives as S. 3337, but there are some important differences in the specific legislative language appearing in the two bills, some of which in the administration bill strongly appeal to me.

The thrust of this legislation is to provide a means whereby our Rural Electric Cooperatives can, with some Federal financial assistance, establish a Federal Electric Bank which eventually will be owned by REC's and their members and which will provide needed financing of electric generating plants and electric transmission and distribution lines or systems required by the rural electrification system. As these units in the system become more viable with the growth of our economy, it will become increasingly difficult to justify 2 percent interest loan rates by the Federal Government to them. Some of this 2 percent interest money will continue to be justifiable; but the REC's, as a group, wish to be able to stand on their own two feet and to conduct their own financing. This is a perfectly sound and laudable objective, and precedents for such a Federal bank will be found in the Federal Banks for Cooperatives, Federal Land Banks, and the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, whose performance records have been highly satisfactory.

I believe that hearings should be held on this legislation with a view to developing a thoroughly sound and practical bill. As presently drafted, S. 3337 does not satisfy me on a number of important points: there is an absence of guidelines for the Governor of the Federal Electric Bank to follow in making loans, and I believe these should be written into the bill instead of leaving loan policies entirely up to him; there should be representation on the Board of Directors from the Commerce, Interior, and Treasury Departments; until such time as the bank is no longer receiving Federal fi-

ancing, Congress should retain appropriation act controls; a more rapid method of repayment of Federal financing should be provided if such repayments are feasible. These and other matters should be thoroughly examined through committee hearings and committee deliberations. Moreover, if we are to avoid further inflation, any new Federal financial commitments must conform to the requirements of a reasonably balanced budget, taking into account demands placed upon our Government by the war in Vietnam.

WITHDRAWAL OF COSPONSORSHIP FROM SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, my name appears as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 64. I do not desire to cosponsor this proposal. I ask unanimous consent that my name be stricken from the list of cosponsors.

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

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, unanimous consent was originally given for Senate bill 3337, to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to facilitate the extension and improvement of rural electric and telephone service, and to strengthen and stabilize rural electrification and telephone systems by supplementation of the existing sources of Federal financing as provided by titles I and II of the Rural Electrification Act, to furnish additional sources of capital funds, and for other purposes, to be held at the desk until May 20, for the purpose of addition of cosponsors. I now ask unanimous consent that the time for holding of this bill be extended to May 31.

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

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of Delmar R. Carlson, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guyana; Elliott P. Skinner, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Upper Volta; Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China; Eugene M. Locke, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan; and Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

Open hearings have been scheduled for nominees Locke, Beam, and Skinner

for Monday morning, May 23, at 10 a.m., in room 4221. At that time, Ambassador designee to Brazil John W. Tuthill will also be heard.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 19, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1098. An act to amend section I(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes;

S. 1748. An act for the relief of Virgilio Acosta-Martinez; and

S. 2696. An act for the relief of Abraham Ezekiel Cohen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 265) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Utah based upon fair market value.

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

H.R. 197. An act to amend chapter 73 of title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into contract with medical schools and clinics for scarce medical specialist services and for other purposes;

H.R. 7728. An act to assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veterans' Administration and other public and private hospitals;

H.R. 11777. An act to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13277. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 197. An act to amend chapter 73 of title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into contract with medical schools and clinics for scarce medical specialist services and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7728. An act to assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veteran's Administration and other public and private hospitals; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 11777. An act to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13277. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature

of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1124.

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

PRINTING OF STUDY ENTITLED "POLICY PLANNING FOR AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 260) to print a study entitled "Policy Planning for Aeronautical Research and Development" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the study entitled "Policy Planning for Aeronautical Research and Development", prepared for the use of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences shall be printed with illustrations as a Senate document; and that there be printed four thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING ENTITLED "THE WAR ON POVERTY AS IT AFFECTS OLDER AMERICANS"

The resolution (S. Res. 263) to print additional copies of a Senate report filed by the Special Committee on Aging was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging six thousand two hundred additional copies of a Senate report of the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, entitled "The War on Poverty as It Affects Older Americans."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE HEARINGS ON "UNITED STATES POLICY WITH RESPECT TO MAINLAND CHINA"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 91) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "United States Policy With Respect to Mainland China" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations five thousand additional copies of its hearings on "United States Policy With Respect to Mainland China," of the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) to authorize printing of additional copies of hearings was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Interior

and Insular Affairs Committee two thousand five hundred additional copies of the Senate hearings of the Study Team Report on the Recreational Opportunities in the State of Washington, held in the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

PRINTING OF "TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946, AN ECONOMIC SYMPOSIUM" FOR USE OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 86) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings entitled "Twentieth Anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946, an Economic Symposium" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee five thousand additional copies of its hearings of the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, entitled "Twentieth Anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946, an Economic Symposium."

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 84) authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments—2d Supp., Jan. 10, 1966," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

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

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The resolution (S. Res. 259) for additional funds for the Committee on the District of Columbia was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress \$5,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK" AS SENATE DOCUMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 264) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of "Election Law Guidebook" as a Senate

document was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 264

Resolved, That a revised edition of Senate Document Numbered 67 of the Eighty-eighth Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook", be printed as a Senate document; and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

HELENE L. MACPHERSON

The resolution (S. Res. 265) to pay a gratuity to Helene L. Macpherson was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 265

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Helene L. Macpherson, widow of Gregor Macpherson, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

JULIA L. CONWAY AND MARY C. DOWNEY

The resolution (S. Res. 266) to pay a gratuity to Julia L. Conway and Mary C. Downey was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 266

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Julia L. Conway and Mary C. Downey, aunts of Louisa R. Pearson, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to six months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

INVESTIGATE THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 251), to investigate the Trading With the Enemy Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules, with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "committee", to strike out "from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive" and insert "through January 31, 1967", and on page 2, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$25,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider proposed legislation affecting said Acts.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, through January 31, 1967, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected

lected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1169), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

The Committee on Rules and Administration to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 251) authorizing the resumption of a study of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the resolution as amended be agreed to.

The amendments adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration would (1) reduce the amount requested by \$10,000—from \$35,000 to \$25,000; and (2) provide that the authorization commence on the date the resolution is approved, rather than on February 1, 1966.

Senate Resolution 251 as amended would authorize the expenditure by the Committee on the Judiciary of not to exceed \$25,000 to enable its Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act through January 31, 1967, to conduct hearings, conferences, and discussions, and to reach areas of agreement with the executive branch in various matters within its jurisdiction.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE I OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

The bill (H.R. 8376) to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment for certain corkboard insulation was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1170), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 8376 is to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment for certain corkboard insulation.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The duty of 2.5 cents per board foot on insulation, coated or not coated, of com-

pressed cork in boards, blocks, or slabs, as now provided for under item 220.30 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, has been suspended for a 3-year period from May 30, 1963, to May 29, 1966, by Public Law 88-32. This suspension is reflected in item 904.40 of the Tariff Schedules. H.R. 8376 amends item 220.30 (and repeals item 904.40) to make permanent the present duty-free status of such corkboard insulation.

Corkboard insulation, because of its low thermal conductivity, is particularly suitable for low temperature applications, such as cold storage rooms, refrigerator cars and trucks, refrigerated warehouses, and fur storage vaults. It is also used to insulate walls, ceilings, and cold-air ducts in air-conditioned buildings, and as insulation in ship construction.

There is no longer any production of corkboard insulation in the United States, such having ceased in 1962. Former domestic producers have now become importers in order to supply and continue their businesses as applicators and suppliers of corkboard insulations. These producers favored the temporary suspension of duty under Public Law 88-32 and support the present bill to make this suspension permanent.

The Committee on Finance agrees with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House that the benefits derived by domestic industry from the current temporary suspension of duty on corkboard insulation warrant continuation of the suspension on a permanent basis. H.R. 8376 would accomplish this objective.

CONTINUED SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON HEPTANOIC ACID

The bill (H.R. 10998) to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1171), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 10998 is to continue the existing suspension of the import duty on heptanoic acid for an additional temporary period, until the close of August 8, 1969.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The duty on heptanoic acid was suspended by Public Law 86-795, approved September 15, 1960, for a period of 3 years, and for an additional period, through August 8, 1966, by Public Law 88-93, approved August 8, 1963. H.R. 10998 would amend item 907.30 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States to continue the existing suspension for an additional 3-year period, until the close of August 8, 1969.

Heptanoic acid is used principally in the making of special lubricants and brake fluids. At the present time there is no production of this acid in the United States, and domestic consumption is entirely dependent on imports. Heptanoic acid is used in the production of synthetic lubricants for the military and aerospace industry, and there appears to be no domestic production of it for commercial uses. We agree with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House that continued suspension of the duty on this product is warranted.

MAKING PERMANENT THE EXISTING SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN NATURAL GRAPHITE

The bill (H.R. 11653) to make permanent the existing suspension of duty on certain natural graphite was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1172), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 11653 is to make permanent the suspension of duty on natural amorphous graphite, crude and refined, valued at \$50 per ton or less.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Natural graphite (plumbago) is a soft, black mineral occurring in disseminated flakes or in scaly, granular, compact, or earthy masses. The term "crystalline graphite" or "flake graphite" refers to varieties that occur in crystals large enough to be visible to the unaided eye. This type covered by H.R. 11653 (amorphous graphite) is a very fine granular variety which is actually cryptocrystalline or featuring particles so fine that they are not recognizable individually except under a high-power microscope. The mineral has a wide variety of industrial uses. For example, it is utilized for foundry facings and in the manufacture of carbon brushes, dry-cell batteries, pencils and paints, lubricants, and brush stock for electric motors.

Amorphous graphite or plumbago, crude or refined, and regardless of value, was made dutiable in paragraph 213 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as originally enacted, at the rate of 10 percent ad valorem. The duty was reduced to 5 percent ad valorem pursuant to a bilateral trade agreement with the United Kingdom, effective January 1, 1939, and the reduced rate was bound against increase in a bilateral trade agreement with Mexico, effective January 30, 1943. The reduced rate of 5 percent of ad valorem was again bound against increase in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, effective January 1, 1948. These concessions extended to both the natural and artificial product. The duty on natural amorphous graphite, however, was further reduced pursuant to additional concessions to 2½ percent ad valorem, effective September 10, 1955; to 1½ percent ad valorem, effective July 1, 1962; and to one-half of 1 percent ad valorem, effective July 1, 1963.

Imports of natural amorphous graphite, crude or refined, valued at \$50 per ton or less, are now temporarily free of duty, under both the most-favored-nation (col. 1) and statutory (col. 2) rates, under item 909.20 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States. This temporary duty suspension, which has been in effect since 1960, will expire as of the close of June 30, 1966, under the provisions of Public Law 88-329. H.R. 11653 would make permanent the present column 1 suspension of duty on such merchandise. The column 2 or statutory rate would, under the bill, be the original 10-percent rate.

The United States has long been dependent on imports for nearly all of its requirements for natural amorphous graphite despite extensive exploration for suitable domestic deposits. Domestic output supplied only a negligible part of domestic consumption of natural amorphous graphite prior to early 1959, and since that time has ceased.

The Department of Commerce in its report of May 17, 1966, has advised your committee, as follows, in this regard:

"According to available information there has been no commercial production of amorphous graphite in the United States since 1959. Amorphous graphite, regardless of value, is not believed to be generally competitive with either natural crystalline or artificial graphite produced in the United States. This Department has received no complaints from domestic industry regarding the present duty suspension on amorphous graphite valued at \$50 per ton or less."

In view of the above, and the experience gained under prior and present suspensions of duty on natural amorphous graphite of the type covered under the bill, the Committee on Finance agrees with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House that provision for permanent suspension, as provided in H.R. 11653, is warranted. H.R. 11653 would accomplish this objective.

CONTINUING THE EXISTING SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN COPYING SHOE LATHES

The bill (H.R. 12262) to continue until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes was considered ordered to a third reading read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1173), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 12262 is to amend item 911.70 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States to continue until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on copying lathes used for making rough or finished shoe lasts from models of shoe lasts and capable of producing more than one size shoe from a single size model of a shoe last.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Public Law 1012 of the 84th Congress, approved August 6, 1956, transferred from the dutiable to the free list of the Tariff Act for a period of 2 years, by adding to paragraph 1643 of the Tariff Act of 1930 the following language:

Copying lathes used for making rough or finished shoe lasts from models of shoe lasts and, in addition, capable of producing more than one size shoe last from a single size model of a shoe last.

The suspension of duty has been in effect continuously since that time, 2-year extensions having been enacted on May 16, 1958 (Public Law 85-416), on June 30, 1960 (Public Law 86-562), and on August 24, 1962 (Public Law 87-807). Since August 31, 1963, the effective date of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, the suspension has been provided under item 911.70, the most recent extension of which has been effected by Public Law 88-336, approved June 30, 1964. The period of suspension provided thereunder is scheduled to expire as of the close of June 30, 1966, if not extended. H.R. 12262 would extend the period for another 3 years, to the close of June 30, 1969.

The suspension of duty was initially made and has been continued, as indicated above, in order to make available to domestic shoe last manufacturers highly specialized and expensive copying lathes which the commit-

tee is advised can only be obtained from foreign sources. There is no domestic production of these lathes and only five have been imported in the 2 years 1964 and 1965. It appears that the sole effect of permitting restoration of the 10-percent duty on this article would be to increase costs to domestic shoe manufacturers.

The Committee on Finance agrees with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House that extension of the suspension of duty as provided in H.R. 12262 will continue to benefit the shoe last manufacturing industry in the United States without detriment to any domestic interests.

No opposition to this legislation has been made known, and your committee has received favorable comment thereon from the interested Federal departments and agencies.

EXTENDING THE SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CRUDE CHICORY AND THE REDUCTION IN DUTY ON GROUND CHICORY

The bill (H.R. 12463) to extend until June 30, 1969, the suspension of duty on crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1174), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 12463 is to continue for a period of 3 years until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on crude chicory roots and to continue for the same period the rate of duty of 2 cents per pound for chicory roots, ground or otherwise prepared.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Public Law 85-378, approved April 16, 1958, provided for the suspension of duty on crude chicory (except endive) for a period of 2 years. This legislation also provided that the duty on chicory, ground or otherwise prepared, be 2 cents per pound for the period during which the duty on crude chicory was suspended. Public Law 86-441, approved April 22, 1960, Public Law 86-479, approved June 1, 1960, and Public Law 88-49, approved June 29, 1963, successively extended the duty treatment provided under Public Law 85-378 for crude chicory and ground chicory. The Tariff Schedules of the United States continued this duty treatment by providing, effective for the period August 31, 1963, through June 30, 1966, that crude chicory roots were to be free of duty (item 903.20) and that chicory roots ground or otherwise prepared were to be dutiable at the rate of 2 cents per pound (item 903.21).

No chicory has been grown in the United States since 1954, and domestic processors of chicory depend upon imports of crude chicory. The purpose of Public Law 85-378 and the extensions thereof was to assist domestic producers of ground chicory in competing with imports of the prepared product. Your committee is advised by the Tariff Commission that the conditions that prompted the original suspension of duty on crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory, and the extensions thereof under the above-cited acts, still prevail.

H.R. 12463 would continue for an additional period of 3 years, until the close of June 30, 1969, the tariff treatment now provided under items 903.20 and 903.21.

In addition to the informative report from the Tariff Commission, favorable reports were received with respect to H.R. 12463 from the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor.

CONTINUING THE SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN ALUMINA AND BAUXITE

The bill (H.R. 12657) to continue the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1175), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 12657, as amended, is to continue for an additional 2 years, to the close of July 15, 1968, the suspension of duty applicable to alumina when imported for use in producing aluminum, and to continue for a like period the suspension of duties on calcined bauxite and bauxite ore.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The duty on alumina, when imported for use in producing aluminum, was suspended for a 2-year period beginning July 17, 1956, by Public Law 725 of the 84th Congress. The duty on crude bauxite and calcined bauxite was suspended by Public Law 83-499, until July 16, 1956. Public Law 84-724 further suspended the duties on crude bauxite and calcined bauxite for an additional period of 2 years. Public Law 85-415 consolidated the provisions of Public Laws 724 and 725 of the 84th Congress and extended for 2 more years the periods of suspension provided therein. This duty-free treatment has been successively extended for additional 2-year periods by Public Law 86-441, Public Law 87-567, and Public Law 88-362. This duty-free treatment is reflected in the Tariff Schedules of the United States in items 907.15, 909.30, and 911.05 and is presently effective for the period on or before July 15, 1966. H.R. 12657, as amended, would continue the present suspensions of duty for another 2-year period, until the close of July 15, 1968.

Alumina is a product used for the production of aluminum, and the bulk of the alumina consumed in the United States is used for that purpose. Bauxite is a mineral used in the production of alumina (from which aluminum is produced), abrasives, chemicals, refractory products, and miscellaneous products, and is vital to domestic industries such as the aluminum, steel, and chemical industries.

The production of aluminum involves two main operations: the production of alumina from the crude ore—almost entirely bauxite—and the production of aluminum metal from alumina. A large part of the domestic production of aluminum in recent years has been derived from imported aluminum-bearing material. Domestic reserves of bauxite are quite limited and the United States relies heavily upon foreign bauxite to fulfill the increasing demand for this raw material. U.S. production of bauxite accounts for only a small fraction of that needed for our expanding aluminum consumption. Free entry of alumina, processed from bauxite for subsequent use in aluminum, has the effect of increasing the domestic capacity to produce aluminum, and so far as we are aware poses no threat to domestic alumina producers or employment.

In its report on this legislation, the U.S. Tariff Commission informed your committee that:

"The Commission believes that the considerations which led the Congress to suspend the duties on each article discussed herein still exist."

In view of this, and the experience gained under prior and present suspensions, the Committee on Finance agrees with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House that the further 2-year suspension of duty on alumina, calcined bauxite, and bauxite ore, until the close of July 15, 1968, as provided by the bill, is warranted.

FREE IMPORTATION OF PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS IMPORTED UNDER GOVERNMENT ORDERS

The bill (H.R. 12864) to make permanent the existing duty free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1176), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 12864 is to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the United States under U.S. Government orders.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The act of June 27, 1942 (Public Law 633, 77th Cong.), allowed, until the day following the proclamation of peace by the President, the free entry of personal and household effects of any person returning to the United States under Government orders.

Public Law 450 of the 82d Congress extended the period of free entry until the close of April 1, 1953.

Public Law 20 of the 83d Congress continued the free entry privilege until the close of June 30, 1955.

Public Law 126 of the 84th Congress extended the period of free entry until the close of June 30, 1958. This public law also amended the basic law in several respects, including granting authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to promulgate appropriate regulations so as to prevent abuse of the free entry privilege with regard to alcoholic beverages and tobacco products.

Public Law 85-398 extended the period of free entry until the close of June 30, 1960; Public Law 86-563, until the close of June 30, 1962; Public Law 87-790, until the close of June 30, 1964; and Public Law 88-323, until the close of June 30, 1966. The free entry privilege is presently provided for under item 915.20 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

H.R. 12864, as reported by your committee, would repeal the temporary provisions in item 915.20 and add new item 817.00 to the Tariff Schedules, to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the United States under U.S. Government orders. These amendments would apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after June 30, 1966.

The principal effect of this duty-free importation privilege has been to avoid the imposition of undue administrative burdens

upon persons returning to the United States from foreign service. It has thus constituted an important morale factor and inducement to oversea service. In view of the continued presence in many parts of the world of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and Government personnel and the favorable experience under the temporary exemption of almost a quarter of a century's duration, continuation of the exemption from duty of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders on a permanent basis is warranted.

In so recommending, your committee is mindful that during the period that these successive extensions of duty-free treatment have been in effect, the statutory provision has been safeguarded from abuse, not only by restrictions contained in the law itself, but also by appropriate regulations issued by the Treasury Department, the Department of State, and within the Department of Defense. In particular, attention is invited to the fact that Public Law 126 of the 84th Congress conferred specific authority upon the Secretary of the Treasury to provide safeguarding regulations with regard to alcoholic beverages and tobacco products. This provision, together with the other substantive provisions of item 915.20, is carried over without change into item 817.00, the new item that would be added to the schedules by this bill. Your committee, therefore, in recommending this legislation, expects increasing diligence on the part of the departments to assure that the exemption will not be abused.

The continuation of this exemption is important both in the encouragement of people to serve abroad and in contributing to the morale of U.S. personnel on duty outside the customs territory of the United States. The Department of the Treasury has indicated to your committee that there are presently no unusual administrative difficulties with the existing duty-free provision. All of the interested departments have consistently reported favorably on the successive extensions of the present temporary exemption.

The Committee on Finance agrees with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of the desirability of this legislation to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

EXTENDING THE SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON ELECTRODES IMPORTED FOR USE IN PRODUCING ALUMINUM

The bill (H.R. 12997) to extend until June 15, 1968, the suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1177), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 12997 is to continue, until the close of July 15, 1968, the suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Under the permanent provisions of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, electrodes of the kind covered by the bill are dutiable under item 517.61 at 12.5 percent

ad valorem. However, this duty was suspended from October 7, 1965, through July 15, 1966, by item 909.25, which was added to the Tariff Schedules of the United States by section 87 of the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965, Public Law 89-241. In commenting on its reason for proposing the suspension of the duty on such electrodes in that legislation, the Senate Finance Committee stated (S. Rept. 530, 89th Cong., 1st sess., p. 23):

"Under the present tariff schedules electrodes used in the production of aluminum are dutiable at 12.5 percent. Typically they are not imported but are manufactured by the aluminum companies themselves at the site where they are to be used in the electrolysis of alumina into aluminum. These electrodes, generally of carbon or graphite, are consumed in great quantities in electrolysis process.

"The committee's attention was called to the fact that some small new aluminum plants do not yet have sufficient volume of production to permit efficient production on the site of the electrodes they need. In order to provide a source for reasonably priced electrodes for these companies your committee has added a provision to the bill to permit electrodes to be imported duty free for use in the production of aluminum. Under the bill, free entry for these electrodes (and no other) will be available until July 15, 1966. This date coincides with the provision already in the law which permits temporary free entry for alumina used in the production of aluminum."

H.R. 12657 has been favorably reported today to continue the present suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite for an additional 2-year period, to the close of July 15, 1968. In view of this and advice from the U.S. Tariff Commission that "the consideration which led Congress to suspend the duty on these electrodes still exists," the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House believes that an extension of the suspension on electrodes imported for use in processing aluminum for a like 2-year period, as provided in H.R. 12997, is warranted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That concludes the call of the calendar.

REPORT ON NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last week, I was privileged to attend the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in Paris as a delegate of the U.S. Congress. As Rapporteur of the Political Committee of the Conference, I submitted a report which was used as the basis of discussion for the meeting. It will be publicized at the 11th annual conference in November 1966. A number of conclusions emerged from this discussion which I think will be of interest to my colleagues.

First, None of the NATO partners are prepared to gamble the Alliance away on the assumption that there is no longer any danger of aggression from the Soviet Union. Although there was agreement that current Soviet actions were moderate, all agreed that future Soviet intentions were not clear, that Soviet capabilities were still powerful, and that the strength of NATO must be maintained to check these capabilities.

Second, There was wide consensus on the necessity for continued large-scale U.S. involvement and commitment in

Europe, not only as a check against aggression, but as the most important stabilizing factor in inter-Alliance relations. Specifically, there was full recognition of the fact that the U.S. presence and the integrated NATO command structure provided the most congenial framework for the German Federal Republic's role in the security of Western Europe. In this regard, one of the most unfortunate effects of the French decision to withdraw from the integrated command has been to place West Germany in an exposed position—a role in which the Germans themselves feel uncomfortable. This is, then, no time to talk about withdrawing U.S. troops from the European Continent; such talk would only confirm the worst fears of our European partners.

Third. There is real consensus among the 14 that, during the current period of French policy, relations with France should be wholly friendly and that the door should be kept open for its full and effective return to NATO. In this connection, it must be emphasized that France proposes to continue its membership in the Alliance. The attendance of French parliamentarians at the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference last week was a positive sign of this. In the meantime, the Europeans made known their sentiment that they do not want to see France isolated within the Alliance, and that they do not want anyone to force them to choose between the United States and France.

Fourth. Article 5 of the NATO Treaty reads, in part, that "The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all." There was an unambiguous realization at the Conference that this phrase must be interpreted to mean any attack, whether it emanates from Europe or elsewhere. The NATO commitments are operative should, for example, Communist China launch an attack against a NATO country.

Fifth. Reports that our European partners are completely unsympathetic to U.S. efforts in Vietnam are exaggerated. There is an understanding that the United States cannot withdraw from Vietnam, that we must see it through, and that we have made honorable attempts to bring the conflict to the negotiating table.

Sixth. The parliamentarians at the Conference are prepared to strengthen the institutions of NATO. In particular, there was substantial agreement on the desirability of transforming the Parliamentarians' Conference into a NATO Consultative Assembly, with a statutory and more effective voice in Atlantic affairs.

Seventh. It was also felt that increased trade in nonstrategic goods between the West and the U.S.S.R. and European Communist nations can have important beneficial effects on our relations. It is for that reason that I have supported the bill introduced yesterday by Senator MAGNUSON, which would furnish greater opportunity to carry on East-West trade. I think this is definitely within the concept of strengthening NATO. The

President's decision to request authority from Congress to accord most-favored-nation treatment to the goods of European Communist nations, like that accorded to members of GATT, is exceedingly important as a step toward expanding this trade on the basis of a common Western policy.

Eighth. Finally, faith in the NATO remains strong. There is no doubt that NATO is still the linchpin of free world strength and unity of purpose.

The French people are in favor of that. They are in favor of pulling out of an integrated command. I think there is no doubt that they are in favor of that. But they have no idea of pulling out of the alliance, which has provided strength and unity, and which should continue to do so.

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on May 13, 1966, the Spanish language New York newspaper, *El Diario-La Prensa*, ran an excellent editorial, in both Spanish and English, concerning pending proposals to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, and particularly focusing attention on the difficult problems raised by the potential impact of this bill upon Puerto Rico.

I ask unanimous consent that the English-language version of this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From *El Diario, La Prensa*,
May 13, 1966]

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

Our well-paid Congressmen are finally realizing that in the United States there are millions of people underpaid and underfed for lack of a fair minimum wage. For months the Administration's minimum wage bill was stalled in the House Rules Committee. However, on Wednesday, the bill was cleared for floor action with surprising ease on a vote of nine to six.

El Diario, La Prensa now hopes that the House would speedily approve this bill whose passage has become imperative due to the rising cost of living. The bill would increase the Federal minimum wage from \$1.25 to \$1.40 an hour next February 1 and to \$1.60 a year later. It also would extend coverage to 7.2 million more persons, including some farm workers.

There undoubtedly would be strong opposition to some sections of the bill, especially those covering farm workers, but *El Diario, La Prensa* feels confident that it will pass without any substantial amendments.

The inclusion of Puerto Rico in the minimum wage bill has been under the fire of the Commonwealth authorities headed by Governor Roberto Sánchez Vilella. The position of La Fortaleza was stated by Resident Commissioner Santiago Polanco Abreu before a House Committee. According to Mr. Polanco Abreu, Puerto Rico's development would be stunted by imposing upon it the identical minimum wages of the United States economy, the most highly industrialized in the world. He admitted, however, that the Puerto Rican workers would be harmed by holding minimum wages at the level of the least developed industries.

Consequently, the Commonwealth considered essential to maintain a flexible approach allowing to set minimum wages, individually for each industry.

Puerto Rico fears that the proposed increase would provoke a serious disruption of its economic development. In the opinion of the Commonwealth, the most seriously affected will be the workers of Puerto Rico because "a wage increase which destroys jobs is no increase at all." In other words, as former Governor Luis Muñoz Marín stated a few years ago, "unemployment has a lower salary than the lowest of salaries."

El Diario-La Prensa has always been in favor of higher salaries for workers of the community. However, we do not wish to pass any judgment on the claims of the Puerto Rican authorities. Naturally, we feel the Island should have the highest possible minimum wage compatible with its steady development but without substantially curtailing employment.

We do hope that our Congress will carefully examine the conditions prevailing in Puerto Rico which are still substantially different from those in the continent.

However, as far as the continental United States is concerned, the bill is an absolute necessity. It represents a compromise between what the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations sought and what the Administration offered.

The compromise plan would affect the 29.6 million workers now covered. The minimum for the 7.2 million workers in restaurants, hotels, motels, hospitals, laundries and dry cleaning establishments not previously covered would be \$1.00 an hour starting next February 1. Four more 15-cent increases would make a top of \$1.60 by 1971.

Coverage would also be extended to some 485,000 workers on larger farms and to big migratory labor crews. For them, the minimum wage will be set at \$1.00 an hour next February 1. This would rise to \$1.15 an hour a year later and to \$1.30 an hour on February 1, 1968.

El Diario-La Prensa thinks that the increases are moderate and would not impose an excessive burden on industry or agriculture. We consider the new bill an absolute necessity. No Congressman with self-respect should vote against it.

ESSAY CONTEST CONDUCTED BY MONROE COUNTY FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Monroe County Federation of Women's Republican Clubs this year sponsored an essay contest among all high school seniors in Rochester and in Monroe County, N.Y.

The winner of the contest, Miss Elaine Ann Kunz, of 1109 Genesee Park Boulevard, Rochester, and a senior at St. Agnes High School, was awarded a 3-day visit to Washington. I was very pleased to be able to meet Miss Kunz when she was here along with Mrs. Edward S. King, vice chairman of the Monroe County Republican Committee and the entire New York delegation to the annual National Republican Women's Conference earlier this month.

Mr. President, I was so impressed with her essay and the thoughts it expressed that I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

Some believe America is gradually withdrawing into a shell of lethargy and indif-

ference. They say Americans are not concerned with the world around them.

I do not agree. I am proud to be living in this beautiful and prosperous land whose history overflows with heroes and heroines—people who have cared. Two centuries ago, people cared enough to cross the ocean in weather-beaten ships, and struggle for another beginning in a wilderness called America. They cared enough to fight courageously for justice, truth and independence; to establish a nation founded on brotherly love; and to make certain that their child-nation grew straight and firm and free. Americans continue to care today—in the rice paddies and bamboo fields of Viet Nam, in a Peace Corps hospital in Nigeria, in the anti-poverty and Medicare programs, in helping the next-door neighbor shovel his snow-laden driveway. It is because of these people, whose love and dedication for their country is sincere and unflinching, that I am proud and honored to be an American.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF REYNOLDS METALS CO. FACILITY AT SHEFFIELD, ALA.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, almost a quarter century ago I called to the attention of this Chamber a significant event that was to have great importance to our country and to the defense of our country during World War II. At that time I stressed that the Congress and a grateful Nation would not forget its one and only aluminum volunteer.

Today in northwest Alabama is the celebration of the dream that became a reality 25 years ago. The Reynolds Metals Co. facility at Sheffield, Ala., is today the largest aluminum plant complex in the world. This plant provides employment for more than 4,800 residents of Alabama with an annual payroll in excess of \$34 million. It contributes substantially to the economy of Alabama. This huge operation reflects the dreams and dedication of many people. But none more so than the late R. S. Reynolds, founder of Reynolds Metals Co.

It was he who saw the war clouds gathering over Europe and pledged himself and his company's resources to giving our country a second source of aluminum.

As early as 1938, Mr. Reynolds had become gravely concerned with Germany's sensational increases in aluminum production. He was convinced that a war would be a light-metals war and would be won or lost in the air. He pressed for increased U.S. production of aluminum. But nobody took him seriously and some labeled him an "alarmist." For a while he was stymied. Then, in June 1940, Mr. Reynolds decided that if no one else would act, his company must. Although he had no previous experience in the production of aluminum, he was inspired by the patriotic motivation of serving our country and its defense.

A \$15,800,000 loan was negotiated from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, secured by a first mortgage on all the company's existing plants which were worth \$24 million. The conditions of the loan were much more exacting and burdensome than were the conditions of

loans made after our entering the war at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack.

Less than 4 months after the RFC loan was granted, Reynolds found a plant site and broke ground in a cotton field near Sheffield, Ala. Some officials said it would take a newcomer 5 years to get started.

But 5 months and 28 days after ground was broken, Reynolds poured its first aluminum ingot on May 18, 1941. It is the 25th anniversary of this first pouring that we celebrate at this time.

By the time of Pearl Harbor, some 6 months later, Reynolds Metals Co. was ready for the challenge. During World War II, Reynolds delivered almost 500,000 tons of aluminum for a variety of military uses.

The industry has grown rapidly since the beginning of World War II. Now there are eight producers of primary aluminum, employing almost 200,000 persons in every State of the Union. Last year, these eight companies shipped over 4 million tons of aluminum, for both military and consumer use. In addition, the industry has stimulated the growth of small businesses which fashion this amazing metal into countless products.

In 25 years Reynolds annual sales have grown from \$48,602,000 in 1941 to \$739,796,000 in 1965; its number of employees from 10,200 to 30,300. In 25 years the company has produced 8.2 million tons of aluminum, has had net earnings of \$511,969,000, has paid out \$575,144,000 in Federal, State, and local taxes, and has disbursed over \$4 billion in wages, salaries, and employee benefits.

I would like to read a portion of a statement I made on this floor 24 years ago. I quote:

The record of the Reynolds Metals Company stands distinct and alone, because this company was the first to realize that enormously increased quantities of aluminum metal would be absolutely vital if victory is to be won. Without waiting for firm orders, cash down payments, or Government protection, the company mortgaged all its peacetime factories to increase the supply of aluminum at the very time America was being lulled to sleep . . . by statements and press notices that America's supply of aluminum would be ample for defense as well as for civilian requirements.

In the light of what has happened since May 1940 I want my colleagues and the Nation to know that Reynolds Metals Company is the only company in the United States that dared to enter, on its resources, the hazardous business of the producing aluminum metal from bauxite.

I am sure the Congress and a grateful Nation will long remember its one and only aluminum volunteer—the Reynolds Metals Company.

Now today after 25 years have passed since that first pouring, I can say, we have remembered—we will remember—the Reynolds Metals Co.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE AT 17TH ANNUAL ALBERT LASKER MEDICAL JOURNALISM AWARDS LUNCHEON

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, delivered an inspiring and challenging address at the 17th annual Albert Lasker

Medical Journalism Awards luncheon at the Sheraton-East Hotel in New York. I ask unanimous consent that Senator PASTORE's address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

My fellow Americans, our coming together today is no ordinary pause in our day's occupation. We pause to praise—and our praise is a human praise for the humanitarian. It takes the physical form of the Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards. And it takes the personal form of our very presence here.

For we honor ourselves when we pay tribute to the artisans of communication—press, magazine, screen—for their service to the science of medicine—in our common cause for humanity.

God-given gifts of the mind are enriched as they are enlisted in His favored causes. Solomon said in the long ago—"God delighteth not when the living perish—for He created all things that they might have being"—and the Healer of Nazareth left us the parable of the Good Samaritan.

Through the grace of public office—I have been privileged to see and share in some of the immensity of the endless struggle of medicine against mortality.

The times in which we live do much to make us—and then we, in turn, do our best to remake our times.

I first came to public office in the trough of the Great Depression. It seemed that radio—that great arm of communication—was created and waiting for a magnificent voice that uplifted a nation that was sick to its very soul.

The words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt gave us new courage—there was nothing to fear but fear itself.

Roosevelt in his way mastered his times—as he mastered his own infirmity—and who can ever forget the inspiration of the March of Dimes!

Albert Lasker never forgot an urgent call he had from President Roosevelt to hurry from Chicago to the White House. Albert Lasker dropped everything—and went. These two great men had a private luncheon—but not a question was asked—not a single important subject discussed. The puzzled visitor never forgot that visit—but what is more important, the President never forgot Albert Lasker and what he stood for.

Today we remember Roosevelt as the mind that set in motion the revolution in governmental responsibility—determining the relationship between government, science and medical research in all these astounding years of achievement.

The initiation was Roosevelt's—but I dare to say the inspiration was the dedicated team of Albert and Mary Lasker.

The best index of that inspiration is the increase in appropriation.

From a pittance of 3 million dollars in 1940 for medical research and development—it has risen to an investment of over a billion dollars in 1965—little enough for a nation that the same year registered a gross national product of 675 billion dollars. It is my belief that we can afford a billion and one-half dollars in 1967.

It is basic that the true wealth of a people is a people's health. No economy can be sound unless its human elements are sound—sound in body and sound in mind.

In my days as Governor something of the zest of medical conquest had communicated itself to the states. I was thrilled to see the retreat of tuberculosis as a scourge. Our State institution that might well have remained a sanatorium of despair could now serve as a hospital of hope. New drugs lightened the load and brightened the future of patients of our mental institutions.

Again there was inspiration in privately operated homes and schools for mentally retarded children—staffed with loving, able, and dedicated people. There was a little humiliation that the State itself was not doing more.

There was a stirring over the fallings of our big cities. It is the product, price and the penalty of civilization that expanding populations shall be compressed in crowded cities—germinating slums and breeding places of poverty, crime and disease against which the State must fight in self defense.

But that battlefield is wider than any State. It even bursts the boundaries of any nation.

Disease and epidemics do not respect national or racial borders. Human suffering—and therefore human service—are as wide as the world.

As I entered Washington in 1950—I sensed the magnitude of all this. There was the revulsion from the mass death that man had inflicted on himself in war.

There was the carnage of the battlefield—there was the madness of genocide that wrote its own end in a bunker in Berlin.

In 1945 a new element of death and disaster confronted mankind. It was the atomic visitation on Hiroshima—with all the dread it would hold for the world in years to come.

Man has always accepted the idea that the Creator of the world could at His pleasure destroy His handiwork. But now that annihilation could be in one man's mad moment of power. Millions of lives would be at his mercy—the mass of mankind is as mortal as the individual.

It became a goal for me—as well as a Senatorial responsibility—to work for atoms for peace. It was a privilege for me to align my efforts with the great minds and great hearts inside and outside our government in the campaign for human welfare over human waste in all the domain of medicine.

I have great respect for cold figures. The economics of medicine are on our side. The accountant can prove that our medical investment pays great dividends—in the lives that are saved—in the days of work retrieved—in the relief checks replaced by earnings—and in the amazing balance of payments when illness is prevented or quickly cured.

Experience teaches us that the unknown is the knowable if we have the determination to discover and explore. Medicine has had that will—and we of government must do our part with farsighted business and private philanthropy to help them find a way.

I like to believe that the spirit of America is not consecrated to material compensation. And I believe that the heart of America is compassion.

We all want to be caught up in the emotion of achievement—we all like to see the heat of enthusiasm reach the boiling point of dedication—we all like to see the sparks of human action fly—and we all want to see the atom of every medical frustration smashed into the explosive discoveries of tomorrow.

All of us want to share something of the pursuit of perfection by that doctor of tomorrow—and all of us want to rejoice in the tiniest particle of the reflected glory of the men and women of yesterday and today.

They have made our world physically more livable and spiritually more lovable.

I need not name names, Mary Lasker, but your New York and our Washington are more magnificent to the eye because of your mind—just as the world is infinitely better because of your heart.

I say these words with hesitancy but with honesty—for I know that to you modesty and not vanity, is the cloak of the Good Samaritan.

The Albert Lasker Award is the inspiration for this hour—and this hour, in turn, is in-

spiration—in the chain reaction of the unremitting search for true health and lasting happiness.

Health and happiness are inseparable in the individual—and in the universe. The prescription for the better individual is the formula for the better world.

Into life's mortar must go all of mankind's ills—disease—hunger—hate—fear—and ignorance, and out of it must come a chance for better health in all of God's world—and the means of happiness shared with all mankind.

For this in truth is the formula for the world's enduring peace.

TRIBUTE TO HON. CYRIL E. KING, GOVERNMENT SECRETARY OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Daily News of St. Thomas, V.I., in connection with the Honorable Cyril E. King, Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands.

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

MR. GOVERNMENT SECRETARY

The Hon. Cyril E. King, Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands, begins his sixth year in office today. Our distinguished native son was appointed to the post in 1961 by the late President John F. Kennedy and has discharged the multiplicity of his duties with honor and efficiency, not unmixed with perseverance.

The refreshing quality about Cyril King is his genial, warm personality and firm determination to serve his country in the face of many obstacles and roadblocks which seem to have arisen mysteriously in his path throughout his entire tenure of office.

Under the able tutelage of the brilliant Senator, now Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Mr. King has had many years of a remarkably complete and thorough training in the art of statesmanship, which he has mastered admirably and well. The only topflight government official in these islands who has had experience both on the national level in Washington and on the territorial level, he has constantly exhibited a sense of order, fitness, and maturity which has been directed to the furtherance of good government in the several areas of his concern. In top circles in Washington he is regarded as a man of "infinite patience."

"Mr. King is rendering excellent service as Government Secretary," Mr. HUMPHREY told the U.S. Senate. "His action and messages have earned for him the admiration of the people of the Virgin Islands."

One could make a good brief for the mere fact of Mr. King's persistence in remaining in office, in spite of the opposition and jealousies which he has encountered from minor puppets and lesser lights in the government of the Virgin Islands. Although misguided attempts have been made from time to time to strip his post of some of its authority, the Government Secretary is fulfilling his calling with integrity.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on nominations.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of commit-

tees, the clerk will state the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald Opie McBride, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 18, 1975.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I support this nomination, although I know it is not necessary that anything be added to the record. I have never seen so many Senators attend a hearing to give testimony for the confirmation of the nomination of any officer as turned out at the Public Works Committee meeting when the committee unanimously recommended Mr. Donald McBride for the high position of Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

This is a fitting tribute to a man who has faithfully served as an employee of the Senate and of Senators for the past 16 years.

When the President nominated Mr. McBride for this position, he did so with personal knowledge of Mr. McBride's professional and administrative skill in the field of the natural resource conservation. Many Members of the Senate, past and present, have had the benefit of Don McBride's talents. Mr. McBride's selection by the President reflects well on all Members of the Senate, and also reflects credit upon many other members of the Senate staff who faithfully serve the Members of the Senate. These men can also aspire, because of such an appointment, to positions of greater responsibility than they now hold in serving Senators, positions in which they can help to perfect legislation and shape the programs that are necessary for our Nation.

The recognition which Donald McBride has received comes as a heartwarming plus for all his associates in Congress who worked with him in water development and natural resources development causes in the past decade and a half.

Those of us from Oklahoma have had a greater opportunity to know of Don McBride's effectiveness, but the record proves that we have shared his skills generously with other States. It is true that when Don McBride first entered public service in the 1930's, Oklahoma did not have a water and land conservation program of any consequence. Now we point with pride to natural resource conservation investments amounting to more than \$2 billion within our State alone. These investments in water and soil conservation will yield benefits many times their cost and will preserve these priceless natural resources for many generations to come.

It is true that virtually all these projects were in Oklahoma, but Don McBride's services extended far beyond the borders of his own State. Projects throughout the land have been built in the past 18 years on the basis of legislation passed by Congress. Much of the basic work of the program was originated by this nominee.

So we can say with the utmost emphasis that the confirmation of Don McBride to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority will benefit many millions of Americans who live far beyond the borders of the fabulous Tennessee Valley Authority, because the work Don McBride does for one area has always been so well designed as to be worthy of repetition elsewhere.

The late Senator Kerr was at his side in all of the promotion of water development and soil conservation that took place during his years of service here.

I feel sure that the Senate will confirm overwhelmingly and unanimously this able public servant.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I would not want this moment to pass without expressing my own high esteem of the Presidential nominee, Donald Opie McBride, to serve as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

His public service has been intimately connected with this field under the sponsorship of my able friend and his former colleague, the late Senator Robert Kerr, of Oklahoma.

In my earlier years in the Senate, I served on the Public Works Committee. That committee fashioned much of the legislation under which the Tennessee Valley Authority now operates.

I remember the excellent contribution which Don McBride gave to the members of the Public Works Committee in the fashioning of that legislation.

I have no doubt that he takes with him to this new public service a unique skill and background in dealing with the problems of administering the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I simply rise to express my gratification from the minority side of the aisle for the appointment by the President of one who is completely qualified for the task that he now faces.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the President of the United States could have appointed no person better qualified by background, education, training, and experience to serve as a member of the Board of Directors of TVA than Don McBride.

I have known Don McBride for many years. In Oklahoma, we call him the "third U.S. Senator" from our State. First on the staff of my distinguished predecessor, the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, and then on the staff of my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], Don McBride has had a greater hand in the development of Oklahoma's soil and water resources than probably any living man.

We will sorely miss him in Oklahoma, but I am confident that he will continue to render outstanding service for his country and his fellowmen in the new post to which he has been appointed.

Mr. President, I was honored to have the opportunity to preside at the hearings of the Senate Public Works Committee which considered Don McBride's confir-

mation for this position. I am happy to report that the approval of his appointment by our committee was unanimous.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Howard Shaw, of Delaware, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. Leon G. Telsey, of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, to be rear admiral.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. Chester I. Steele, of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, to be rear admiral.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OF WATERLOO, N.Y., BIRTHPLACE OF MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate a concurrent resolution which earlier today was received by the Senate from the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 587, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States, in recognition of the patriotic tradition set in motion one hundred years ago in the village of Waterloo, New York, does hereby officially recognize Waterloo, New York, as the birthplace of Memorial Day, and authorizes and requests the President to issue, prior to May 30, 1966, an appropriate proclamation calling the attention of all citizens to the centennial anniversary of the first observance of Memorial Day in Waterloo, New York.

Mr. INOUE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present

consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], who is necessarily absent, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY OF NEW YORK

I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 587, which the House of Representatives passed earlier this week. This Resolution, introduced by Congressman STRATTON of New York in the House, recognizes the One Hundredth Anniversary of the birth of Memorial Day at Waterloo, New York.

As the first anniversary of the end of the Civil War rolled around in early 1866, many communities across the country paused to decorate the graves of their sons who had been lost in that tragic conflict. But according to the records of the Library of Congress and other historical data, Waterloo, New York, was the first community to declare the existence of an annual holiday to pay tribute to those who had fallen. On May 5, 1866, following some weeks of planning by local civil leaders, the people of Waterloo began the annual observance of Memorial Day by holding services at each of the community's three cemeteries and placing wreaths and flowers at each veteran's grave.

Since that time, Memorial Day has become not only a time to remember those who gave their lives in the Civil War, but an occasion on which we remember all of those who have sacrificed their lives for their country, all of those who gave their fondest hopes so that we could live in freedom.

I congratulate the village of Waterloo at this time. The recognition which it receives today from the Senate is well deserved. Its leaders in 1966 have shown the same patriotism and initiative as its leaders did in 1866. The village has scheduled a centennial parade and observance on May 28, 29, and 30, which will fittingly mark the 100th anniversary of Waterloo's initiative in 1866. Again, I congratulate the village of Waterloo. Its people have my best wishes for a successful and fruitful centennial celebration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 587) was agreed to.

THE TRAGIC FARCE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the situation in southeast Asia grows steadily worse and increasingly perilous. Its tragic aspects vie with its farcical ones. Never has a great nation, never before has the United States, been made to look so utterly ridiculous than in its efforts to make a patently worthless cause appear a worthy one and to create an image of it which exists only in the purpose of those who, having unjustified and in violation of our solemn treaty commitments involved us militarily, feel they must now justify their past errors by intensifying them. Blown up are all the

pretenses that a brave and gallant regime has asked for our help to repel aggression. The fact is that the United States invited itself into Vietnam. The self-imposed outfits—nine of them since the fall of Diem—which our administrations have supported and support now are corrupt, concerned only with their own perquisites, uninterested in the welfare of the South Vietnamese people, who are now openly rebelling. Thus we have a civil war within a civil war. The rebels against the government we are seeking frantically to prop up and which exists only by virtue of our lavish military and financial support, have now shot down an American plane. Americans are warned by our own leaders to keep off the streets of Saigon lest they be attacked.

While last year there were 96,000 desertions from the South Vietnamese Army, we are drafting our young men to go and fight and kill people against whom they have no grievance and against whom the United States has no legitimate grievance, and be killed in the process.

We are now threatening to extend the war to Cambodia and bring it ever closer to China—a steady escalation and expansion which can only lead to greater and greater disaster.

And this is the cause the President asks us to support.

I ask unanimous consent that a few recent publications be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. They are: first, a leading editorial from the New York Times of this morning, entitled: "The Childish, Divisive Things"; second, an article by Joseph Kraft entitled: "Insight and Outlook: Degringolade," which appeared in the Washington Post of May 18; third, an article by Art Buchwald from the Washington Post of Thursday, May 19, entitled: "Testing the Testers"; and, fourth, an article by James Reston which appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, May 18, entitled: "Washington: The Evaded Moral Question in Vietnam."

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

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1966]

"THE CHILDISH, DIVISIVE THINGS"

Of President Johnson's earnest desire for peace we have no doubt, nor have we ever had any doubt. But we take strong exception to some of the President's other statements at the Cook County Democratic fund-raising dinner, night before last.

What is unacceptable in the speech the President made in a highly political context to a highly political audience is his clear intimation that critics of his Vietnam policy are somehow just a little less American, just a little less patriotic, than those who go down the line for it. This is a most dangerous tack for the President to take, particularly in an election year, and it is not the first time that spokesmen for his Administration have taken it.

"I ask every American to put our country first," said the President, with the unmistakable implication that those of us who believe that the continued escalation of the war in Vietnam is dangerously unwise are putting our country second. It apparently has not occurred to Mr. Johnson that untold numbers of patriotic Americans are critical of

present policy just because they do love this country, just because they are uneasy over the moral, legal and political position of the United States in Vietnam, and just because they fear that the side-effects of this war may even be bringing the American democratic ideal into jeopardy.

"Put away all the childish, divisive things," said the President, demanding "unity" and an end to "the luxury of fighting each other back home." Perhaps the critics of Vietnam policy are wrong—what man is wise enough today to know that his is the right solution? But certainly the President is wrong in thus dismissing the questioning, the dissent, the criticism. And he is even more seriously wrong in his unsubtle suggestion that "every candidate for every office" who is a critic of the war's conduct becomes by that very circumstance a mere self-serving demagogue.

Few responsible critics, and certainly not this newspaper, have ever suggested that the United States "run out" on its Vietnam commitment, as the President would have his listeners believe. Few have even questioned the primacy of the American commitment, at last while there seemed some hope of a popularly based Vietnamese government to be committed to. But many question the large-scale bombing, the constant build-up, the apparent belief of the Administration that the United States' commitment is to whatever group of Vietnamese generals happens to be in power. And many question whether the present policy and strategy of the United States, however well meant, will, in President Johnson's words, insure that "the gallant people of South Vietnam have their own choice of their own government."

We do not pretend that it is easy to counter Communist attempts to control Southeast Asia. We do not dispute President Johnson's comment that neither Communist China nor Communist North Vietnam has—at least in recent months—shown any interest in peace negotiations; nor that if they wanted to, the Communists could speedily bring the hostilities to an end at a negotiating table.

But that is quite different from saying that all American policies have been wise, that the emphasis and the actions have always been well judged, that things could not have been done differently or even better, or that those who are in disagreement are somehow unpatriotic. On the contrary, we believe it to be the right and the duty of every American to voice his criticism and dissent when he thinks it.

[From the Washington Post, May 18, 1966]

INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK: DEGRINGOLADE

(By Joseph Kraft)

Degringolade is a French word meaning how everything slowly came apart. It is the only word I know that adequately indicates what has been set in motion by the events of last weekend in South Vietnam. For the military seizure of Danang is an episode so many-sided in its potential dangers that the perils have to be counted in order to be realized.

The first danger is the reinforcement of the regime of Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky. But the Ky regime is unfit to govern South Vietnam, or any other country. As now organized, it is not suited even to fight a war. It has little capacity to clear and hold territory in the wake of American military successes, still less to provide security and social services.

Most of the leading generals in the regime—particularly the regional, or corps, commanders—are quite simply racketeers, selling off jobs, contracts, real estate, supplies and anything else that comes under their control. Marshal Ky, though evidently honest, is a hot-headed young pilot. The immediate seat of all the recent trouble seems to

be a kind of temper tantrum last March that led him to sack the former corps commander at Danang.

Secondly, there is the probable alienation, not only of the militant Buddhists but of virtually the whole elite of the central coastal plain stretching from Hue to within a few hours of Saigon. Though cool to the Saigon government and suspicious of all foreigners, including Americans, the center has at all times represented a distinctly nationalistic strain.

Probably the best way to repel communism in Vietnam is to mobilize the xenophobic nationalism of the center. But now the center is under the gun of the government. It will be a very lucky thing if the center, and in particular the militant Buddhists, do not commence private negotiations with the Communists. It will not be the first time that militaristic efforts to repel communism by force have driven local nationalists into the arms of the Communists.

Thirdly, the avenue for moving from military to civilian rule has now been blocked. Even if some kind of elections are held, nobody can have any faith in their honesty or seriousness. General Ky has already indicated that he intends to rule no matter what the result of the poll.

Lastly, the other side can only be further convinced of the utility of keeping up the fight. The only true possibility of heading off the insurgency is to divert its support to a genuinely nationalistic regime—a regime that might have emerged from free elections. But against a regime that is as inherently weak and unstable as the Ky regime, the Communists are bound to keep up the pressure.

The American role in all this is murky. But it is certainly no good pleading that the United States was caught by surprise. Virtually everybody in South Vietnam knew for weeks that some such move was in the offing. On April 27, this column, written from Saigon under the title "Coups and Counter Coups" suggested the possibility of a move by Marshal Ky "aimed at preserving the present military crowd in power."

The truth of the matter is that in the face of this plain menace the American response was uncertain and weak. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge never made it clear that the United States absolutely insisted on free elections without any advance military horse-play. When Ky first said that he would stay in power for another year, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said only that he must have been misinterpreted. No effort seems to have been made to forestall Ky's airlift to Danang by putting a tight check on fuel supplies. On the contrary, all signs indicate that American officials, by turning a blind eye and deaf ear, actually encouraged Marshal Ky to move to Danang.

Perhaps Rusk and Lodge have some clear program for South Vietnam. But to me, anyway, that is not the way it looks. To me, it is not clear that they know what they are doing. And maybe that is why, at every juncture, President Johnson finds that his only choice is to send in more troops and step up the bombing.

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1966]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT: TESTING THE TESTERS

(By Art Buchwald)

The recent test given to college students by Selective Service officials to help decide whether they would be deferred or not has been up for some criticism. As one college student put it, "What they're going to wind up with is a dumb army."

I'm not against giving college students tests to see if they go to Vietnam or not, but I think it's only fair that we give tests to people who are responsible for our Vietnam policy, including all State Department, Defense, and White House officials.

Here are some of the questions that could be included in the tests:

(1) Name one (just one) South Vietnamese official whom we could support to head up a South Vietnam government.

(2) Explain in a short essay what the Buddhists want in South Vietnam.

(3) Explain in a short essay what the Catholics want in South Vietnam.

(4) Describe in detail how there can be free elections in South Vietnam under the present government.

(5) If you can't get the South Vietnamese military to talk to the Buddhists and you can't get the Buddhists to talk to the Catholics and you can't get the Catholics to talk to Ambassador Lodge, how you can get the North Vietnamese to talk to the Americans?

(6) If the South Vietnamese troops in the south are used to protect Gen. Ky in Saigon and the South Vietnamese troops in the north are used to protect Gen. Dinh in Danang, what troops will be left to fight the Vietcong in the countryside?

Answer true or false:

(a) The State Department has no idea of what is going on in South Vietnam.

(b) Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, by nature, is an optimist.

(c) The CIA knows more about what is happening in Hanoi than what is happening in Saigon.

(d) President Johnson would like to buy back his introduction to Gen. Ky.

(e) Buddhists in South Vietnam are anti-Communists.

(f) Buddhists in South Vietnam are anti-American.

(g) It would be much better if South Vietnam were made up of Moslems.

(h) Dean Rusk is looking forward to his next appearance in front of Senator FULBRIGHT's Foreign Relations Committee.

The following are choice questions. Select just one.

1. If it takes 500 B-52 bombers 3000 tons of bombs to shut down one road from North Vietnam, it will take the Vietcong how long to open that road? (a) One week. (b) Five days. (c) 24 hours. (d) They bombed the wrong road.

2. If you can kill 159 Vietcong in one week, how long will it take to kill every Communist soldier in South Vietnam? (a) Two years. (b) Five years. (c) Ten years. (d) The rest of this century.

3. The bombing of Haiphong and Hanoi as advocated by some military and Senators would bring this about: (a) A better morale situation among the South Vietnamese troops. (b) A new bomb shortage. (c) Student protests. (d) World War III.

4. The reason the U.S. is in so much more trouble in South Vietnam is that: (a) Sen. MORSE is against them. (b) Walter Lippmann is a dove. (c) President Johnson is doing the best he can. (d) Administration policymakers have tests for college students, but they haven't come up with any for themselves.

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1966]
WASHINGTON: THE EVADED MORAL QUESTION IN VIETNAM

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 17.—President Johnson has been confronted for some time with a moral question in Vietnam, but he keeps evading it. The question is this: What justifies more and more killing in Vietnam when the President's own conditions for an effective war effort—a government that can govern and fight in Saigon—are not met?

By his own definition, this struggle cannot succeed without a regime that commands the respect of the South Vietnamese people and a Vietnamese army can pacify the country. Yet though the fighting qualities of the South Vietnamese are now being demonstrated more and more against one another,

the President's orders are sending more and more Americans into the battle to replace the Vietnamese who are fighting among themselves.

THE TWO OPTIONS

Ever since the start of this latest political crisis in Saigon, the President has had before him two courses of action. The first was to make clear to all the contending South Vietnamese leaders that the United States was going to limit its reinforcements, its military and economic aid, its casualties, and its military operations to the minimum until they had composed their differences.

The objective of this course was to try to produce unity, and failing that, to provide time for a basic reappraisal of the American commitment.

The second course was to appeal to everybody to get together and meanwhile to keep the war going as best we could with the American forces. President Johnson chose the second course. He is appealing and fighting, though he has even less reason to believe in the formation of a stable government now than he had at the beginning of the crisis.

WHAT JUSTIFICATION?

Justifying this historically, and particularly, justifying it personally to families of the casualties in the coming monsoon offensive will not be easy. If there were a reasonable expectation of political stability, the thing might be done, but lacking that, it is hard to see why the President rejected the course of a defensive pause.

The latest review of the war here with Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge did not deal primarily with fundamental policy, but with operations. It did not focus on where we now stand or where we mean to go from here, but on what to do about the inflation and the shipping in Saigon, and the tactical problems in Danang and Hue, and how to pump a little more sawdust into the ruling generals in the capital.

There is little reason to believe that President Johnson's latest "appeal" to the Buddhist leader, Thich Tri Quang, will have any more effect than the other innumerable appeals that have been made to that militant monk by other Americans in the last few weeks.

He is clearly not thinking much about putting aside "the lesser issues in order to get on with the great national tasks." He is summoning his followers to new demonstrations against the military junta in Saigon and the generals in the Government are moving troops of the Seventh Infantry Division out of the operations against the Communists to deal with the expected rioting in the capital.

Plenty of appeals have been made by President Johnson, among others, to General Ky, to "compose his differences" with the Buddhists and get on with the formation of a civilian government, but his answer to that was first to increase his military power by kicking out the rival general in the First Corps area, and lately sending his marines to Danang and bringing the country to the verge of civil war.

It may be that, in the face of all this petty and provocative folly, President Johnson is playing a waiting game and being more clever than anybody here can see. What he will do if his latest appeal to Tri Quang is ignored and followed by more chaos in the streets remains to be seen.

WHAT COMMITMENTS?

At one point, however, if the present trend continues, there will have to be a new definition of all the commitments that have been given. Our commitment to Saigon originally rested on Saigon's commitment to fight and govern, neither of which it is now doing effectively. The President's commitments in this war involve not only a handful of gen-

erals who seized power, but involve the Vietnamese people and the American people as well.

Our commitment was to a "legitimate government" and what we now have in Saigon is neither "legitimate" nor a "government." Our commitment was to help them win the war not to replace them on the battlefield. Our arms were provided to fight the aggressors and not to start a civil war. Our promise was to help South Vietnam, not to destroy it.

THE EVADED MORAL QUESTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the time has come for us to consider what possible justification there is for us to continue fighting in Vietnam, killing Vietnamese men, women, and children when there is no effective government in Saigon or in South Vietnam. We should not evade this problem any longer.

It is interesting to note that upon his recent return to the United States, Ambassador Lodge remained vacationing in New England for about 5 days instead of coming direct to Washington to report to the President. One could conjecture as to whether by deliberate action he came to the United States knowing that civil war inside another civil war was going to erupt.

What are our commitments to justify more killing when there is no Saigon government capable of pacifying the country and no Saigon regime exercising authority even over Saigon itself and admittedly not exercising authority over three-fourths of the area of South Vietnam?

With the South Vietnamese fighting one another instead of the Vietcong, the President now apparently has two alternatives. One, to send 100,000 to 200,000 more American GI's to Vietnam, bringing our forces in Vietnam, Thailand, and in the South China Sea off the coast of Vietnam, close to 600,000. This is one alternative, and a bad one. Why should we send more and more Americans into Vietnam to replace South Vietnamese soldiers who desert by the thousands, who in some recent weeks have had fewer battle casualties than we Americans and who seem interested principally in fighting among themselves?

The action our Commander in Chief should take seems to me, is the other alternative—to announce that we are suspending all bombing of areas of Vietnam north of the 17th parallel and that this bombing pause will be followed by efforts to go to the conference table with representatives of the National Liberation Front, or Vietcong, and representatives of what is left of the Saigon government, and delegates of North Vietnam, seeking a cease-fire and an armistice in Vietnam.

This should be followed by elections later this year under the supervision of the International Control Commission consisting of representatives from Poland, India, and Canada, or under the auspices of the United Nations. Then, when there is a Saigon government capable of maintaining authority over the area south of the demarcation line, or the 17th parallel, we could effect an orderly withdrawal of our Armed Forces.

President Johnson in the past repeatedly has laid down the condition that there must be an effective war effort by a friendly government in Saigon that can really govern and fight to maintain itself against the Vietcong. It has been his position all along that the friendly forces of South Vietnam, so called, headed by generals who overcame the civilian regime in Saigon last June and then placed Ky as Prime Minister, must exercise authority, command the respect of the South Vietnamese people and be supported by armed forces capable of pacifying South Vietnam.

We have sent hundreds of thousands of our best soldiers to aid the Saigon regime. We have suffered casualties frequently exceeding those of the South Vietnamese forces. We have provided enormous economic aid. Now the time has come for us to reappraise the entire situation and then act without delay.

What have been our commitments in the past? President Eisenhower offered in 1954 in a letter to the then Premier of South Vietnam to—

assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. * * * The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government.

This was the extent of the commitment made by President Eisenhower. During his administration the U.S. military advisory group in Vietnam never exceeded 685. The Vietnamese were fighting, it is true, but American GI's were not waging a land war in Vietnam or any other place in southeast Asia.

Then, President Kennedy on September 3, 1963, shortly before his assassination said:

Unless a greater effort is made by the Government—

Referring to the Saigon government—to win popular support the war cannot be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the government has gotten out of touch with the people.

Also, on another occasion, our late great President John F. Kennedy said:

Transforming Vietnam into a Western redbut is ridiculous.

It is crystal clear that those two Presidents made no commitment whatever for our GI's to fight and die in Vietnam.

Recently President Johnson urged Prime Minister Ky to compose his differences with the Buddhists and form an effective viable government. Instead, Ky threatened to kill the mayor of Danang and ordered 2,000 marines to Danang and suddenly and without any warning assailed the Buddhists and the Vietnamese forces led by a rival general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SIMPSON in the chair). The 3 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Prime Minister Ky talks big. He acts small. His is not a legitimate government. It was based on the military seizure of power.

Premier Nguyen Cao Ky cannot be depended upon to so run his country that peaceful preparations for the elections can be held. Another interim head of government should be found, and found quickly.

We are involved in a miserable civil war in South Vietnam. If we continue in combat there, we will help depopulate South Vietnam. We shall be adding to the millions of refugees whose homes have been destroyed. President Johnson no doubt considered that everything he has done has been done to help Vietnam. Now, he must know what we are doing over there will really result not in helping but in destroying Vietnam.

Vietnam was never of any strategic importance to the defense of the United States. Certainly it is not now of any economic or strategic importance to the defense of our country.

Throughout Asia the unfortunate facts are that we Americans are now regarded as a neocolonial power. In other words, the French who sought to retain and reestablish their huge Indochinese colonial empire and who were fought by the forces of the National Liberation Front, have been succeeded by us.

In 1953 and 1954 it was unfortunate but it is a fact, that under President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles the United States provided massive military aid to the French and in addition to providing war planes, munitions, trucks, machineguns, tanks, and bombs, we contemplated making an actual military intervention. At that time reason finally prevailed and the French colonial forces of 200,000 withdrew. This, directly after their so-called offensive base at Dienbienphu which Gen. Henri Navarre had established and garrisoned was overrun and surrendered May 8, 1954.

Following that, through the operations of our CIA, we established the first puppet government in Saigon and President Diem was brought from the United States to Saigon as President by our CIA. He called off the elections stipulated in the Geneva accords. President Eisenhower, in his reminiscences, stated that had the elections been held as provided in the Geneva agreement which we approved Ho Chi Minh would have received 80 percent of the vote of the Vietnamese living to the north and south of the demarcation line.

Now we are in the unfortunate situation of aggressor and neocolonial oppressor. Here is the time and opportunity for our President to announce a pause in bombing and propose a ceasefire to be followed, we would hope, by an armistice agreed to by delegates repre-

senting the National Liberation Front or Vietcong, and delegates of the Hanoi government and our own delegates and those of the Saigon regime.

Mr. President, the hour is late. The opportunity for a suspension of bombing of North Vietnam and putting an end to waging an American ground and air war in Vietnam is here. That highly respected columnist, James Reston, referred to the situation in his column published in the New York Times of May 18, 1966, under the caption, "The Evaded Moral Question in Vietnam." The statements made by James Reston are irrefutable. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this column be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1966]

WASHINGTON: THE EVADED MORAL QUESTION IN VIETNAM

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 17.—President Johnson has been confronted for some time with a moral question in Vietnam, but he keeps evading it. The question is this: What justifies more and more killing in Vietnam when the President's own conditions for an effective war effort—a government that can govern and fight in Saigon—are not met?

By his own definition, this struggle cannot succeed without a regime that commands the respect of the South Vietnamese people and a Vietnamese army that can pacify the country. Yet though the fighting qualities of the South Vietnamese are now being demonstrated more and more against one another, the President's orders are sending more and more Americans into the battle to replace the Vietnamese who are fighting among themselves.

THE TWO OPTIONS

Ever since the start of this latest political crisis in Saigon, the President has had before him two courses of action. The first was to make clear to all the contending South Vietnamese leaders that the United States was going to limit its reinforcements, its military and economic aid, its casualties, and its military operations to the minimum until they had composed their differences.

The objective of this course was to try to produce unity, and failing that, to provide time for a basic reappraisal of the American commitment.

The second course was to appeal to everybody to get together and meanwhile to keep the war going as best we could with the American forces. President Johnson chose the second course. He is appealing and fighting, though he has even less reason to believe in the formation of a stable government now than he had at the beginning of the crisis.

WHAT JUSTIFICATION?

Justifying this historically, and particularly, justifying it personally to families of the casualties in the coming monsoon offensive will not be easy. If there were a reasonable expectation of political stability, the thing might be done, but lacking that, it is hard to see why the President rejected the course of a defensive pause.

The latest review of the war here with Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge did not deal primarily with fundamental policy, but with operations. It did not focus on where we now stand or where we mean to go from here, but on what to do about the inflation and the shipping in Saigon, and the tactical problems in Danang and Hue, and how to

pump a little more sawdust into the ruling generals in the capital.

There is little reason to believe that President Johnson's latest "appeal" to the Buddhist leader, Thich Tri Quang, will have any more effect than the other innumerable appeals that have been made to that militant monk by other Americans in the last few weeks.

He is clearly not thinking much about putting aside "the lesser issues in order to get on with the great national tasks." He is summoning his followers to new demonstrations against the military junta in Saigon and the generals in the Government are moving troops of the Seventh Infantry Division out of the operations against the Communists to deal with the expected rioting in the capital.

Plenty of appeals have been made by President Johnson, among others, to General Ky, to "compose his differences" with the Buddhists and get on with the formation of a civilian government, but his answer to that was first to increase his military power by kicking out his rival general in the First Corps area, and lately sending his marines to Danang and bringing the country to the verge of civil war.

It may be that, in the face of all this petty and provocative folly, President Johnson is playing a waiting game and being more clever than anybody here can see. What he will do if his latest appeal to Tri Quang is ignored and followed by more chaos in the streets remains to be seen.

WHAT COMMITMENTS?

At one point, however, if the present trend continues, there will have to be a new definition of all the commitments that have been given. Our commitment to Saigon originally rested on Saigon's commitment to fight and govern, neither of which it is now doing effectively. The President's commitments in this war involve not only a handful of generals who seized power, but involve the Vietnamese people and the American people as well.

Our commitment was to a "legitimate government" and what we now have in Saigon is neither "legitimate" nor a "government." Our commitment was to help them win the war not to replace them on the battlefield. Our arms were provided to fight the aggressors and not to start a civil war. Our promise was to help South Vietnam, not to destroy it.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this year marks the 150th anniversary of Southbridge, Mass. Incorporated in 1816, the town was first settled in 1730. Southbridge is a valley town, rich in heritage, and situated in the heart of a New England abundant in tradition. Among its first settlers were French-Canadians, and many of their descendants live and work there today, contributing to this manufacturing community.

The first factory in Southbridge was built to make cotton yarns. Later it became a woolen mill. Today the town's economy is based on a wider range of manufacturing activity and includes tool and die, machinery fabricating, electronics and instrumentation, optical products, research and development, and others.

It is my pleasure to join with the people of Southbridge today as they celebrate their 150th anniversary.

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. CHARLES E. BROWN, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE ARMED FORCES CHAPLAINS BOARD

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of reading an inspiring address delivered by Maj. Gen. Charles E. Brown, Jr., chairman of the Armed Forces Chaplains Board, at the luncheon of the Women's Organizations' Services of the National Jewish Welfare Board on April 28, 1966.

Chaplain Brown's remarks offer a close-up picture of the vital work that is being performed for the spiritual welfare of our servicemen by members of the Chaplains Corps of all religious faiths. The importance of the chaplain's role is underscored by a significant statistic cited by Chaplain Brown; namely, that although only about 60 percent of the people in civilian life have a church or synagogue affiliation, in the military more than 97 percent state a religious preference and most participate in the religious program.

In discussing the religious programs in the Armed Forces, General Brown calls attention to the interfaith activities of the Chaplains Corps and observes that—

Every chaplain has a concern for all men in his unit, regardless of faith * * * Christian chaplains have been concerned for the needs of Jewish personnel and have served Jewish personnel (and) Jewish chaplains have helped in counseling and serving men of all faiths.

It is this demonstrated universality of the Chaplains Corps and the dedication and devotion of the individual chaplains that is in a large measure responsible for the high morale of America's service men and women everywhere. Certainly this is true of our men who are fighting under their country's flag today in Vietnam.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on the Armed Services, I commend and salute the Chaplains Corps for its great work. I think Chaplain Brown has made a most worthwhile contribution to a better knowledge and understanding of this work, and I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS AT 25TH ANNIVERSARY TRIBUTE LUNCHEON NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD, WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS' SERVICES, APRIL 28, 1966, AMERICANA HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y.

(By Chaplain (Major General) Charles E. Brown, Jr., Chairman, Armed Forces Chaplains Board Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.)

I am delighted to have the opportunity to bring you greetings from the Department of Defense. Although I serve as Chief of Chaplains of the Army, I am here today in my capacity as Chairman of the Armed Forces Chaplains Board which is on the Department of Defense level and is composed of the Chiefs of Chaplains of each of the three services. The Executive Secretary of this Board is a Jewish chaplain, a Captain in the Navy—Chaplain Samuel Sobel. At present he is the only chaplain serving full time on the Department of Defense level.

The basic mission of the chaplaincy is to provide for the morale and religious needs of our military personnel. No military force in history has ever had a more fully rounded religious program than the men and women in the American Armed Forces. Americans are God-fearing people. Although in civilian life only about 60% are church and synagogue affiliated, in the military more than 97% state their religious preference and, for the most part, participate in the religious program.

The chaplaincy is held in high regard by all Commanders. In fact, in my trips throughout the United States and around the world I am continually amazed, even after 25 years of service, at the high priority Commanders place on the service of the chaplains and the credit which they give them for the maintenance of high morale among the troops. The military has highly sophisticated administrative and technical means for dealing with the life of the soldier. They have recognized, however, that no matter how well a soldier is clothed, fed, housed and trained, the indefinable factor which is most significant in his effectiveness is morale. The chaplain is a valuable instrument in helping to develop this morale. We take pride in the superb group of clergymen of all faiths that we have trained and put into the field to serve the needs of the men and women in uniform.

I think you might be interested in knowing how we obtain chaplains to serve in the military. Because of our historical tradition of separation of Church and State, the government can never set up seminaries to teach and ordain military chaplains. Therefore, the military merely sets up the basic requirements for commissioning a chaplain. An applicant for the chaplaincy must be a college graduate, have completed a course of study at a theological seminary, and have been validly ordained by his denomination. The actual recruiting and endorsement of these chaplains is turned over to the denominations themselves.

To accomplish this, the major denominations of this country have set up their own ecclesiastical endorsement agencies. For the Jewish group the recruiting and endorsing of chaplains is done by the Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy of the National Jewish Welfare Board. One of my purposes for being here today is to express, on behalf of the Department of Defense, and more particularly The Department of Army, our appreciation to all the various Jewish groups (I know that you are fragmented just as we Protestants are) who have united themselves under JWB's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy to provide us with Jewish chaplains to serve our military personnel.

Today, I want to pay tribute to the three rabbinic organizations—for the Reform, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, for the Conservative, the Rabbinical Assembly and for the Orthodox, the Rabbinical Council of America—which have worked together through the Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy to provide Jewish chaplains to the military. I am especially appreciative that they have recognized the importance of this obligation and, in spite of their severe manpower shortage, have given first priority to the needs of the military chaplaincy. The records show that since the Korean War, one third of the graduates of your seminaries have served as chaplains in uniform.

I am here to praise the National Jewish Welfare Board not only for past services but for having created a new retention program for Jewish chaplains so that many of them may be persuaded to make the chaplaincy a life-time career. This will be most helpful, not only in providing mature and experienced Jewish chaplains to serve Jewish personnel, but even more, it will provide

for more Jewish chaplains to move up in the administrative ranks and become senior supervisory chaplains with responsibility for chaplains of all faiths. Navy Chaplain Sobel is in such a position now. Army Chaplain Kleinberg is a full Colonel in such a position; Army Chaplain Messing, who will soon become a full Colonel, is in such a position new. Air Force Chaplain Levitan is in such a position now. These are only four when there should be a score or more in such positions in the three services. There is no reason why eventually a Jewish chaplain should not be named a Deputy Chief or a Chief of Chaplains of one or more of the three services. This can only be accomplished if enough rabbis remain in the service for long periods of time to develop a substantial, mature Jewish leadership. I am convinced that the Chaplaincy Retention Program that is soon to go into effect will go a long way toward making these possibilities a reality.

I especially want to pay tribute to the Jewish chaplains serving in Vietnam. There are three Jewish chaplains there—two Army and one Marine. They each serve a different geographic section of Vietnam and provide religious services for all Jewish personnel in their respective areas. They are constantly on the move by jeep and by helicopter to cover the various units for which they have responsibility. The work closely with the Christian chaplains who constantly help by bringing together their Jewish personnel for brief services, counselling and religious educational programs. This service is highly regarded by the Command which has already cited each of the Jewish chaplains serving there. I treasure with you the cherished memory of Chaplain Meir Engel who lost his life in Vietnam a year and a half ago. He was an unusually fine and capable chaplain, whose devotion to duty is symbolic of the chaplaincy.

Now I want to turn specifically to the work that the Women's Organizations' Services of the National Jewish Welfare Board has been contributing to our national defense effort.

The Military itself, and I speak to you in terms of my travels around the world to large and small installations over a long period of time, has set up a fine logistical system of support chaplains' activities. It provides chaplains with nondenominational chapels, religious and educational programs and materials, church and synagogue appurtenances. Although the military tries to provide for all faiths on an equal basis, the vast majority of the people in the military are of the Christian faith. Naturally, the programs are geared toward the well over 95% of the military population which is Christian. We are, however, very much concerned about the religious requirements of the Jewish personnel and a fine program has been developed for them too. In planning and executing that program we have had the help and cooperation of the National Jewish Welfare Board's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy.

Special thanks are due to the Women's Organizations' Services. You have recognized that Jewish Personnel are widely dispersed and very often in small numbers at hundreds upon hundreds of installations throughout the United States and the World over. Because they are so widely dispersed, it is difficult to reach the individuals at far-off installations. Your ingenious program called "Serv-A-Chaplain" has provided an excellent service which has won significant recognition. Jewish chaplains, especially overseas, cover large areas. They are distributed the world over on the basis of geographic need. Each chaplain serves many installations, often hundreds of miles apart. Through the Serv-A-Chaplain program you have made available to the Chaplain resources such as books and records, ceremonial items, holiday gifts, decorations and foods, pre-

kindergarten materials, and other items which he can distribute as he makes his rounds from one small congregation to another in the geographic area which he covers.

I remember, during the Korean War, the exceptionally fine work done by your organization when you provided your chaplains with Polaroid cameras so that as they visited the sick and the wounded they could take a picture of the young men which they would then send on to their families. Parents and wives who had previously received information from the military that their sons had been wounded, were naturally filled with deep concern. When they received a picture of their son or husband, smiling and lying comfortably in a bed, it was a tremendous morale factor not only for the families but for the soldier himself who knew that the picture would be reassuring to his loved ones at home.

Christmas is a great time for exchanging gifts. Our Post Exchanges stock many gifts but almost all carry Christian symbols. Hanukkah falls during the same season. Post Exchanges do not carry gifts which are of a Jewish character. The gifts which you women provide to Jewish chaplains for distribution to the servicemen and their families play a very important role in providing a Jewish atmosphere and a sense of Jewish identification at a time when the Christmas spirit seems to pervade the atmosphere of the entire military establishment. It is important that, at this time, Jewish children should be taught the difference between Hanukkah and Christmas and be strengthened in their own religious faith.

I am aware of the hundreds of thousands of paperback books on Judaism which your organization is distributing to chaplains for their libraries so that personnel of the Jewish faith can increase their knowledge of their religion, history and traditions, and of the fine contributions which your religion has made in the field of ethics and morals. Your gifts of ceremonial objects, ark curtains and table covers with Jewish symbols, and Jewish art objects help create an atmosphere conducive to worship and a link with home. I am especially appreciative that, on Passover, you are concerned about individual Jewish GI's in hospitals, at radar stations, at anti-aircraft emplacements, and other far-off, lonely places, who can not attend a Passover Seder. The "Solo Seder" packages which you send to these individual men containing Passover foods, a Haggadah and pamphlets which explain the holiday, are tremendously helpful to these individuals who would otherwise be denied the opportunity of participating in the Seder observance.

The concern which you have shown for the wives of servicemen by organizing Jewish Military Chapel Women's Associations and providing them materials, advice and assistance has not only helped enormously in raising the morale of these young women far from home but has helped strengthen Jewish family life amid strange surrounds, in parts of the world where organized Jewish communities do not exist.

It is for these unique services to individuals that we of the Department of Defense salute you and express our heartfelt thanks. Indeed, you are one of General Harold K. Johnson's, our Army Chief of Staff, strong arms in his determination to put the personal back into personnel.

America is great. We are a people of diverse background, of diverse ways, of diverse faiths, and of diverse opinions—but we are all Americans. The spirit of universality which has been dominant in civilian religious life in the last few years is not new to the military. The chaplaincy has been practicing it for years. Christian chaplains have been concerned for the needs of Jewish personnel and have served Jewish personnel. Many of us have helped organize Jewish services and preached at Jewish services. Jewish chap-

lains have helped in counseling and serving men of all faiths. Every chaplain has a concern for all men in his unit, regardless of faith. Your organization, too, has shown its concern for men of all faiths. During World War II and in Korea your chaplains distributed the gifts you sent to all men, whoever had need of them. Today, in Vietnam, the thousands of comfort items, the battery operated fans and other gifts, are distributed in that same broad spirit.

In the armed forces of every other country the chaplaincy is divided into faith groups. There is a Chief of Chaplains for each religion in their Armies, Navies and Air Forces. In America all chaplains are under one Chief and one never knows if he will be a Protestant, Catholic or Jew. America has taken the view that men of all colors—white, black, red and brown, and of all religions—Catholic, Protestant and Jew, fight and die side by side. And we know it is much harder and much more important for us to live together than it is for us to die together. We are therefore dedicated to the proposition that they must also learn to live side by side. We have a great country with great ideals. All of us, in uniform or out, whether of the Department of Defense or the National Jewish Welfare Board, should be and are highly resolved that we are going to do our very best to make sure that the United States remains just that, a united people striving to obtain liberty and justice for itself and for all mankind.

IMPACTED AREAS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the administration budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, provides for a reduction of \$217 million in payments to school districts under Public Law 874, better known as the impacted areas program.

Proposed amendments to this program would reduce the number of districts entitled to participate from 4,077 to 2,846. In my State of California alone, this reduction would amount to more than \$35 million; the number of districts participating would decline from 515 to 374.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I oppose these cuts. I urge that the school districts of this Nation be given their full entitlement for the coming year. No Federal program has been provided to compensate for this loss, nor did Congress intend with the passage of recent advances in Federal aid to education that the impacted areas program be curtailed. I believe it is a false economy to cut back programs in this critical area of education without providing a satisfactory replacement.

Reduction in impacted area funds means essentially a transfer of the cost of necessary education expenditures to the local taxpayers. Unlike other Federal programs of assistance to education, Public Law 874 support is noncategorical; it can be used directly in local school budgets as needed. It can only be replaced by the local revenue of individual school districts.

In California the proposed reduction would mean an increased tax burden of \$778,000 on the citizens of Oakland, \$1,083,000 on the citizens of Long Beach, \$1,268,000 on the citizens of San Francisco, and over \$5 million on the citizens of San Diego. Moreover, if as proposed by the administration, the formula is

changed for assistance to large cities, the citizens of Los Angeles will lose expected revenues of \$3,069,233 for the next year's school budget.

Proposals to reduce impacted areas payments were introduced earlier this year. If they should become law between now and the close of this session, and the budget for fiscal year 1967 reduced accordingly, in all probability there would not be time for school districts to put through measures to raise necessary taxes to pay for expenses accruing next fall. School districts are planning now for next year, and they need to know what their income will be. On this ground alone the administration's proposals for fiscal year 1967 are hasty and are inconsiderate of local problems.

When the impacted areas program was passed in 1950, during the Korean war, it became the declared policy of the United States to provide financial assistance for "local education agencies upon which the United States has placed financial burdens by reason of the fact that such agencies provide education for children residing on Federal property or such agencies provide education for children whose parents are employed on Federal property."

Since the Land Ordinance of 1785 the American system of public education has been based chiefly on revenue earned from land. The State of California has been greatly benefited by this program and would in turn be greatly affected by its reduction. While 90 percent of the people of California, the Nation's most populous State, live in urban areas which require a high rate of investment in schools and other public services, 45 percent of the lands of the State of California are federally owned. There are over 250,000 Federal employees in the State of California. The normal tax base of our State, the Nation's third largest, is greatly reduced by large scale Federal land ownership. I might choose one example to illustrate. The school district of China Lake in Kern County is organized to educate a group of students each one of which is the child of parents employed in or living on Federal lands. China Lake School District has no other means of support than funds provided under Public Law 874.

The method of Federal payment under Public Law 874 has met wide approval not only in California, but also throughout the United States and has been consistently supported in testimony before committees of the Congress since establishment of the impacted areas program in 1950. The Congress has recognized that the burden imposed on individual school districts has required continuing Federal support. This Federal commitment has been particularly vital to rapidly growing communities, of which we have a great many in California. In new communities there is an immediate requirement for investment not only in schools, but also in streets, lighting, sewers, fire and police protection and other items referred to by economists as "social overhead." In 1966, as we face a period of rising prices, the costs of providing each of these facilities has increased rapidly. In California, these costs have imposed an unusually high

tax burden, over \$10 per \$100 of assessed valuation in many urban communities. The cost of education has moved relentlessly forward both as a result of increasing prices, including the necessary adjustments in teachers' salaries, and also because of a rising demand for education on the part of an enlightened citizenry.

The administration's proposed reduction of impacted area funds comes at a time when school districts in California are having increasing difficulties in balancing their budgets, when citizens are attaching an increasing value to the education of their children and when every phase of economic activity in our country is demanding higher educational and intellectual standards. It comes, moreover, at a time when throughout the Nation, and particularly in California, there is the same increase in Federal activity and Federal employment which was experienced during the Korean war and which was one of the principal causes of establishing this program.

Despite the burgeoning costs of defense I would argue, as in earlier years did the late Senator Robert A. Taft:

If a million children who are not receiving education today continue without education, it will be lost and gone to them forever.

Today education has been recognized at last as a vital element in the foundation of American life—indeed, we cannot survive in these complex times without it.

I refer to one of the most urgent and critical situations which the reduction in these funds would affect. Oakland, one of the largest cities of the State of California, employs a highly qualified body of teachers and has established a school system that is moving effectively to assist the disadvantaged areas in the city. Well over half of the school population of Oakland can be classified as "culturally disadvantaged" under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The school system draws \$2.5 million for specialized purposes under this law. Nevertheless, even with this help the system will have to reduce its staff by 180 teachers in the next year because of increasing costs and limited revenues.

The citizens of Oakland are working hard to establish the bonds of community trust and to provide for all the necessary stake in society through education which will lead to civil peace. Foremost among them are the teachers of the Oakland school system. I am informed that a reduction of impacted area money would contribute substantially to the loss of teachers which Oakland must face next year.

This is wrong. I do not believe the administration has thought through its proposal for substitution of other educational programs for money long provided under Public Law 874. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, despite its enormous value, was not designed to meet the problems of loss of land from the tax rolls to the Federal Government. It would not save the situation in Oakland because, while it will aid the children who are not now enjoying the full benefits of American life, it does not meet the need for teachers' salaries.

The case is clear. No adequate arrangement has been made to provide replacement of funds under Public Law 874 by other programs. These funds are needed for the education of our children, for their education as citizens who later will be the leaders of our country. Their preparation for this task may ultimately decide the future of our country. I believe that process should not be disturbed.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI ELI A. BOHNEN, AS PRESIDENT OF THE RABBINICAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a distinctive international honor has come to Rhode Island because it has come to one of its most prominent citizens.

Word comes from Toronto that Rabbi Eli A. Bohnen, of Temple Emanu-El of Providence, has been chosen president for a 2-year term by the Rabbinical Assembly. This is the International Association of Conservative Rabbis with 500 in attendance at the assembly's 66th annual convention at Toronto.

An interesting sidelight is that this honor comes to Rabbi Bohnen in the very city of his birth.

The Rabbinical Assembly is an organization of 800 rabbis serving in the United States, Canada, South America, Europe, and Asia. Its members constitute the rabbinic arm of conservative Judaism. The academic arm of conservative Judaism is the Jewish Theological Seminary, whose chancellor is the world-famous Dr. Louis Finkelstein, and whose chairman of the board of overseers is Ambassador Arthur Goldberg. The lay arm of the conservative movement is the United Synagogue, whose president is Mr. Henry Rapaport.

Rabbi Bohnen is at present president of the Rhode Island Board of Rabbis. In Rhode Island he has served innumerable civic and religious organizations. He has been on the boards of the United Fund, Council of Community Services, Community Workshops, Narragansett Council Boy Scouts of America, Big Brothers, the General Jewish Committee, the Miriam Hospital, Jewish Family and Children's Service, the Governor's committee on refugees, the mayor's committee on juvenile delinquency, and so forth. He was cited as "Man of the Year" by the Conference of Christians and Jews, and has received many other citations and awards.

Rabbi Bohnen has served the Rabbinical Assembly as secretary and then vice president before his elevation to the presidency. He has been chairman of the placement commission, which is comprised of representatives of the Rabbinical Assembly, United Synagogue, and the Jewish Theological Seminary. He has been chairman of the ethics committee and a member of the committee on Jewish law and standards.

Rabbi Bohnen came to Providence from Temple Emanu-El, Buffalo, N.Y., where he served for 10 years and was active in both civic and religious work. Prior to this he was, for 4 years, assistant rabbi of Congregation Adath Jeshurun, in Philadelphia, Pa.

During World War II Rabbi Bohnen served with the 42d Infantry—Rainbow—Division and rose to the position of assistant division chaplain with the rank of major. He was with the division during its training period at Camp Gruber, Okla., and its combat experience in France and Germany. He remained with the division during most of its service as occupying force in Austria where he was able to do a great deal in furthering the division's work with displaced persons. He was awarded the Bronze Star and the Army Commendation Ribbon.

Conservative Judaism is one of the three groupings within the Jewish religious life in America. It began in the United States in the middle of the 19th century as a reaction to a trend, whose leaders had abandoned many of the ancient traditions of the Jewish faith, in their belief that Judaism would not be able to survive in the New World in its traditional form. They felt that the Jewish religion should express itself in new forms, closer to those of the Christian majority.

The founders of conservative Judaism believed that it was important that the ancient values be conserved, hence the term "conservative Judaism." They believed the liturgy should remain Hebrew. They were convinced that Jewish children should be nurtured in a tradition of scholarship, based on the knowledge of the Bible and other religious writings in the original Hebrew and Aramaic. They were confident that the Jewish immigrants from Europe would not want to reject the heritage of their fathers, sustained over thousands of years.

The vision and faith of the founders of conservative Judaism were justified. Today the conservative movement includes the largest number of Jews affiliated with synagogues. Its seminary is recognized as one of the greatest institutions of learning in the world. The United Synagogue is a leader in the areas of religious education textbook publishing, social action, adult education, and in many other related fields.

As President of the Rabbinical Assembly, Rabbi Bohnen will have a prominent place on the boards of the Jewish Theological Seminary and of the United Synagogue, and will have intimate contact with national and international Jewish religious and service organizations.

The presidency of the Rabbinical Assembly is one of the highest offices within Jewry. The president joins illustrious predecessors in this office who include Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, chancellor of the seminary; Rabbi Simon Greenberg and Rabbi Max Arz, vice chancellors; Prof. Mordecai Kaplan, founder of the reconstructionist movement in Judaism; and Rabbi Edward Sandrow, president of the New York Board of Rabbis; Prof. Robert Gordis, professor of Bible at the Jewish Theological Seminary.

The Rabbinical Assembly has given to the armed services of our country military chaplains from every branch of the services. Indeed, no one is eligible for membership in the Rabbinical Assembly unless he has volunteered to serve as a military chaplain immediately following his ordination.

The Rabbinical Assembly publishes "Conservative Judaism" a quarterly devoted to ideas and philosophies of Judaism. It has a special department for the publication of prayer books adapted for conservative congregations. It assists in the publication of textbooks for religious schools in English-speaking countries.

PRICES BETWEEN FARM AND STORE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the accusation that the farmers are largely responsible for the present inflationary trend is completely unjustified.

Farm prices are now at 80 percent of parity and the farmer is earning only about 60 percent as much as his city cousin.

The prices farmers receive for most commodities are lower now than they were 20 years ago, while the cost of farm operations has increased sharply year after year with no end in sight.

The American consumer is today buying more food and fiber at the smallest percentage of his take home pay than at any time in our Nation's history, while the American farmers and rancher are receiving much less than parity for their products.

The American farmer and rancher are entitled to their fair share of our national income and they do not ask for more. They both deserve praise instead of criticism.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a very excellent article by Sylvia Porter, which appeared in a recent issue of the Evening Star.

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

PRICES BETWEEN FARM, STORE (By Sylvia Porter)

The U.S. farmer will be getting an average of 4 cents for a pound of lettuce in the final quarter of 1966, according to authoritative projections. But the U.S. consumer will be paying an average retail price of 26-28 cents for the same lettuce. Lettuce doesn't go through a transformation between farm and store—comparable to, say, the change from a pound of hog on the hoof to a pound of pork on the counter. A head of lettuce is a head of lettuce is a head of lettuce.

The farmer will be getting about 33 cents for a dozen eggs at year end, according to the same projections. But you'll be paying an average of 52-54 cents for these eggs. Eggs don't go through a transformation either. An egg is an egg is an egg.

A pound of potatoes should be bringing the farmer 1.7 cents in the last quarter while you'll probably be paying 5½-6½ cents. The above observations apply to potatoes, too.

Where does the money go between farm and store? It goes into all the operations lumped under "food marketing": Transportation, processing, packaging, displaying, advertising, promoting, selling. It goes into an ever-widening number of store services: Big parking lots, check-cashing, baby-sitting.

The farmer's share of the \$1 you spend for food rose from a postwar annual low of 37 cents in 1964 to 41 cents in the first quarter of this year, reflecting generally higher farm prices and bringing net realized income per farm to an estimated \$4,600 in 1966, an increase of 55 percent since 1960.

Nevertheless, a full 59 cents of your dollar still is going to the "intermediaries." Since

1950, the cost of marketing of food has climbed 25 percent while the farm value of food actually has declined.

The food price spread has risen so relentlessly—in times of falling as well as rising farm prices—that Congress in 1964 established a National Commission on Food Marketing and ordered it to make an exhaustive probe into every aspect of the spread. After more than a year of investigation, the commission is slated to release its findings June 30.

Its recommendations to Congress well may carry some explosive implications. While the commission's findings are a secret, an informed report is that it will make "critical observations" about the parts played in retail food prices by advertising, trading stamps and such marginal services as babysitting.

Of course, much of the rise in the spread between farm prices and retail food prices is easy to explain.

On our side, we're demanding and getting an enormous array of services ranging from elaborate parking lots to dazzling display cases for perishables. We're trading up to more and more convenience foods, pre-cut, pre-cleaned, pre-frozen, all processes which cost money. We're generally buying more expensive meats, fruits, vegetables.

On the marketer's side there's no doubt that costs of most processing and marketing services have been increasing steadily. In food marketing firms, average hourly wages are 86 percent above 1950. Also on the retailer's side, there are the inevitable hidden expenses of spoilage and trimming.

Relatively speaking, food remains a bargain, taking an average of only 18.2 cents of each of our after-tax-dollars.

But the warning to the food industry, largest in our nation, is clear: With the Marketing Commission's report on the price spread coming up and with consumer resentment over food prices so widespread, it will be in a hot spotlight in coming months.

What's more, if a substantial percentage of the projected slide in farm prices is not reflected in declining food prices, the industry also could be on a hot spot.

THE SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, during the past 2 weeks, I have addressed the Senate twice on the subject of Vietnam. The thrust of my argument has been that elections in South Vietnam must be held. Most important, these elections must be free and fair. And it will take an international presence to assure that the elections are, indeed, free and fair. The United Nations, it seems to me, must undertake this task.

There has been a wide and positive reaction to my proposal. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the most recent editorials supporting my position which appeared in the Hartford Times, the New York Times and the Litchfield Enquirer, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, May 17, 1966]

AGONY OF DECISION

The nearest thing to a clear-cut policy decision the United States has made in many months of trouble in its involvement in Viet Nam is the Honolulu announcement of support for the military junta ruling South Viet Nam under Premier Ky.

Now that junta is in serious trouble. It may not survive. The threat of civil war, with Buddhist rebels shooting at government supporters, raises the prospect of a double war—

the fight against the Communists going on at the same time as the Buddhist rebellion. There is a chance that the internal troubles may so vitiate the South Vietnamese determination to fight the North Vietnamese that the war of South versus North will collapse, leaving the United States to choose whether to carry it on alone.

American policy in Viet Nam has been for a long time a series of compromises, all dodging essential moral and political questions. In the present turmoil, there are only a few really clear courses open to the United States:

Continue our support of the Ky government, backing it with military force against the Buddhists.

Abandon the Ky government in favor of the Buddhists, which would involve an attempt somehow to disarm the present government.

Determine to carry on the anti-Communist fight alone if necessary, promising to cooperate with whatever Vietnamese government turns out to be dominant in the South.

Get out of Viet Nam.

Assume as an American responsibility the maintenance of order, the operations of civil government and the direction of the armed forces of South Viet Nam until the people are capable of electing a stable and competent government.

Every one of those policies involves terrible difficulties and not one of them has much to recommend it. Yet unless there is a choice, we shall go on in an interminable muddle of doubt, insecurity, sacrifice, loss, expenditure and death with no prospect of any gain worth a fraction of the cost.

One more possibility offers itself, but first let us briefly consider these five.

Continued American support of the Ky government or any successor with the same political orientation implies contravening the obvious will of a majority of the politically active population of South Viet Nam. Neither the Ky regime nor any of its predecessors has been stable.

Abandonment of the Ky government would involve, in all probability, a bloody fight between Americans and Ky supporters, who will not willingly surrender control of their forces to the Buddhists.

Carrying on the anti-Communist fight alone while the South Vietnamese iron out their own political troubles would multiply our military investment in a war in which our objectives are becoming less attractive every day, and it might prove an intolerable burden.

Pulling out of Viet Nam entirely would be a betrayal of every American who has lost his life there. All the sacrifice would have gone for naught. The proper objectives of the war would be lost.

And taking over the country as trustee of the future and the fate of the South Vietnamese would expose the United States to charges of colonialism and tyranny that we would be hard put to rebut.

These are over-simplified judgments of the five courses of action. Each has many subtle and complex implications, and proponents and opponents of each could argue for years over their merits and demerits. We don't have that much time to decide, for events are crowding judgment.

The remaining course—we believe the best—is to appeal to the United Nations to intervene by force and put an end to the fighting, both the anti-Communist war and the civil war in South Viet Nam.

The UN is the only authority in the world with the requisite prestige and the potential power to be able to stop the shooting. Our appeal for UN intervention would have to include an expression of willingness to offer our own forces in Viet Nam as a police force under whatever command the UN chose to establish or, alternatively, to pull them all out of the country as quickly as they could

be replaced by an international army strong enough to keep order.

The UN might not agree to intervene. But an appeal for intervention would be a step toward the establishment of peace. All the alternative courses seem to lead inevitably to one result: the destruction of any hope of peaceful, responsible government in South Viet Nam except by the total extermination of one side or the other in the civil war.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
May 16, 1966]

THE DANANG COUP

The seizure of Danang by the Ky Government means a determination to fight it out with the dissident political elements of the Unified Buddhist Church. Unless the struggle is quickly stopped, this would mean an end to the hopes, expectations and promises of an election by Sept. 15 for a constituent assembly and later an elected government.

The gravity of the situation is obvious. Civil war is one possibility. The South Vietnamese struggle against the Vietcong is bound to be seriously hampered. Worst of all would be the embarrassing and perhaps critical position of the American forces in Vietnam and the handicap to the war they are waging.

Once again, Washington has been caught by surprise—even to the extent of Ambassador Lodge being in the United States instead of in Saigon. When Marshal Ky calmly announced a few days ago that he intended to keep his government in power for at least another year, Secretary Rusk declared that the Premier had been misunderstood and really did not mean what he seemed to be saying. He meant it all right, and this development becomes another in the long series of misunderstandings and miscalculations of the Vietnamese by the United States Government.

As always when a sudden and unexpected event of this sort explodes in Vietnam, it is necessary to let the storm blow over. When it does, every effort must be made to bring the electoral position back to where it was, if that is going to be possible.

The desirability and, indeed, necessity to hold elections that would permit a broad-based civilian government in South Vietnam is as clear as ever. Washington's orders to the American advisers in Saigon to urge a peaceful settlement can only be a stopgap move. The military may prove strong enough to prevent the militant Buddhists from creating a chaotic situation in Danang, Hue and Saigon. The damage is by no means beyond repair. In South Vietnam the pessimists as well as the optimists are often confounded.

But the coup emphasizes once again that it has never been possible to interpret Vietnamese events in terms of American ideas or Western logic. Premier Ky obviously feels strong enough to assert Saigon's authority over the virtually rebellious northern provinces. If, having done so, he then turns back to the concept of constitutional and legislative elections, the harm can be held to a minimum.

Once the situation has stabilized it is more important than ever that the election be demonstrably fair. The very nature of the American involvement in South Vietnam makes it impossible for the United States to operate with total detachment in this respect. As Senator RIBICOFF has suggested, the United Nations would be the best possible choice to exercise a supervisory function to guarantee the fairness of a vote in a country with no democratic tradition.

The alternative to elections is chaos. Premier Ky must realize this. So much Washington. Whatever happens now, the final goal still has to be elections.

[From the Litchfield (Conn.) Enquirer,
May 12, 1966]

THE END WE SEEK

Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF of Connecticut stood up on the Senate floor in Washington last week and delivered a "major speech" on a major issue—Viet Nam. What he had to offer was hard, plain talk.

"No amount of bombs or bullets alone can assure success (in Viet Nam)," he said. "We could commit a million men—stamp out the Viet Cong—and 'lose' the war. The end we seek in Viet Nam must never be military in nature. We cannot become a colonial power.

"We must get back to the original premise of our involvement in South Viet Nam. It is not an American war—it is a South Viet Nam war. We are in Viet Nam to help—not to conquer."

In his speech, RIBICOFF called for two things: United Nations supervision of the forthcoming elections in Viet Nam, and an address by President Johnson before the U.N. General Assembly, redefining this country's role in the war-ravaged land. The Senator thus aligned himself with other men in high places who are convinced that some form of stable government in Viet Nam must exist before the conflict can be resolved.

What RIBICOFF suggests is that elections be held within those areas of South Viet Nam that could reasonably be secured against violence and intimidation, and where U.N. observers could gain access to assure impartiality. He sees this working to advantage in two ways: "If the peasant is assured that he plays a role in the policies of his government, his suspicion of that government decreases. If the central figures of government know that their future depends on the people—then their support of a program to help the people will be assured."

And what would RIBICOFF have President Johnson tell the world through the General Assembly? Simply that America sees in the Viet Nam elections an "opportunity as well as a challenge," and that the United States is committed to the success of those elections. In this simple restatement of purpose, the Senator believes, there would be reassurance for all that our primary purpose in the Far East is indeed help and not military victory.

COASTAL FISHING LIMITS AND THE ROAMING FISHERMAN

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Pacific coast fishermen are seriously concerned at the present time with the recent arrival of a fleet of Soviet fishing vessels to harvest the adjacent resources. Soviet vessels off the coast of the United States is not a new problem, for we have long had such operations by that nation and others off the State of Alaska and off the Atlantic coast. The present Pacific coast effort is critical. The resources being harvested by the Soviet vessels are stocks upon which our trawl fleets have operated historically.

Further, there is growing evidence that the kind of gear being used by the Russian fleet is of a smaller mesh than that used by our own fleet for such species as Pacific Ocean perch, and the Soviets appear to be taking everything in their path, with no apparent thought to the future.

As you know, I have spoken on this floor many times of the need for conservation of the fishery resources, not only off our own coast, but throughout the world ocean, for I foresee great need for this food in the long-range survival of mankind. I have regularly sought

assistance for our domestic fishermen, feeling that their welfare and well-being is a matter of deep concern in the long-range, broad national interest.

Pacific coast fishermen are gathering at Seattle, I am informed, to discuss the question of jurisdiction in regard to the coastal fisheries. I am further advised that there will be representatives from the Atlantic coast present and I await with interest the deliberations and decisions from the meeting. It is important that the United States give serious thoughts as to what is in the broad national interest in this question of jurisdiction, and I am hopeful for good testimony at the hearings scheduled May 18 and 19 on Senator BARTLETT's 12-mile-limit bill.

But in the meantime, Mr. President, I repeat my overall concern as to the conservation of the world fishery resources. The problem which is now being faced by Oregon and Washington fishermen in relation to the fleets of the Soviet Union has been faced and is currently being faced by others and the circumstances are not as unlike as you might suspect.

I was particularly interested in this regard, in an editorial in a recent issue of the British fishery trade publication, "Fishing News International," inasmuch as it does a commendable job of comparing some of the problems on the Pacific coast of the United States with those of South Africa. 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:

FISHING LIMITS AND THE ROAMING FISHERMAN

It would be hard to think of two fishing areas more widely separated than those of the west coast of North America and of the south west coast of Africa. Their fishermen are as different as a halibut and a hake; they use different methods and boats to catch different species of fish. But the global spread of the fishing effort of several nations has given each fishery a problem common to the other and shared by fishermen all over the world.

In an age when the screeching jet and the howling ether have made a nonsense of distance, it was inevitable that some fishing areas would lose the protection their remoteness once gave them. The ocean hunt for fish is on and only the exhaustion of stocks is likely to stop it. The question anxiously asked from Vancouver to Cape Town and from Buenos Aires to Reykjavik is: How far away is exhaustion?

For some fisheries the signs are already ominous. "Every year," wrote Mr. Roy Matthews, chairman of the British White Fish Authority in an article in *The Times*, "larger fleets range more widely and declining yields in one traditional ground after another tell their own story of over-fishing." Mr. Matthews was adding his plea to that of many other far-sighted fishing men for "effective international agreement for productive management of the world's fisheries".

Inevitably men, industries and nations will find ways of managing the resources of the oceans. But events over the past year show that such co-operation will be slow in coming and that some cherished concepts of commercial fishing may have to be discarded in the process. One of these is the illusion of "our fish" and "our grounds."

There is a limit to what can be claimed as the exclusive fishing preserve of any one na-

tion and this is generally recognized today as 12 miles from the shore. In some fortunate areas this protects valuable stocks; in other the best fish are being found well outside the limit.

Off the west coast of Canada a particularly rich trawling area lies in the tumultuous Hecate Strait between the mainland and Queen Charlotte Island. As Canadian base lines are drawn, the Strait is open fishing water outside 12 miles. But just south of Queen Charlotte is Vancouver Island and it is being contended that the base line should be drawn between the two islands enclosing the Strait in territorial waters. Urgency has been added to this contention by the appearance over the Hecate trawling grounds of a large Russian fleet complete with factory ships and modern stern trawlers. In law this Soviet fleet is working in the open sea as are smaller American trawlers who have fished the Hecate Strait as a traditional ground. To oust these ships by drawing fresh base lines will create a delicate international situation. But Canadian fishermen are calling on their government to do something to protect these productive grounds before other wide-ranging fleets come in.

Across the other side of the world what has been described as a "fishing free for all" has surged beyond control of any one nation.

Less than five years ago fishermen of South Africa and South West Africa were working a rich, remote backwater.

From Cape Town a fleet of about 70 local trawlers brought in about 100,000 tons of hake and other bottom fish a year. This catch has now soared beyond 200,000 tons but the entire increase is coming up in the nets of vessels from seven or eight countries.

The hurried extension of the local fishing limit from three to 12 miles has had no effect on trawlers working 20 or more miles off the coast. When it was introduced in 1963 there were about a dozen ships from Spain and Japan operating off the Cape coast; last year they were joined by vessels from Israel, Holland, Italy and Germany. The fleet—including ships of the Soviet Union, East Germany, Poland, Bulgaria and Ghana operating to the north—now exceeds 100 vessels and the local industry is becoming more and more anxious for the future of its stocks.

One positive result of this anxiety is a suggestion that all or most of the nations with ships fishing off Southern Africa should work together in an investigation of the little-known resources of demersal fish. Encouragement for this has come from the owner of the first West German trawler to arrive in Cape Town who believes an international agreement could be reached for the conservation of Southern African stocks. Further support is implied in the interest being shown in the area by the White Fish Authority. The views of the Japanese are not known, but the largest of the Spanish companies with ships based on Cape Town has a 40 percent stake in a South African fishing company and it could well take a leading part in negotiations for a joint research/conservation project.

While these are still the early, turbulent days of long range fishing, they are already showing that reluctant "hosts" will get nowhere by standing on the cliff tops and shouting at the factory ships and freezer trawlers on the horizon. Restrictions, shut-outs and other, perhaps more ingenious, measures may temporarily restrain them, but they are not likely to stop nations and industries who have spent millions on this new ocean-wide pursuit of fish.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as Fishing News International says, "what has been described as a 'fishing free for all' has surged beyond control of any one nation."

These are critical times in fisheries, though they come as no surprise. The U.S. Senate well recognized the pending disorder when it unanimously adopted the resolution I sponsored for a World Fisheries Conference. Today foreign vessels are fishing heavily off our shores and in many cases we do not actually know whether they are depleting the fisheries or not. The appearance of the sizable fleet off Oregon and Washington indicates to me that the waters to the north, closer to the Soviet fishing bases, are either depleted or reduced to a point where productive fishing is no longer possible.

The United States must move firmly and swiftly in this question of jurisdiction and conservation for the protection and productive future of its citizens, but in an even broader sense, we must take the world leadership in assembling the coastal and fishing nations to determine the proper conservation regime that there may be hope for the hungry.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency has always been the subject of some controversy and it is inevitable that an Agency with the duties and responsibilities such as it has, always will be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial on the subject of the CIA in the May 18, 1966, issue of a very reputable newspaper, the Washington Evening Star. Also, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as a part of my remarks a column in the same issue of the Washington Evening Star which deals with the CIA, written by a very reputable journalist, David Lawrence, entitled "Danger Seen in Proposal on CIA."

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 18, 1966]

WATCHING THE CIA

It would be difficult to find any cloak-and-dagger organization that is more closely supervised than the Central Intelligence Agency.

It is watched over by the President and the National Security Council. By designation of the President, a non-governmental group headed by Clark Clifford closely scrutinizes what the CIA is doing. Finally, its activities and its expenditures, though concealed, have to run the gantlet of two congressional committees. In the Senate, this committee is made up of three representatives each from the Armed Services and Appropriations committees.

There would seem to be no need for any additional watchers. Senator Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee, however, wants to add three of its members to the watching group. Senator Russell, who heads the supervisory committee, is strongly opposed.

Because there are already so many watchers, it might be wondered what valid objection there is to adding three more, especially if they come from Mr. Fulbright's committee since CIA activities undoubtedly influence foreign relations.

The reason for the objection was not quite spelled out in Monday's debate. But its essence emerged clearly enough.

Ohio's Senator LAUSCHE, himself a member of Foreign Relations, said that committee "has also distinguished itself for the frequency of leaks that come out of their (executive) hearings."

Later on, Senator MORSE, who thinks the CIA is a "police state institution," said: "I do not accept the major premise that the elected officials of the American people should not have an opportunity to be briefed in executive sessions of their committees in regard to what their checking committee has found."

This lets the cat out of the bag. While no Senator would stand up on the floor and say so, the obvious fact is that the opponents of enlarging the watchdog committee are afraid of leaks if representatives of Foreign Relations should be added to the watchdog group. And this would be especially true if all 19 members of Mr. FULBRIGHT's committee would be briefed, as Senator MORSE advocates, "on what their checking committee has found out."

The "leak" from executive sessions to favored newsmen is an ancient institution on Capitol Hill. But there have been no leaks from Senator RUSSELL's watchdog committee. The tightness of its security has been remarkable. And this is as it should be.

Why? Because secrecy, like it or not, is essential to the successful operation of the CIA. Without it, vital sources of information, carefully cultivated over a long period of time, would vanish, not to mention the informants themselves. Consequently, in the absence of a substantial showing of need, and there has been no such showing, we hope the Senate will turn down the bid by Foreign Relations to "muscle in" (Senator RUSSELL's words) on the watching process.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, 18 May 1966]

DANGER SEEN IN PROPOSAL ON CIA

(By David Lawrence)

There is more than meets the eye in the innocent-looking proposal to allow the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to add three members of its own to the "legislative oversight" committee of the Senate which, in a confidential way, keeps in touch with the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Just why, for instance, should the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wish to check up on the special committee now composed of a small group from the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee? The reason given by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is that the people in the CIA "very greatly influence foreign policy."

But, in rebuttal, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the special committee which now supervises CIA operations, says that "it is just pure poppycock that the CIA fixes, and makes, foreign policy."

On the surface, it might seem that the whole thing is merely a matter of procedure and that theoretically some representation from the Foreign Relations Committee, along with members of the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, would be logical. But the truth is that the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency could be imperilled if members of the Senate who are primarily interested in arguing about foreign policy were entrusted with the secrets of the agency.

It is customary for various senators every now and then to divulge things they have learned in confidence about domestic policy. But with respect to what's going on in foreign countries, there has to be restraint. For if the information obtained by the CIA is

dealt with casually and "leaked" to the press like domestic news, this could cause serious damage to American interests around the world.

The risks in changing the nature of the membership of the special committee that keeps in touch with the CIA are considerable. The public knows hardly anything about the devious efforts of foreign governments to get secret data in Washington. They employ go-betweens who themselves may not know just who is behind the request for information that comes to them. After long experience with the technique of keeping things really secret, the CIA has concluded that the fewer the people who know anything about the operation, the better in the long run.

After World War II was over, the late Admiral Ernest King, chief of naval operations, told this correspondent that in two of the important engagements in the Pacific he never even told the secretary of the Navy ahead of time that a certain battle plan was about to be put into operation.

"My job," he said, "was strictly within the armed services, and if the secretary of the Navy wanted to find out what was coming, he could always ask the commander in chief—namely, the President of the United States."

This kind of caution is just as important in a "cold war" as in a "hot war." The President, of course, has access to everything the CIA is doing.

Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, D-Ohio, says that, while Senator RUSSELL's subcommittee has "distinguished itself" by not leaking information, the Foreign Relations Committee—of which he is a member—"distinguishes itself by the number of leaks that have come out of that committee."

Senator RUSSELL thinks that overexposure of the CIA would make difficult the gathering of information, because it would cause many people to hesitate to help for fear of eventual reprisals if their identity became known. The Georgia senator, in his speech to the Senate this week, said that the mere discussion of what appears to be a jurisdictional squabble "has a tendency to chill" some of the CIA informants even in the national capital.

It takes many years to develop contacts in foreign countries, where the CIA operates almost entirely. To require the agency to reveal much of its information to members of the Senate who are themselves involved in foreign-policy controversies could result in a substantial drop in the efficiency of the organization.

JOHN J. DWYER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, earlier this month the people of Missouri and the Nation lost a great public servant, John J. Dwyer, for many years treasurer of the city of St. Louis, and chairman of the Democratic City Central Committee.

Mr. Dwyer leaves a reputation for high character and unusual ability as a public servant. In addition, he leaves literally thousands of devoted friends, all over the country.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the Board of Aldermen of the City of St. Louis, dated May 13, be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION No. 10

Whereas, on Friday, May 6th, last, the members of this honorable board of aldermen and the people of this city and State were shocked, then grieved to learn of the sudden death of the Honorable John J. Dwyer, City Treasurer; and,

Whereas, the late Mr. Dwyer as chairman of the Democratic City Central Committee, provided successful leadership to this party for more than a generation becoming known as "Mr. Democrat" because of the stalwart stature he had attained in local, State and National party affairs; and,

Whereas, only last February 3rd, at a dinner constituting a mock convention called in his honor, he was elected as the first member of the "political hall of fame" created at said "convention" the proceeds of which, at Mr. Dwyer's request, established the "John J. Dwyer scholarship fund" allowing grants to deserving students of political science;

Now, therefore, be it resolved That this board of aldermen in respectful memory of and honor to the late John J. "Mr. Democrat" Dwyer, stand in one moment of prayerful silence; that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Senators STUART SYMINGTON and EDWARD V. LONG, U.S. Representatives LEONOR SULLIVAN and FRANK M. KARSTEN and that it be personally delivered by its author, to Miss Olive Dwyer, surviving daughter, as this board's tribute to the late leader and as an expression of its sympathy over the bereavement suffered by all of his immediate family.

Adopted this 13th day of May, 1966.

Offered by Alderman Joseph W. B. Clark, as a Resolution, en banc.

FRANK C. BOLAND,

Clerk.

DONALD GUNN,

President, St. Louis Board of Aldermen.

THE 17TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMED FORCES DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the United States will celebrate its 17th annual observance of Armed Forces Day on Saturday, May 21, by paying tribute to the millions of American servicemen and women who devotedly served their country in defending its liberty and preserving its freedom. It is fitting that we commemorate this occasion each year, and I join the millions of grateful American citizens in the expression of a tribute so richly deserved.

Our American men and women in uniform maintain a constant vigilance against possible aggression in the remote and far-flung reaches of the world. At this very moment, our valiant soldiers, sailors, and airmen are fighting in the jungles and rice paddies, on the seas and in the air of southeast Asia to repel the unprovoked and ruthless aggression of the treacherous tyranny that would strive to engulf and enslave freedom-loving men everywhere. As a nation of people traditionally devoted to the cause of peace in the world, we all regret the necessity of again sending American young men to fight on foreign soil, but we recognize that it is the sacrifice we must make and the price we must pay if liberty and freedom are to be preserved in this troubled world.

American citizens everywhere should take the opportunity provided by Armed Forces Day to analyze the reasons why a nation so desirous of peace must annually devote so much of its resources and treasure to its national security through military preparedness.

In his first annual address to both Houses of Congress in 1790, President George Washington stated that "to be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace." But

the isolation of America from the warring nations on other continents and the protection afforded us by the vast expanses of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans permitted us, in years past, to ignore his advice and we knowingly accepted serious shortcomings in the state of our military readiness. We were secure in the comforting knowledge that our geographic isolation and protection would provide us with whatever time we might require to arm and prepare ourselves for war. Consequently, there was no need for America to maintain a huge military establishment in time of peace, and it naturally followed that on those two occasions in the first half of this century we found ourselves involved in major wars for which we were poorly prepared.

The aftermath of World War II and the revolution in science and technology required the United States to reevaluate her role in world affairs. Emerging from that war as a world power, the United States had to discard its cloak of isolationism, agree to participate in a world organization of nations and stem the tide of encroaching communism which sought to enslave a Europe devastated by war. In contrast to the "arrogance" which some would attribute to us, instead of demanding indemnification and tribute from our enemies, we, a victorious nation, made huge financial contributions to the rehabilitation of our former foes.

The revolution in science and technology was responsible for the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile, which eliminated completely the protection formerly provided by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Moreover, the terribly destructive force of thermonuclear weapons coming into the possession of aggressive and unfriendly nations required a significant readjustment in our philosophies of military strategy. It was first thought that the threatened use of these awesomely destructive weapons would deter all wars, both large and small. However, we found that militant communism was not deterred from its aggressive purposes as it sought to subvert and terrorize weaker nations under the protection of the nuclear umbrella.

Thus, we came to realize that although an all-out thermonuclear war was our greatest danger, the most probable threats to peace would occur in resisting the Communist-inspired wars of national liberation. Accordingly, we have provided for a diversified military capability consisting of both nuclear and conventional weapons.

In 1950, America was called upon to resist the aggression of the Communists in Korea. Today, we are meeting a similar challenge in Vietnam by responding to a desperate cry for help from a relatively weak and undeveloped country which is now the target of Communist aggression.

As President Johnson said only last year:

From Munich until today, we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace.

And so it is that on Armed Forces Day we pay tribute as a nation grateful to the dedicated men and women of our Armed Forces everywhere in the world for the privations and sacrifices which they endure in defending the cherished principles and ideals of a free America.

OMBUDSMAN: AN INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR CIVILIANS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the more I begin to learn about the Scandinavian concept of ombudsman, the more interested I become in trying to create some form of American ombudsman to help our citizens "fight city hall." Recently, a most interesting article appeared in the March issue of the magazine, *We the People of North Carolina*, entitled "The Ombudsman: An Inspector General for Civilians." I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the RECORD.

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

AN INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR CIVILIANS

American citizens who have seen service in the armed forces—and they number now living about 24 million—have had experience with a major type of government organization which by its very nature is necessarily encumbered with official channels and enmeshed in an elaborate tangle of red-tape. But these ex-service citizens will be well aware that the military has always provided a means of cutting through the red-tape quickly and effectively when justice and fairness to the individual soldier or officer justified quick remedy.

The soldier can take his grievance to the chaplain who can often get action in minor matters without delay. But, far more important, the soldier or officer can contact directly a high and powerful officer who will give prompt attention if the cause deserves it. This officer is the Inspector General. His function originated in the armies of the Roman Republic sometime about 500 B.C. In the Roman military such officers were called tribunes. Usually there were two of them. They had aides called aediles. Our modern military Inspector General also has a small staff of aides. Eventually they also set up Civilian Tribunes.

Many a civilian, faced with maladministration, injustice, abuse, or oppression at the hands of civilian governmental bureaucrats, has often wished that the civilian government had such an influential Inspector General who could be promptly reached, bypassing civilian red-tape—someone who could call the bureaucracy to account without delay and get it back on the track of justice and fairness.

A SOURCE OF GROWING CONTEMPT

Lacking such an intervenor or justiciar, growing millions of Americans seek to invent one: They write their Congressman or their Senator. As the bureaucracy has grown, the abuses, both real and imagined, have grown; and the trend to cut through the red-tape by writing one's Congressman or Senator has grown by leaps and bounds. The result is that the volume of work required in handling personal grievances and rendering needed individual or group assistance has taken up more and more of the time of the legislator, leaving him less and less time to give to his primary job of considering the legislative work.

In turn, as the legislator has become more a leg-man and less a legislator, the Executive Branch—the body of which is the bureaucracy—has taken over more and more the

work of writing laws. They give laws to the legislators to glance at and to give a rubber-stamp type of approval. Congress has chafed at this. It is a source of a growing contempt of Congress in the minds of many citizens who simply cannot understand how a good man, once elected, so promptly becomes another "rubber-stamp." Such citizens have half a mind not to vote for him again; but, remembering quite frequently some service or assistance he has rendered them, or some close friend or relative, they have another half mind to vote him in again.

SOME CONGRESSMEN LIKE THE DIVERSION

Inquiries indicate that many Congressmen feel that their citizen-services activity enhances their chances of re-election far more than their voting records on legislation. This activity has created pressure for larger and larger staffs for Congressmen, with the strong trend being toward hiring people who can help with this function, rather than with research and study of legislative proposals. Such a growing demand for service to constituents also helps to explain the recurring need for new giant-size Congressional office buildings on Capitol Hill in Washington.

There is nothing necessarily wrong with a Congressman or Senator wanting to make individual constituents happy by rendering them small services; but there are serious disadvantages to the public in trying innocently to make of the Congress two Houses of Inspectors General—535 in the House and 100 in the Senate. In the first place, citizens of the opposition party often may not feel free to write their Congressman for aid. It is even possible that some Congressmen may not have the same tender concern for citizens of all parties or of all classes. Logically, assistance is likely to be more graciously given when one feels that it will pay back the largest dividend of election day influence.

Secondly, there is no place where a troublesome problem can be seen overall. Each Congressman and Senator sees a part, the part which communications from his constituents discloses. If Congress had an Inspector General to assist in this service, as well as to receive communications directly from individual citizens, this official would be in a position to classify complaints and grievances, discover the patterns of abuses, locate the sources of maladministration, report these to the offending agencies for correction and, if necessary, to the Congress, with suggested legislation to correct problem situations in the administration of the laws. The finger could be put on particular executive administrative agencies which showed abusive tendencies and perhaps even upon individual recalcitrant administrators. Of course, a Congressman who banks heavily upon his service function, rather than his qualifications as a legislator, might prefer to see bureaucratic abuses grow unchecked in order that he may receive even more complaints and get even more opportunities to show his correspondents what a great guy he is for "getting things done." But the result hardly approaches equal justice for all citizens, nor is it good for the legislative system or the legislative process of the nation.

SOME PECULIAR EARLY AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

The problem of bureaucratic intransigence and abuse was not completely overlooked by the founders of the American States. They knew that the Roman Republic had found it necessary rather early to invent the civil inspector general idea—the tribunes of the people. It was expected in our early days, however, that the problem would arise from the growth of bureaucracy at the State level, rather than at the Federal level where everyone thought the limited grant of powers would operate—as it did for nearly a hundred years—to keep the bureaucracy rather smallish and controllable. But at the State

level, some thought was given to a sort of tribune idea.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania from 1776 to 1790 and the State of Vermont from 1777 to 1870 had in the governmental schemes of their constitutions a tribunitarian-type elective body called in each State the Council of Censors. Far from having any duty of exercising censorship over the press or freedom of speech, these bodies were elected at seven-year intervals to check against infringements of the State constitution, against administrative abuses, abuse of power by State officers, and even to censure the laws, and the moral conduct of public officials. The Council of Censors also had the power to call a Constitutional Convention to change the State Constitution in the public interest, if it thought a change was needed.

PULLING TEETH FROM THE BITE OF RESPONSIBILITY

The bite of responsibility given these Censors was strongly resented by politicians and bureaucrats. The Council in Pennsylvania was abolished in 1790. The one in Vermont lasted much longer; but, in 1869, enemies of the idea were elected to the Council itself. The new Council of Censors called a Constitutional Convention and, among other recommendations, recommended its own demise. The Convention, dominated by enemies of the Council idea, obliged by amending Vermont's constitution to abolish the Council of Censors. Nevertheless, it is worthy of note that the idea of the civilian inspector general is not entirely unheard of on the American governmental scene.

NOW CONSIDERING THE OMBUDSMAN

More recently the growth of bureaucracy and the need to humanize it has led to a revival of interest in this ancient device for maintaining checks and balances in the good interest of the individual citizen. In 1809 the Kingdom of Sweden established such a civilian inspector general with the outlandish title of *ombudsman* (pronounced approximately ahm-BOOTS-man). He is specially commissioned by the Swedish parliament as its agent. Finland established one in 1919, Denmark in 1955, New Zealand in 1962, and Norway in 1965. The British government has recently had the establishment of such an office under consideration. The idea is receiving study and consideration in the United States Congress and in a number of State legislatures.

Earlier this month, Mr. Alfred Bexelius, present ombudsman of Sweden, was invited to appear before a Congressional committee—the House Sub-committee on Administrative Practice and Procedures—to testify concerning the history, operation, and functions of the ombudsman in the Swedish governmental system.

WHAT THE OMBUDSMAN DOES

Briefly summarized, the functions of the ombudsman (or civil inspector general) are as follows: He stands ready to receive any citizen's complaint concerning government administration. He has discretion to investigate a complaint or not, depending upon his objective judgment of its merit; and he may undertake investigations on his own initiative if he feels it would be in the public's interest. He may compel testimony and the production of evidence. He may make unannounced inspection tours. When he has completed his investigation, he may make recommendations for the correction of any abuse or error he finds. He may suggest changes in procedures to avoid future difficulties. He may publicize his findings and make recommendations to the Legislative branch.

Although he has no power to change an administrative decision, the prestige of the office gives the ombudsman's recommendations for remedial action great weight. The

possibility of adverse publicity, marshaling public opinion against any agency, or of legislative action, adds to the tendency of government agencies and administrators to heed the ombudsman's recommendations. Carefully chosen and appointed by the Legislative branch for a long term of office, he affords the citizen a short-cut through the welter of government red-tape and gives the individual prompt access to a guardian of the citizen's rights against abuses and malfunctions by government, its programs, its officials, and its bureaucrats.

BUREAUCRACY NEED NOT BE TYRANNY

History demonstrates that a government without a bureaucracy is a feeble, ineffective government. Bureaucracy is essential to effective government, just as it is essential to the military and to major business and commercial enterprises. But, in the absence of adequate checks and balances, bureaucracy tends to become a form of tyranny. Signs that this is developing in the Federal government and in many governments at the State and local levels are becoming increasingly evident. Complaints of bureaucratic abuses—petty and great—flood the courts with litigation in a procedure so formidable in costs and red-tape that most citizens prefer to bear the wrong rather than to be further impoverished by pursuing the remedies in that direction. Complaints of bureaucratic abuses—petty and great—flood the offices of the legislators, to the detriment of their legislative duties and with the possibility usually of only an aspirin-type of relief for the citizen.

The idea of the ancient Romans—the greatest political geniuses prior to modern times—is worthy of full consideration as an improvement in our system of checks and balances.

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY ENTITLED "PRICES AND THE BALANCE SHEET IN 10 YEARS OF SOVIET-CAPTIVE COUNTRIES TRADE, 1955-1964"

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a study by an Estonian economist, Aleksander Kutt, recently published by the Assembly of Captive European Nations, New York, and based on data in the yearbooks of the Ministry of Foreign Trade of the U.S.S.R. for the period 1955-64, indicates that the captive European countries are not an economic liability to the Soviet Union as they are sometimes assumed to be. Quite the contrary, these countries have been a considerable asset, and an object of economic exploitation to the Soviet Union.

For a comparison, let it be pointed out that in 10 years, 1955 to 1964, the United States has granted the huge amount of \$12.3 billion of unrepayable economic aid, apart from loans and military assistance, to various needy countries of the world—more exactly: \$12,268 million; Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1965, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1965, page 863.

During the same 10 years, the captive European countries of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania have been compelled to make a contribution of about \$12.8 billion, also unrepayable, to the Soviet economy. This contribution consists of losses to the captive countries to the amount of \$7.3 billion on their imports from, and \$5.5 billion on their exports to, the Soviet Union. With a population scarcely one-half of that of the United States, and a per capita real

personal income many times lower than that in the United States, the payment of this even larger amount has been so much harder for the population of the Communist-dominated East European countries.

As the Soviet foreign trade yearbooks reveal, this amount represents illegitimate profits which have accrued to the Soviet Union through charging higher prices on exports to, and paying lower prices for imports from, the captive countries, as compared with prices for similar goods in Soviet trade with Western Europe.

Some examples from the study illustrate the extent of Soviet price discrimination against the captive countries. On the Soviet export side these countries were overcharged, in 1963 and 1964, respectively, for: crude oil, 111 and 101 percent; coal, 87 and 71 percent; iron ore, 63 and 86 percent; manganese ore, 99 and 117 percent; pig iron, 82 and 76 percent; electric energy, 216 and 159 percent; synthetic caoutchouc, 51 and 54 percent; vegetable food oils, 53 and 48 percent.

It appears not all goods were overpriced to the extent of the goods named above. There were even some comparable commodities of smaller importance for which the captive countries paid less than was obtained by the Soviet Union from Western Europe. Still, on the average, the captive countries were overcharged 52 percent in 1963 and 43 percent in 1964 on comparable sample commodities covering 57 percent of all Soviet exports to these countries in both years.

There are goods, the prices of which cannot be compared, notably machinery and equipment, because of insufficient technical data in Soviet statistics. However, it can hardly be expected that while the captive countries were overcharged or underpaid for comparable goods, they were not also overcharged and underpaid for goods which cannot be compared. Therefore, an extension of percentage losses on comparable goods to goods which cannot be compared, is justified.

Applying the statistics showing the losses to the captive nations on 57 percent of comparable Soviet exports to the goods which cannot be compared, indicates a loss of about \$2.8 billion for these countries on Soviet exports during these 2 years alone. During the 10-year period 1955-64, the losses of the captive countries on imports from the Soviet Union amounted, according to the study, to about \$7.3 billion.

By applying a similar method of computation, the study concludes that the losses of the captive countries on their exports to the Soviet Union, resulting from Soviet underpayments for their goods, reached in 10 years about \$5.5 billion.

The Soviet price discrimination distorts the true picture of balance of trade between the Soviet Union and the captive countries. During the 10 years, 1955 to 1964, at prices paid and received, Soviet exports to the captive countries amounted to \$30.6 billion and imports to \$28.2 billion with a balance of \$2.4 billion in favor of the Soviet Union. At prices in Soviet trade with Western Europe, Soviet exports to the captive

countries would have been worth only \$23.3 billion and imports \$33.7 billion, with a balance of \$10.4 billion in favor of the captive countries.

The study recalls Soviet bloc denials of any Soviet price discrimination against the captive countries. Such denials include one by N. S. Khrushchev, in a speech in Zagreb, Yugoslavia, in 1963, and by Wladyslaw Gomulka of Poland in Gdansk, in 1962. It is also recalled that, along with these denials, official statements have been issued according to which the Communist Council of Economic Mutual Aid has been engaged at least since December 1962 in deliberations about the "correction" of prices.

The study does not expect any significant improvements in the price situation for the captive countries in the years ahead. This assumption is based on the dramatic suicide of Dr. E. Apel, the East German planning chief, in December 1965, immediately before he was to sign the Soviet-East German trade agreement for the next 5 years.

Also, in connection with this suicide, information leaked out that the new agreement foresees price cuts of 30 percent below the free market prices for East German deliveries to the Soviet Union. An underpayment of that order, it is pointed out, is nearly double the average underpayment rate to the captive countries for their exports to the Soviet Union in the years 1955 to 1964. The latter rate, according to the study, was 16.3 percent in relation to prices paid by the Soviet Union to Western Europe.

CHICAGO STUDY SHOWS PRICE MOST SIGNIFICANT FACTOR IN SCHOOL MILK CONSUMPTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the administration's proposal to cut the special milk program for schoolchildren by 80 percent flies in the face of the facts. If this program has proved anything, it has shown that price is an extremely significant factor in promoting or discouraging milk consumption in the Nation's schools. The school milk program has substantially increased consumption of milk by lowering the cost of milk to schoolchildren. Since the program was initiated, milk consumption per student in the United States has increased 3½ times the preschool milk figures, from 12 quarts per pupil in 1952-53 to 42.7 quarts per pupil in 1962-63.

An 80-percent cut in the school milk program would mean an 80-percent increase in the cost of milk to schoolchildren with a corresponding dropoff in consumption. Let me take the Chicago experience as an example.

According to a study made by the Co-operative Extension Service of the University of Illinois, an increase in the price of milk to the student in the Chicago school system between 1959 and 1962 resulted in a substantial reduction in consumption. Here are the facts. In 1959 the price of milk to students in Chicago schools was 2 cents per half pint for white and 3 cents per half pint for chocolate milk. In the 1961-62 school year the price was boosted to 3 and 4

cents per half pint, respectively. The result? A drop in quarts consumed annually per student from 20.5 to 12.6.

The author of the paper states:

These results indicate a strong relationship between price and milk consumption, although price was not the only contributing factor. I searched for other reasons but was not able to come up with any satisfactory answers.

Mr. President, this study simply illustrates that the legislative intent of Congress in passing the school milk act has been carried out. It is quite obvious that by paying part of the cost of the milk the Federal Government has increased consumption of milk in the Nation's schools, day care centers and other child care institutions while at the same time providing the dairy farmer with an additional market for his milk.

Now the Federal Government wants to cut back this highly successful program. The latest excuse is that there soon will not be enough milk to justify providing it between meals to schoolchildren. The answer to this problem, Mr. President, is not to ration the milk we have by slashing the school milk program but to encourage more farmers to go into and stay in the dairy business by increasing dairy price supports and taking other steps to see that the dairy farmer achieves a proper return on his investment.

AN AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the National Council on the Arts has been given an appropriation for the creation of an American Film Institute. The idea is presently under study by the Stanford Research Institute which has received a \$100,000 grant to develop a plan and find an appropriate location.

I have written Roger Stevens, as Director of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, urging that the Foundation select the only appropriate site which, in my judgment, is Los Angeles, Calif., the acknowledged world center of the motion picture industry for half a century. I think it goes without saying that the Institute should be located in Los Angeles, or more specifically, Hollywood.

Livingston L. Biddle, Deputy Chairman of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, has replied to my letter to Mr. Stevens, reporting that the feasibility study will be completed toward the end of this year and that the Foundation has heard from many groups in Hollywood and Los Angeles also urging that the Film Institute be located in that area.

Los Angeles is indeed the center of this creative industry. It would be proper that the Institute be located in the same community as most of the major studios and the many distinguished organizations representing various aspects of the industry, such as: The Academy of Motion Picture Arts & Sciences, Screen Actors Guild, Association of Motion Picture & Television Producers, Directors Guild of America, Screen Producers Guild, Writers Guild of America West, Society of Motion Picture Engineers, American

Society of Cinematographers, Artist Managers Guild, Screen Cartoonists Guild, and the Screen Extras Guild.

It is my sincere hope that Mr. Stevens, Mr. Biddle, the National Foundation, and Stanford Research will weigh carefully the many advantages found in locating the Film Institute in southern California—the unquestioned motion picture center of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to Mr. Stevens plus resolutions passed by the California State Assembly and the Los Angeles City Council and a similar resolution passed by the board of directors of the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, and an editorial from the Hollywood Citizen-News be printed in the Record.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., March 24, 1966.

Mr. ROGER L. STEVENS,
Chairman, National Foundation on the Arts
and the Humanities, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROGER: It has been brought to my attention that Stanford Research has received a grant of \$100,000 from the National Council on the Arts, which Congress voted last year, to select a location for the American Film Institute.

As you might imagine, I have received many letters from the Hollywood area, plus resolutions from the Hollywood and Los Angeles Chambers of Commerce and telephone calls from mayors, councilmen and other public officials. They feel that there should be no question whatsoever as to the location to be selected.

I must say that I find great logic in their arguments. It seems that since Hollywood has been the unquestioned motion picture center of the world all these years it would, without doubt, be the natural place to be selected.

As you well know, not only are all the major studios located in Hollywood, but also the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences and the Society of Motion Picture Engineers, the Directors Guild, and all of the other organizations which could contribute so much to the project.

I would also like to bring to your attention a situation which may be most fortunate in your overall plan. For some time, the motion picture industry and all the guilds and unions of the industry have talked of and planned a Hollywood Museum. There was an ideal site selected which is exactly opposite the Hollywood Bowl, in a most desirable location on land which is county-owned and could be donated. There are also, I believe, carefully prepared plans drawn by William L. Pereira and Associates of Los Angeles, for an exciting building. It is the result of about three or four years of hard work by a committee which did a marvelous job in researching and collecting all sorts of important and interesting historic objects and memorabilia connected with the industry.

Because of personality differences and other incidentals of which I am not too familiar, this great plan was abandoned not too long ago. I have a feeling that all the pieces could be put back together and might result in providing a great share of the work needed for the new suggested project.

The man who was in charge is probably known to you. He was one of the very successful producers of motion pictures, and a gentleman who over the years has been active in civic affairs as well as affairs of the industry and is highly respected and regarded. He is Mr. Sol Lesser, who resides in Westwood, California. I have a hunch that he not only might be most helpful because of his back-

ground and experience of the past few years, but also would be more than pleased to make available the benefit of all the work and planning by the Hollywood Museum which he headed.

I would be pleased to hear from you if you think this suggestion has merit, and I am quite sure Mr. Lesser would be happy to come East to meet with you if you so desire.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MURPHY.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 11

Joint resolution relative to the American Film Institute

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Members of this Legislature that the federal government, in establishing the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities, has authorized the creation of an American Film Institute; and

Whereas such an institute should be located in an area which is synonymous with the development and production of motion picture films; and

Whereas there is only one city in the world which can meet these qualifications, Hollywood, California; and

Whereas millions recognize Hollywood as the "Motion Picture Capital of the World," for no other area has been so closely connected with the growth of the picture business; and

Whereas it is only fitting that Hollywood, which has supplied the world with so many delightful motion pictures, should be chosen as the location of the new American Film Institute; 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 memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take whatever steps are necessary to insure that the American Film Institute will be located in Hollywood, California and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly be 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 each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to Mr. Roger L. Stevens, the Chairman of the National Council on the Arts.

RESOLUTION BY CITY OF LOS ANGELES

Whereas the Federal Government has recently established a National Council of the Arts; and

Whereas under said act, a sum of five hundred thousand dollars has been set aside for the creation of an American Film Institute; and

Whereas Mr. Roger Stevens of the White House staff has appointed a committee of three men consisting of film director George Stevens, actor Gregory Peck and architect William Pereira to plan and recommend the location of the institute; and

Whereas a movement is under way to persuade the National Council of the Arts to establish the said American Film Institute in New York City; and

Whereas the names Hollywood and motion pictures are synonymous throughout the world; and

Whereas Los Angeles is the home of the motion picture industry and further is the home of that industry's leaders and technicians, artists and craftsmen; and

Whereas Los Angeles is the repository of the greatest collections of motion picture memorabilia; and

Whereas the City of Los Angeles is the only logical place for the establishment of such a film institute; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Los Angeles go on record as strongly urging and recommending that said American Film Institute be located here in the City

that is the logical home for such an undertaking; and be it further

Resolved, That this Council send telegrams to President Johnson, Mr. Roger Stevens, Mr. George Stevens, Mr. Gregory Peck, and Mr. William Pereira and to all of the elected officials representing the City of Los Angeles in Washington, D.C., requesting that they use their good offices in helping to create this American Film Institute in the only logical place for such an institute, namely, the City of Los Angeles; and be it further

Resolved, That this Council ask the assistance of Mayor Sam Yorty, the Members of the County Board of Supervisors, the various guilds and unions representing the industry and all other persons who may be interested to aid with their influence and support in the establishment of this institute in Los Angeles.

Presented by Paul H. Lampport, Councilman, 13th District.

Seconded by James B. Potter, Jr., Councilman, 2nd District.

JANUARY 3, 1966.

RESOLUTION BY HOLLYWOOD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

At the January meeting of the board of directors of the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, the following resolution was passed unanimously:

"The Hollywood Chamber of Commerce declares that the location of the proposed American Film Institute be logically placed in the community that has contributed most to its development: That it support efforts to secure the location of said institution here: And that it further seek the support of its friends and representatives in Congress to provide for the development of the institution in this community."

[From the Citizen-News, Jan. 11, 1966]

LET'S GET FILM INSTITUTE

No decisions have been made yet on the proposed American Film Institute, so now is the time for the people of this area to speak up and demand that if it is established that it be located here.

The public is indebted to Councilman Paul H. Lampport of Hollywood and to Supervisor Ernest E. Debs for their alertness in reporting that such an institute has been proposed and that New York and Washington have been considered as sites.

The two officials believe it should be in Hollywood, or in the San Fernando Valley.

It has been proposed that \$500,000 of the \$21 million voted by Congress for a cultural program under the new National Council of the Arts should be earmarked for the Film Institute.

The Institute ought to be integrated with the Hollywood Museum backed by Los Angeles County and envisioned as an international center for the audio visual arts and sciences.

Progress on the Hollywood Museum has been stalled but those of us who have been "plugging" for it for more than 20 years see that much of its program has been picked up for the Institute.

Ideas in common include a depository for all films from the first to the present; a gathering place for memorabilia; an educational adjunct of the film, television, radio and recording industries with classes; and with plans for assisting young people interested in a career in the technical end of the industry.

The Hollywood Museum has in storage or pledged the bulk of the memorabilia available as well as the films. The "Golden Northwest" section of greater Los Angeles, which includes Hollywood, Beverly Hills, Brentwood and the San Fernando Valley, is the home of the 75,000 or so entertainment industry technical men, writers, composers, singers, players, directors, producers and oth-

ers needed to make the educational part of the project successful.

The Institute, as a part of the Museum, could be made more useful and successful here than in any other city.

Councilman Lampport and Supervisor Debs deserve our thanks and our support in their efforts to have the Film Institute established here.

If the site provided by the county for the Hollywood Museum near the Hollywood Bowl seems inadequate with the addition of the Institute, perhaps the two officials could prevail upon an organization such as MCA, which owns Universal Studios, to provide space on their property in Cahuenga Pass.

Perhaps MCA even could be persuaded to take over the operation of the project, acting for the benefit of the public and the industry.

INVESTMENT ABROAD AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, one of the more provocative addresses given at the annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce recently held in Washington, D.C., was delivered by Mr. Richard C. Fenton, president of Pfizer International, whose major production facilities and research laboratory are in Groton, Conn. Mr. Fenton's informed comments and suggestions regarding the problem of our international balance of payments are worthy of serious consideration and I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY RICHARD C. FENTON, PRESIDENT, PFIZER INTERNATIONAL, INC., BALANCE OF PAYMENTS LUNCHEON, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, ANNUAL MEETING, MAY 3, 1966

My remarks will be directed to the balance of payments from the point of view of Direct Investments, and their relationship to exports. First, I believe it is worthwhile to define the terms I shall use. Direct investments are our total operating businesses abroad. They are not the dollars which the parent companies here send to assist in financing their foreign affiliates—these dollars are dollar outflows. Obviously, the businesses abroad and any particular projects which they may undertake, have other sources of finance, such as internal cash flow and local borrowings. Neither the dollars which we send to our businesses nor their retained earnings are adequately described as directed investments—they are connected with the investments, but are not the investments themselves.

The value of our direct investments abroad—that is of our operating businesses abroad—is now estimated at about \$50 billion at book values. The total sales by these businesses are estimated at above \$100 billion—more than the British or the French GNP, and four times total U. S. exports.

Most of these businesses abroad were set up to market products or exploit technology which their U.S. parent companies have developed.

They operate abroad because, as Mr. Stevenson said, the parent companies regard the world as their total market. If they manufacture abroad, it is because they have to in order to support marketing efforts.

It is not therefore surprising that the 500 U.S. companies with most of the direct investments who were involved in the 1965 voluntary program, account for two-thirds of total U.S. exports of manufactured products.

The fact is that these companies have recognized a *fundamental principle*, which is that *in order to export most products successfully you have to set up an operating business abroad; that is you have to make direct investments abroad.* The two, exports and direct investments, are intimately linked—the link is the need to develop markets locally abroad if continuous exports are to flow. We cannot meaningfully discuss exports without discussing direct investments which are the controlling factors in the larger part of our export trade.

What is the effect of direct investments on the balance of payments and the U.S. economy? Very briefly, using almost entirely Department of Commerce published statistics, direct investments abroad made a total net contribution to the U.S. balance of payments in 1964 of at least \$3.7 billion. I say at least because in addition to this sum, the parent companies of the foreign operations concerned exported an additional \$5 billion of goods to customers other than their affiliates, and I am quite sure that research would show a large part of these exports as being due to the marketing efforts of the affiliates—which is certainly true in Pfizer's case. Manufacturing companies alone made an even greater contribution to the U.S. balance of payments, \$4.2 billion in 1964—again without counting exports to non-affiliates. These figures are the net of exports to affiliates, imports from affiliates, and dollar outflows and inflows.

The exports to affiliates alone totaled \$6.3 billion. Secretary of Commerce Connor recently said that every \$7,500 of export sales equals one job in the U.S. Exports of \$6.3 billion on this basis equal over 800,000 jobs in the U.S. The other \$5 billion of exports by the same parent companies in the U.S. to non-affiliates abroad means another 650,000 jobs here at home.

The figures for 1965 are not all published yet, although we do know that the 500 companies increased their contribution by \$1.3 billion in the selected transactions and that a lot of this increase was in exports. The total net contribution of direct investments in 1965 was probably over \$5 billion. And it is clear it will be more again in 1966.

There may be arguments on details, but there can surely no longer be dispute on the broad conclusions. As Secretary Connor recently put it: "Direct investments overseas make an immense contribution to our national economy and our balance of payments through repatriation of profits and fostering of exports."

It is clear that in the future, provided we ensure that these operating businesses abroad can develop free of restrictions to meet competition and world market opportunities, there must be a continuing source of increased contribution to the balance of payments and jobs here in the U.S.

Now, has the voluntary balance of payments program so far done any damage to our business operations abroad? I believe the answer to this is generally and up to now, "No." Remember that the basic aim of the program has been *not* to curtail our operations abroad, but as Secretary Connor has put it: "... to minimize the impact of the outflow of funds on the U.S. balance of payments. Corporations are encouraged to arrange financing for overseas plans in foreign money markets." This is, of course, exactly what we have done and how we have been able to expand our businesses abroad and at the same time expand our contribution to the U.S. balance of payments.

However, doing this has certainly cost us some money and probably this has hurt hardest the smaller companies who need most to be encouraged to go abroad to operate. Also I am sure there has been some misunderstanding about the intention of the program, and some companies have passed up opportunities abroad thinking they were help-

ing the country by doing so. Doing business abroad is already complicated enough with foreign languages, laws, regulations, currencies, taxes here and abroad, not to speak of different habits and tastes, and for some this program was just the last straw and they lost interest—to the detriment of the U.S. balance of payments and economy. Perhaps these disadvantages were not too serious in the short-run—assuming that it was essential to achieve the objectives that the program set out to achieve and has achieved.

However, Secretary Fowler has recently been reported more than once as having said that the program will stay in effect until the hostilities in South Vietnam cease or are sharply reduced. Secretary Fowler did not say so, but it seems to me that the hostilities may well continue on the present basis for several years. Is the program then to go on for several years? If this possibility is being seriously contemplated, then I believe there could be a serious question as to whether the virtual cutting off of American businesses abroad from their U.S. sources of financing for any considerable period of time is really a good policy either for the United States or for other countries. Is it really wise to run the risk of harm both to American businesses abroad and to American banks at home?

Furthermore, some other fundamental questions need to be raised. Have we adequately analyzed the balance of payments problem? Are the current policies based on a right interpretation of the facts?

I was talking the other day to four very well-known economists, and all of them agreed that all the measures taken in the last few years to solve the balance of payments problem, including the exchange equalization tax, and the bank and industry voluntary programs, had probably not affected the balance of payments by more than a few hundred million dollars, if all factors were taken into account—and none of them was willing to say which way, plus or minus, this few hundred million dollar effect might be. If this view is even approximately correct, is our official balance of payments bookkeeping as helpful as it should be to our understanding of the problem?

On the same lines, there is a view which I know is shared by many economists of world reputation which goes something like this: What is called the United States deficit in its balance of payments is actually the result of United States economic strength, growth and political stability. Because of these factors the United States attracts the deposits of many other countries, just like a good bank attracts deposits. Do South Americans or Africans or Arabians put their money in French francs? No, they prefer to deposit their money in New York, or in Swiss banks who in turn purchase Euro dollars. Dollars are preferred because it is the strongest and safest currency in the world. In a sense, the United States, like a bank, is taking in deposits, and lending them back—borrowing short and lending and investing short and long. Some of these funds are going into good solid investments, including our own businesses abroad, which have earned and will earn good returns. This is what any good bank will do—within limits of course. The proponents of this view say that the limit is hard to define, but that it is certainly nearer to \$2 billion dollars of net deposits (or deficits if you wish) per annum than \$250 million.

What do these economists say about gold? They say that we should not worry if some foreigners decided to convert their deposits into gold. Let them take it if they want it—but we should make it clear that we shall not necessarily buy it back from them. Gold, say these economists, does not earn anything either for the foreigners or for us—whereas, we pay interest on the dollar deposits.

Now, I have oversimplified the argument, but I believe I have said enough to suggest

that the approach has some appeal to a businessman's experience. In our companies, if we are growth oriented, we prefer plants and sales organizations and new products from research to cash in the bank—or to a gold bar in the vault. Certainly, investors prefer the company that uses its cash for productive assets to the company which sits on its cash. Similarly, I can see that if there is a choice for the United States between owning \$10 billion of gold and owning \$10 billion of plant and other income-producing assets, the choice should be for the plant. I cannot help noticing that in the recent years of deficits of \$2 billion or so per annum, the United States has been adding several tens of billions of dollars to its productive resources here at home and building up its \$50 billion of businesses around the world. Maybe it has been a good exchange, letting France have the gold, and our getting the productive assets. On the face of it, there seems to be something wrong with a balance of payments accounting which ignores over \$50 billion of businesses abroad. However, foreign investors and depositors perhaps do not ignore them.

Now, when an increasing number of eminent economists is talking in this kind of way, which is so different from the official line, what is an ordinary businessman to think? Can both views be right? My own reaction in these circumstances is that since the matter is so important, to the United States, and also to our companies and stockholders, we had better do our best to try to understand the issues and come to a point of view about them. There is too much at stake for us to stand aside. We must put our weight on one side or the other, or perhaps somewhere in the middle.

Finally, with this kind of basic disagreement between the experts as to the facts and policies, I am certain that we should hold on to two clear basic principles. The first is that the U.S. domestic economy must remain strong and dynamically growing—on this, all else depends. I will not discuss this further.

The second principle is that exports must continue to grow. For this purpose our business operations abroad are vital and should be encouraged as much as possible. Certainly, they should not be discouraged or subjected to restrictions.

What can we do to help our business operations abroad to grow and return more income to this country? I make the following recommendations:

First, that a determined effort be made in Government, in *all* departments concerned, and in business to get the connection between exports and direct investments better understood. I recommend that the National Industrial Conference Board's recent study on U.S. production abroad and the balance of payments, as well as an article by Professor Emile Benoit of Columbia University in the April issue of the "Columbia Journal of World Business", be made compulsory reading by all officials concerned with exports and the balance of payments;

Second I recommend that the National Export Expansion Council Gerstacker Committee's report be very seriously considered by all concerned, for in it are several very practical and apparently easy to implement proposals to ease restrictions on our operations abroad; I have not had the opportunity to study the other two reports made to the Council;

Third, I recommend that the 1962 Revenue Act—so far as it applies to the operation of American business abroad—be thoroughly reviewed (perhaps by a high level task force from Government and the academic and business worlds), since many of its provisions irk and restrict our foreign business under the mistaken premise that we operate abroad to escape taxes and are basically doing something inimical to U.S. interests instead of the reverse;

Fourth, I recommend that a determined effort be made to locate and correct any other possible disincentives in Government policies towards operations abroad;

Fifth, perhaps some kinds of incentives could be devised to encourage companies who operate abroad to increase their total contribution to the balance of payments—not only in exports but in all ways—without harming the growth of their businesses or antagonizing foreign governments. Incentives to do something positive are better than penalties for not doing something;

Sixth, in order to encourage a continuation of a high level of borrowing abroad when, as I hope soon, the restrictions on dollar outflows are eased, perhaps some kind of exchange equalization tax in reverse could be devised to make up to companies borrowing abroad the extra cost, if any, of doing so as compared with using U.S. sources of finance.

There really is no reason why we should export only 5% of our GNP, while the European Common Market exports 15% of theirs. What we need is a coordinated and consistent government policy, embracing all interested Departments, which clearly aims to foster business operations abroad, together with wide-spread appreciation by business of the immense opportunities which await them in world markets.

HOMING DEVICES FOUND BY NAVY ON CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there may have been those who scoffed at the recent statements made on this floor concerning the danger of "homing devices" which a Navy magazine article has charged were found by the U.S. Navy on our Continental Shelf. According to the author, they were placed there by the Soviet trawl fleet which is now exploiting our adjacent resources and harassing our fishing fleets. I would like to call your attention to a resolution which I have just received from the King County Television Service Association, Inc., an organization of competent technicians who are expressing deep concern as to the potential dangers of such devices. These men—specialists in the field of sophisticated electronics—recognizes the capabilities of electronic "snooping" equipment, and find serious danger to the safety and welfare of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

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

Whereas the King County Television Service Association, Inc. is an organization of shops in the King County area engaged in the professional servicing and maintenance of electronic equipment, and

Whereas because of our specialized knowledge, training, and experience we are peculiarly aware of the capabilities of electronic snooping equipment, and the possibility of under water implants of homing devices and relay stations for the re-broadcast of weak electronic signals originating on the mainland, and

Whereas the presence of a large armada of foreign vessels completely equipped with the most sophisticated of electronic gear on our immediate coast provides an ideal opportunity for the use and implanting of such equipment and devices, and

Whereas the use and implanting of such equipment and devices could seriously affect the safety and welfare of our Nation, Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, as your constituents, pray that you use every means at your command to speedily remove this or any other such armada, and prevent a recurrence.

Unanimously adopted in regular meeting this 11th day of May, 1966.

ENOS R. RICE,
President, King County T.S.A.
THOMAS N. ASKEY,
Secretary, King County T.S.A.

INDUSTRIAL ESPIONAGE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, apparently industrial espionage—or IE as it is referred to in the trade—is becoming big business. Recently, it was disclosed that General Motors was trailing Ralph Nader, the young attorney who has been so instrumental in telling the American public about automobile safety.

But this industrial espionage, or spying goes on within the industry also. The current issue of Motor Trend reports on some of the automotive industry's activities. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Spotlight on Detroit," from the June 1966, issue of Motor Trend.

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

SPOTLIGHT ON DETROIT

First word on the '67 models . . . Chevy's new Mustang-type car looks more like the Corvaire.

Fords have wrap-around tail lights. Plymouth, Dodge, Chrysler all have major face lift.

Pontiac hides headlights in grille. The name of the game is industrial espionage. Or, if you prefer, spying. When it comes to this sort of thing, the auto industry is in a class by itself. Months ago, the Big Three auto firms of General Motors, Ford and Chrysler knew what competitors were planning for 1967. With new car tooling orders placed a year or more before production, an enterprising automotive cloak-and-dagger man can acquire a lot of information just by visiting Detroit jobbing shops. It's also possible that employees of the major firms, bent on making a few bucks, might leak some advance dope on a new model to a competitor.

But one thing is certain: The spy types, armed with cameras and telephoto lenses, begin staking out the automotive proving grounds each January, when prototypes of next year's car start to appear in number. Farmhouse attic windows have been a favorite vantage point to observe the winding roads of the GM proving grounds near Milford, Mich., a rural area 35 miles northwest of Detroit. That is, they were until GM started buying up the farmhouses. Nevertheless, good sets of pictures are available on most of the new GM offerings.

Things are not as bright at Chrysler. "They only make one prototype of each car," laments one competitor who nosed around the Chrysler proving ground near Chelsea, Mich., about 60 miles west of Detroit.

The choice is better at Ford, where the new cars are tested at both the Dearborn proving ground adjacent to the engineering center and at another one near Romeo, Mich., north of Detroit. For example, back in 1957, the first published picture of the Edsel was taken by an inquisitive high school youth who simply climbed a wall at the Dearborn test track and hid in the bushes with his camera until the new car came by.

Spying can sometimes work to the advantage of the company spied upon, even when the information is accurate. About nine

months before the 1949 Pontiac was introduced, George Walker, who was then styling for Ford, discovered the Pontiac featured a spinner arrangement on its grille. So did the Walker-designed 1949 Ford. Walker called Pontiac and told them of the coincidence. Pontiac, which was to introduce its car after Ford, avoided the possibility of appearing to copy Ford by making a minor change which corrected the situation. And that's about the only type of change that can be made a few months before a car goes into production.

The major decisions on the 1967 models were made a year ago. But it's nice to know what your competitor is up to, even if it's too late to do anything about it. However, the companies feel they can be hurt by information leaking to the public too far in advance. The belief is that prospective customers for '66 models might decide to wait a few months for the '67 offerings if they knew what was coming up in the future. But the word gets out anyway.

THE STRUGGLE FOR GRAND CANYON

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, with America embarked on a campaign to preserve its natural beauty, it is ironic that one of our scenic treasures should be in danger of serious damage or worse.

Yet this is the case with the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, known the world over for its spectacular beauty. If legislation, presently pending before the Congress, is enacted, power dams would be constructed above and below the Grand Canyon National Park on the Colorado River.

While there is some dispute over the exact impact of this project on the national park itself, it seems clear that the majestic scenery in the area of the dams, and indeed the living river, would be drastically altered.

This is a very complex matter, involving the critical water needs of central Arizona as well as the need to protect our diminishing natural resources.

The pros and cons of the dispute were incisively presented in a recent article by William V. Shannon, a member of the editorial board of the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE STRUGGLE FOR GRAND CANYON (By William V. Shannon)

The fate of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River is now a subject of bitter controversy. The Bureau of Reclamation and the political leaders of Arizona want to build two hydroelectric dams in the Grand Canyon to carry forward a complex water project in that fast growing but arid state. Conservationists across the nation believe that additional dams would desecrate one of the world's magnificent scenic treasures.

UDALL'S DILEMMA

Caught in the middle is Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall. The Reclamation Bureau, which is pushing for the dams, and the National Park Service, which is discreetly opposing them, are both constituent agencies of his department. He is an articulate and energetic official who has done a great deal for the cause of conservation. But he is also an ex-Congressman from Arizona who may someday want to resume his political career in his native state. By quietly supporting the dams, he seems to be having the worst of both worlds. His support is taken

for granted by other Arizonans but it outrages his conservationist friends.

The terms of the controversy are somewhat obscured by the semantic quarrel as to whether the dams would affect Grand Canyon National Park. Advocates of the dams say they would not since both would be built outside the park's boundaries. But it has to be understood that the Colorado River is over 1,400 miles long. It has cut spectacular gorges of which the Grand Canyon—extending for 218 miles—is only one, although it is the most extraordinary. The national park covers only the most accessible portion of the river's length. There is splendid canyon scenery along the river far outside the park, some of it distinct from Grand Canyon. It is this scenery whose fate is primarily in dispute.

But the national park would also be significantly, though indirectly, affected. The dams already built prevent the Colorado from flowing freely and make it difficult for the river to move the loose rock and silt in the many side canyons. The rock accumulates at the mouths of these canyons, blocking them and turning their waters into small dead lakes rather than arms of a living river.

Glen Canyon exemplifies both aspects of the problem. The Bureau of Reclamation built a dam there several years ago that not only slowed the river but also flooded out many once-accessible canyons.

Defenders of the dam counter by pointing out that the rising waters have opened up to boat travel certain side canyons that previously lay behind impassable waterfalls. Lake Powell, the artificial lake which the dam created, is on its way to becoming a popular recreation area for weekend sailors, fishermen and tourists. This is no consolation to conservationists, who emphasize that there are thousands of lakes in this country, but only one Colorado River with its sheer, towering canyon walls.

The two proposed dam sites—Marble Gorge and Bridge Canyon—are as beautiful as Glen Canyon. Marble Gorge is particularly awesome. When *The Reader's Digest* held a two-day meeting last month to publicize the issue of the dams, Barry Goldwater showed up to defend them but even he, a loyal Arizonan, volunteered that he wished it were possible to spare Marble Gorge.

In effect, the 1964 Republican Presidential candidate posed the issue as a necessary and tragic choice of people's need for water over their need for scenery. Conservationists, while not questioning his sincerity, refuse to see the question in these terms. They have suggested several alternatives for meeting Arizona's legitimate water needs without building these dams.

Conservationists are also striving to get across to the public something that is not generally realized—namely, that the dams are not necessary to divert water to Arizona. The only purpose of the dam is to generate electricity which can be sold for a profit, and these profits will pay some of the cost of the irrigation and water diversion project. In short, these are "cash register dams" that would make the Arizona water project more nearly self-supporting. Conservationists argue it would be better to finance the project from taxes than to flood the irreplaceable canyons.

CHANGE THE IRREPLACEABLE?

Scenic beauty is the decisive consideration. No one objected three decades ago when the Hoover Dam was built much farther west on the Colorado, because the terrain there is undistinguished. But dams at Bridge Canyon, with its sheer walls 3,000 feet deep, and at Marble Gorge would transform a unique natural scene. Do the American people really want Congress to alter irreversibly what nature has created and what man can never replace?

LOCATION OF 200-BILLION-ELECTRON-VOLT ACCELERATOR

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] has addressed the Senate on a matter of significant importance to the Nation. On that day, my colleague took issue with the acceptance by the Atomic Energy Commission of the report of the National Academy of Sciences concerning the selection of six finalists for the 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator laboratory.

The merit of this project is above debate. There can be no doubt that the accelerator is necessary. If the free world is to maintain its leadership in the research of high-energy physics, this accelerator must become more than a scientific dream. The advancement of science into the realm of the unknown must continue if man is to learn the essential facts about his surroundings and to discover nuclear solutions to age-old problems.

This project, one of unequalled scope and benefit to both the scientific and cultural community in which it will reside, may well merit its description by the Governor of Indiana as the "greatest scientific prize of our time."

The Washington Post carried a story this morning about the agreement of France and the Soviet Union to join in nuclear research. The story stated that the new Russian 70-billion-electron-volt laboratory and the French bubble chamber would be completed before our 200-billion-electron-volt machine is built.

In view of the just announced agreement, it is even more important that the greatest care be taken in selecting the very best possible site for this urgently needed facility.

Senator LONG has clearly pointed out some of the more obvious fallacies in the reasoning behind the selection of the finalists. No site is perfect; if one had existed, there would have been no competition.

A total of 126 sites were submitted to the Commission. In each case questions grouped in seven broad categories had to be answered. Some proposals were submitted in very brief, skeletal form; others, such as the two from my own State, were voluminous, detailed, and costly. All proposers acted in good faith. The criteria outlined in the AEC memorandum to the Academy opened widely the door of competition.

The good faith of the Commission that inspired the numerous proposals were jeopardized by the action of the National Academy of Sciences. As a consultant to the Commission, the Academy erred in substituting its own criteria when the proposals were evaluated. Although the Academy established criteria which it considered to be in the best interests of the project, by not utilizing the previously announced standards, it effectively removed 90 percent of the proposals from the competition. Acting completely oblivious to the Commission's original directive was an act of bad faith.

The Academy obviously overlooked significant economic factors which would

be of great importance in the construction and operation of the project. This comes at a time when funds for non-military projects are greatly restricted. Every dollar saved without compromising the successful operation of the project is most important and necessary.

The AEC original memorandum about sites further suggested that States now lacking any stable facilities for high-energy physics would have an opportunity to gain the laboratory that would be equal to or greater than those States which have a high concentration of such facilities. In this connection the AEC states:

Consideration to the establishment of a new center of excellence. The impact of the accelerator laboratory on a local university makes possible the transition to a new level of performance. Desirability of broadening the educational base of the Nation should be considered.

There is reason to believe that adequate consideration has not been given to the important factors of establishing "a new center of academic excellence" or to "broadening the educational base of the Nation."

The question arises whether the selection of a site for the new laboratory near an already existing center of research constitutes either expanding our "educational base" or "creating a new center of academic excellence." It appears doubtful to me that such a choice would be in the best national interest.

No one advocates that the 200-billion-electron-volt machine be built on the ocean floor, on a mountain top, or in an unpopulated desert. A number of us are advocating, however, that the center for excellence in this new vital area be built, where the Nation as a whole will benefit the most.

One cannot belittle the importance of a strong design group or a resident staff capable of managing the facility. The location of the accelerator in an area conducive to advanced learning and able to adapt to enormous demands will best serve the interests of the scientific community and the Nation.

Finally, it is interesting to note that the seven sites mentioned in the Academy report were the only ones apparently visited by the Academy team. These visitations coincided with others conducted by teams from the Commission to the remaining 85 sites.

The Nation and the free world will have much at stake in the location of this project. Acceptance of the Academy's recommendations takes on the appearance of an act of bad faith in light of the original project considerations.

The time has come for Congress to take a hard look at how best to assist in the future advancement of the scientific community. We must do everything possible to broaden the scientific and educational backbone of the Nation. The 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator has afforded us this possibility; I feel compelled to ask the Commission to take a second look at selection of the site for the laboratory. It is within the national interest that action be taken to broaden the academic base of the Nation.

"WORLD PEACE: THE NEW CONVERSATION"—SPECIAL REPORT II ON THE "PACEM IN TERRIS" CONVOCATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in mid February of 1965, I was privileged to participate in the International Convocation on the Requirements of Peace, which was held in New York City. This convocation was a meeting of academicians, statesmen, and religious leaders from various countries throughout the world, all of whom have the common goal of attaining the realization of the ideals of which Pope John XXIII spoke in his encyclical, "Pacem in Terris."

The dialog that occurred at this convocation centered around an attempt to implement, through practical deed and action, the great purpose of which Pope John spoke—world peace. A broad spectrum of ideas was represented at the convocation, but all present had this one common goal.

The Dominican House of Studies' fine publication "Dominicana" recently published the reflections of some of the participants 10 months after the conclusion of the convocation. This report has, I feel, a great deal of merit, for it contributes further to the realization of Pope John's goal, a goal for which we all fervently pray during this period of strife.

I ask unanimous consent that the special report on the Pacem in Terris Convocation, entitled "World Peace: The New Conversation," be inserted into the RECORD so that all who share our interest in this vital subject may have access to this lucid commentary.

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

WORLD PEACE: THE NEW CONVERSATION—SPECIAL REPORT II ON THE PACEM IN TERRIS CONVOCATION

Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, head of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, called the International Convocation on the Requirements of Peace "a new conversation" when he announced the event as scheduled for New York City in mid-February, 1965. Dr. Hutchins hoped the discussion would be conducted "on a level somewhere between apathy and panic, and this side of the irrelevance of propaganda." He recently commended *Dominicana's* coverage of the Convocation (Spring issue) as "one of the best we have encountered," and joins here with other major participants in reflecting on the historic Convocation. It what light should the New York gathering now be seen and what concrete results have come from it?

In the late afternoon of February 17, sixty chosen "elders" of the world community came to the dais of the United Nations General Assembly Hall. Fully aware of the plight of mankind today, their prevailing mood was a hesitant expectancy. While listening to Vice-President HUMPHREY challenge the world to strive for a realistic peace, they looked out at an audience of 2200 invited guests, drawn from the academic, political and religious communities. It was the absence of peace, so painfully exposed in the gentle Pope John's Encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, which had brought participants and guests together; an impulse had arisen in conscientious men everywhere to articulate the meaning of the Pope's plea for themselves. Mr. HUMPHREY spoke of some who would "abandon the United Nations as an imperfect instrument for preserving world peace because they dislike our imperfect

world." Those present knew that the terror of nuclear war, the troubled state of Latin America and Asia, and the tremors in body and spirit of vast numbers of our human brotherhood, are merely symptomatic of this imperfection. Today the world cries for peace and yet there is no peace. Instead we live with mistrust and the megaton, with promises made and then broken, and each drains out a little of man's respect for man. The world figures in the Hall that afternoon knew that world peace is not an abstraction, much less an impossibility. But before he can share it, peace must be born within man's heart. Perhaps it was this common belief which struck the deepest chord among the participants. They realized their task on returning home: to use the highest of human achievements for the supreme goal the world community can seek.

At a distance of ten months, it is the glimpse of this vision which remains with Rhode Island's Senator CLAIBORNE PELL. In retrospect, he told *Dominicana* editors, "the convocation was a most remarkable gathering. It was both ecumenical and universal in its makeup and yet purposefully secular in its approach. The effect, which I know was apparent to all of us who participated, was to elevate to the highest degree our world concern for the survival of civilization. I know that each of us returned to our respective posts of service and duty illuminated and inspired by the pervasive spirit and intent of Pope John. And each of us therefore has been commissioned to do whatever he can, in our own small ways, to translate the great purpose of Pope John into constructive deeds and actions."

ROLE OF NATIONAL AND WORLD COMMUNITIES

To assist local groups, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions has been developing, since the close of the Convocation, a format for conferences on international cooperation. At one all-day conference held October 23, over fifty civic organizations sent representatives to Center headquarters in Santa Barbara, California, to hear addresses honoring the United Nations' International Cooperation Year (ICY), now drawing to a close. The audience listened to government and professional leaders outline problems the world faces with the scientific revolution of the last decade. The Honorable Theodore Lefevre, former Prime Minister of Belgium and presently in charge of Belgium's economic coordination and scientific development, pointed to the distinction between nationalism and patriotism. The nationalist's slogan—"my country, right or wrong"—differs from that of the patriot. The latter will try to guide his country in directions that benefit all men. In the aftermath of the Convocation many are beginning to see the worth of M. Lefevre's distinction. Dr. Hutchins told us, "The practical implementation of the principles discussed at our Pacem in Terris Convocation will depend upon the development of world opinion in support of a world community. Leaders in all countries now know that we shall have one world or none; but the governments of many countries are still bound by outmoded ideas of nationalism."

Certainly the United Nations' experience of the past decade shows the international community lacking a full realization of the important "principle of interdependence." This conception, of course, cannot emerge at the national level until it is appreciated by the individuals a government represents. Vice-President HUMPHREY, who had pointed out the difficulties of projecting the vision of a harmonious world society down to the personal level, expressed his opinion to *Dominicana* editors that it is in this area the Convocation will have lasting significance. "The Pacem in Terris Convocation may stand years from now as one of the events which, in

the perilous Twentieth Century, helped turn man from his course toward self-destruction toward a common quest for a better life.

"There is no question that, in the months since the convocation, all men—not merely those who participated in the Convocation—are more deeply aware of the perils of our time and the necessity of the never ending search for peace."

Reflecting further, the Vice-President said: "I am reminded each day of the words and actions of the men who came to the Pacem in Terris Convocation. I am sure that others in the world with responsibility for leadership bear similar remembrance. This may seem a small thing. But those who bear the remembrance are custodians of vast national military arsenals. They are the makers of policies which can turn their nations toward peaceful cooperation or toward international antagonisms.

"Nor is there any question that in these months man has come to realize more fully that, living under a nuclear cloud, it is incumbent on all men to preserve life and, inevitably, to perfect it."

This country's search was highlighted by the White House Conference, held at the end of November. Drawing a wide variety of creative thinkers, the conference looked toward new or improved channels for private and official cooperation on national and international levels.

The concept of law as basic to any lasting world peace has come rapidly to the fore since the International Convocation. Within six months of the Convocation's closing, the Washington Conference On World Peace Through Law assembled three thousand judicial officials, legal experts and observers, from over one hundred countries, for a meeting which culminated Saturday, September 18, with the adoption of a "Declaration of Faith In World Order Under Law" and a "Global Program of Research and Action." The purpose of the Conference was to open channels for the development and communication of legal processes, highlighted there as vital instruments in fostering world harmony. The impact of this meeting on both the legal profession and the public was far-reaching. In conjunction with international celebrations of World Law Day, this meeting focused more attention on the rule of law as the best formal route to peace than has been done before. Chief Justice Earl Warren, in delivering the keynote address of the Law Conference emphasized this point when he said: "Our task at this conference is to move humankind forward along the road of peace . . . for mankind's most practical hope for world peace lies in an orderly world community under the rule of law."

In order to dramatize the meaning of the week-long sessions some of the world's basic legal documents were brought together for the first time. Conferees and visitors viewed the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen displayed beside one another. This was the first time the 1225 authorized version of the Magna Carta had left Great Britain.

Resolutions were passed here establishing a World Center of Documentation for legal materials, appointing a staff of scholars to prepare a multilingual legal dictionary and another group to collect and publish a World Law Code which will include all generally accepted multilateral treaties.

THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS CONSCIENCE

The author of *Pacem in Terris* took his title of Pontiff seriously; John XXIII was interested in building bridges between men rather than delineating the gap of theological, philosophic and cultural differences already dividing mankind. His was a monumental effort to create a bond of sympathy

between "all men of good will," religious believers and atheists alike. The Convocation exemplified this effort by including as participants three religious leaders, Bishop Gullfoyle of New York, Professor Ramsey of Princeton Theological School and the late Dr. Paul Tillich. Four speakers came from Russia and Poland to present Communist viewpoints to the Convocation. This spirit of dialogue between ideologies has since spread and was particularly evident at the Conference on Peace and Change, held June 18-19 at Georgetown University. Under the auspices of the Forces of Change Discussion Program of Dr. Hutchins' Center, the Fellowship of Reconciliation of Nyack, New York, and the Washington Peace Center, the assembly was a regional reflection of the Convocation spirit. This meeting was one of a series of one hundred Convocations for Leaders of Religion, which began a month after the February Convocation in New York had dissolved. In six concentrated sessions over two days, men and women influential in the local community's religious life are challenged with the moral and technological implications of our nuclear age. These conferences will continue through 1967 in major American cities. The Fellowship, a national co-sponsor with the Forces of Change group, has a broad Christian backing while the Washington Peace Center is a local agency of the American Friends (Quakers) Service Committee.

The relationship of peace to civil rights for minority groups was highlighted by CORE's James Farmer and Fr. Philip Berrigan, S.S.J.; Robert Theobald and Ben E. Seligman examined the implications of technology—especially cybernation—for the world's future; and socialist Norman Thomas offered his views on the international political situation. The diversity of speakers only served to focus attention on their common cause: the peaceful solution of trans-national problems.

The sponsoring of the Georgetown Conference by religious organizations points up a new and welcome phenomenon on the secular scene. Inspired by Pope John's attitude toward the world's problems, men of every ethical and religious persuasion are stepping into the middle of economic, social and political arenas to offer a guidance which is finding ready acceptance.

The attention to moral leadership by upright men everywhere came clearly into focus with Pope Paul's visit to the United Nations on the twentieth anniversary of its foundation this past September. It is now known that Mr. C. V. Narasimham, adviser to Secretary-General U Thant, suggested at a preliminary meeting for the Convocation in Racine, Wisconsin, during May, 1964 that Pope Paul be invited to the gathering. Shortly afterward, rumors of a papal visit became rampant. Although the Pope shared the Convocation's ideals and did send a message which was read at the first assembly, he apparently decided to postpone his visit until the anniversary celebration. In this way he acted in full accord with the objectives of the Convocation: his appearance in the General Assembly seven months later served to strengthen the prestige of the United Nations, a need often emphasized in the participants' speeches.

Pope Paul's visit, like his predecessor's letter, lent tangible support to a growing number of Americans, with prominent Catholics among them, who are denouncing war in this nuclear age. Approaching the problem from differing viewpoints, their spokesmen are not unanimous in specific goals but all hoped the Church would speak in strong terms to a world equipped with the capacity to annihilate itself. Those deeply concerned with this possibility saw the Convocation bringing it into clear moral focus. On this point, Dr. H. Stuart Hughes, Professor of History at Harvard, stated to *Dominicana* editors that: "The great contribution of last February's Convocation on

Peace in Terris was to bring together the most advanced Catholic social thought and the secular movement devoted to the cause of peace. Non-Catholics who opposed nuclear war over a number of years now realized that their efforts were in full harmony with the latest teachings of the Church on international morality. Catholics similarly discovered that Pope John's words had behind them a massive endorsement from men of good will of the most varied religious and philosophical orientations. The result was a mutual reinforcement that strengthened the cause of peace everywhere."

Undoubtedly another effect of the Convocation will be heightened interest in the Vatican Council's long awaited Schema 13, "The Church in the Modern World." Part II, Chapter 5, Sections 1 and 2 of this Pastoral Constitution discuss the international community of the peoples and means of fostering peace. Peace is here seen as the work of justice and as the order willed by God for society. This presupposes on the part of man a constant effort at self-domination and of adaption to the changing needs of society. Justice, then, must be nourished by brotherhood. But we are cautioned that in the degree that man is a sinner, the danger of war always threatens, while insofar as he triumphs over sin, he can win the battle against violence. Both in the general principles the Constitution lays down and in the mandate it gives Christians to work for world peace, there are remarkable parallels between the statements of the Council and the Convocation.

While the Constitution does allow definite tasks to world organizations, it also declares that international order does not depend on such structures alone but on individual respect for justice and for fraternal and reciprocal friendship. If all peoples are to be liberated from abusive dependence, then the foundations of international cooperation on the economic level must be renewed. The Council calls for far-reaching modification of world commerce patterns in favor of the underprivileged nations, and the obstacles of economic, political and ideological ambition are castigated. The Council document holds Christians to cooperate in these steps; action should be organized and, where necessary, implemented in union with the separated brethren. This burden falls especially upon the followers of Christ because the prosperous nations of the world are generally what are known as "Christian" nations.

THE ROLE OF ECONOMICS

If the speeches at the New York Convocation served to direct world attention toward the work of the Council, this service was not unilateral. One of the two professional economists at the discussions, and one of five women ranked among the sixty participants, was Barbara Ward (Lady Jackson). Miss Ward has battled continually for a fairer distribution of the world's wealth. Her stature as a major twentieth century thinker is admitted even by those who do not agree with her diagnoses of international economic situations. But in view of the Council's position on aid to the underprivileged, Miss Ward's position requires depth consideration by every Christian. When *Dominicana* asked for a current analysis of the world's economic posture and how this had been affected by the Convocation, Miss Ward said:

"One of the purposes of the Conference on Peace in Terris was to bring home to the rich, white, post-Christian, ex-imperial peoples of the North Atlantic that they represent a small elite—under 20 per cent—of the world's population and yet enjoy over 70 per cent of the world's income, trade and investment. It must be said that 1965 was a good year in which to make the reminder since the combined national incomes of the wealthy nations has passed the 1,000,000 million dollar mark this year—nearly seven-tenths of the sum being the share of the

United States. In fact, the statistics of American wealth now reach almost into the realm of fantasy. By adding some \$30,000 million to its national income in 1964-65, the United States acquired, over and above its earlier income of some \$630,000 millions, the equivalent of the entire national income of the whole of Africa, or 50 per cent of the national income of the whole of Latin America. Thus, in a couple of years, the United States can add, almost casually, to the top of its pyramid of riches, the equivalent of the wealth available to its poorer Latin neighbors to the South.

The abolition of world poverty, Miss Ward believes, is demanded not so much by love, as by the justice principle in the humanistic Jewish, and Christian traditions. But for the Christian, these concepts are not mutually exclusive and the imbalance of economic development finds a striking paradigm in the New Testament.

"These disproportions recreate, at the world level, the relationship of Dives and Lazarus.

"Unhappily, the reactions of Dives are also being recreated. One can say that 1965 as a year has seen a decline in any urgency to do anything about the growing gap between rich and poor nations. The proportion of Western wealth devoted to capital assistance is actually declining as the level of aid remains the same and Atlantic national income soars upwards. Any policies to ease the discrimination against the poor nations' trade have been lost in wrangles about the site for the new United Nations Trade and Development Board. This pause is not, of course, only the fault of the rich. The war over Kashmir between Pakistan and India, two of the most aided nations in the world, has understandably lessened peoples' fervor. But it is also being used as an excuse to put international economic cooperation at the bottom of the agenda.

"Yet Lazarus is just as hungry, just as homeless, just as sick and unemployed. He still sits at the gate. He still requires, on a world scale, the assistance—in institutional change, in capital grants, in new trade policies—without which poverty remains a dead morass at the base of society, destroying those who live in it, and corrupting the conscience of those who take notice of it. At no time has a Christian witness, based on principle and compassion, been more needed to ensure that the wealthy West is 'not weary of well-doing.'

"Will it be made and sustained? Or will Christians, like any other comfortable, well-fed, well-housed and well-entertained group, 'pass by on the other side'?"

"PEACE IN OUR TIME"?

The cry "peace," once exchanged among men as a Christian greeting, as a pledge to a common law of love, has come upon hard times. Modern history has heard it shouted from lying lips. A British Prime Minister was so deceived by a depraved prophet that returning from negotiations on the eve of World War II, he triumphantly announced we would have "peace in our time." The catastrophe of that war, with bombings for the cities of the innocent and ovens for the ethnically disinherited, made mockery of the very word.

The vision of great world leaders, meeting to form the League of Nations in the glass ballroom of Versailles, had by then dimmed; today it threatens to blur again with the stalemates and disputes in the Security Council chamber of the United Nations.

Have men learned? Looking at the world situation, it seem not. Smoke rises from the scenes of carnage all over the world. Everyone apparently believes in peace, but few receive any evidence that others do. On October 4, Pope Paul stood on the dais in the General Assembly Hall where the International Convocation had opened eight months earlier. In the interim we had suf-

ferred the tragedies of Santo Domingo and Kashmir, witnessed the spectacle of Watts and seen war escalate in Vietnam. Was the Pope oversimplifying the case of peace when he told the United Nations delegates: "The real danger comes from man himself . . . If you wish to be brothers, let the arms fall from your hands . . . No more war, war never again"? Rather, he realized that the complicated structure of any peace-keeping organization depends ultimately on the motivation of its human component. No computer has a conscience, and in a real sense, statistics do not lie; only men do. International organizations may be necessary for initiating the "new conversation" the Convocation sought; but peace cannot reign until each of us, regardless of ideology or religion, speaks the word in concord with his neighbor. The "new conversation" will be far-reaching, according to Chief S. O. Adebo, Nigeria's Permanent Representative to the United Nations and one of the Convocation's spokesmen for the worlds emerging nations. The Ambassador told us: ". . . the greatest achievement of the Convocation was, to my mind, its success in projecting the message of Pope John's great encyclical to millions who had not till then heard it or understood its practical implications. This was the result of the special effort made by the organizers to ensure the widest possible publicity for the Convocation proceedings.

"Because of that successful effort, the impact of the Convocation has been tremendous and, in my opinion, will endure. It cannot be said that we now have, as a result, a transformed world. But we do have a slightly better informed world.

A TRIP TO MOSCOW AND EAST EUROPE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I came across a very interesting article in the May 11 issue of *Le Monde* by Paul de Auer entitled "Free Opinions, the Trip to Moscow and East Europe," which I have asked the Library of Congress to translate and which I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD.

I believe it contains ideas and thoughts of real merit, particularly because of its emphasis on the need not to let our attention become completely engrossed by the problems of Vietnam. He also points out that General de Gaulle may well take a lead in developing real "openings to the East" when he visits Russia.

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

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington 25, D.C.

Translation (French)

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

[Senator PELL]

[Source: *Le Monde*, May 11, 1966, Page 3]

FREE OPINIONS—THE TRIP TO MOSCOW AND EAST EUROPE

(By Paul Auer)¹

The decision of the French government to leave NATO has turned the public world opinion from the events in Southeast Asia and Central Africa to the problems in Europe.

It is quite a matter of course that the French are now judging whether this decision is in their interests. The National Assembly has already taken up this question. The governments of the other NATO member states have also taken their positions. This event can, however, not leave indifferent those countries of Central and East Europe

which do not have an opportunity to voice their anxieties.

These countries have, after losing the right of choosing their own system according to which they want to live, always maintained that a powerful Western organization engaging in a coordinated foreign policy is of vital interest to them. They know that their problems cannot be solved by the armies of the Atlantic Alliance but thanks to the fact of their existence, and, notably, on account of the presence of NATO troops and U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. They hoped that negotiations between West and East would one day bring about a general settlement of European affairs and, at this occasion, a closer examination of their own problems. They were convinced that such negotiations would bring only the desired results if, on the Western side, they were conducted by a powerful and united organization.

It is probable that the Soviet Union, right after the settlement of the Vietnamese affairs, will strive to come to a peaceful coexistence with the West in order to concentrate more on her defense against China's aspirations in Asia. Therefore, the Soviet leaders must already now be impressed with the fact that a peaceful coexistence can only be established on a solid and durable basis if the problems of East Germany and of the other countries of East Europe are solved according to the wishes of the respective peoples. It is evident that this can be materialized only if the border and limitations of armament problems are solved simultaneously, and if the settlement of European collective security satisfies Soviet Russia.

What the peoples at the present desire are: a) the end of the war in Southeast Asia; b) a resumption of European cooperation with Great Britain joining the Common Market and negotiations in the interest of a European political organization that will enable our continent to become an equal partner to the United States; c) the diplomatic preparation for a parley with the USSR to arrive at a settlement of Central and East European problems.

General de Gaulle promised Chancellor Erhard to bring up the problem of Germany's unification at his Moscow visit at the end of June. The President of the French Republic will render an important service to Europe and to the cause of peace if he tries in a relatively relaxed atmosphere to convince his interlocutors that situations contrary to nature can in the long run only be maintained by force. Such a force used against a strong people will in the course of time create violence, revolutions and wars.

This is not only true in the case of Germany but applies also to the other countries of Central and East Europe ruled by dictatorial regimes. The German problem is not the only European problem that needs to be solved in the interest of peace. We are too easily inclined to forget what had happened in Yalta and then in 1956.

It is not sufficient to state that the atmosphere in the countries of Central and East Europe has improved. It cannot be denied that it is more tolerable now than prior to the death of Stalin in spite of a certain tension of recent times. But does one really believe that the nations will accept this situation as final, that peoples of high culture and Western mentality will renounce forever the possibility of controlling and criticizing their government in the press and in parliament? That they will continue being satisfied with one political party and voting on one list only? That they will still tolerate for a long time unjustified arrests for alleged political crimes and a sub-standard living? And does one really believe that cultural exchanges only—even their usefulness is debatable—and commercial treaties which the West tries to conclude with them in order to enlarge its marketing areas will stimulate the evolution in such a measure that the

problems will then soon solve themselves to the satisfaction of these peoples with the result that the explosive elements in that region disappear? Certainly not. These problems will not be solved and peace in Europe cannot be guaranteed unless the negotiations in the interest of these peoples are started from a strong position and concessions demanded, and offered at the same time in other provinces. Those who insist on letting the Asians and Africans live as they want should also permit the Europeans to organize their lives according to their interests and desires.

Let us therefore hope that the President of the Republic of France will not limit his parley in Moscow to the German problem, only but also bring up the problems of the other countries of East Europe. After having told the NATO member states to withdraw their troops from French territory, he is now in an excellent position to ask the USSR to withdraw her troops from Hungary and Poland and to respect the fundamental freedom of more than 100 million Europeans.

(Translated by Paul Vidal.)

HOW WILL AUTHORITIES PREVENT PROFITEERING UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in less than 6 weeks the hospital and physician insurance parts of Medicare will go into effect. More than 18 million Americans over 65 will be covered. Although a good deal of attention has been centered on this large new system for protecting the aged directly, and their families indirectly, against the high cost of medical and hospital services, the public still has questions.

I tried to answer many of these questions in an interview in a recent issue of *Look* magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the interview be printed in the RECORD.

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

Senator ANDERSON, do you anticipate continuous opposition to Medicare from many doctors?

Not really. Some doctors in one community in New Jersey a few years ago said they would treat no patients under Medicare, and there have been a few medical societies that have passed resolutions urging members to boycott the program. But the public and other physicians were quick to condemn that attitude. The AMA president, Dr. James Z. Appel, has stated that Medicare is the law of the land and that while doctors as individuals could refuse treatment of the aged, to do so in organized groups would probably invite action under the anti-trust laws. Sure, some doctors are going to talk about Federal controls and wave all the old battle flags, but they will be few.

If a patient's family doctor does refuse to treat him under the Medicare program, what can the patient do?

He can go to another doctor. The bill gives him complete freedom of choice. But I honestly don't think very many physicians are going to refuse him care. They treat other patients who are under Blue Shield, and commercial insurance companies, which will handle doctors' bills under Medicare.

Physicians have received hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal money over the years to treat welfare and other patients without Federal interference. The hospitals in which they practice have been built in large part with Federal Hill-Burton funds. I think most doctors recognize this, and

¹ Former Hungarian minister to France.

Medicare patients will receive just as good care as other patients.

How will you prevent doctors from performing unnecessary operations or ordering automatic hospitalization for the aged?

Studies show that far too often, doctors perform unnecessary surgery, but this happens most often in the institutions that, in other ways as well, fail to provide the best care. Hospitals affiliated with medical schools, and others with teaching programs, are seldom guilty.

Most good hospitals now have tissue committees that conscientiously monitor operations and analyze organs removed and case records to make sure that the operations were necessary. The fact that, under Medicare's provisions, a hospital-staff committee may look at the case to check if hospitalization was medically proper will discourage doctors from automatically ordering a person into a hospital if such care isn't actually needed.

Do you see any sign that doctors and hospitals will inflate their fees to profiteer on Medicare?

Well, I wouldn't call it profiteering. There are some signs that physicians are taking steps to increase their fees and charges before July 1. I am a little reluctant to call anyone a profiteer, but I am distressed about reports of fees being inflated to get the most out of Medicare. I am concerned that some physicians may regard the program as an open invitation to give unnecessary treatment—such as vitamin injections, unwarranted laboratory tests and the like—simply because Medicare will pay. I learned that in Gary, Ind., several years ago, when the health benefits of the United Steelworkers' contract there included outpatient X-ray services, many physicians put in X-ray machines because there was now a guarantee of payment for such services.

We have reports that some physicians will go into a nursing home, spend ten minutes to see ten welfare patients and send bills for each of them for examinations, I don't want to see this type of medicine. Not only is it bad medicine but it's costly. Regrettably, there are such cases, and they are documented. One physician testified before a Senate committee: "We watched a doctor who came in, took off his coat, put it on his arm, and 20 minutes later, left the nursing home. I asked the nurse how many patients he had seen. He had seen 20 patients in those 20 minutes."

I've suffered from tuberculosis, diabetes, shingles, heart disease and undergone major surgery twice in recent years. So I depend quite heavily on physicians and know the vast majority to be honest men. But I think there are also a few who will try to abuse this program. The honest doctors are going to have to watch their colleagues, and of course, the Congress that created this program will be watching too.

Many of our hospital beds are occupied by people over 65. How much do you expect this figure to rise?

The aged now account for about 25 percent of hospital bed-days occupancy. If they were to increase their use as much as 20 percent, total hospital use by patients of all ages would rise only five percent, which is not too much. But many hospitals are jammed. Some preliminary work, such as diagnostic tests, can be performed before the patient is admitted to the hospital, thereby shortening his hospital stay and reducing costs. There will be increased use after July 1, but I think it will level off, and with alternative kinds of care for the physician and patient actually to choose, we can get wiser use of facilities. It should also be understood that the initial increased usage will not be frivolous; there is much unmet medical need among older people, which, quite properly, should be taken care of.

With the heavier use of hospitals by the aged, will there be a shortage of doctors and facilities for handling emergency cases?

There is already a shortage of physicians and, in some places, of hospital facilities, unrelated to Medicare. But Medicare covers some alternatives to hospital care, such as the use of outpatient diagnostic clinics and doctors' offices. I don't think the aged, come July 1, will pour into the hospitals and flood the corridors, especially right after the program becomes effective and those who couldn't afford care before can get it.

One of the things that concerns me as much as the shortage of physicians, nurses and hospitals is that we don't properly employ those we now have. We have a heavy concentration of doctors in cities. We have hospitals that unnecessarily duplicate facilities available in other nearby institutions. Since it is going to be a long time—despite the increased Federal aid for medical students, construction of medical schools and training of other health personnel—before we close the gap, it is absolutely essential that we use more efficiently the personnel and facilities we now have.

Will standards for hospital accreditation be lowered to provide more beds for the hundreds of thousands of new patients?

I certainly hope not. The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals, whose standards the law follows, is composed of representatives of the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association and other professional groups. I do not expect those organizations, which have worked over the years to improve standards, to suddenly reverse their position and let down the barriers. It doesn't help the health of our people, when hospitals are in short supply, to call what amount to large rooming houses hospitals. As we build more medical schools, the prospects increase that more hospitals will have affiliation with teaching institutions. We know from experience that such hospitals offer excellent care.

How will Medicare protect old people from being bilked by quacks?

The Medicare law defines a physician as an individual "legally authorized to practice medicine and surgery by the state." So we are not going to be paying charlatans. If a man is not a physician, his bill for "medical service" will not be paid.

Many doctors not now certified as surgeons perform operations in privately owned hospitals. Will this be permitted under Medicare?

As the Medicare proposal moved through Congress, some of our friends in medicine and public health urged us to require that generally only board-certified physicians—that is, diplomates of the American Board of Surgery—be reimbursed for surgery performed on the aged.

WHAT IT WILL COVER

Hospital service (excluding physicians' services) for a period of up to 90 days in a spell of illness.

Posthospital extended care for up to 100 days in a spell of illness.

Outpatient diagnostic services at a hospital and posthospital home health services—as many as 100 visits a year.

*Doctors' bills for home, office and hospital visits.

*Surgery, consultation and specialists' fees.

*Home health services; previous hospitalization not required.

*Laboratory and X-ray tests outside a hospital.

*X-ray, radium and radioactive-isotope therapy.

*Rental of durable medical equipment.

*Ambulance services, Surgical dressings.

*This coverage available only to those who have taken out the \$3-a-month medical insurance.

WHAT IT WON'T COVER

Cost of private-duty nurses. Long stays in nursing homes.

Routine physical checkups and general dental care.

Routine eye and ear examinations. Eyeglasses and hearing aids.

Drugs outside the hospital or institution. Custodial care.

Note: The patient pays the first \$50 in a calendar year under the voluntary part. He also must pay 20 percent of additional expenses above the \$50. The patient also pays the first \$40 of his total hospital bill for the first 60 days and \$10 a day on the next 30 days. After the first 20 days in an extended-care facility, he pays \$5 a day. He pays the first \$20 for outpatient diagnostic care (but he can count this toward the \$50 deductible) and 20 percent of the amount over that.

Of course, that might be an ideal situation, but it would mean that a lot of people who needed surgery could not have it performed because there are a limited number of such doctors in some parts of the country. So Medicare will pay for surgery performed by any licensed physician. In the future, however, desirable standards may be established.

How would you encourage this?

Perhaps—and this is only an idea—we would want to develop within the General Accounting Office, which is Congress' watchdog on Federal spending, teams of medical auditors who could review the records on a particular surgical procedure. Then, in consultation with physicians, these teams could evaluate the information they had gathered to see if there was any unusual rise in surgical procedures as a result of Medicare.

Some profiteers have already entered the nursing-home field. Will more of the aged now be victimized by firetrap homes staffed by incompetents?

I should make it absolutely clear that Medicare does not cover nursing-home care generally. The program pays for a very special type of care after a period in the hospital. We deliberately called it "posthospital extended care" to avoid any notion that we were going to pay for long-term stays in a home or even for brief custodial or domiciliary care. About \$500 million worth of nursing-home care is provided annually from public funds. Even though half this amount comes from the Federal Government, too often old people are kept in homes with dangerous conditions, without registered nurses, without adequate records and without any degree of supervision by a physician, mostly because welfare cannot pay for good-quality care. Medicare is not going to encourage that kind of care by paying for it. State agencies may continue to wink at substandard conditions, but substandard homes will not qualify for Medicare patients, and Medicare standards will avoid the danger to health at many existing homes.

What limitation will be placed on the care of the senile? If they cannot be looked after by members of their families, will they be provided with nursing-home care indefinitely?

No. Medicare is designed to take care of the very heavy expenses involved in hospitalization and physicians' fees. It is not designed to take care of people who have to spend years in bed and who really require long-term personal care. But public assistance can aid those who require prolonged custodial care beyond the capacity of their personal resources, and, relieved, of a major part of the cost of caring for indigent aged by Federal programs, the states should be able to raise their payments for nursing-home services.

Will Medicare require that doctors prescribe "generic drugs" rather than the higher cost trademark drugs?

Medicare pays for drugs only for patients in hospitals or in extended-care facilities.

Hospitals by and large use generic drugs, a procedure recommended by the American Hospital Association. We wrote into the bill prohibitions against the prescription of drugs that were not approved by hospital committees or were not in approved formularies. The drug industry urged that Medicare be amended to pay for any drugs prescribed by a patient's physician, but we wisely refused. The industry proposal would probably have increased Medicare's costs by use of higher-priced trade-name drugs.

How will medical care be provided for people in isolated rural areas?

About the way it is provided now. Rural areas generally suffer from a shortage of medical personnel and facilities, and the seriously ill frequently have to travel to the cities in order to get adequate care. It seems to me that the Federal Government, which is providing grants and loans to medical students, might want to offer inducements to young physicians to practice in rural areas.

The day may come when medical personnel will fly by helicopter—in "airborne clinics"—to these isolated areas. But, of course, complicated cases and major surgery will still have to be taken care of mainly in the metropolitan areas.

After Canada's Province of Saskatchewan adopted its prepaid plan, patients who wanted nonemergency surgery had to wait as long as six months for beds. Are we going to have a similar problem during the first months of Medicare?

The situation in Saskatchewan was different. The entire population was covered, and hospitals were fuller when their program started. In this country, hospitals are not so crowded, although patients awaiting elective surgery normally wait days or a few weeks for an operation. Priority is given cases that need immediate admission. I am quite confident that any aged patient who needs surgery will have it done promptly and that the physicians will establish the same sort of priorities that now prevail in handling non-Medicare patients.

Many people feel that, over the next few years, many new hospitals and nursing homes will have to be built. Will Medicare provide some funds for this purpose?

No, not directly, but Medicare will pay the reasonable cost of care in these facilities, and that will serve as an incentive for the construction of additional extended-care facilities. Medicare payments will include depreciation allowance that can be used to finance the rebuilding of obsolete hospitals. More hospitals and nursing homes are needed, but I think we have to be quite careful about the kinds we build and where we build them. We really need to do a far better job of planning.

The Hill-Burton program, which began in 1946, has put hundreds of millions of Federal dollars into the construction of nonprofit hospitals and nursing facilities. The Federal Housing Administration and the Small Business Administration provide loans and guarantees for profitmaking nursing homes. These need to be stepped up, but only in accordance with the best in local planning and the highest standards of care.

We are accustomed to the idea that the cost of almost anything can be reduced. Do you have any hope that the expansion of medical services under Medicare will lead to some cost reduction through the use of more economical techniques?

Not in the near future. I expect that with the wage scales in hospitals leveling off, we may find hospital costs will not rise as sharply as they have. We need to modernize our hospitals—one-third of them are frightfully obsolete. The estimated cost of this modernization is over \$4 billion. In New York City alone, modernization and replacement of obsolete hospitals—without even

trying to construct new bed capacity—would run at least \$250 million; in greater Chicago, \$180 million. Old hospitals are deteriorating rapidly, and care in these hospitals is inefficient. But hospital services don't lend themselves to mechanization to the same extent as manufacturing processes, so medical care will probably never benefit as much from productivity increases as do most other industries.

You once suggested that we need to develop alternatives to high-cost general-hospital care. What do you have in mind?

When the cost of short-term care in general hospitals is running around \$50 a day, we need to provide the physicians with some alternatives. More emphasis on prevention is required so that illness can be detected before it becomes expensive to relieve and a threat to life. You know, if we could do a better job—and we are making some gains—in early detection of cancer, we might cut the long stays in hospitals and convalescent homes. Too many patients use costly hospital beds when they might be just as well-off in less-intensive nursing wards or convalescent units affiliated with the hospital. Costs might be cut in half. But the fact is that even those less-intensive-care units require trained personnel. Medicare, for example, requires that the extended-care facility have a full-time RN.

Right now, there are hospital wards that are closed because of a lack of nurses to staff them. Everything possible should be done to encourage the return of women who have left nursing and who may now have raised their own families and are free to resume this vital service.

Under Medicare, we understand that review committees will determine whether or not hospital rooms are being properly utilized. What will happen in the case of patients who resist being discharged, even though the utilization-review committee feels hospitalization is no longer necessary?

We must rely on the doctors. One of the real gains in Medicare over some other health-insurance programs is its alternatives to prolonged hospitalization. A patient whose doctor considers him ready may move on to an extended-care facility, where the costs are only about half as much as the general-hospital bed, and Medicare will continue to cover him. Or the doctor may recommend that he be sent home and be seen by a visiting nurse or a therapist. That means a further reduction in costs. Or the patient can take advantage of Part B and receive care in the physician's office. One of the problems with hospital use now is that much of present insurance does not cover enough of these alternatives, and so sometimes a patient—young or old—occupies an expensive hospital bed because that is the only place his policy covers.

This belief in using less costly types of medical facilities when the patient and hospital would be better served was behind my fierce antagonism last year to a proposal of Sen. RUSSELL LONG. He advocated taking off any limits on a Medicare patient's stay in the hospital and skilled nursing home. Sen. PAUL DOUGLAS, a Medicare champion, at first supported Long's amendment. But he helped me defeat it later. PAUL, who was wounded while with the Marines in the South Pacific, recalled that he had been in a naval hospital about 12 or 13 months. "One morning, I awoke," he told us, "and thought, 'Isn't this a nice, comfortable life?' Suddenly, I realized what was going through my mind, and I got out of there." We don't want the patient to remain hospitalized beyond useful stays.

Will privately owned hospitals and nursing homes be permitted to make a profit on Medicare patients as they are now allowed to do on Blue Cross patients?

Generally, the major return to proprietary hospitals and homes is the payment of salary

for the services of the owner, an allowable cost for reimbursement under Medicare. Whether there will be a specific payment to take into account the actual money investment has been an issue.

Some hospitals claim they now lose money on most Blue Cross cases. Will such hospitals also lose money on Medicare?

No. The law requires that hospitals be paid the cost of the care they provide older people. The hospitals will be much better off financially under Medicare. They have often had to pick up the tab for indigent patients who are either totally unable to pay or for whom welfare programs pay only a small portion of the actual cost. The hospitals have had to appeal to charity for aid. Medicare will relieve them of the unfair burden of providing needed care to persons without the capacity to pay. They will be paid the "reasonable cost."

How will the reasonable cost of a hospital stay be worked out?

The law provides that consideration be given to all necessary expenses incurred in rendering hospital services—including the costs of training for nurses and other medical personnel, and expenses for research—as well as to the principles for reimbursement that have been developed by private organizations. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has consulted with these organizations in the development of the regulations. Congress intended that payments be fair to hospitals, to the beneficiaries of the hospital-insurance program and to other patients, and that they reflect differences in the quality and intensity of care provided by the individual hospitals.

Why was Blue Cross chosen to serve as a middleman for Medicare?

Blue Cross is the creature of the hospitals, and the hospitals wanted Blue Cross to administer Medicare. I opposed making Blue Cross the administrator of the total, vast new program because it isn't clear they would represent the broad public interest, and we are dealing with billions of dollars in public money. Responsibility for administration is lodged solely with Social Security—a public agency. I think it is perfectly all right, however, that Medicare permits Blue Cross to be an agent of the hospitals in dealing with the Government, but not to set policy on the spending of public funds.

Since Blue Cross has failed to restrain the steady increase in hospital costs during the past two or three decades, how can it be counted upon to hold down costs now?

I don't think Blue Cross ought to be charged with all the blame for rising hospital costs. Expensive new equipment, personnel to operate it, rapid increases in labor costs—labor takes two-thirds of the hospital budget—have driven costs up. I think Blue Cross, over the years, should have taken greater responsibility in those areas where some restraints could be exercised, but it is moving in this direction now. For example, Blue Cross has refused to sign participation agreements with hospitals that are expanding or being built contrary to the judgment of community hospital-planning agencies. This is a real weapon in preventing unnecessary hospital construction.

With its new responsibilities under Medicare, will Blue Cross be able to offer adequate service to its subscribers?

I think so. The aged as a group have represented the heaviest per capita claims burden for Blue Cross. With the Federal program taking care of a large slice of the health costs of the elderly, Blue Cross plans should be able to provide a broader package of benefits for older persons, supplementing Social Security hospital insurance at a price they can more easily afford to pay. I suspect that hospital costs will continue to rise, and therefore, Blue Cross and other premiums will go up. But I certainly believe that these increases should not be near the 25

and 50 percent jumps in premiums that have become so commonplace. This should help younger subscribers, whose rates have been affected to a significant extent by the high-claims experience of the aged.

What will be the effects of Medicare on the costs of hospital insurance for people under 65?

The health-insurance companies keep going to state insurance commissions to ask for substantial rate increases. Aside from the general rise in health costs, one of the reasons for premium increases has been the burden of protecting the aged, whose costs generally are greater than any other group's. Now, if we cover the aged under a Government plan, the premium increases for those under 65 should be less than those of recent years.

Since Medicare benefits do not apply until the patient reaches the age of 65, what will happen to someone who is 62 or 63, too ill to work and unable to afford regular medical care?

The Medicare bill we passed last year also provides a new program for the medically indigent under 65. It may be that the states, at least the poorer ones, will not provide sufficient matching money to make this program adequate. But there are incentives in terms of Federal cost sharing to encourage these states to do so.

Will some substantial funds be invested in research into the diseases of the aged?

This year, the National Institutes of Health are spending almost \$10 million on geriatrics research. While that is specifically directed at the ill of old age, the NIH is spending over \$1 billion on all medical research, with particular attention to cancer and heart diseases. Work on establishment of centers for cancer, stroke and heart diseases—afflictions primarily of the elderly—is also moving ahead.

Many people believe there will be a gradual lowering of the age for eligibility under Medicare. Do you foresee such a development?

I have watched for a quarter-century, as the original Social Security program has grown in response to obvious need. The disability protection is an example. We began that in 1956 for persons over 50, and then, because it was somewhat arbitrary, we later removed the age limit. We have lowered retirement ages, made it easier for widows to receive benefits and increased those benefits over the years to keep pace with the cost of living.

You just don't put this kind of program in concrete and vow never to change it no matter what. Our Government and our society simply do not work that way. We have to be flexible. The Advisory Council on Social Security recommended last year that Medicare cover some 975,000 disabled workers under 65 because they face the same plight as so many aged—low or no income, high medical costs and inability to get adequate health insurance.

But I don't foresee Medicare growing into a sweeping program for all ages. After all, private health insurance has done reasonably well at covering workingmen and women and their families. Moreover, the broad improvements in Title XIX of the law could cover as many as 35 million indigent and low-income people. That is quite a sleeper in this law. It is the extension of Kerr-Mills, which originally covered only the aged, to all medically needy persons. I want to see us maintain a strong private-health-insurance sector. Private insurance tried for years to cover the aged adequately. It failed. That is why we needed and got Medicare. I don't see the same problems for those under 65.

Do you anticipate many major changes in Medicare in the next five years?

Not in five years. We will need several years to test out what has been done and not make changes until we are certain.

In general, how well do you feel the Medicare program will work in the first months, the first years and the future?

A program covering 18 million or more persons over 65, involving some 5,000 hospitals and about 200,000 physicians, obviously is going to experience some rough ground. Medical people and patients will have complaints, some of them justified. Congress will hear those complaints and, where justified, will try to remedy them. The first months will show us where the bugs are, but then, the program will stabilize, and I think people will recognize it as a very useful system.

DISCLOSURE OF ASSETS AND INCOME FOR 1965 OF SENATOR AND MRS. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, during the last several years I have published an annual statement of my income and assets. I began this practice as a Chicago alderman in 1940, and, more recently, as a Senator. I have felt that this should be a continuing and not a sporadic disclosure. Continuing with this practice, I now wish to make such a disclosure for 1965, and, as before, to make this a joint statement for both my wife and myself:

Income of Mr. and Mrs. Paul H. Douglas for 1965 classified by source

U.S. Senate.....	\$29,947.91
Add:	
Reimbursed travel.....	490.54
Reimbursed office expense.....	900.00
Unused stationery allowance.....	989.52
Subtotal.....	2,380.06
Total.....	32,327.97
Less:	
Travel expense.....	3,211.59
Home office expense.....	900.00
Cost of living, Washington, D.C.....	3,000.00
Subtotal.....	7,111.59
Total.....	25,216.39
Annuities: University of Chicago.....	2,270.28
Annuities: Teachers insurance and annuity.....	793.14
Dividends.....	1,336.16
Capital gains.....	1,260.29
Interest.....	202.85
Book royalties, articles and honorariums for lecture less travel.....	4,458.52
Total income.....	35,537.62

II

Just as I did last year, I think I should include an explanation of two features of the statement; namely, first, the necessary expenses of a public official, and second, income from lectures. I do not think the general public realizes the necessary expenses involved in holding elected office. I have tried to keep a fairly accurate account of these items and estimate them for 1965 as follows:

1. Travel to and within home State.....	\$3,211.59
2. Radio and television program.....	1,570.00
3. Entertainment of constituents and others.....	4,051.00
4. Contributions to political organizations and candidates.....	635.00

5. Incidentals:

Western Union and telephone.....	\$16.25
Subscriptions and memberships.....	643.90
Miscellaneous.....	88.35
Total.....	10,216.09

Several comments should be made about these items. I receive a mileage allowance at the beginning of each session of Congress of \$307. In addition, each year I am allowed actual transportation costs for six trips to any one point in my home State. I try to make at least two trips a month back to Illinois while the Senate is in session and last year I was in the State for 95 days and visited nearly every county. I spoke at well over 250 meetings in Illinois during the year. I regard this reporting to the people and obtaining their views in return as an essential part of my job. Despite these necessary trips back to Illinois, I have been able to answer just about 94 percent of all the rollcalls during my more than 17 years in the Senate. Last year I answered 97 percent. I hope I may be pardoned if I point out that according to the Congressional Quarterly my 17-year average of 94 percent is more than 8 percentage points higher than the 86-percent average for the Senate as a whole during the last 12 years. Last year I answered 251 of the 259 rollcalls.

The coming of radio and television has widened the scope and increased the cost of adequately reporting to the people. Some stations have generously shared these costs with me, but the net expense in a normal year is between \$2,200 and \$2,500.

More and more people are coming to visit our National Capital. This is a very healthy and constructive development. Many naturally expect their Senators to show them attention and offer them modest entertainment. It is not only a duty but also a pleasure to do this and during a large part of 1965 I held two receptions a week and met with smaller groups at luncheons and teas. All of this also costs money, approximately \$4,051. In my judgment, my legitimate entertainment expenses are much more than the amounts listed, but I am only counting these sums.

I regard contributions to my party and to candidates in whom I believe to be as much a civic duty as contributions to church and charity. If more of us would share these burdens, then parties and candidates would be freed from a humiliating and sometimes compromising search for necessary funds to wage the campaigns which are essential to the proper functioning of our democracy.

It will be seen that my total expenses for these purposes in nonelection years are around \$10,000. In election years such as this my personal political expenditures paid from my own pocket will probably amount to at least \$15,000.

If we add the average political expenses of \$10,000, the income tax of \$4,005.50 on the base salary, another \$1,000 for local property taxes in Chicago and Washington, and the \$2,250 for the 7½-percent contribution to the annuity

fund, I had left an apparent take-home pay for the year of approximately \$12,774. But expenses inside Cook County not included in the above came to at least another \$3,000, making my actual net income from my job, between \$9,000 and \$10,000.

Considering the other personal costs of living and the heavy burden of election campaigns, it is obvious that it would be very difficult to stay in public life were it not for the lectures which I give and which last year together with royalties brought in \$4,731. I should therefore add a few words of explanation about these. I have made it a general rule never knowingly to accept a lecture or other fee from any organization which to my knowledge seeks national legislation or a given foreign policy. I have therefore confined my paid addresses to educational institutions, forums, and social clubs, and have tried to guard against being influenced by lecture fees. Moreover, I try to arrange these lectures during periods in which the Senate is not in session or on weekends so as not to interfere with my Senate duties.

III

And now for our holdings of property. Mrs. Douglas and I own jointly our house and adjoining lots in Washington subject to a mortgage of approximately \$6,000. I do not know what the precise net worth of these properties is, but I believe it is not far from \$50,000. In addition, of course, we own the usual amount of furniture and a fairly extensive collection of books and reproductions of works of art along with a limited number of originals. I am unable to fix a value on these items. Some years ago we sold all our small holdings of stocks in order to remove any possibilities of conflicts of interest and put the proceeds into investment trusts which have such broadly distributed assets that we cannot identify any sources or be influenced by them. The market value of these stocks in May amounted to \$68,656.48. A listing of these is as follows: Stein, Roe & Farnham Fund, Inc., 496 shares; Growth Industries, 666 shares; Lehman Corp., 475 shares; Adams Express, 138 shares; Niagara Share, 600 shares; National Industries, 1,103 shares.

The major portion of these shares is owned by my wife, purchased from inheritances which she has received. In addition, we own \$10,500 of U.S. Government bonds and about \$500 of miscellaneous bonds and stock in public, cooperative, and quasi-cooperative institutions.

Three years ago I inherited \$11,316 from the estate of my brother. I gave \$2,280 of this to political candidates in whom I believed, used \$228 for Illinois travel expenses, met additional political expenses of \$4,214.11, and now have \$4,593.89 of this deposited in a special account. My personal bank account as of May 5, 1965, was \$2,912 and that of my wife \$1,950. However, I owe \$4,100 for radio and television tapes, but I hope to recoup about \$500 of this from certain radio and television stations which have generously offered to pay for part or all of the costs of the tapes furnished them.

I therefore estimate my net outstanding indebtedness at about \$3,600 plus \$6,000 on the mortgage, or a total of \$9,600.

As a result of wounds suffered on Peleliu and Okinawa, I was awarded a service-connected disability pension on retiring from the Marine Corps in 1946. Since being sworn in as a Senator in 1949 I have refused to receive a dollar of this on the ground that it was obvious that the wounds did not interfere with my ability to serve. The paymasters told me, however, that I could not turn these checks back to the Treasury and they have therefore credited these sums to my account. Some years ago these came to \$32,399.60 and this will be their approximate maximum as long as I am in the Senate. I shall not draw upon them as long as I serve as an elected official and upon retirement, it is my intention to accept such sums only if needed. Upon my death the principal is to be invested in Government bonds and put in a trust fund, the income of which is to be used for the benefit of my wife and my daughter, Jean. Upon their deaths the principal is, in turn, to revert to the United States of America with some emphasis upon the acquisition of added recreational land for the people of Illinois.

Taken all together, the net value of our holdings of property amount to approximately \$129,512.37 plus the \$32,399.60 credited to my account, but which after meeting retirement needs and the care of my wife and daughter, I intend as stated to have revert to the United States for the beneficial use of the people. Our total assets therefore amount to approximately \$161,911.97, plus the value of furniture, books, and works of art, not counting the withdrawal value of my senatorial pension rights. These holdings have been accumulated through lifelong savings and small inheritances. They were decreased this year by approximately \$8,000 because of losses in the value of investments, drawing upon an inheritance to meet added political expenses and increased indebtedness for radio and television.

These are the salient facts about our income and holdings as I have been able to compile them. I have had thermo-faxed copies made of my income tax statement for 1965, and this is open for inspection and verification at my office.

Speaking only for myself, I find the salary paid to Senators to be fair and adequate if one is able and willing to live a modest personal life.

I believe, however, that the people who elected me have a right to know these facts. Primarily, the disclosure of a Senator's income and assets is, I believe, the best assurance possible to the people that their representatives are not engaging in possible conflicts of interest. I am not, however, urging my point of view upon others and am making this statement merely as a personal matter.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH TURKEY CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is the practice of the Joint Committee on

Atomic Energy to inform the Senate when any proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy has been submitted to the committee pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In accordance with that practice I, as chairman of the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation, wish to inform the Senate that on May 3, 1966, a proposed amendment to this country's civil agreement for cooperation with the Turkish Republic was submitted to the committee.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the State Department and the Atomic Energy Commission and approved by the President, would extend the existing agreement for another 5 years, to June 9, 1971. Among the more significant revisions in the agreement which this amendment would affect, perhaps the most noteworthy is that providing for the transfer to the International Atomic Energy Agency of the responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities transferred under the agreement for cooperation. Presently, safeguards against the diversion of these materials and facilities to military purposes are administered by the United States.

Under the terms of the Atomic Energy Act this amendment, together with certain proposed diplomatic notes which are considered part of the amending agreement, must lie before the Joint Committee for a period of 30 days while Congress is in session before becoming effective. It is anticipated that, in accordance with the general practice of the Joint Committee, a public hearing on this matter will be held prior to expiration of this statutory waiting period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the amendment to the agreement with Turkey, together with copies of the above-mentioned diplomatic notes and other supporting correspondence.

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

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, Washington, D.C. May 3, 1966.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: Pursuant to Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) a copy of a proposed agreement amending the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, together with copies of proposed diplomatic notes which are to be considered as part of the amending agreement;

(b) a copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amending agreement; and

(c) a copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amending agreement and authorizing its execution.

The amending agreement, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended would revise and extend the Agreement between the United States of America and

Turkey which was signed at Washington on June 10, 1955, as amended by Agreements signed at Washington on April 27, 1961 and June 3, 1965.

The amending agreement would extend the Agreement for five years, until June 9, 1971. The Government of the Turkish Republic has agreed to the transfer to the International Atomic Energy Agency of safeguards responsibilities for materials and facilities transferred under the Agreement for Cooperation. Agreement with respect to this transfer would be effected by Article V of the amending agreement, together with the diplomatic notes.

Article II of the proposed amending agreement would permit the transfer to Turkey of material enriched to more than 20% in the isotope U-235 when there is a technical or economic requirement for such a transfer. Article IV would reflect the recent changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permitting private ownership of special nuclear material by enabling private parties in the United States and Turkey to be parties to arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material. Previously, such transactions were confined to Governments. Arrangements made directly between private parties under Article IV would be undertaken pursuant to applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the United States and Turkish Governments.

The amending agreement also includes several minor revisions. Article I would conform the fields of information exchange to our more current practice, while Article III would delete the now-obsolete requirement for the Turkish Government to retain title to enriched uranium it receives under the Agreement until such time as United States users may acquire title to such material. Article VII of the amendment would clarify Article IX of the Agreement for Cooperation by explicitly stating that the U.S. and Turkey "may" consult, not necessarily "will" consult, with each other concerning an additional agreement covering nuclear power production in Turkey.

The proposed amendment will enter into force when the two Governments have exchanged written notifications that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

Cordially,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

Enclosures:

1. Agreement amending the Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of the Turkish Republic, together with Notes (3).
2. Letter from the Commission to the President (3).
3. Letter from the President to the Commission (3).

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TURKISH REPUBLIC CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic, signed at Washington on June 10, 1955 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"), as amended by the Agreement signed at Washington on April 27, 1961, and the Agreement signed at Washington on June 3, 1965, and

Recognizing that, as the result of the consultations initiated in accordance with Article VI bis of the Agreement for Cooperation, the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic have agreed to promptly request the International Atomic Energy Agency to assume responsibility for the application of safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the Agreement for Cooperation,

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article I, Paragraph A of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"A. Subject to the limitations of Article V, the Parties hereto will exchange scientific, technical, and economic information useful for research, training, and application in the following fields:

"1. design, construction, operation, and use of research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments;

"2. the use of radioactive isotopes and source, special nuclear, or byproduct material in physical and biological research, medicine, agriculture, and industry; and the production of radioactive isotopes for such uses; and

"3. health and safety problems related to the foregoing."

ARTICLE II

Article II, Paragraph C of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"C. The Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make all or a portion of the foregoing special nuclear material available as uranium enriched to more than twenty per cent (20%) by weight in the isotope U-235 when there is a technical or economic requirement for such a transfer for use in research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed eight (8) kilograms of the isotope U-235 contained in such uranium."

ARTICLE III

Article II, Paragraph D of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is deleted in its entirety; Paragraphs E through H are lettered as D through G.

ARTICLE IV

Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information referred to in Article I, it is understood that either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction may make arrangements to transfer materials, including special nuclear material, and equipment and devices to, and to perform services for, authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other. Likewise, authorized private persons under the jurisdiction of either Party may make such arrangements with the other Party. Such arrangements shall be subject to:

"1. the limitations applicable to transactions between the Parties under Article II;

"2. Article V; and

"3. applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements of the Parties and their policies with regard to transactions involving private persons."

ARTICLE V

Article VI bis of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"ARTICLE VI BIS

"The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic, recognizing the desirability of mak-

ing use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement through an agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded to the United States Commission by Article VI of this Agreement, as amended, during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards as set forth in IAEA document Inf/Circ/66, and any revision thereof, apply to such materials and facilities."

ARTICLE VI

Article VIII of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended by deleting the date "June 9, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 9, 1971".

ARTICLE VII

Article IX of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the word "will" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "may".

ARTICLE VIII

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as hereby amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this _____ of _____, 1966.

For the Government of the United States of America:

DONOVAN Q. ZOOK,
Officer-in-Charge, Atomic Energy Affairs, International Scientific and Technological Affairs, Department of State.

WILLIAM L. YEOMANS,
Assistant Director for Program Development & Liaison, Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Turkish Republic:

ERDIL K. AKAY,
First Secretary,
Embassy of Turkey.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Initialed on April 18, 1966.

WASHINGTON, April —, 1966.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the Turkish Republic and the Government of the United States of America Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy which is being signed today.

In connection with the Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation, the Government of the Turkish Republic and the Government of the United States of America further agree as follows:

In the event any of the Parties to the trilateral arrangement envisioned in Article VI bis of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is unable to agree to the terms of that arrangement, either the Government of the Turkish Republic or the Government of the United States of America may, by notification, terminate the Agreement for Cooperation. In the event the Agreement for Cooperation should be so terminated by either Government, the Government of the Turkish Republic agrees that it shall, at the

request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to the Agreement for Cooperation still in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of the Turkish Republic for its interest in such material so returned at the United States Atomic Energy Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically.

It would be appreciated if you would confirm the agreement of the Government of the United States of America to the foregoing.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

Ambassador of the Turkish Republic:

ERDIL K. AKAY,
First Secretary,
Embassy of Turkey.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

DONOVAN Q. ZOOK,
Officer-in-Charge, Atomic Energy Affairs, International Scientific and Technological Affairs, Department of State.

WILLIAM L. YEOMANS,
Assistant Director for Program Development and Liaison,
Atomic Energy Commission.

His Excellency DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

Initialed on April 18, 1966.

WASHINGTON, April —, 1966.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to your note of April —, 1966, which reads as follows:

"EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the Turkish Republic and the Government of the United States of America Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy which is being signed today.

"In connection with the Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation, the Government of the Turkish Republic and the Government of the United States of America further agree as follows:

In the event any of the Parties to the trilateral arrangement envisaged in Article VI bis of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is unable to agree to the terms of that arrangement, either the Government of the Turkish Republic or the Government of the United States of America may, by notification, terminate the Agreement for Cooperation. In the event the Agreement for Cooperation should be so terminated by either Government, the Government of the Turkish Republic agrees that it shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to the Agreement for Cooperation still in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of the Turkish Republic for its interest in such material so returned at the United States Atomic Energy Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically.

It would be appreciated if you would confirm the agreement of the Government of the United States of America to the foregoing.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration."

I have the honor to confirm the agreement of the Government of the United States of America as requested.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

For the Secretary of State:

DONOVAN Q. ZOOK,
Officer-in-Charge, Atomic Energy Affairs, International Scientific and Technological Affairs, Department of State.

WILLIAM L. YEOMANS,
Assistant Director for Program Development & Liaison, Atomic Energy Commission.

His Excellency TURGUT MENEMENCIOLU,
Ambassador of the Turkish Republic.

ERDIL K. AKAY,
First Secretary,
Embassy of Turkey.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Initialed on April 18, 1966.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY
COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1966.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement amending the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, together with the enclosed proposed notes to be exchanged between the two Governments, which notes are to be considered as part of the proposed amending agreement, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amending agreement, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise and extend the Agreement between the United States of America and Turkey which was signed at Washington on June 10, 1955, as amended by Agreements signed at Washington on April 27, 1961, and June 3, 1965.

The proposed amending agreement would extend the Agreement for five years, until June 9, 1971. The Government of the Turkish Republic has agreed to the transfer to the International Atomic Energy Agency of safeguards responsibilities for materials and facilities transferred under the Agreement for Cooperation. Agreement with respect to this transfer would be effected by an article in the amendment, together with the enclosed notes.

Article II of the proposed amending agreement would permit the transfer to Turkey of material enriched to more than 20% in the isotope U-235 when there is a technical or economic requirement for such a transfer. Article IV would reflect the recent changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permitting private ownership of special nuclear material by enabling private parties in the United States and Turkey to be parties to arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material. Previously, such transactions were confined to Governments. Arrangements made directly between private parties under Article IV would be undertaken pursuant to applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the United States and Turkish Governments.

The amending agreement also includes several minor revisions. Article I would conform the fields of information exchange to our more current practice, while Article III would delete the now-obsolete requirement for the Turkish Government to retain title to enriched uranium it receives under the Agreement until such time as United States users may acquire title to such material. Article

IX would be clarified by explicitly stating that the U.S. and Turkey "may" consult, not necessarily "will" consult, with each other concerning an additional agreement covering nuclear power production in Turkey.

Following your approval, determination, and authorization, the proposed amending agreement will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic. In compliance with Section 123c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the agreement will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

The President,
The White House.

Enclosures:

1. Proposed Agreement Amending the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic.
2. Proposed Notes.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 22, 1966.

The Honorable GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me by letter dated April 20, 1966, a proposed agreement amending the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, together with proposed notes to be exchanged between the two Governments, which notes are to be considered as part of the proposed amending agreement, and has recommended that I approve the proposed amending agreement, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution.

Pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) approve the proposed amending agreement and determine that the performance of the Agreement as amended will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) authorize the execution of the proposed amending agreement on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

CONSIDER ALTERNATIVES

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer about the formulation of our Vietnam policy makes good sense.

It recalls that "U.S. policy in Vietnam has not been embarked upon blindly, with no consideration of alternatives or with no thought of what might happen if that policy is abandoned."

The paper points out that the framers of any policy must examine the alternatives and their probable consequences, and then take the calculated risk that the policy they have determined upon is the best that could be pursued.

I want to make this editorial available to my colleagues and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, May 8, 1966]

TO JUSTIFY POLICY—OR CRITICISM

"To justify a course of policy in its largest dimension," wrote Richard N. Goodwin, former assistant to President Kennedy and President Johnson, in a recent "New Yorker" article, "is to predict what will happen if that course is not taken; to prophesy the unknowable turns of history."

"All that any leader can do," he went on, "is call upon wisdom, judgment and national principle, a sense of history and a knowledge of present reality, and act on the speculative and intuitive guess that results."

This enormous limitation haunts the decision-makers at every moment of history, whether the course to be taken involves the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima, Hitler's invasion of Russia, the missile confrontation in Cuba, or U.S. military operations in Southeast Asia.

If the men who make the decisions could read the future, their task would be simple. Because they cannot, they are vulnerable to misjudgment and miscalculation—as Hitler was when he invaded Russia.

The framers of any policy must examine the alternatives and their probable consequences, and then take the calculated risk that the policy they have determined upon is the best that could be pursued. They may be mistaken. They can hope that they are not, and leave room for quick changes if events contradict judgment.

U.S. policy in Vietnam has not been embarked upon blindly, with no consideration of alternatives or with no thought to what might happen if that policy is abandoned. What if South Vietnam is thrown to the Communist wolves? What if Red China is given free rein to take over all Southeast Asia? What if we retreat ignominiously and leave people now free to Communist domination?

These possibilities loom large in our decision-making, and they should be given equal weight by those critics of U.S. policy who, untroubled by the responsibility of leadership, find fault with our presence in Vietnam.

To justify their fault-finding, these critics, in and out of the U.S. Senate, must also "prophesy the unknowable." They also have the burden of considering what may happen if their assessment is wrong—as it may well be. The men who make the decisions have their responsibility, and it is an awesome one; but those who criticize the decisions, once made, cannot escape their share of responsibility also. It is something to think about.

FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGMENT AGAINST THE HANNA COMPANIES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on April 27th last, in the U.S. District Court, Portland, Oreg., Judge Gus J. Solomon entered judgment for the Government after finding that the Hanna Nickel Smelting Co., wholly owned by the Hanna Mining Co., had breached its nickel stockpiling contract and overcharged the Government. The court awarded the Government \$560,633 in addition to \$63,525 which Hanna previously paid to satisfy one count of the complaint.

In exercising his discretion to allow interest on the improper overcharges from the date of overpayment rather than the date the breach was legally established, the court observed:

This is a classic case of unjust enrichment.

This is in strange contrast to a statement issued by Hanna when the court handed down its initial opinion last February. At that time, the president of Hanna, stated in part:

We are pleased with the report which vindicates the company's position and removes any question of the integrity of the company's performance and accounting.

This statement was both premature and inaccurate. Contrary to this assertion, the opinion of the district court demonstrates that the decision was not a vindication of Hanna's conduct but a repudiation of it.

Four years ago, a report made by the General Accounting Office, plus a statement inserted in the RECORD by Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, of Delaware, led the Senate Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves under the chairmanship of Senator SYMINGTON, to investigate this matter thoroughly.

As noted by Senator WILLIAMS in a statement on the Senate floor on May 29, 1962, the Comptroller General made the following points regarding the Hanna nickel contracts:

1. Although other contracts made by GSA under the Defense Production Act of 1950 that we have reviewed limited in varying degrees the financial risks of the contractors, the Hanna Mining and Smelting Company contracts eliminated practically any risk of financial loss to the Hanna companies. Under the Hanna contracts the Government guaranteed virtually all the contractor's capital investment and provided a market for all the contractor's production at prices which virtually preclude operating losses. . . .

2. The smelting contract permits Hanna to acquire clear title to the smelting facilities costing about \$22 million by paying the government the estimated salvage value of the facilities (about \$1,700,000) after the Government's advance has been amortized. . . .

3. The mining contract provides a basic fixed price of \$6 a ton for the sale of ore to the Government subject only to escalation of certain base costs and premiums or discounts for variances in the nickel content of the ore. The price was based on estimates submitted by Hanna, prior to actual operations, which indicated a rate of profit of about 90 percent of costs before taxes. Since the contract precludes GSA from examining the financial results of the mining operation, GSA is not in a position to ascertain the reasonableness of the estimate upon which the fixed price was established. . . .

Peculiarly limited as Hanna's obligations were under the contracts, the performance of those limited obligations came under the scrutiny of the subcommittee. The contract provided that costs of production were to be borne by the Government, while capital items were to be paid for by Hanna.

As a result of the hearings held in 1962, on November 8, 1963, the Department of Justice filed suit against the Hanna companies in the U.S. district court in Portland, Oreg., seeking damages for breach of contract. I was impressed then, as I am now, with the diligence and thoroughness with which

Senator SYMINGTON pursued the facts in this case. His chairmanship was a model of impartiality and dedication to the public interest for which he deserves the thanks of this body and of the American people.

The Government alleged that the overcharges arose because the Hanna Smelting Co.: First, charged to reimbursable costs of production various items which under the contract were actually expenditures for capital items; second, obtained an inflated price for approximately 19.5 million pounds of nickel to be delivered after March 31, 1961, this as the result of its erroneous statements to the Government with respect to its actual production costs; and third, failed to properly account for certain other expenditures and receipts, the latter resulting in an overstatement of reimbursable costs.

In February 1964 the Hanna companies admitted their liability arising out of the smelting company's failure to properly account for other expenditures and receipts, and therefore paid to the Government the sum of \$54,325, plus accrued interest of \$9,290, or a total of \$63,525, as claimed by the Government.

After an extensive trial of the remaining claims asserted by the Government, the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon found that Hanna had breached the contract with respect to some 38 items. Accordingly judgment on these items was entered in favor of the Government in the amount of \$231,506.

The court observed that the 38 capital items in question were expensed "solely to obtain reimbursement" from the Government for the expenditures that Hanna companies otherwise would have had to bear themselves.

In addition to the Government's recovery of \$231,506 for the capital items which the Government decided were unjustifiably charged to costs of production, the court reformed the contract as requested by the Department of Justice, so as to reduce the price the Government was obligated to pay for the 19.5 million pounds of nickel remaining undelivered after March 31, 1961.

The court found that the parties had agreed to a price which in turn was based on a formula that was predicated upon Hanna's 1959 and 1960 costs of production.

Since the court found, however, that the smelting company charged improperly capital items to its reported cost of production, the contract was reformed in order to reflect a price which was based on actual costs of production; and this reformation reduced the price by 1.24 cents per pound on the 19.5 million pounds of nickel scheduled to be delivered after March 31, 1961, as a result entitling the Government to obtain an additional recovery of \$241,798.

In its decision the court also granted the Government interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the amounts which the smelting company overcharged the Government. This return amounted to \$87,329.

These amounts, together with the \$63,525 already paid results in a total

recovery of \$624,158 by the Government from the Hanna Co.

The Department of Justice deserves congratulations for obtaining this large reimbursement to the Treasury as a result of the determination by the court of the illegality of the Hanna Co. costing under their nickel agreements with the Government.

It is to be hoped that the decision of the court will have a salutary effect on other contractors and businessmen coming into public office to see that their companies are not found to have been unjustly enriched in their dealings with the Government.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD a news article on the Federal court judgment against the Hanna Co. that appeared in the Portland Oregonian of April 29.

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

[From the Oregonian, Apr. 29, 1966]

JUDGE ORDERS HANNA TO PAY INTEREST ON U.S. OVERPAYMENTS

U.S. Dist. Judge Gus J. Solomon has issued an order and judgment awarding the federal government some \$624,154 from Hanna Nickel Smelting Co., of Riddle, Ore., and Hanna Mining Co., of Cleveland, Ohio.

The Oregon chief federal judge's action apparently closed 2½ years of litigation in federal court here.

Awards were for overcharges by Hanna to the government on the price of nickel and operations at its Riddle plant.

"This is a classic case of unjust enrichment," Judge Solomon noted in his opinion. "From the dates of overpayments, the company has had the use of the government's money."

Consequently, Solomon allowed the government's interest demands. On Feb. 24, 1966, he ruled that Hanna owed \$215,109 for wrongly charged capital outlay, but left other issues unsettled.

In the original suit, the government asked \$1.8 million from the firms, alleging overpayments on 107.7 million pounds of nickel produced on a government stockpiling contract from 1954 to 1961.

In the government-Hanna contract, the firms agreed to operate the Riddle smelter on a cost-plus basis. The government paid operating expenses, but was not to make equipment investments after it built the \$22 million facility.

The Riddle plant was sold to Hanna in 1961 for \$1.7 million.

Actually, there were four contracts signed with the government by Hanna firms on Jan. 16, 1953:

One for delivery of nickel ore at \$6 a ton, another for delivery of a minimum of 95 million pounds of nickel and a maximum of 125 million pounds, a third which made Hanna Mining the government's sales agency, and a fourth which paid the company \$100,000 for managing all this.

From 1946 to 1962, strategic stockpile materials were a deep government secret. Then President John F. Kennedy lifted the secrecy label and the roof blew off when a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Forces Committee headed by Sen. STUART SYMINGTON, D-Mo., began investigating in 1963.

BILLING TRIED

After unsuccessfully billing the Hanna firms for \$1.8 million, the government went to court in Oregon.

Awards to the government from Judge Solomon's opinions and Hanna concessions are \$63,525, paid earlier by Hanna; \$215,109, capital acquisitions wrongly billed as produc-

tion expenses; \$16,395 for 32 "smaller" items similarly charged; \$27,111 for overpayment on some 2.2 million pounds of nickel produced before March, 1961; \$214,686 from the 1964 termination agreement; \$79,603 interest on overcharges, and \$7,724 interest from pre-March 1961 production.

In the Feb. 24 opinion, Judge Solomon held that six capital expenditures for the experimental smelter had been wrongly charged against the government.

Of "smaller" items, Solomon originally said Hanna could reclassify in expense accounts 61 items valued at \$34,143.

The company reclassified 27 it said were worth \$15,915, allowing 32 at a cost of \$16,396 to be awarded the government.

The government, noted Solomon, conceded two items at \$1,801.

CEILING NOTED

Solomon said adjustments in company costs resulting from item overcharges would require reformation of a 1961 agreement with the government to put a 58.77 cents a pound ceiling price on nickel.

Hanna, the judge said, agreed to lower the ceiling to 57.53 cents a pound, giving the government \$27,111 for overpayments on 2.2 million pounds of previously produced metal.

In a 1964 termination agreement between the Hanna firms and the government, the firms agreed to pay the reduction in cost a pound on the 17.3 million pounds the government subsequently purchased.

This amounts to \$214,686.

The reduction also applies to some 19.5 million pounds undelivered as of March 31, 1966, Solomon ordered.

He allowed a total of \$37,327 interest on the pre-1961 nickel payments and expense overpayments.

The Riddle plant is America's sole domestic nickel producer.

SECRETARY McNAMARA'S ADDRESS TO SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Secretary McNamara delivered yesterday an excellent, thoughtful speech in which he ably set forth some of the problems that face the world. In presenting his thoughts on handling these problems, he spoke as a man thinking deeply and seeking peace in the world of the future. He draws on our national and international experience and economic facts of life to show that far-reaching changes must—and can—be achieved in order to achieve some sort of international law and order.

I also applaud his thought that our young people should be called upon to give 2 years of service to their Nation in some form of volunteer work.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Secretary's address printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1966]

THE TEXT OF ADDRESS BY McNAMARA TO AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS

(WASHINGTON, May 18.—Following is the text of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors as prepared for delivery in Montreal today:)

Any American would be fortunate to visit this lovely island city, in this hospitable land.

But there is a special satisfaction for a Secretary of Defense to cross the longest border in the world—and realize that it is also the least armed border in the world.

It prompts one to reflect how negative and narrow a notion of defense still clouds our century.

There is still among us an almost eradicable tendency to think of our security problem as being exclusively a military problem—and to think of the military problem as being exclusively a weapons-system or hardware problem.

The plain, blunt truth is that contemporary man still conceives of war and peace in much the same stereotyped terms that his ancestors did. The fact that these ancestors—both recent and remote—were conspicuously unsuccessful at avoiding war, and enlarging peace, doesn't seem to dampen our capacity for clichés.

We still tend to conceive of national security almost solely as a state of armed readiness: a vast, awesome arsenal of weaponry.

We still tend to assume that it is primarily this purely military ingredient that creates security.

We are still haunted by this concept of military hardware.

But how limited a concept this actually is, becomes apparent when one ponders the kind of peace that exists between the United States and Canada.

It is a very cogent example. Here we are, two modern nations: highly developed technologically, each with immense territory, both enriched with great reserves of natural resources, each militarily sophisticated—and yet, we sit across from one another, divided by an unguarded frontier of thousands of miles . . . and there is not a remotest set of circumstances, in any imaginable time-frame of the future, in which our two nations would wage war on one another.

It is so unthinkable an idea as to be totally absurd.

But why is that so?

Is it because we are both ready in an instant to hurl our military hardware at one another?

Is it because we are both zeroed in on one another's vital targets?

Is it because we are both armed to our technological teeth that we do not go to war?

The whole notion—as applied to our two countries—is ludicrous.

Canada and the United States are at peace for reasons that have nothing whatever to do with our mutual military readiness.

We are at peace—truly at peace—because of the vast fund of compatible beliefs, common principles, and shared ideals.

We have our differences and our diversity—and let us hope for the sake of a mutually rewarding relationship we never become sterile carbon copies of one another.

BASIS OF MUTUAL PEACE

But the whole point is that our basis of mutual peace has nothing whatever to do with our military hardware.

Now this is not to say, obviously enough, that the concept of military deterrence is no longer relevant in the contemporary world.

Unhappily, it still is critically relevant with respect to our potential adversaries.

But it has no relevance whatever between the United States and Canada.

We are not adversaries. We are not going to become adversaries. And it is not mutual military deterrence that keeps us from becoming adversaries. It is mutual respect for common principles.

Now I mention this—as obvious as it all is—simply as a kind of reductio ad absurdum of the concept that military hardware is the exclusive or even the primary ingredient of permanent peace in the mid-20th century.

In the United States—over the past five years—we have achieved a considerably improved balance in our total military posture. That was the mandate I received from Presidents Kennedy and Johnson; and with their support, and that of the Congress, we have

been able to create a strengthened force structure of land, sea, and air components—with a vast increase in mobility and materiel—and with a massive superiority in nuclear retaliatory power over any combination of potential adversaries.

Our capabilities for nuclear, conventional, and countersubversive war have all been broadened and improved; and we have accomplished this through military budgets that were in fact lesser percentages of our gross national product than in the past.

From the point of view of combat readiness, the United States has never been militarily stronger.

We intend to maintain that readiness.

But if we think profoundly about the matter, it is clear that this purely military posture is not the central element in our security.

A nation can reach the point at which it does not buy more security for itself simply by buying more military hardware—we are at that point.

The decisive factor for a powerful nation—already adequately armed—is the character of its relationships with the world. And groups of nations: first, those that are struggling to develop; secondly, those free nations that have reached a level of strength and prosperity that enables them to contribute to the peace of the world; and finally, those nations who might be tempted to make themselves our adversaries.

For each of these groups, the United States—to preserve its own intrinsic security—has to have distinctive sets of relationships.

First, we have to help protect those developing countries which genuinely need and request our help, and which—as an essential precondition—are willing and able to help themselves.

Second, we have to encourage and achieve a more effective partnership with those nations who can and should share international peace-keeping responsibilities.

Third, we must do all we realistically can to reduce the risk of conflict with those who might be tempted to take up arms against us.

Let us examine these three sets of relationships in detail.

First, the developing nations.

Roughly 100 countries today are caught up in the difficult transition from traditional to modern societies.

There is no uniform rate of progress among them, and they range from primitive mosaic societies—fractured by tribalism and held feebly together by the slenderest of political sinews—to relatively sophisticated countries, well on the road to agricultural sufficiency and industrial competence.

This sweeping surge of development, particularly across the whole southern half of the globe, has no parallel in history.

It has turned traditionally listless areas of the world into seething cauldrons of change. On the whole, it has not been a very peaceful process.

In the last eight years alone there have been no less than 164 internationally significant outbreaks of violence—each of them specifically designed as a serious challenge to the authority, or the very existence of the government in question.

Eighty-two different governments have been directly involved.

What is striking is that only 15 of these 164 significant resorts to violence have been military conflicts between two states.

And not a single one of the 164 conflicts has been a formally declared war.

Indeed, there has not been a formal declaration of war—anywhere in the world—since World War II.

The planet is becoming a more dangerous place to live on—not merely because of a potential nuclear holocaust—but also because of the large number of de facto conflicts and

because of the trend of such conflicts is growing rather than diminishing.

At the beginning of 1958, there were 23 prolonged insurgencies going on about the world. As of February 1, 1966, there were 40.

Further, the total number of outbreaks of violence has increased each year: in 1958, there were 34; in 1965, there were 58.

But what is most significant of all is that there is a direct and constant relationship between the incidence of violence and the economic status of the countries afflicted.

The World Bank divides nations, on the basis of per capita income, into four categories, rich, middle-income, poor, and very poor.

The rich nations are those with a per capita income of \$750 per year or more. The current United States level is more than \$2,700. There are 27 of these rich nations. They possess 75 per cent of the world's wealth, though roughly only 25 per cent of the world's population.

Since 1958, only one of these 27 nations has suffered a major internal upheaval on its own territory.

But observe what happens at the other end of the economic scale. Among the 38 very poor nations—those with a per capita income of under \$100 a year—no less than 32 have suffered significant conflicts. Indeed, they have suffered an average of two major outbreaks of violence per country in the eight year period. That is a great deal of conflict.

What is worse, it has been, predominantly, conflict of a prolonged nature.

TREND HOLDS CONSTANT

The trend holds predictably constant in the case of the two other categories: the poor, and the middle-income nations. Since 1958, 87 per cent of the very poor nations, 69 per cent of the poor nations, and 48 per cent of the middle-income nations have suffered serious violence.

There can, then, be no question but that there is an irrefutable relationship between violence and economic backwardness. And the trend of such violence is up, not down.

Now, it would perhaps be somewhat reassuring if the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations were closing; and economic backwardness were significantly receding.

But it is not. The economic gap is widening.

By the year 1970, over one-half of the world's total population will live in the independent nations sweeping across the southern half of the planet. But this hungry half of the human race will by then command only one-sixth of the world's total of goods and services.

By the year 1975, the dependent children of these nations alone—children under 15 years of age—will equal the total population of the developed nations to the north.

Even in our own abundant societies, we have reason enough to worry over the tensions that coil and tighten among underprivileged young people, and finally flail out in delinquency and crime. What are we to expect from a whole hemisphere of youth where mounting frustrations are likely to fester into eruptions of violence and extremism?

Annual per capita income in roughly half of the 80 underdeveloped nations that are members of the World Bank is rising by a paltry 1 per cent a year or less. By the end of the century, these nations—at their present rates of growth—will reach a per capita income of barely \$170 a year. The United States, by the same criteria, will attain a per capita income of \$4,500.

The conclusion to all of this is blunt and inescapable: Given the certain connection between economic stagnation and the incidence of violence, the years that lie ahead for the nations in the southern half of the globe are pregnant with violence.

This would be true even if no threat of Communist subversion existed—as it clearly does.

Both Moscow and Peking—however harsh their internal differences—regard the whole modernization process as an ideal environment for the growth of Communism. Their experience with subversive internal war is extensive; and they have developed a considerable array of both doctrine and practical measures in the art of political violence.

What is often misunderstood is that Communists are capable of subverting, manipulating, and finally, directing for their own ends, the wholly legitimate grievances of a developing society.

But it would be a gross oversimplification to regard Communism as the central factor in every conflict throughout the underdeveloped world. Of the 149 serious internal insurgencies in the past eight years, Communists have been involved in only 58 of them—38 per cent of the total—and this includes seven instances in which a Communist regime itself was the target of the uprising.

VIOLENCE SENDS SIGNALS

Whether Communists are involved or not, violence anywhere in a taut world transmits sharp signals through the complex ganglia of international relations; and the security of the United States is related to the security and stability of nations half a globe away.

But neither conscience nor sanity itself suggests that the United States is, should, or could be the global gendarme.

Quite the contrary, experience confirms what human nature suggests: that in most instances of internal violence, the local people themselves are best able to deal directly with the situation within the framework of their own traditions.

The United States has no mandate from on high to police the world, and no inclination to do so. There have been classic cases in which our deliberate non-action was the wisest action of all.

Where our help is not sought, it is seldom prudent to volunteer.

Certainly we have no charter to rescue floundering regimes, who have brought violence on themselves by deliberately refusing to meet the legitimate expectations of their citizenry.

Further, throughout the next decade advancing technology will reduce the requirement for bases and staging rights at particular locations abroad, and the whole pattern of forward deployment will gradually change.

But—though all these caveats are clear enough—the irreducible fact remains that our security is related directly to the security of the newly developing world.

And our role must be precisely this: To help provide security to those developing nations which genuinely need and request our help, and which demonstrably are willing and able to help themselves.

The rub comes in this: We do not always grasp the meaning of the word security in this context.

In a modernizing society, security means development.

Security is not military hardware—though it may include it. Security is not military force—though it may involve it. Security is not traditional military activity—though it may encompass it.

Security is development.

Without development, there can be no security.

A developing nation that does not in fact develop simply cannot remain "secure."

It cannot remain secure for the intractable reason that its own citizenry cannot shed its human nature.

If security implies anything, it implies a minimal measure of order and stability.

Without internal development of at least a minimal degree, order and stability are simply not possible. They are not possible be-

cause human nature cannot be frustrated beyond intrinsic limits. It reacts—because it must.

NOT ALWAYS UNDERSTOOD

Now, that is what we do not always understand; and that is also what governments of modernizing nations do not always understand.

But by emphasizing that security arises from development, I do not say that an underdeveloped nation cannot be subverted from within; or be aggressed upon from without; or be the victim of a combination of the two.

It can. And to prevent any or all of these conditions, a nation does require appropriate military capabilities to deal with the specific problem. But the specific military problem is only a narrow facet of the broader security problem.

Military force can help provide law and order—but only to the degree that a basis for law and order already exists in the developing society: A basic willingness on the part of the people to cooperate.

The law and order is a shield, behind which the central fact of security—development—can be achieved.

Now we are not playing a semantic game with these words.

The trouble is that we have been lost in a semantic jungle for too long. We have come to identify "security" with exclusively military phenomena; and most particularly with military hardware.

But it just isn't so. And we need to accommodate to the facts of the matter, if we want to see security survive and grow in the southern half of the globe.

Development means economic, social, and political progress. It means a reasonable standard of living—and the word "reasonable" in this context requires continual redefinition. What is "reasonable" in an earlier stage of development will become "unreasonable" in a later stage.

As development progresses, security progresses; and when the people of a nation have organized their own human and natural resources to provide themselves with what they need and expect out of life—and have learned to compromise peacefully among competing demands in the larger national interest—then, their resistance to disorder and violence will be enormously increased.

Conversely, the tragic need of desperate men to resort to force to achieve the inner imperatives of human decency will diminish.

Now I have said that the role of the United States is to help provide security to these modernizing nations—providing they need and request our help; and are clearly willing and able to help themselves.

But what should our help be?

Clearly, it should be help towards development. In the military sphere, that involves two broad categories of assistance.

We should help the developing nation with such training and equipment as is necessary to maintain the protective shield behind which development can go forward.

The dimensions of that shield vary from country to country; but what is essential is that it should be a shield, and not a capacity for external aggression.

TRAINING IN CIVIC ACTION

The second—and perhaps less understood category of military assistance in a modernizing nation—is training in civil action.

"Civic Action" is another one of those semantic puzzles. Too few Americans—and too few officials in developing nations—really comprehend what military civic action means.

Essentially, it means using indigenous military forces for non-traditional military projects—projects that are useful to the local population in fields such as education, public works, health, sanitation, agricul-

ture—indeed, anything connected with economic or social progress.

It has had some impressive results. In the past four years, the United States-assisted civic action program, worldwide, has constructed or repaired more than 10,000 miles of roads; built over 1,000 schools, hundreds of hospitals and clinics; and has provided medical and dental care to approximately four million people.

What is important is that all this was done by indigenous men in uniform. Quite apart from the developmental projects themselves, the program powerfully alters the negative image of the military man, as the oppressive preserver of the stagnant status quo.

But assistance in the purely military sphere is not enough. Economic assistance is also essential. The President is determined that our aid should be hardheaded and rigorously realistic: that it should deal directly with the roots of underdevelopment, and not merely attempt to alleviate the symptoms. His bedrock principle is that United States economic aid—no matter what its magnitude—is futile unless the country in question is resolute in making the primary effort itself. That will be the criterion, and that will be the crucial condition for all our future assistance.

Only the developing nations themselves can take the fundamental measures that make outside assistance meaningful. These measures are often unpalatable—and frequently call for political courage and decisiveness. But to fail to undertake painful, but essential, reform inevitably leads to far more painful revolutionary violence. Our economic assistance is designed to offer a reasonable alternative to that violence. It is designed to help substitute peaceful progress for tragic internal conflict.

The United States intends to be compassionate and generous in this effort, but it is not an effort it can carry exclusively by itself. And thus it looks to those nations who have reached the point of self-sustaining prosperity to increase their contribution to the development—and, thus, to the security—of the modernizing world.

And that brings me to the second set of relationships that I underscored at the outset; it is the policy of the United States to encourage and achieve a more effective partnership with those nations who can, and should, share international peace-keeping responsibilities.

THE HIGHEST PROPORTION

America has devoted a higher proportion of its gross national product to its military establishment than any other major free world nation. This was true even before our increased expenditures in Southeast Asia.

We have had, over the last few years, as many men in uniform as all the nations of Western Europe combined—even though they have a population half again greater than our own.

Now, the American people are not going to shirk their obligations in any part of the world, but they clearly cannot be expected to bear a disproportionate share of the common burden indefinitely.

If, for example, other nations genuinely believe—as they say they do—that it is in the common interest to deter the expansion of Red China's economic and political control beyond its national boundaries, then they must take a more active role in guarding the defense perimeter.

Let me be perfectly clear: This is not to question the policy of neutralism or non-alignment of any particular nation. But it is to emphasize that the independence of such nations can—in the end—be fully safeguarded only by collective agreements among themselves and their neighbors.

The plain truth is the day is coming when no single nation, however powerful, can undertake by itself to keep the peace out-

side its own borders. Regional and international organizations for peace-keeping purposes are as yet rudimentary; but they must grow in experience and be strengthened by deliberate and practical cooperative action.

In this matter, the example of Canada is a model for nations everywhere. As Prime Minister Pearson pointed out eloquently in New York just last week: Canada "is as deeply involved in the world's affairs as any country of its size. We accept this because we have learned over 50 years that isolation from the policies that determine war does not give us immunity from the bloody, sacrificial consequences of their failure. We learned that in 1914 and again in 1939. . . . That is why we have been proud to send our men to take part in every peace-keeping operation of the United Nations—in Korea, and Kashmir, and the Suez, and the Congo, and Cyprus."

The organization of the American states in the Dominican Republic, the more than 30 nations contributing troops or supplies to assist the Government of South Vietnam, indeed even the parallel efforts of the United States and the Soviet Union in the Pakistan-India conflict—these efforts, together with those of the United Nations, are the first attempts to substitute multinational for unilateral policing of violence. They point to the peace-keeping patterns of the future.

We must not merely applaud the idea. We must dedicate talent, resources, and hard practical thinking to its implementation.

In Western Europe—an area whose burgeoning economic vitality stands as a monument to the wisdom of the Marshall Plan—the problems of security are neither static nor wholly new. Fundamental changes are under way, though certain inescapable realities remain.

NUCLEAR BACKDROP NEEDED

The conventional forces of NATO, for example, still require a nuclear backdrop far beyond the capability of any Western European nation to supply, and the United States is fully committed to provide that major nuclear deterrent.

However, the European members of the alliance have a natural desire to participate more actively in nuclear planning. A central task of the alliance today is, therefore, to work out the relationships and institutions through which shared nuclear planning can be effective. We have made a practical and promising start in the special committee of NATO defense ministers.

Common planning and consultation are essential aspects of any sensible substitute to the unworkable and dangerous alternative of independent national nuclear forces within the alliance.

And even beyond the alliance, we must find the means to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. That is a clear imperative.

There are, of course, risks in nonproliferation arrangements; but they cannot be compared with the indefinitely greater risks that would arise out of the increase in national nuclear stockpiles.

In the calculus of risk, to proliferate independent national nuclear forces is not a mere arithmetical addition of danger. We would not be merely adding up risks. We would be insanely multiplying them.

If we seriously intend to pass on a world to our children that is not threatened by nuclear holocaust, we must come to grips with the problem of proliferation.

A reasonable nonproliferation agreement is feasible. For there is no adversary with whom we do not share a common interest in avoiding mutual destruction triggered by an irresponsible nth power.

That brings me to the third and last set of relationships the United States must deal with. Those with nations who might be tempted to take up arms against us.

These relationships call for realism. But realism is not a hardened, inflexible, unimaginative attitude. The realistic mind is a restlessly creative mind—free of naive delusions, but full of practical alternatives.

There are practical alternatives to our current relationships with both the Soviet Union and Communist China.

A vast ideological chasm separates us from them—and to a degree, separates them from one another.

There is nothing to be gained from our seeking an ideological rapprochement; but breaching the isolation of great nations like Red China, even when that isolation is largely of its own making, reduces the danger of potentially catastrophic misunderstandings, and increases the incentive on both sides to resolve disputes by reason rather than by force.

TRADE AND DIPLOMACY

There are many ways in which we can build bridges toward nations who would cut themselves off from meaningful contact with us. We can do so with properly balanced trade relations, diplomatic contacts, and in some cases even by exchanges of military observers.

We have to know where it is we want to place this bridge; what sort of traffic we want to travel over it; and on what mutual foundations the whole structure can be designed.

There are no one-cliff bridges. If you are going to span a chasm, you have to rest the structure on both cliffs.

Now cliffs, generally speaking, are rather hazardous places. Some people are afraid even to look over the edge. But in a thermo-nuclear world, we cannot afford any political acrophobia.

President Johnson has put the matter squarely. By building bridges to those who make themselves our adversaries "we can help gradually to create a community of interest, a community of trust, and a community of effort."

With respect to a "community of effort" let me suggest a concrete proposal for our own present young generation in the United States.

It is a committed and dedicated generation: It has proven that in its enormously impressive performance in the Peace Corps overseas; and in its willingness to volunteer for a final assault on such poverty and lack of opportunity that still remain in our own country.

As matters stand, our present Selective systems draws on only a minority of eligible young men.

That is an inequity.

It seems to me that we could move toward remedying that inequity by asking every young person in the United States to give two years of service to his country—whether in one of the military services, in the Peace Corps or in some other volunteer developmental work at home or abroad.

We could encourage other countries to do the same; and we could work out exchange programs—much as the Peace Corps is already planning to do.

While this is not an altogether new suggestion, it has been criticized as inappropriate while we are engaged in a shooting war.

But I believe precisely the opposite is the case. It is more appropriate now than ever. For it would underscore what our whole purpose is in Vietnam—and indeed anywhere in the world where coercion, or injustice, or lack of decent opportunity still holds sway.

It would make meaningful the central concept of security: A world of decency and development—where every man can feel that his personal horizon is rimmed with hope.

Mutual interest—mutual trust—mutual effort; those are the goals. Can we achieve those goals with the Soviet Union, and with Communist China? Can they achieve them with one another?

The answer to these questions lies in the answer to an even more fundamental question.

Who is man?

Is he a rational animal?

If he is, then the goals can ultimately be achieved.

If he is not, then there is little point in making the effort.

All the evidence of history suggests that man is indeed a rational animal—but with a near infinite capacity for folly. His history seems largely a halting, but persistent, effort to raise his reason above his animality.

He draws blueprints for utopia. But never quite gets it built. In the end, he plugs away obstinately with the only building material really ever at hand: His own part-comic, part-tragic, part-cussed, but part-glorious nature.

I, for one, would not count a global free society out.

Coercion, after all, merely captures man.

Freedom captivates him.

Thank you very much.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SIMPSON in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3283) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Participation Sales Act of 1966".

Sec. 2. (a) Section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(c)";

(2) by inserting after "undertakings and activities" a comma and "hereinafter in this subsection called 'trusts.'";

(3) by striking "obligations offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, or any first mortgages in which the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof" in the first sentence thereof and inserting "mortgages or other types of obligations in which any department or agency of the United States listed in paragraph (2) of this subsection";

(4) by striking out the third sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following: "Participations or other instruments issued by the Association pursuant to this subsection shall to the same extent as securities which are direct obligations of or obligations guaranteed as to principal or interest by the United States be deemed to be exempt securities within the meaning of laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission."; and

(5) by striking out the fourth sentence thereof.

(b) Section 302(c) of such Act is further amended by adding the following:

"(2) Subject to the limitations provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection, one or more trusts may be established as provided in this subsection by each of the following departments or agencies:

"(A) The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, but only with respect to operating loans, direct farm ownership loans, direct housing loans, and direct soil and water loans. Such trusts may not be established with respect to loans for housing for the elderly under sections 502 and 515(a) of the Housing Act of 1949, nor with respect to loans for nonfarm recreational development.

"(B) The Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but only with respect to loans for construction of academic facilities.

"(C) The Department of Housing and Urban Development, except that such authority may not be used with respect to secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

"(D) The Veterans' Administration.

"(E) The Export-Import Bank.

"(F) The Small Business Administration.

The head of each such department or agency, hereinafter in this subsection called the 'trustor', is authorized to set aside a part or all of any obligations held by him and subject them to a trust or trusts and, incident thereto, shall guarantee to the trustee timely payment thereof. The trust instrument may provide for the issuance and sale of beneficial interests or participations, by the trustee, in such obligations or in the right to receive interest and principal collections therefrom; and may provide for the substitution or withdrawal of such obligations, or for the substitution of cash for obligations. The trust or trusts shall be exempt from all taxation. The trust instrument may also contain other appropriate provisions in keeping with the purposes of this subsection. The Association shall be named and shall act as trustee of any such trusts and, for the purposes thereof, the title to such obligations shall be deemed to have passed to the Association in trust. The trust instrument shall provide that custody, control, and administration of the obligations shall remain in the trustor subjecting the obligations to the trust, subject to transfer to the trustee in event of default or probable default, as determined by the trustee, in the payment of principal and interest of the beneficial interests or participations. Collections from obligations subject to the trust shall be dealt with as provided in the instrument creating the trust. The trust instrument shall provide that the trustee will promptly pay to the trustor the full net proceeds of any sale of beneficial interests or participations to the extent they are based upon such obligations or collections. Such proceeds shall be dealt with as otherwise provided by law for sales or repayment of such obligations. The effect of both past and future sales of any issue of beneficial interests or participations shall be the same, to the extent of the principal of such issue, as the direct sale with recourse of the obligations subject to the trust. Any trustor creating a trust or trusts hereunder is authorized to purchase, through the facilities of the trustee, outstanding beneficial interests or participations to the extent of the amount of his responsibility to the trustee on beneficial interests or participations outstanding, and to pay his proper share of the costs and expenses incurred by the Federal National Mortgage Association as trustee pursuant to the trust instrument.

"(3) When any trustor guarantees to the trustee the timely payment of obligations he subjects to a trust pursuant to this subsection, and it becomes necessary for such

trustor to meet his responsibilities under such guaranty, he is authorized to fulfill such guaranty.

"(4) Beneficial interests or participations shall not be issued for the account of any trustor in an aggregate principal amount greater than is authorized with respect to such trustor in an appropriation Act. Any such authorization shall remain available only for the fiscal year for which it is granted and for the succeeding fiscal year.

"(5) The Association, as trustee, is authorized to issue and sell beneficial interests or participations under this subsection, notwithstanding that there may be an insufficiency in aggregate receipts from obligations subject to the related trust to provide for the payment by the trustee (on a timely basis out of current receipts or otherwise) of all interest or principal on such interests or participations (after provision for all costs and expenses incurred by the trustee, fairly prorated among trustors). There are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation such sums as may be necessary to enable any trustor to pay the trustee such insufficiency as the trustee may require on account of outstanding beneficial interests or participations authorized to be issued pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection. Such trustor shall make timely payments to the trustee from such appropriations, subject to and in accord with the trust instrument."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 305(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended by deleting "by \$450,000,000 on July 1, 1966."

(b) Section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by deleting "1968:" immediately preceding the first proviso and by substituting therefor "1965, and 1967 and 1968:".

Sec. 4. (a) Section 303(c) of title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out the first nine words in the second sentence and substituting therefor the following: "For the purpose of making payments into the fund established under section 305".

(b) Title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is further amended by adding after section 304 the following new section:

"REVOLVING LOAN FUND

"Sec. 305. (a) There is hereby created within the Treasury a separate fund for higher education academic facilities loans (hereafter in this section called 'the fund') which shall be available to the Commissioner without fiscal year limitation as a revolving fund for the purposes of this title. The total of any loans made from the fund in any fiscal year shall not exceed limitations specified in appropriation Acts. A business-type budget for the fund shall be prepared, transmitted to the Congress, considered, and enacted in the manner prescribed by law (sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 847-849)) for wholly owned Government corporations.

"(b) (1) The Commissioner, when authorized by an appropriation Act, may transfer to the fund available appropriations provided under section 303(c) to provide capital for the fund. All amounts received by the Commissioner as interest payments or repayments of principal on loans, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by him from his operations in connection with this title, including any moneys derived directly or indirectly from the sale of assets, or beneficial interests or participations in assets, of the fund, shall be deposited in the fund.

"(2) All loans, expenses, and payments pursuant to operations of the Commissioner under this title shall be paid from the fund, including (but not limited to) expenses and payments of the Commissioner in connection with sale, under section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act,

of participations in obligations acquired under this title. From time to time, and at least at the close of each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall pay from the fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts interest on the cumulative amount of appropriations paid out for loans under this title or available as capital to the fund, less the average undisbursed cash balance in the fund during the year. The rate of such interest shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield during the month preceding each fiscal year on outstanding Treasury obligations of maturity comparable to the average maturity of loans made from the fund. Interest payments may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest. If at any time the Commissioner determines that moneys in the fund exceed the present and any reasonably prospective future requirements of the fund, such excess may be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury."

Sec. 5. Section 338(c) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by striking in the second sentence "and (8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(8) section 8 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1006a); (9) section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1011); and (10)"; and by inserting in the fifth sentence after "title," the following: "section 8 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, and section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended."

Sec. 6. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify the provisions of section 1820(e) of title 38, United States Code, respecting the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

(b) After June 30, 1966, no department or agency listed in section 302(c) (2) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act may sell any obligation held by it except as provided in section 302(c) of that Act, or as approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, except that this prohibition shall not apply to secondary market operations carried on by the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Sec. 7. Paragraph (7) of section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757) is amended to read:

"(7) to invest its funds (A) in loans exclusively to members; (B) in obligations of the United States of America, or securities fully guaranteed as to principal and interest thereby; (C) in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Director, in loans to other credit unions in the total amount not exceeding 25 percentum of its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus; (D) in shares or accounts of savings and loan associations, the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; (E) in obligations issued by banks for cooperatives, Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal home loan banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or any corporation designated in section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act as a wholly owned Government corporation; or in obligations, participations, or other instruments of or issued by, or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the Federal National Mortgage Association; or (F) in participation certificates evidencing beneficial interests in obligations, or in the right to receive interest and principal collections therefrom, which obligations have been subjected by one or more Government agencies to a trust or trusts for which any executive department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States (or the head thereof) has been named to act as trustee;"

Sec. 8. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with heads of agencies of the United States carrying on direct loan programs, shall conduct a study, in such manner as he shall determine, on the feasibility, advantages, and disadvantages of direct loan programs compared to guaranteed or insured loan programs and shall report his findings together with specific legislative proposals to the Congress not later than six months after the effective date of this act. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as necessary for the purpose of this section.

Sec. 9. The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized during the fiscal year 1966 to sell—

(1) additional participations in the Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust, and

(2) participations in a trust to be established by the Small Business Administration, each without regard to the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that members of the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency may have the privilege of the floor during consideration of the pending bill.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I believe it would be well for the Senator to explain the differences between the House version and the Senate version. I am hoping that the Senator is not planning on pushing the bill to a vote today because I have been advised that there is but one copy of the conference report in the Senate Chamber, and therefore only one copy available. This bill is of such importance that all Senators should have an opportunity to examine overnight what changes may have been made by the House.

Mr. MUSKIE. Let me say to the Senator that I will undertake to explain the differences between the House and Senate versions. It is our desire to get the bill to a vote today. I trust that the explanation and such discussion as we may have will clarify the questions which the Senator from Delaware may have at that point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the text of the bill as passed by the Senate on May 5 and a brief explanation of the principal differences between the Senate and House versions of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF PRINCIPAL DIFFERENCES

The House changes were mainly of a clarifying or technical nature. There are three principal substantive differences between the Senate and House versions of the bill:

(1) Section 2(b) of the bill specifies the departments or agencies which may establish trusts under this Act. The House bill amends the Senate language applying to the Farmers Home Administration to describe more precisely the programs to be included. The House amendment adds direct soil and water loans to the included programs. The House also specifies certain

types of loans within the included programs on which trusts may not be established.

(2) The House amendments added a subsection (b) to Section 6 of the bill, which provides that no department or agency listed in this bill may sell any obligations except as provided by this bill or as approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The effect of this provision is to assure effective coordination of all asset sales by the various departments and agencies of the Government.

(3) The House version omits section 8(b) of the Senate version, which would require the Secretary of the Treasury to make an annual report to the Congress giving certain specified information regarding asset sales and related matters.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it will provide such a report, whether or not there is a statutory requirement.

S. 3283

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Participation Sales Act of 1966".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(c)";

(2) by inserting after "undertakings and activities" a comma and "hereinafter in this subsection called 'trusts'";

(3) by striking out the words "offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, or any first mortgages in which the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof" in the first sentence thereof and by inserting "and other types of securities, including any instrument commonly known as a security, hereinafter in this subsection called 'obligations,' in which any department or agency of the United States listed in section 302(c) of this Act";

(4) by striking out the third sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following: "Participations or other instruments issued by the Association pursuant to this subsection shall to the same extent as securities which are direct obligations of or obligations guaranteed as to principal or interest by the United States be deemed to be exempt securities within the meaning of laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission."; and

(5) by striking out the fourth sentence thereof.

(b) Section 302(c) of such Act is further amended by adding the following:

"(2) Subject to the limitations provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection, one or more trusts may be established as herein provided by each of the following departments or agencies:

"Department of Agriculture: Farmers Home Administration (with respect only to loans for land acquisition, rural housing, and crop production);

"Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Education (with respect to loans for construction of academic facilities);

"Department of Housing and Urban Development (including the Federal National Mortgage Association);

"Veterans' Administration;

"Export-Import Bank;

"Small Business Administration.

The head of each such department or agency, hereinafter in this subsection called the "trustor", is authorized to set aside a part or all of any obligations held by him and subject them to a trust or trusts and, incident thereto, shall guarantee to the trustee timely payment thereof. The trust instrument may provide for the issuance and sale of bene-

ficial interests or participations, by the trustee, in such obligations or in the right to receive interest and principal collections therefrom; and may provide for the substitution or withdrawal of such obligations, or for the substitution of cash for obligations. The trust or trusts shall be exempt from all taxation. The trust instrument may also contain other appropriate provisions in keeping with the purposes of this subsection. The Association may be named and may act as trustee of any such trusts and, for the purposes thereof, the title to such obligations shall pass to the Association in trust: *Provided*, That the trust instrument shall provide that custody, control, and administration of the obligations shall remain in the trustor subjecting the obligations to the trust, subject to transfer to the trustee in event of default or probable default, as determined by the trustee, in the payment of principal and interest of the beneficial interests or participations. Collections from obligations subject to the trust shall be dealt with as provided in the instrument creating the trust. The trust instrument shall provide that the trustee will promptly pay to the trustor the full net proceeds of any sale of beneficial interests or participations to the extent they are based upon such obligations or collections. Such proceeds shall be dealt with as otherwise provided by law for sales or repayment of such obligations. The effect of both past and future sales of any issue of beneficial interests or participations shall be the same, to the extent of the principal of such issue, as the direct sale of the obligations subject to the trust. Any trustor creating a trust or trusts hereunder is authorized to purchase, through the facilities of the trustee, outstanding beneficial interests or participations to the extent of the amount of his responsibility to the trustee on beneficial interests or participations outstanding, and to pay his proper share of the costs and expenses incurred by the Association as trustee pursuant to the trust instrument, and for these purposes may use any appropriated funds or other amounts available to him for the general purposes or programs to which the obligations subjected to the trust are related.

"(3) When any trustor guarantees to the trustee the timely payment of obligations he subjects to a trust pursuant to this subsection, and it becomes necessary for such trustor to meet his responsibilities under such guaranty, he is authorized to fulfill such guaranty by using any appropriated funds or other amounts available to him for the general purposes or programs to which the obligations subjected to the trust are related.

"(4) Beneficial interests or participations shall not be issued for the account of any trustor in an aggregate principal amount greater than is authorized with respect to such trustor in an appropriation Act. Any such authorization shall remain available only for the fiscal year for which it is granted and for the succeeding fiscal year.

"(5) The Association, as trustee, is authorized to issue and sell beneficial interests or participations under this subsection, notwithstanding that there may be an insufficiency in aggregate receipts from obligations subject to the related trust to provide for the payment by the trustee (on a timely basis out of current receipts or otherwise) of all interest or principal on such interests or participations (after provision for all costs and expenses incurred by the trustee, fairly prorated among trustors). Whenever the issuance of an aggregate principal amount is authorized pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection, such an authorization in an appropriation Act shall establish on the books of the Treasury as appropriations such sums as may be necessary from time to time to enable the trustor to pay the trustee such insufficiency as the trustee may require on

account of outstanding beneficial interests or participations. Such trustor shall make timely payments to the trustee from such appropriations, subject to and in accord with the trust instrument."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 305(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended by deleting "by \$450,000,000 on July 1, 1966,"

(b) Section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by deleting "1968:" immediately preceding the first proviso and by substituting therefor "1965, and 1967 and 1968:"

SEC. 4. (a) Section 303(c) of title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out the first nine words in the second sentence and substituting therefor the following: "For the purpose of making payments into the fund established under section 305".

(b) Title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is further amended by adding after section 304 the following new section:

"REVOLVING LOAN FUND

"SEC. 305. (a) There is hereby created within the Treasury a separate fund for higher education academic facilities loans (hereafter in this section called 'the fund') which shall be available to the Commissioner without fiscal-year limitation as a revolving fund for the purposes of this title. The total of any loans made from the fund in any fiscal year shall not exceed limitations specified in appropriation Acts.

"(b)(1) The Commissioner is authorized to transfer to the fund available appropriations provided under section 303(c) to provide capital for the fund. All amounts received by the Commissioner as interest payments or repayments of principal on loans, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by him from his operations in connection with this title, including any moneys derived directly or indirectly from the sale of assets, or beneficial interests or participations in assets, of the fund, shall be deposited in the fund.

"(2) All loans, expenses, and payments pursuant to operations of the Commissioner under this title shall be paid from the fund, including (but not limited to) expenses and payments of the Commissioner in connection with the sale, under section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, of participations in obligations acquired under this title. From time to time and at least at the close of each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall pay from the fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts interest on the cumulative amount of appropriations paid out for loans under this title or available as capital to the fund, less the average undisbursed cash balance in the fund during the year. The rate of such interest shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield during the month preceding such fiscal year on outstanding Treasury obligations of maturity comparable to the average maturity of loans made from the fund. Interest payments may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest. If at any time the Commissioner determines that moneys in the fund exceed the present and any reasonably prospective future requirements of the fund, such excess may be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury."

SEC. 5. Section 338(c) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by striking in the second sentence "and (8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(8) section 8 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1006a); (9) section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1011); and (10)"; and by inserting in the fifth sentence after "title,"

the following: "section 8 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, and section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended."

Sec. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify the provisions of section 1820(e) of title 38, United States Code, respecting the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Sec. 7. Paragraph (7) of section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757) is amended to read:

"(7) to invest its funds (A) in loans exclusively to members; (B) in obligations of the United States of America, or securities fully guaranteed as to principal and interest thereby; (C) in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Director, in loans to other credit unions in the total amount not exceeding 25 per centum of its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus; (D) in shares or accounts of savings and loan associations, the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; (E) in obligations issued by banks for cooperatives, Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal home loan banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board or any corporation designated in section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act as a wholly owned Government corporation; or in obligations, participations, or other instruments of or issued by, or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the Federal National Mortgage Association; or (F) in participation certificates evidencing beneficial interests in obligations, or in the right to receive interest and principal collections therefrom, which obligations have been subjected by one or more Government agencies to a trust or trusts for which any executive department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States (or the head thereof) has been named to act as trustee;"

Sec. 8. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with heads of agencies of the United States carrying on direct loan programs, shall conduct a study, in such manner as he shall determine, on the feasibility, advantages, and disadvantages of direct loan programs compared to guaranteed or insured loan programs and shall report his findings together with specific legislative proposals to the Congress not later than six months after the effective date of this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as necessary for the purpose of this section.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall each year make a report to the Senate and House of Representatives setting forth—

(1) the net increase or decrease during the preceding fiscal year (A) in the aggregate principal amount of obligations acquired by the executive departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States which may be subjected to a trust under section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, and (B) in the total amount of outstanding beneficial interests or participations in such obligations; and

(2) the extent to which the sale of such beneficial interests or participations reduced the deficit or increased the surplus realized by the Government in its operations during the preceding fiscal year.

Sec. 9. The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized during fiscal year 1966 to sell (1) additional participations in the Government Mortgage Liquidation Trust, and (2) participations in a trust to be established by the Small Business Administration, each without regard to the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, as added by this Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But the Senator knows that we are dealing with a rather far-reaching proposal here. While not for one moment do I distrust

the sincerity of the Senator from Maine, I am not unmindful of the fact that the administration which is sponsoring the proposed legislation tried to sneak through a bill granting it authority to sell \$33 billion worth of our assets. After they were caught with their hands in the cookie jar we were able to reduce that amount down to approximately \$11 billion. But the principle is wrong, and I want to make sure we are not selling the Washington Monument—I would not put that past the administration if it could get away with it. I welcome the explanation of the Senator, but I wish to reserve the right to examine this bill very carefully before the Senate votes to see exactly what little gimmicks, if any, the administration may have slipped in.

Therefore, in the interests of orderly procedure I shall ask that it go over until next week. I am sure we will move along much faster if the bill is not pushed to a vote this afternoon.

That is a friendly suggestion.

Mr. MUSKIE. In friendly response to the Senator from Delaware, let me say to him that of course I do not agree with his description of the procedure which we undertook in presenting the original administration bill. I do not believe there was anything sneaky about it, but of course the Senator is entitled to his own opinion. In any case, let me say that the point the Senator has just made is the same one we discussed when the bill was recently before the Senate; namely, whether in principle this is a sound thing to do. That question was resolved in two record votes on this side in the Capitol.

The changes made by the House do not raise that issue and do not go to it. The fact is, the changes made by the House tend to tighten the bill in the direction in which the Senator from Delaware would like it to go, so that I am sure he would approve of the House changes, by and large—I will not presume to make that judgment, but I believe that he would.

In any case, I will undertake to explain the differences and we can see where we go from there.

Mr. President, a few days ago, the Senate considered and passed S. 3283, the Participation Sales Act of 1966.

Yesterday the House considered and passed H.R. 14544, which was the House version of the same legislation.

The bill as amended by the House is now before us and has now been laid down, and I would like, at the proper time, to make a motion that we accept the amended bill as it is before us.

The amendments which were adopted in the House and which make it differ from the Senate version are largely technical and clarifying amendments.

There are three, however, which I think ought to be brought to the attention of the Senate so it may know what they are.

The first which I undertake to bring to the attention of the Senate has to do with the list of programs which would be covered by the legislation if enacted.

The Senate will recall that in the consideration by the Senate of this legislation the program was narrowed, as indicated by the distinguished Senator from

Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], from some \$33 billion to some \$11 billion.

The amendment adopted by the Senate which accomplished that, listed the programs and agencies which would be covered by the legislation.

The language which was adopted by the Senate has been clarified by the House. In order to indicate the nature of that clarification, I will read first the Senate language, and then the House language as it relates to the difference between the two versions.

The Senate language reads as follows:

2. Subject to the limitations provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection, one or more trusts may be established as herein provided by each of the following Departments or Agencies:

The Department of Agriculture: Farmers Home Administration (with respect only to loans for land acquisition, rural housing, and crop production).

The House language or version reads as follows:

The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, but only with respect to operating loans, direct farm ownership loans, direct housing loans, and direct soil and water loans. Such trusts may not be established with respect to loans for housing for the elderly under sections 502 and 515(a) of the Housing Act of 1949, nor with respect to loans for non-farm recreational development.

The Senate will recall that the Senate language was modified in respect to questions raised by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who was disturbed that the language as it then stood in the Senate bill would be too comprehensive with respect to the Farmers Home Administration programs and would include programs that ought not to be included.

The House has further refined the language adopted by the Senate. The House language has been reviewed by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and he raises no objection to it.

I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], if he would like to direct any questions now to this difference between the House and Senate version.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. I merely want to have a written copy to see for myself what the differences are.

Did I understand the Senator correctly to say that he intends to move that the Senate adopt H.R. 14544?

Mr. MUSKIE. That is my intention.

I shall be happy to show the Senator the language I have just read.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I would like to direct a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair. I understand the Senator from Maine intends to move that the Senate adopt the House bill, H.R. 14544. That bill is not on the Senate Calendar. The Senate originally passed a bill (S. 3283) which went to the House, and the House amendment to the Senate bill is now before us. But H.R. 14544 as such is not before the Senate.

I ask the Chair if it is in order to consider a bill that has not been before the Senate.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I was not as precise in stating what my intention was as I should have been.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The matter before the Senate is to concur in the House amendment, which is a substitute for the Senate bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding, and that is the reason why I raised the question. Perhaps the Senator from Maine misstated what he intended. I understood him to say he was going to move that the Senate adopt H.R. 14544, which is a House bill. I do not think it would be in order if such a motion were made, and I shall make a point of order at the proper time.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I did not at that point make a motion. I indicated my intention. I did not indicate it as precisely as I should have from a parliamentary point of view. I regret I was not more precise. But at the proper time I shall undertake to make a motion that is parliamentarily correct.

The second difference between the two versions of the bill which I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate is a requirement added by the House bill which was not included in the Senate bill.

The requirement which has been added to the House bill is to the effect that with respect to direct sales of these obligations outside the authority of the bill or participation sales outside the authority of the bill, such sales could not take place without direct approval by the Secretary of the Treasury. Clearly, the effect of this requirement in the House bill is to bring the entire operation with respect to these obligations under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury.

This requirement appears to be important from the standpoint of managing sales of Government paper, whether direct Treasury borrowings, participation sales or direct sales under any program. It appears to make sense and is in fact in conformity with existing practices and I see no difficulty in the requirement which has been provided by the House bill.

The third difference between the two bills deals with an amendment initially offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], subsequently cosponsored by the Senator from Utah and myself, which established a requirement for an annual report.

The language reads as follows:

(b) the Secretary of the Treasury shall each year make a report to the Senate and House of Representatives setting forth—

(1) the net increase or decrease during the preceding fiscal year (A) in the aggregate principal amount of obligations acquired by the executive departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States which may be subjected to a trust under section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act; and (B) in the total amount of outstanding beneficial interests or participations in such obligations; and

(2) the extent to which the sale of such beneficial interests or participations reduced the deficit or increased the surplus realized by the Government in its operations during the preceding fiscal year.

This language was not included in the House version of the bill because, as I

understand, it was not offered in the House.

The Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Joseph W. Barr, has been in touch with the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and has advised the Senator that he will send him a letter accepting the obligation or responsibility which was imposed by the Senate version of the bill. So the annual report contemplated by the language that I have just read will be made, notwithstanding the fact that it is not included in the House version of the bill and may not be included in the bill as enacted by Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the event that Mr. Barr leaves the Treasury Department and someone else takes his place, would the person who succeeds him be bound by anything that was promised by Mr. Barr?

Mr. MUSKIE. The commitment is by the Secretary of the Treasury as an office, not as an individual.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would like to read such a commitment, because it is my understanding that one Secretary of the Treasury cannot bind a succeeding Secretary of the Treasury any more than one Congress can bind another.

Does the Senator have the text of the letter so that it can be read to the Senate at this time?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] conducted the discussions with the Under Secretary of the Treasury. The Senator from Utah is in a better position to reassure the Senator from Delaware than is the Senator from Maine.

I have received this commitment from the representatives of the Secretary of the Treasury with whom I have talked. They have informed me that such a report will be made and that it is not dependent upon the verbal commitment of any individual who is now an employee of the Treasury Department. I have received this commitment.

The record that is being made here also commits the Secretary of the Treasury or the Treasury Department to this obligation. I see no doubt about it.

If the Senator from Delaware desires additional reassurance, I suggest that he discuss it with the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is the Senator now speaking of a verbal commitment?

Mr. MUSKIE. I did not discuss this question with the Secretary of the Treasury. My understanding is that the Secretary of the Treasury promised to send Senator BENNETT a letter in which the commitment would be made. I do not know whether that letter has been delivered to the Senator from Utah.

My understanding is that the Senator from Utah received the verbal assurance of the Under Secretary of the Treasury that such a letter would be sent to the Senator. I undertook to establish that fact. If my understanding is incorrect, I desire to be told. My understanding is that the Senator from Utah has been

reassured that the Treasury Department is committed to make such a report. I have no reason to believe that the Senator from Utah has not been reassured.

If the Senator from Delaware is not reassured, then by all means the Senator from Delaware should take whatever steps appeal to him to obtain such assurance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am trying to learn whether the Senator from Maine has received a verbal commitment or a written commitment.

Mr. MUSKIE. I attempted to describe to the Senator from Delaware, in as precise language as I could, what it is I have.

Mr. President, these are the three principal differences between the Senate version and the House version of the legislation. It is my opinion that they are reasonable and that the Senate would be well advised to accept them.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 77 Leg.]

Anderson	Hartke	Pastore
Bartlett	Hill	Pell
Bennett	Holland	Prouty
Bible	Javits	Randolph
Boggs	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Robertson
Church	Metcalf	Simpson
Clark	Mondale	Sparkman
Douglas	Monroney	Talmadge
Eastland	Montoya	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Morton	Williams, Del.
Gore	Moss	Yarborough
Griffin	Murphy	
Harris	Muskie	

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DONN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion is agreed to, and the Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Nelson
Allott	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bayh	Inouye	Proxmire
Brewster	Jackson	Russell, Ga.
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Lausche	Scott
Cannon	Long, La.	Smith
Case	Magnuson	Stennis
Cooper	McCarthy	Symington
Dominick	McClellan	Thurmond
Ellender	McIntyre	Tydings
Fannin	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Mundt	Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the further consideration of the pending question on Monday next, immediately after the conclusion of morning business, debate on said motion be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That after the conclusion of morning business on Monday, May 23, further debate on the motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill S. 3283, to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes, shall be limited to 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

MAY 19, 1966.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF UTAH—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 265) to authorize conveyance of certain lands to the State of Utah based upon fair market value. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today, pp 11078-11080, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am informed that the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] desires to be in the Chamber as this matter is presented.

Under those circumstances 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. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the basic problem of the Great Salt Lake stems from the geology of the great basin area of which western Utah is a part. The Great Salt Lake lies in a broad shallow basin and the surrounding land is flat. Thus the situation is much like that of a vast flat plain which is periodically under water. During wet cycles, such as the one which hopefully we are beginning, the water flows out over the level land, inundating thousands of acres with each rise of a few inches of water. During dry cycles, the lake drops, exposing equally large areas of mudflats.

For a long period of time the fluctuations of this dead sea were of interest only to academicians and local residents. But recently the extremely saline brines of the lake have been discovered as a rich source of magnesium and other minerals. To develop these minerals large evaporation ponds are necessary which will make use of the heretofore worthless mudflats. It was at this point that a problem arose. The companies wishing to evaporate the brines needed a clear lease to the mudflats before they could start developing this new industry. The State, which owns the lake, since it was navigable at statehood, had always assumed these lands belonged to it. The Federal Government had also assumed the State owned these lands and had even bought a portion of the lands to use for a wildlife refuge. In 1961 the Department of the Interior did an about-face and in a solicitor's opinion decided that these were Federal lands under the common law doctrine of accretion and reliction adjacent to navigable waters. Since the lands around the lake are largely public domain, as the lake receded the exposed lands would, under this theory, become public domain. Then as the lake rose the lands would magically become State property again as the water edged over them. The State disputes that the doctrine of reliction has any relevance in a situation of fluctuating waters such as this. This dispute is obviously a legal question. But until some adjustment is made, no clear lease can be given to this land and a new industry, which will benefit both the State and the Nation, is stymied. This compromise bill seeks to solve that problem by allowing the State to administer these lands as it has done since statehood, but now as a

trustee. The legal dispute will be solved either by negotiation between the Secretary of Interior and the State of Utah, or at the option of the State, the Supreme Court will settle the problem.

It should be made perfectly clear, Mr. President, that Congress is not passing judgment on the legal claim of the United States or the State of Utah. The Justice Department and the Interior Department feel that under one legal doctrine they can claim this land. The State of Utah feels that the doctrine proposed by these Departments has no validity with respect to the Great Salt Lake. Congress has made provision in the bill for a negotiated settlement to be worked out between the interested parties. This has necessarily involved setting standards of payment by the party getting possession of the disputed land. This should not be interpreted as in any way declaring the claims of the United States to these lands are valid. These provisions are merely a method of enabling the parties to avoid the expense and delay of a suit before the Supreme Court, nothing more.

There are some considerations that are assumed by the conferees, however, that are not spelled out in the bill. The first of these is the right of the State to use their right to sections numbered 2, 16, 32, and 36 in these lands, the so-called school sections, as a value to be traded off in any fair market value type exchange. It is understood that the State owns the school sections even under the theory of Interior, so in reserving mineral rights to the United States, as we did in the bill, we could not include the minerals under these school sections. The time-honored right of the State to that part of the public domain is not impaired. I am sure that it will be to the benefit of both Utah and the United States to transfer all mineral rights to one government or the other for administrative convenience. We envision a trade of this kind occurring in case a fair market value exchange develops.

Another provision deleted from the final bill in the interests of simplification and freedom of negotiations was the one directing that the State's ownership of the waters of the lake be considered in valuing the otherwise almost worthless mudflats. The purpose of this provision was to make clear that the mudflats in dispute are not to be assigned a high value because of their use in connection with a resource, the brines of the lake, solely owned by the State. The lands are valuable to the owner of the waters of the lake, but they are practically worthless to anyone else. Since only small sections of these disputed lands will be used for evaporation ponds, the value of these vast mudflats should not be valued as if all were to be used for this purpose, nor indeed should the value be inflated because of potential use.

The most obvious fact about this bill, Mr. President, is that it was designed to solve the fluctuating boundary line problem caused by the rise and fall of the Great Salt Lake but this bill does not solve this difficulty. I should say it solves only one-half of the problem.

Under the bill before the Senate, all surface rights to lands below the meander line—the boundary fixed in the bill—will pass to the State, but there will be a reservation of minerals in the Government of the United States—except school sections. Since the State of Utah owns the waters of the lake and the bed and subsoil beneath these waters, as the waters rise or fall, there will result a change of ownership in the mineral estate, assuming that the United States is held or admitted to be fee owner of the relicted lands.

Under earlier drafts of this bill we had considered requiring a survey of the waterline of the lake as of the date of enactment. This could then have been the boundary for the mineral interests reserved to the United States. We eliminated this provision in the hope that it would not be necessary. A survey of the waterline was estimated to cost in the neighborhood of half a million dollars. It was in the hope that a final settlement will render this boundary question moot that we eliminated this provision.

Specifically, we envision that the mineral rights underneath the waters of the lake, which the State owns, can be exchanged for the surface rights of the relicted lands—if these are held to belong to the Federal Government. This will solve the boundary problem. All surface rights below the meander line would then belong to the State and all the subsurface mineral rights would then belong to the Federal Government. Thus the fluctuations of the waters of the lake would no longer affect either title. We eliminated from the bill any wording compelling the parties to exchange mineral for surface rights, but unless this course is adopted, an expensive survey will still have to be authorized later in order to have some boundary line for the mineral estate.

If there is no boundary line then the mineral reservation, so carefully preserved to the United States at the insistence of the Justice Department, will be practically worthless since no one will accept a lease that reads "valid only until the land is inundated by rising waters." It is to make perfectly clear that the conferees are aware that we have solved only half of the problem that I am making this detailed statement. The solution is as I have just expounded. If the United States has any interest in these disputed lands, then there must be a trade of mineral interests for surface rights in order to solve the fluctuating boundary. If not, then sometime in the future there must be new legislation, authorizing a survey and designating this new survey as the boundary between the respective mineral estates.

This has been a very laborious and taxing dispute for both Houses of Congress. It has taken a much larger expenditure of effort than any of us thought would be necessary. Hopefully, it will be the beginning of new industry on the shores of this lake with new jobs and new revenues to bolster our economy.

I think it is most important that the negotiation and transfer of land author-

ized in this bill take place in a spirit of cooperation and fairness. We have required the State of Utah to pay fair market value for the Federal interests in the relicted lands whether negotiated or declared by the Supreme Court. But the words "fair market value" are a relative term and an extremely vague standard for land that has rarely been traded on the open market. The values determined for the disputed land will necessarily be based on subjective, not objective considerations. In view of this, I would warn that either party to the negotiations, by being obdurate or unrealistic, could frustrate the congressional intent. I think it most important that both sides consider the common problem, their common purpose to administer the lands for the benefit of the people, and their mandate from this body. If this is done, I am sure that further legislation will not be needed. Instead, this most perplexing problem will become an example of the ability of the State and National Government to work together in our federal system.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the report of the Conferees on S. 265, the Great Salt Lake Relicced Lands bill, is a true compromise between the differing versions of the two Houses.

The Members of the Senate will recall that the subject of this measure is the title to and development of several hundred thousand acres of land which once were beneath the waters of the Great Salt Lake but which now are upland flats. These lands are of great potential value for industrial purposes in connection with the development of the mineral resources of the lake, for waterfowl habitat, and for other recreational purposes. With respect to industrial uses, the committee was informed that there has been something of a "break-through" in recent years with respect to extraction of magnesium, lithium, potash, and other minerals in the brines. Such development, however, requires the use of large areas of land relatively near the waters.

Both the State and Federal Governments claimed title to these relicted lands: The State claimed under theory that when Utah became a State in 1896, ownership of the beds of all inland navigable waters within its boundaries passed to it.

The Federal Government's claim, which was firmly asserted by the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, and all other administrative agencies, was based on the time-honored common law theory of reliction—that as the undisputed owner of the uplands, the lands added by recession of the waters became the property of the upland owner, in this case the Federal Government. This theory has been upheld in the Federal courts.

The applicability of this long-established common law principle to situations similar to that of the Great Salt Lake lands was upheld as recently as 1961 by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in the case of United States against State of Washington by a decision which the Supreme Court of the United States refused to upset.

The Senate Interior Committee, after long and careful study, amended S. 265

to conform to the position of the Circuit and Supreme Courts, and that of the Department of Justice and other agencies, by recognizing Federal ownership of the lands but authorizing their sale to the State at fair market value. The minerals in these lands, necessarily being of unknown and indeterminable value, were reserved to the United States. Since the committee was informed by the Governor of Utah and other State officials that there was an urgent need for prompt action, we provided for immediate transfer of title to the State, so that development could begin, and with the amount and manner of compensation to be worked out later.

The House version left the question of title to the relicted lands open to judicial determination by directing the Attorney General of the United States to institute a suit in a court of competent jurisdiction. Possession would have passed to the State only after fulfillment of certain conditions precedent. Oil and gas rights, rather than all mineral rights, in whatever lands were determined to belong to the United States would have been reserved.

The report of the conferees combines the best features of both of these versions. That is, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to convey title to the relicted lands to the State, such title being subject to fulfillment of conditions subsequent. The State then has a choice of two alternative courses of action: One is to have the Secretary of the Interior determine the amount and manner of compensation as of the date of completion of the survey, thus bringing to a speedy end the entire controversy. The other is to institute an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to obtain judicial determination of the present right, title, and interest of the United States. After completion of the Court action, the Secretary then will determine fair market value as of the time of the Court's decision.

Thus, it well could be that if the State elected to go to the Supreme Court on the question of title, and the Court affirms the legal position of the United States, the price Utah would have to pay for the lands might be substantially higher. This would result because at that point in time the values received by the State will probably be much greater. All of the minerals in the relicted lands are reserved to the Federal Government and are withdrawn from development under the mining laws, except those in solution in the brines or precipitated or extracted from brines, all of which are conveyed to the State for their fair market value.

Thus, Mr. President, it will be seen that the measure reported by the conferees is a true compromise. Under it, the State of Utah can proceed immediately to issue leases and permits for the industrial development of the lands and the minerals in the waters of the Great Salt Lake. At the same time, the interests of the Federal Government are fully protected, as are whatever private rights there may be in the lands. The State has a free and full choice with respect to having the Supreme Court de-

cide the title question, or of laying at rest the controversy promptly.

I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the conference report be inserted at this point as a part of my remarks.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF CONFEREES REPORT ON S. 265

Section 1 directs the completion of the public land survey, begun in 1855 and continued intermittently, around the lake by closing the present meander line. Thus, there will be no question as to just what lands are sold and conveyed to the State.

Section 2 directs the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the State the lands below the meander line as soon as it is closed in accordance with section 1 and the State agrees to assume responsibility for administration as a trustee of the lands until compensation is determined. A proviso specifically protects existing private rights, if any, in the lands, and exempts the lands in the Weber Basin Federal reclamation project and the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge.

Section 3 directs reservation to the Federal government of all minerals in the conveyed lands, except those in brines or precipitated or extracted from brines. The minerals so reserved are withdrawn from appropriation under the mining laws, but at the discretion of the Secretary the deposits may be developed under the mineral leasing laws. A proviso makes State use of the lands the dominant use.

Section 4 provides that as a condition of the conveyance of the lands below the meander line, the State in its turn shall quitclaim to the Federal government its interests in the lands above or upland from the meander line. These interests are those based on the fact that such lands might at one time have been covered by the waters of the lake, or that they may be so covered sometime in the future. A second provision requires that the State agree to pay the fair market value of the lands conveyed, including the minerals in the brines or precipitated or extracted from the brines. In lieu of money alone, the Secretary may accept as payment or part payment property or rights to property of the State, including mineral rights, and the relinquishment of the State's right to select certain public lands.

Section 5 confers on the State the choice, to be made within 9 months of enactment, of alternative actions with respect to settlement of the amount of compensation. First, it may request the Secretary to determine the fair market value of the lands and minerals conveyed as of the date of completion of the survey.

Or, as an alternative, the State may initiate an action in the Supreme Court of the United States for a judicial determination of the extent of the Federal government's rights, title and interest in the lands conveyed. Consent to joinder of the United States as a defendant in such an action is expressly given.

Within two years of the completion of the court action, the Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the lands and minerals conveyed which are found to have been owned by the United States prior to the conveyance. The values shall be determined as of the date of the Court's decision, rather than at the time of the closing of the meander line, as provided by the first alternative.

Failure of the State to elect one of the foregoing two alternative actions within nine months of the date of enactment will nullify the conveyance. Under the first alternative, the Secretary must transmit his findings as to fair market value within two years after the request, and the State must make payment within two years after receiving the determination.

Under the second alternative also the State must make payment within two years of receiving the Secretary's determination, based on the Supreme Court's decision.

Section 6 authorizes the State to issue leases, permits or licenses for utilization of the conveyed lands and resources immediately after it agrees to assume the obligation to administer the lands as a trustee, pending settlement of the amount and manner of the compensation to be paid to the Federal government. Revenues received by the State from such development shall be paid to the United States for the credit of the State, until the full amount of the compensation has been paid. In the event the State adopts the second alternative and the Supreme Court finds the United States had no property rights in the lands conveyed, then such revenues shall be returned to the State without interest.

The second paragraph of section 6 provides that if the conveyance becomes null and void for any reason, then the leases, licenses or permits issued by the State under the authority of this section shall be deemed instruments issued by the Federal government and shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with their terms.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as the original sponsor of the Great Salt Lake Shoreline legislation in the 87th Congress, I am much pleased to see that this long controversy is about to be resolved. I recommend that the Senate adopt the Senate-House conference report as quickly as possible so that the bill can be prepared for the President's signature.

Now that this longstanding conflict is about to be resolved, the State of Utah will be able to move ahead and plan for the early development of hitherto untapped natural resources around and in Great Salt Lake. One provision in the conference report calls for action by the Utah State Legislature, and I am pleased to report that as soon as this bill becomes law the legislature, which is currently in special session, can dispose of the bill quickly itself.

I am also pleased to see that the Senate-House conferees generally have agreed that Utah's claim to the lands around the lake will be protected as will the rights of the Federal Government and of the private individuals or groups who own land around the lake.

The conference committee has recommended an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House amendment to the Senate bill. The substitute contains features from both the Senate and the House versions and provides for conveyance to the State of Utah of the interests of the United States in relicited lands surrounding Great Salt Lake below the established meander line, for the surveys necessary to close the line, for the protection of valid existing rights in third parties, for the United States to retain ownership of lands it now holds within the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge and the Weber Basin Federal reclamation project, for payment by the State to the United States in cash or equivalent of the fair market value of the interests transferred to it by the United States, for the State to manage the lands pending final resolution of questions of ownership or compensation, and for the State to relinquish any claim to lands lying above the meander line which may heretofore or may hereafter become submerged by the water in the lake.

Mr. President, the conference committee has solved the differences between the two versions by requiring the State of Utah to elect whether to pay the fair market value of the land transferred to it or to institute suit in the Supreme Court to test the United States claim of title.

This election must be made within 9 months after the Secretary of Interior completes the closing of the meander line.

In addition, the conference report provides that if the State elects to pay fair market value, the Secretary of Interior shall determine that value as of the date of the completed survey. If the State elects to sue and the judgment is in favor of the United States, the State will be bound to pay the fair market value as of the date of judgment as determined by the Secretary. If payment is not made within 2 years after receipt of the Secretary's determination the conveyance becomes null and void.

The bill also provides that the conveyance shall reserve to the United States all minerals "except brines and minerals in solution in the brines or precipitated or extracted therefrom." The value of the latter will be a part of the total fair market value to be paid by the State. The mineral reservation extends to "whatever Federal lands there may be below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake."

Mr. President, legislation is nothing more than compromise, and it is my feeling that the compromise we have before us today will resolve the longstanding question of who owns the land. Before the passage of this bill and because of the nature of the lake it was conceivable that a firm on the shores of the lake would find itself one day under jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the next under jurisdiction of the State government as far as the land is concerned.

I recommend the early adoption of the conference report, so that the State and the Federal Government can begin to receive the benefits for the potential industry that is there.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to. The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understand there will be nothing further during the day in connection with the conference report which deals with the sale of about \$11 billion worth of Government assets.

I think that the Senate made a wise decision to postpone this matter until Monday in order that Senators may examine the bill and vote more intelligently.

There may not be too much difference between the two versions of the bill, but we cannot escape the fact that this represents a major change of Government policy in financing its expenditures. The proposal involves the authorization of the sale of about \$11 billion of our assets, the

proceeds of which can be used to defray regular operating expenses of the Government and thereby reduce the amount of the deficit as will be reported by the Government.

There are some of us who feel strongly that this is a deceitful method of financing and that it does not tell the American people the truth in regard to the cost of these Great Society programs.

For that reason we strongly object to any effort to steamroller this bill through without Senators having had an opportunity to read it.

I am not unmindful of the fact that this legislation as first presented called for an authority to sell \$33 billion of assets.

(At this point Mr. BYRD of West Virginia took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senate held but 2 days of hearings on the bill, which deals with a \$33 billion authorization; but, what is worse, the RECORD shows that the first day's hearings were held before the bill had even been introduced. The second day's hearings were finished before the bill had returned from the printer. It was reported the same day, and on the very next day it was made the pending business before the Senate.

There has been an unusual rush to have this bill passed ever since it was first discovered by the White House that this might be a convenient method to make it look like they are balancing the budget. Had it passed as it was originally introduced, the Government could have spent, for the next 3 years, \$10 billion a year more than it is taking in, while still reporting a balanced budget. This is deceitful.

Under the bill in its modified form, which is \$20 billion lower than the original request, the administration can spend between \$10 billion and \$11 billion next year more than it will be taking in and still deceive the American people by telling them they have a balanced budget. The President, in his message to Congress, advocated truth in lending and truth in packaging; I strongly suggest that the White House lend its support to a policy of truth in Government.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senate has been discussing House action

on S. 3283. For the RECORD, I should like to report that under today's date I received a communication from Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, with respect to an amendment which I offered, which was accepted and made a part of the bill when the Senate passed it, but was omitted by the House.

Let me read Mr. Barr's letter:

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: The asset sales bill as passed by the House omitted your amendment to section 8 which would have required the Secretary of the Treasury to make an annual report to the Congress regarding loans held by Federal agencies, participation sales and the effect of participation sales on the deficit or surplus in the administrative budget.

Let me assure you that the Treasury Department will make such a report on a voluntary basis in accordance with the intent of your amendment. Treasury staff will be available to your staff at any time to work out the details and timing of the report procedure.

Since the bill has now gone over until Monday for action, I though I had better get this statement in today's RECORD, in the off chance that I might not be available on the floor during the limited time which has been set for consideration of the bill.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding to me and giving me the opportunity to make this statement.

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to oblige the Senator from Utah.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of May 18, 1966, pp. 10887-10889, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, as this bill passed the Senate, it provided for appropriations totaling \$1,329,755,000 for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior, exclusive of the Bureau of Reclamation and power marketing agencies, and the various related agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service.

The conference committee bill provides appropriations totaling \$1,321,615,800 for the programs and activities of these agencies. This total is under the budget estimates of \$1,340,260,500 by \$18,644,700; over the House bill of \$1,295,169,500 by \$26,446,300; and under the Senate bill of \$1,329,755,000 by \$8,139,200.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a tabulation setting out the appropriation for the current year, the budget estimate, the House allowance, the Senate allowance, and the conference allowance for each appropriation in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the House conferees concurred with \$9,500,000 of the \$10,300,000 budgeted for the heavy metals program which had not been considered by the House of Representatives. The House also concurred in the Senate's provision of funds to implement the anadromous fisheries program which was authorized by law approved last October.

In addition, there is agreement on the \$2 million allowed by the Senate for the National Foundation on the Humanities. Furthermore, the Senate's distribution of the Land and Water Conservation Act funds has been accepted by the House.

The conference was a most friendly, cooperative meeting. I believe that the report deals very fairly with the actions and views of both branches of the Congress.

EXHIBIT 1

Interior Department and related agencies appropriations bill, 1967 (H.R. 14215)

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Allowances			Conference allowance compared with—		
			House	Senate	Conference	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR								
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT								
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT								
Management of lands and resources.....	\$50,575,000	\$48,755,000	\$48,755,000	\$48,970,000	\$48,855,000	+\$100,000	+\$100,000	-\$115,000
Construction and maintenance.....	3,150,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	3,062,000	3,032,000	+132,000	+132,000	-30,000
Public lands development roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization).....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000			
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(16,945,000)	(9,750,000)	(9,750,000)	(9,750,000)	(9,750,000)			
Range improvements (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(1,346,000)	(1,448,000)	(1,448,000)	(1,448,000)	(1,448,000)			
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	55,725,000	53,655,000	53,655,000	54,032,000	53,887,000	+232,000	+232,000	-145,000

EXHIBIT 1—Continued

Interior Department and related agencies appropriations bill, 1967 (H.R. 14215)—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Allowances			Conference allowance compared with—		
			House	Senate	Conference	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued								
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT—Continued								
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS								
Education and welfare services.....	\$107,048,400	\$115,296,000	\$114,475,000	\$115,061,300	\$114,690,300	-\$605,700	+\$215,300	-\$371,000
Resources management.....	43,551,000	44,611,000	44,086,000	44,086,000	44,086,000	-525,000		
Construction.....	35,151,000	57,164,000	55,325,000	56,848,000	56,118,000	-1,046,000	+793,000	-730,000
Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization).....	17,445,000	16,754,000	16,754,000	16,889,000	16,889,000	+135,000	+135,000	
General administrative expenses.....	4,623,000	4,677,000	4,623,000	4,623,000	4,623,000	-54,000		
Menominee educational grants.....	44,000							
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds.....	207,862,400	238,502,000	235,263,000	237,507,300	236,406,300	-2,095,700	+1,143,300	-1,101,000
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation).....	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)			
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION								
Salaries and expenses.....	3,466,000	3,910,000	3,910,000	3,960,000	3,910,000			-50,000
Land and water conservation (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(125,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)			
Total, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.....	3,466,000	3,910,000	3,910,000	3,960,000	3,910,000			-50,000
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES								
Administration of territories.....	17,079,000	10,513,000	10,513,000	10,513,000	10,513,000			
Trust territory of the Pacific Islands.....	17,446,600	17,494,000	17,494,000	17,494,000	17,494,000			
Limitation on administrative expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation.....	(100,000)							
Total, Office of Territories.....	34,525,600	28,007,000	28,007,000	28,007,000	28,007,000			
THE ALASKA RAILROAD								
Payment to the Alaska Railroad revolving fund.....	4,100,000							
Total, Public Land Management.....	305,679,000	324,074,000	320,835,000	323,506,300	322,210,300	-1,863,700	+1,375,300	-1,296,000
MINERAL RESOURCES								
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY								
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	73,190,870	80,520,000	72,782,000	80,932,000	80,032,000	-488,000	+7,250,000	-900,000
BUREAU OF MINES								
Conservation and development of mineral resources.....	32,391,000	35,166,000	31,540,000	34,940,000	34,740,000	-426,000	+3,200,000	-200,000
Health and safety.....	9,599,000	9,390,000	9,390,000	9,390,000	9,390,000			
Solid waste disposal.....	1,400,000	4,335,000	4,000,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	-35,000	+300,000	
Appalachian region mining area restoration.....		10,866,000	8,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	-3,866,000	-1,000,000	
General administrative expenses.....	1,551,000	1,556,000	1,556,000	1,556,000	1,556,000			
Helium Fund: Borrowing authorization.....	(16,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)			
Total, Bureau of Mines.....	44,941,000	61,013,000	54,486,000	57,186,000	56,986,000	-4,027,000	+2,500,000	-200,000
OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH								
Salaries and expenses.....	7,220,000	8,237,000	8,220,000	8,220,000	8,220,000	-17,000		
OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS								
Salaries and expenses.....	720,300	722,000	722,000	722,000	722,000			
Total, Mineral Resources.....	126,072,170	150,492,000	136,210,000	147,060,000	145,960,000	-4,532,000	+9,750,000	-1,100,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS								
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE								
Salaries and expenses.....	452,500							
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES								
Management and investigations of resources.....	22,072,800	20,092,000	20,312,000	21,076,000	20,701,000	+609,000	+389,000	+375,000
Management and investigations of resources (appropriation of receipts).....		(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)			
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program).....	300,000	200,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	+300,000		
Construction.....	1,980,000	495,000	1,245,000	1,245,000	1,245,000	+750,000		
Construction of fishing vessels.....	5,000,000	3,300,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	-300,000		
Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development.....	4,713,200	3,210,000	4,710,000	4,710,000	4,710,000	+1,500,000		
Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation.....				2,675,000	2,675,000	+2,675,000	+2,675,000	
General administrative expenses.....	689,000	739,000	739,000	739,000	739,000			
Administration of Pribilof Islands (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(2,464,000)	(2,468,000)	(2,468,000)	(2,468,000)	(2,468,000)			
Limitation on administrative expenses, Fisheries loan fund.....	(309,000)	(309,000)	(309,000)	(309,000)	(309,000)			
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.....	34,755,000	28,086,000	30,506,000	33,945,000	33,570,000	+5,534,000	+3,064,000	-375,000

EXHIBIT 1—Continued

Interior Department and related agencies appropriations bill, 1967 (H.R. 14215)—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Allowances			Conference allowance compared with—		
			House	Senate	Conference	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued								
FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS—Continued								
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE								
Management and investigations of resources	\$36,792,300	\$37,304,000	\$37,164,000	\$39,161,400	\$38,145,800	+\$841,800	+\$981,800	-\$1,015,600
Construction	18,299,200	3,169,000	5,130,000	8,341,600	7,118,600	+3,949,600	+1,988,600	-1,223,000
Migratory bird conservation account	7,500,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000			
Appalachian region fish and wildlife restoration projects		1,350,000	1,000,000	500,000	500,000	-850,000	-500,000	
Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation				2,675,000	2,675,000	+2,675,000	+2,675,000	
General administrative expenses	1,492,300	1,564,000	1,549,000	1,564,000	1,549,000	-15,000		-15,000
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	64,083,800	49,387,000	50,843,000	58,242,000	55,988,400	+6,601,400	+5,145,400	-2,253,600
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE								
Management and protection	33,394,000	36,177,000	35,694,000	36,171,600	35,932,800	-244,200	+238,800	-238,800
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	25,487,000	27,022,000	26,680,000	26,680,000	26,680,000	-342,000		
Construction	27,888,000	23,500,000	22,894,000	23,494,000	22,894,000	-606,000		-600,000
Parkway and road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	38,500,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000			
General administrative expenses	2,522,000	2,562,100	2,562,000	2,562,000	2,562,000	-100		
Total, National Park Service	127,791,000	119,261,100	117,830,000	118,907,600	118,068,800	-1,192,300	+238,800	-838,800
Total, Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	227,082,300	196,684,100	199,179,000	211,094,600	207,627,200	+10,943,100	+8,448,200	-3,467,400
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER								
Salaries and expenses	20,000,000	28,595,000	27,500,000	27,500,000	27,500,000	-1,095,000		
Operation and maintenance	2,485,000	2,351,000	2,351,000	2,351,000	2,351,000			
Total, Office of Saline Water	22,485,000	30,946,000	29,851,000	29,851,000	29,851,000	-1,095,000		
OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH								
Salaries and expenses	6,396,000	6,894,000	6,894,000	6,894,000	6,894,000			
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR								
Salaries and expenses	4,596,800	4,704,000	4,650,000	4,704,000	4,704,000		+54,000	
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY								
Salaries and expenses	4,557,200	5,186,000	4,984,100	5,051,700	4,998,900	-\$187,100	+14,800	-52,800
Total, direct appropriations	696,868,470	718,980,100	702,603,100	728,161,600	722,245,400	+3,265,300	+19,642,300	-5,916,200
Total, appropriation of receipts	145,755,000	124,666,000	124,666,000	124,666,000	124,666,000			
Total, borrowing authorization	16,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000			
Total, title I, Department of the Interior	858,623,470	869,646,100	853,269,100	878,827,600	872,911,400	+3,265,300	+19,642,300	-5,916,200
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES								
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE								
FOREST SERVICE								
Forest protection and utilization:								
Forest land management	171,953,000	172,856,000	172,821,000	174,521,000	173,850,000	+994,000	+1,029,000	-671,000
Forest research	37,374,000	34,435,000	34,955,000	38,578,000	37,821,000	+3,386,000	+2,866,000	-757,000
State and private forestry cooperation	17,558,000	17,897,000	17,897,000	17,897,000	17,897,000			
Total, forest protection and utilization	226,885,000	225,188,000	225,673,000	230,996,000	229,568,000	+4,380,000	+3,895,000	-1,428,000
Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	102,136,000	102,530,000	101,230,000	101,230,000	101,230,000	-1,300,000		
Timber development organization loans and technical assistance		500,000				-500,000		
Acquisitions of lands for national forests:								
Uinta National Forest		300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000			
Special acts (appropriation of receipts)	(80,000)	(80,000)	(80,000)	(80,000)	(80,000)			
Cooperative range improvements (appropriation of receipts)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)			
Assistance to States for tree planting	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000			
Total, definite appropriations	330,021,000	329,518,000	328,203,000	333,526,000	332,098,000	+2,580,000	+3,895,000	-1,428,000
Total, appropriation of receipts	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000			
Total, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture	330,801,000	330,298,000	328,983,000	334,306,000	332,878,000	+2,580,000	+3,895,000	-1,428,000
FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW								
Salaries and expenses	91,000	61,400	61,400	61,400	61,400			
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS								
Salaries and expenses	123,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000			
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE								
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE								
Indian health activities	67,548,000	73,448,000	73,250,000	73,671,000	73,671,000	+223,000	+421,000	
Construction of Indian health facilities	14,096,000	14,422,000	13,000,000	13,928,000	13,464,000	-958,000	+464,000	-464,000
Total, Public Health Service	81,644,000	87,870,000	86,250,000	87,599,000	87,135,000	-735,000	+885,000	

EXHIBIT 1—Continued

Interior Department and related agencies appropriations bill, 1967 (H.R. 14215)—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Allowances			Conference allowance compared with—		
			House	Senate	Conference	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Con.								
DEPARTMENT OF HEW—Continued								
OFFICE OF EDUCATION								
Arts and humanities educational activities.....	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000			-\$464,000
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare.....	82,644,000	88,870,000	87,250,000	88,599,000	88,135,000	\$-735,000	\$+885,000	-464,000
INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	347,000	438,000	382,000	382,000	382,000	-56,000		
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	818,000	1,144,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	-139,000		
Land acquisition, National Capital park, parkway, and playground system.....		6,100,000				-6,100,000		
Total, National Capital Planning Commission.....	818,000	7,244,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	-6,239,000		
NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY								
Salaries and expenses.....	425,000	1,575,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	-175,000		
Construction, rail rapid transit system.....	3,679,000	17,055,000	9,055,000	9,055,000	9,055,000	-8,000,000		
Total, National Capital Transportation Agency.....	4,104,000	18,630,000	10,455,000	10,455,000	10,455,000	-8,175,000		
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES								
Salaries and expenses.....	5,700,000	13,930,000	7,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-4,930,000	+2,000,000	
Endowment for the arts.....	2,000,000							
Endowment for the humanities.....	3,000,000							
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.....	10,700,000	13,930,000	7,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-4,930,000	+2,000,000	
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS								
Salaries and expenses.....	50,000							
PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	750,000	907,000	907,000	907,000	907,000			
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION								
Salaries and expenses.....	18,921,000	23,437,000	22,523,000	22,844,000	22,523,000	-914,000		-321,000
Archeological research and excavation (special foreign currency program).....	1,300,000	5,700,000	2,316,000	2,316,000	2,316,000	-3,384,000		
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	1,539,000	1,589,000	1,589,000	1,589,000	1,589,000			
Restoration and renovation of buildings.....	2,248,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000			
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art.....	2,531,000	2,765,000	2,694,000	2,718,000	2,718,000	-47,000	+24,000	
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	26,539,000	35,791,000	31,422,000	31,767,000	31,446,000	-4,345,000	+24,000	-321,000
CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	100,000							
CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	25,000	35,000	25,000	35,000	25,000	-10,000		-10,000
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION								
Construction, Corregidor-Bataan Memorial.....	1,400,000							
Total, Corregidor-Bataan Memorial.....	1,425,000	35,000	25,000	35,000	25,000	-10,000		-10,000
LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000			
TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA								
Grants.....	5,376,000							
FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR ALASKA								
Salaries and expenses.....	174,000	190,000	190,000	190,000	190,000			
COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO								
Salaries and expenses.....	200,000							
HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSION								
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.....	20,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000			
Total, direct appropriations.....	463,507,000	495,834,400	467,120,400	476,147,400	473,924,400	-21,910,000	+6,804,000	-2,223,000
Total, appropriation of receipts.....	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000			
Total, title II, related agencies.....	464,287,000	496,614,400	467,900,400	476,927,400	474,704,400	-21,910,000	+6,804,000	-2,223,000
Grand total.....	1,322,910,470	1,366,260,500	1,321,169,500	1,355,755,000	1,347,615,800	-18,644,700	+26,446,300	-8,139,200
Consisting of—								
Direct appropriations.....	1,160,375,470	1,214,814,500	1,169,723,500	1,204,309,000	1,196,169,800	-18,644,700	+26,446,300	-8,139,200
Appropriation of receipts.....	146,535,000	125,446,000	125,446,000	125,446,000	125,446,000			
Borrowing authorization.....	16,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000			

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, before conclusion of Senate consideration of the House-Senate conference committee approved appropriations bill for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the coming fiscal year, I believe it is appropriate to note for the RECORD two of the items included.

One concerns the program to protect endangered wildlife species, the other is the effort to prevent destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City.

ENDANGERED SPECIES

Concerning endangered species of wildlife, included with this bill in the report is language authorizing the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to add six new positions to the program being undertaken by the Endangered Wildlife Research Station at the Patuxent Wildlife Center located not too far from our Capital City.

This language was submitted by me during our Senate appropriations subcommittee consideration of the Interior bill. As a matter of record, I might point out that the endangered wildlife facility at Patuxent, which is now under development, is the project which I recommended a year ago.

At that time I submitted a funding amendment to the Interior appropriations bill, asking that \$350,000 be allocated for establishing the endangered species center so as to expand the research efforts underway in the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

This recommendation received approval of the Senate Appropriations Committee and subsequently the Congress, and last fall work was started on locating the facility at Patuxent. This spring, I received a progress report on the endangered species program at Patuxent, which, I should point out, is under the direction of one of the outstanding biologists in this field in the country, Dr. Ray Erickson. Dr. Erickson brings to this vital research effort the knowledge and experience of many years of dedicated work in behalf of preserving our wildlife resources. I am confident that under the direction of this most able public servant, we are going to witness tremendous progress in the important tasks of saving from extinction such valuable birds and animals as the whooping crane, the black-footed ferret and many, many others.

Mr. President, I would like to include at this point in my remarks, the progress report on the endangered species program resulting from the utilization of funds which I had recommended.

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

ENDANGERED SPECIES PROGRAM

The sum of \$350,000, appropriated by Congress last spring, has permitted the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to embark on an active research and propagation program for threatened American wildlife.

All captive wildlife stock formerly held at Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge in southern Colorado was moved on February 21 to Patuxent Wildlife Research Center near Laurel, Maryland, where temporary pens and ponds had been built for their immediate

occupancy. The stock included "Canus", the young whooping crane which was rescued after being found injured in Wood Buffalo National Park nearly two years ago; 45 greater and lesser sandhill cranes; 8 Aleutian Canada geese, 3 tule white-fronted geese; 4 dusky grouse; and several dozen silky bantams used for incubation studies.

Also on hand are 8 South American snail kites which are being studied to develop rearing methods which might be used with the endangered Florida Everglade kites; 4 pairs of masked bobwhite quail as a result of my request to the Levy brothers, Seymour and James, of Tucson, Arizona, soon will be air-shipped to Patuxent for propagation purposes.

A staff of ten is assigned to this new program. Dr. R. C. Erickson, as Assistant Director of the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, is the responsible biologist in charge. The field investigations phase was initiated with the assignment of Winston E. Banko to Honolulu on the study of endangered Hawaiian birds; Fred C. Sibley to Ojai, California, on the California condor; Donald K. Fortenberry to Rapid City, South Dakota, on the black-footed ferret; and Norman E. Holgersen to southern Florida to study the Florida Everglades kite and other southeastern threatened species.

Two previously authorized positions are being occupied by C. Eugene Knoder, who heads the propagation aspects of the program, and his assistant, Donald Fricke. A secretary and two animal keepers remain to be assigned, though temporary employees are meeting interim needs.

Engineering planning is now complete and bids will be accepted soon for construction of a propagation building, a service-equipment storage building, a well, storage reservoir, and water distribution system, and a series of enclosures and ponds. Preliminary plans are at hand for a laboratory building, whose construction is proposed for fiscal year 1968. Other major construction contemplated during the next five years includes a large complex of covered and open enclosures and ponds; two more propagation buildings for shore and wading birds and for such perching birds as eagles, condors, hawks, woodpeckers, and songbirds; a building containing environmental control chambers; 2 custodial residences; and a visitors center where live examples of many rare and endangered wildlife species will be on public display near Washington.

An eventual staff of approximately 60 is anticipated, about half of them being technical personnel. It is expected that when the program reaches full stride within eight or ten years studies at Patuxent will be in progress on at least 100 different species in captivity which may be annually producing more than 5,000 birds for release to the wild. At this time several smaller research substations may also be developed at existing refuges or other Federal properties to meet the needs of species of threatened wildlife which cannot be held at Patuxent because of climatic or other reasons.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the language I submitted for inclusion in the report for fiscal 1967, will now permit adding six new positions to the research program, and this will be accomplished within operating funds provided in the budget request.

The total authorized staff of the endangered species program now consists of 10 employees. The six new positions will be needed to carry forward the functions of the station, with two of the staff assignments directed to field studies of such species as the Tule white-fronted goose, the masked bobwhite, the Attwater's prairie chicken, and the red wolf.

Two of the positions are for animal caretakers to provide care of the captive stock on a 24-hour-day, 7-day-week basis for much of each year. Another staff assignment is for a secretary and the remaining post is for an animal physiologist-nutritionist needed to give continuing attention to the dietary requirements and the formulation of foods, as well as to make continuing appraisals of the physical condition of the captive stock.

Mr. President, I have here one further example of not only the progress being made at the endangered species center but a demonstration of the wonderful cooperation which is being received around the country in the effort to save our wildlife.

Recently Seymour and James Levy, of Tucson, Ariz., donated to the center four pairs of the rare masked bobwhite birds. The Levy brothers conduct their own efforts to propagate this particular variety, and are representative of many Americans who are devoting their talents to this significant conservation effort to preserve and enhance the tremendous wildlife heritage given to this country.

Mr. President, I request permission to include at this point in the RECORD a news story concerning the Levy brothers' contribution.

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

APRIL 15, 1966.

Arrival this week of eight masked bobwhite quail at the Patuxent National Wildlife Research Center near Washington marks another step forward in the program to save endangered species of wildlife.

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, announced today that four pairs of the rare variety of quail (*Colinus virginianus ridgwayi*) have been presented to the center by Seymour and James Levy of Tucson, Arizona.

MUNDT said the Levy brothers, who are conducting their own efforts to propagate masked bobwhites, donated the birds to the center's new endangered species program established at Patuxent through the South Dakota Senator's efforts last year.

MUNDT said the masked bobwhite are being housed in pens specially built for them. He said the eight quail will provide a breeding nucleus for the endangered species project in an effort to repopulate the former range in Arizona of this species.

He said until the early 1900's, masked bobwhites were found in the desert areas of central southern Arizona. Their former range extended through middle Sonora in Mexico to about 50 miles north of the U.S.-Mexico border, and from the Baboquivari Mountains east to the upper Santo Cruz Valley.

"Present distribution of the variety," MUNDT said, "is confined to Southern Sonora, with some reported northeast of Guaymas, Sonora."

MUNDT said there is no estimate on the number of masked bobwhite quail in the wild, but noted that only a few sets of eggs have been discovered in recent years.

The endangered species program at Patuxent is under direction of Dr. R. C. Erickson, assistant director of the Patuxent Center. Already on hand at the station is the captive wildlife stock formerly held at Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge in southern Colorado.

Temporary pens and ponds were built at Patuxent to house the stock which included "Canus," the young whooping crane which was rescued after being injured in Wood

Buffalo National Park, Canada, nearly two years ago; 45 greater and lesser sandhill cranes to be used in research to develop techniques for successful propagation of the rare whooping crane; eight Aleutian Canada geese; three tule white-fronted geese, four dusky grouse; and several dozen silky bantams used for incubation studies.

Also on hand are several South American small kites which are being studied to develop rearing methods which might be used with the endangered Florida Everglade kites.

METROPOLITAN OPERA AMENDMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in connection with the Metropolitan Opera House, the conference approved bill contains my amendment which prohibits the National Foundation of Arts and Humanities from making any grant or other payment which would be used directly or indirectly for destruction of the Met.

It should be made clear, Mr. President, that this amendment in itself cannot prevent the destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House, if that is the desire of the owners.

However, it does accomplish the purpose of preventing any expenditure of Federal funds for such purpose, and secondly, in my opinion, through adoption, it expresses the sense of the Congress as being opposed to destruction of this world famous structure in New York City.

The inception of this amendment originated with Representative WILLIAM WIDNALL, of New Jersey, and he is deserving of great credit for the effort made here in behalf of preserving this fine structure in New York City.

Unfortunately, when he proposed it in the other body, it was stricken on a point of order. I then submitted it in our Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, which agreed to it, and it subsequently received approval of the conference committee and is now part of the bill considered today in the Senate.

What this amendment also does, is pointed out by Mr. WIDNALL in his remarks. He stated:

Many of our historic buildings and sites that are rich in tradition, history, and architecture and of great cultural and artistic value are threatened by the bulldozers and the wrecking balls. Already, some 6,000 of our heritage of 12,000 most historically significant buildings have been destroyed, by progress of a kind which takes no account of history or cultural and artistic values. The Metropolitan Opera House was almost a victim of this kind of shortsighted progress.

Mr. WIDNALL continues:

The amendment voted by this House today has had a major role in saving the Metropolitan Opera House, and it established a precedent of major significance. Certainly no Federal funds should be used to destroy our historic landmarks and our cultural monuments. Saving these is a mark of our maturity as a nation.

Mr. President, I could not agree more with Mr. WIDNALL's statement and I share his pleasure that the New York State Legislature has passed overwhelmingly a measure to save the Metropolitan Opera House.

This, of course, is where the final action must come to save this magnificent structure, in the State of New York and the city of New York.

However, it is my hope that through the action taken by the Congress in approval of this amendment, we have provided some direction and some encouragement to those who continue to carry on the fight.

Mr. President, for the purposes of the historical record of the effort to save the Met here in Congress, I request permission to include several items which are pertinent to the issue and which are in chronological order.

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

STATEMENT OF MR. WIDNALL, APRIL 5, 1966

In December 1962 Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall declared the Metropolitan Opera House eligible for registration as a national historic landmark, but the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., opposed such registration, and the board of directors, including Roger L. Stevens and Anthony A. Bliss, has continued to press for the destruction of the historic Metropolitan Opera House.

Mayor John Lindsay, of New York City, is interested in saving the Metropolitan Opera House, as are many other well-known people including Artur Rubinstein, Isaac Stern, Leonard Bernstein, Dr. Howard Hanson, Laszlo Halasz, Leopold Stokowski, Martha Graham, Rebekah Harkness, Dr. Harold Taylor, and Phillip Langer of the Theater Guild.

My proposed amendment would simply require that, as a condition of the expenditure of the millions of dollars provided, by this appropriation bill for the National Endowment for the Arts, none of these funds would be used directly or indirectly to destroy the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City at 39th Street and Broadway. The Metropolitan Opera House should be preserved and operated on a sound basis for the enjoyment and appreciation of generations yet to come. The Met's friends are legion, and will yet save this exceptional structure known as a landmark throughout the world.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1966]

MAJOR SUPPORTS SAVING OLD MET—AID SAYS LINDSAY SEEKS CONSTRUCTIVE PURPOSE FOR OPERA HOUSE—DEMOLITION SCHEDULED, BUT SEVERAL GROUPS HOPE THAT RAZING FOR OFFICES CAN BE PREVENTED

(By Theodore Strongin)

Woody Klein, Mayor Lindsay's press secretary, said yesterday the mayor believed that the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street "should be saved and used for some constructive purpose. He has one or two staff members working on it," Mr. Klein added.

The opera house, which was completed in 1883, is scheduled to be demolished to make way for an office building after the opera company moves out next month. In September the new Met at Lincoln Center will open.

The mayor is pleased with the efforts of various groups who are trying to save the old building, said Mr. Klein.

Among these are the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit group with headquarters in Mount Vernon; the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects, whose members will testify at a meeting of the city planning commission on March 30, and the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street, which has asked the planning commission to institute condemnation proceedings so that the city acquires title to the Met property.

The architects' group believes that by easing certain zoning restrictions and granting special permits the builders of the planned office structure can be compensated for the loss they would incur if the present auditorium is preserved.

These matters would have to be studied, the architects concede. So they will suggest at the planning commission meeting that an impartial feasibility study be made to investigate their suggestions and, maybe, find new ones.

Roy Anderson, head of the Save the Met Foundation, said that this organization was circulating petitions to be sent to Governor Rockefeller, asking him to "introduce, support, and pass New York State legislation to preserve the famous Metropolitan Opera House." Mr. Anderson also said that he had information that could lead to a rehearing of the Met case before the Landmarks Preservation Commission or to a contest of the Met's lease to the group of real estate investors who plan to erect the office building.

TURNED DOWN LAST YEAR

In December the Landmarks Preservation Commission declined to designate the opera house a landmark, which would have saved it. At that time, the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects suggested preserving the auditorium and building the office building over it. The commission found the plan economically unfeasible.

TO TAKE POSSESSION MAY 8

The group that leased the old Met site is headed by Jack D. Weiler and Irwin S. Chalin of New York. It will take possession on May 8. The Met expects to get an average of \$485,000 a year in rentals.

A provision in the lease forbids the use of the site for grand opera or musical presentations. Anthony Bliss, president of the Met, said that the limiting provision was made for financial reasons only, so that the new building would produce the greatest revenue possible for the Met.

He said that many feasibility studies had been made over the years, and that the Met itself had investigated the possibility of building over the present house, but that all plans had proved to be financially unsound.

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, today advised the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York that he will propose an amendment to an appropriations bill "to help prevent the destruction of the world famous opera house".

MUNDT, ranking Republican on the Senate Appropriations subcommittee which considers funding for the Department of the Interior, said his amendment would be in the form of a prohibition against expenditure of Federal funds in the Interior bill which could be used "directly or indirectly to destroy the Metropolitan Opera House".

The South Dakota Senator sent word of his action by telegram to Mr. Leonard Altman, Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, 33 East 61st Street, New York.

Text of MUNDT's telegram follows:

"It is with pleasure that I notify you that I will offer an amendment to the Interior Department and related agencies appropriation bill to help prevent the destruction of the world famous Metropolitan Opera House.

"At the earliest possible convenience I intend to propose an amendment that would prohibit the expenditure of any of the funds of that bill which would be used directly or indirectly to destroy the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City at 39th Street and Broadway.

"Your fight to preserve this symbol of our national heritage has inspired the entire Nation. It has pointed out that in spite of

the emphasis on the promotion and advancement of our cultural heritage we have a tendency to betray the very cause which we honor if we do not look to the past as well as the future.

"In its eight decades of existence, the Met has brought countless hours of joy to millions in every State of the Union. Its preservation means as much to those who have never had the opportunity to hear in person the thrilling performances presented there, but have listened to its Saturday afternoon broadcasts, as those who were fortunate enough to attend in person.

"I know that the fans of the Metropolitan Opera are legion and will welcome this opportunity to save this symbol of America's highest artistic achievement. In a similar vein, I do not believe this is or should be a political issue. Both parties are equally in favor of the preservation and promotion of our cultural life and I therefore will invite Senators on both sides of the aisle to join with me in this battle so we may hopefully echo the words of Radames in Act I, Scene I of Aida:

"Per te ho pugnoto, per te ho vinto!
"For you I fought, for you I conquered!"
"KARL E. MUNDT,
"U.S. Senator."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1966]

\$8 MILLION IS GOAL TO SAVE OLD MET—CITY WOULD HAVE TO CONDEMN PROPERTY—MAY 10 DEADLINE

(By Dan Sullivan)

A last-minute campaign to raise \$8-million to save the old Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street was announced yesterday.

Leonard Altman, executive chairman of the recently formed Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, said his committee had exactly 34 days to raise the money. The opera house is scheduled to be razed for an office building any time after May 10.

The \$8-million would be enough to purchase the building, Mr. Altman said, but another fund-raising campaign would be necessary to renovate its interior.

The campaign was announced at a press conference at the Overseas Press Club. Among the speakers were Marian Anderson, Isaac Stern, Agnes De Mille, Tony Randall and Leopold Stokowski, national chairman of the campaign.

PUBLIC APPEAL PLANNED

All echoed Miss Anderson's statement that tearing down the old opera house would be "a tragedy."

Details of the fund-raising plan, as announced by Mr. Altman, were vague. He said that private individuals of means would be approached, that foundation help would be sought and that public appeals would be made through advertisements.

The committee proposes to purchase the opera house from the city, provided that the money can be raised and that the city agrees to condemn the property.

After purchase of the building, a non-profit corporation would operate it, renting the house to various attractions like ballet companies and orchestras. Mr. Altman said the committee already could guarantee 31 weeks of engagements at the house next season, none of them performances of opera.

He identified one of them as the American Ballet Theater, which wants to put on two four-week seasons at the old Met. He declined to name the others. "They are afraid of getting in trouble with other concert halls if our plan doesn't go through," he said.

NO LOSS FOR OPERA SEEN

The 8-million, Mr. Altman said, will guarantee the Metropolitan Opera Association as

much money from the sale of the property as it would receive from the long-term leasing program under which the office building is to be constructed.

The group that is planning to put up the office building will receive "fair compensation" for the money they have spent on the project, Mr. Altman said. Jack Weler and Irwin S. Chainin of New York head that group.

Whether condemnation proceedings will be initiated "rests primarily with Mayor Lindsay," Mr. Altman said. The Mayor knows about the committee's plans and seems "friendly" he said, but no promises have been made. Mayor Lindsay's office had no comment on the matter last night.

DISAGREEMENT ON FIGURES

Anthony Bliss, president of the opera association, had several comments on Mr. Altman's plan. He said that the building would have to be sold for at least \$12 million—not \$8 million—to net as much money as the Met would receive over the next 50 years from leasing the property.

He added that he doubted there were enough attractions to fill both the old Met and the new Met, which opens at Lincoln Center in September and will be available for touring attractions during the spring and summer.

Management has not always been able to keep even the old house busy when the regular company has not been appearing there, Mr. Bliss said.

Most of the speakers at Mr. Altman's press conference were convinced that the old Met would be busy all year. Mr. Stokowski said that with the population growth of Greater New York, the central city would be called upon to increase its cultural facilities.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1966]
CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE METROPOLITAN OPERA HOUSE

(Leonard Altman, Executive Chairman; Bronson Binger, Secretary; Couderc Bros., General Counsel, 33 East 61st Street, New York 10022, TE 2-8621.)

["From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 7, 1966]

"NATIONAL SAVE-THE-MET GOAL—RAISING \$8 MILLION IN 34 DAYS
(By William Bender)

"Four greats in the music and dance world launched a nationwide drive yesterday to raise \$8 million in 34 days to save the old Metropolitan Opera House from demolition.

"The four were Leopold Stokowski, Agnes De Mille, Isaac Stern, and Marian Anderson, acting as spokesmen for the three-week-old Citizens' Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House. Maestro Stokowski assumed the post of national chairman.

"The Committee wants to keep the old building in operation under a non-profit arrangement with New York City similar to that under which Carnegie Hall now is maintained."

Leopold Stokowski, National Chairman: "The Metropolitan Opera House is one of the finest and most famous in the world. All difficulties should be overcome so that this historic monument of American Culture can continue to be available to the public. . . ."

Isaac Stern: "I feel that this Hall could operate for 40 weeks a year to add most necessarily to the greatness of the cultural activity of New York and the United States, with absolutely no detriment or competition whatsoever to the new auditoriums now being completed. I am sure it will prove its value as a home for many groups searching desperately for a major theatre in which to perform, and also excite new ideas and new productions so necessary to the continuous development of our cultural life."

Senator KARL E. MUNDT: "I know that the fans of the Metropolitan are legion and will welcome the opportunity to save this symbol of America's highest artistic achievement. . . ."

Agnes De Mille: ". . . the building has a mysterious combination of qualities that makes great theatre possible."

Marian Anderson: "It would be a tragedy to tear down this house."

Vladimir Horowitz: "To destroy the Met would be an act of barbarism."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1966]

FAREWELL FOR A GRAND OLD MET WILL OPEN A NEW ERA IN CITY'S OPERATIC HISTORY—8 P.M. TOMORROW. FINALE AT 39TH ST.—COMPANY TO PRESENT ALMOST 60 LEADING SINGERS IN BENEFIT PERFORMANCE

(By Theodore Strongin)

With a fine sense of history, the Metropolitan Opera will end 83 years in its home at Broadway and 39th Street tomorrow night with the closing scene from Gounod's "Faust."

It was "Faust," on Oct. 22, 1883, which opened the house before an audience sparkling with Goelets, Goulds, Iselins, Morgans, Rhinelanders, Vanderbilts, Warrens and other wealthy families whose demands for more and more box space had led to the construction of the building and the establishment of the company.

Many of their descendants, as well as about 40 former Met singers, will be in the audience at the Gala Farewell, a soldout benefit for the company with ticket prices as high as \$200. The performance begins at 8.

Nearly 60 of the Met's leading artists will sing parts of 25 operas, donating their services.

Plans to broadcast the performance have failed. Radio station WNYC had received the green light from both the Met and the American Federation of Musicians' Local 802 to make the broadcast, but the American Guild of Musical Artists "regretfully" declined to give permission. It gave no reason.

LABOR PROBLEMS UNRESOLVED

Probably only a few in the audience tomorrow night will be concerned with a grim undercurrent behind the scenes: Unresolved labor negotiations may jeopardize the opening of the company's Lincoln Center home on Sept. 16. There is also annoyance on the part of the Met's management at wide efforts to save the old house. The management has already signed a profitable agreement disposing of it.

Next week the company starts on its annual tour. The final stages of the move to Lincoln Center will be carried out during the Bolshoi Ballet's run at the old Met from next Tuesday through May 9, when the famous gold curtain will fall for the last time.

The Met intends to open its new house in September with the world premiere of Samuel Barber's "Antony and Cleopatra." A banner opening week is planned, with new productions of Ponchielli's "La Gioconda," Verdi's "La Traviata" and Strauss's "Die Frau Ohne Schatten."

Whether it will open as planned could depend on the outcome of the two-year-old negotiations between the Met and the members of its orchestra. The musicians have been working without a contract since June 30, 1964.

TALKS ARE "DRAGGING"

Neither side will say that agreement is in sight. "The negotiations are dragging," said one observer. The latest impasse reportedly concerns retroactivity.

The musicians want the new contract to put them, financially, where they would have been had agreement been reached at the expiration of the last contract. The management is said to have offered a flat sum of

\$1,000 to cover the two years and a three-year contract with a minimum weekly pay of \$200 the first year rising to \$220 in the third. The minimum in the old contract was \$190.

The old Met will be officially taken over by Keystone Associates, a group of real-estate operators, on May 10. They have leased the site from the Met for 50 years. The building is to be razed and replaced with a 40-story office structure. Several groups and individuals are now campaigning to save the house (or at least the auditorium) both because of its historic value and because of its usefulness as a hall for the performing arts.

Among the principal backers of the drive are the Save the Met Foundation, the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street and the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

\$8 MILLION DRIVE UNDERWAY

The Citizens Committee, formed last month, is trying to raise \$8-million by May 10 to buy the building. It would renovate it (for \$14-million more) and operate it as a music and dance theater.

The architect's chapter proposes that Keystone Associates build its offices over the present auditorium, saving the "Golden Horseshoe" of boxes and balconies and the gold-decorated interior.

Mayor Lindsay has said that he would be interested in saving the building if "some constructive purpose" could be found for it.

At Lincoln Center, the Met will move into a \$45.7-million structure that is now 95 percent complete. The modern backstage facilities, rehearsal rooms, dressing rooms, lobby space are such as to make the company members' mouth water. The 39th Street house had been criticized as inadequate almost since it was built.

The new Met, which will seat 3,800—175 more than the old house—is like a 47-story skyscraper laid on its side. More than half of its cubic footage is behind the proscenium, where most of a season's scenery can be stored. The old Met allowed the storage of only 20 per cent of a season's scenery.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1966]
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES—MET MUSICAL LANDMARK

To the Editor:

The salvation of the Metropolitan Opera House has sparked the imaginations of Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL of New Jersey and Senator KARL E. MUNDT of South Dakota.

The fact that efforts to save the Met are being made in Washington only point up the fact that the Opera House is more than a New York landmark. It is a musical landmark, of great significance throughout the world, and should be preserved in the interests of art and history for the benefit of all people.

JANET GOLLER.

FOREST HILLS, LONG ISLAND,
April 18, 1966.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1966]
SAVE-THE-MET COMMITTEE IS TOLD ITS GOAL IS \$7 MILLION TOO LOW
(By Theodore Strongin)

At least \$15 million would be needed to save the old Metropolitan Opera House, Anthony Bliss, Met president, has told a citizens committee now working to raise \$8 million to save the building.

It was learned yesterday that Mayor Lindsay does not plan to intervene in the campaign to save the house. He will leave its fate to the private individuals concerned.

Mr. Bliss met on Monday with the committee's counsel at the request of the Mayor, to discuss finances.

The opera company opens in its new home at Lincoln Center on Sept. 16. It has already leased the site of its old house at Broadway and 39th Street to Keystone Associates, a group of real estate investors who will take over May 10. Keystone plans to demolish the building and replace it with a 40-story office building.

\$8 MILLION GOAL PROPOSED

The Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House estimates that the \$8-million it is trying to get, would, if invested, return the Met as much money as it will get from the lease to Keystone.

"The \$8-million doesn't even begin to do the job," Mr. Bliss said yesterday.

Under the terms of the lease, the Met will receive \$24.2-million over the next 50 years, the committee asserts. It says that "a prudent investment" of the \$8-million would yield to the Met more than the \$24.2-million.

Mr. Bliss called the committee's figures "ridiculous." The committee, he said, did not count the returns from investing the lease income, and disregarded certain rights the Met will have in the new office building.

Mr. Bliss will hold no more meetings, he said yesterday, until the committee can approach him with sufficient cash or pledges of cash to make the possibility of saving the old building a reality. Such an approach would make "research by our bankers really worth our while," he said, commenting on the approximate nature of the \$15-million figure.

PLANNING COSTS SUBSTANTIAL

Beyond the Met's needs, Mr. Bliss said, Keystone Associates would have to be reimbursed for the planning work done on the project office building since the lease was signed five years ago. Irwin Chanin, representing Keystone, would not estimate that amount yesterday. An informed source placed it at somewhere near \$3-million. Thus, according to Mr. Bliss, the Citizen Committee would have to raise \$18-million by May 10 to save the old house and its famous "Diamond Horseshoe" of boxes and balconies.

The committee has received \$500 from the Independent Concert Managers Association, representing the major New York management firms, and \$250 from the Theater Guild.

It has also received \$8,000 from the Avon Foundation, a St. Paul group. The \$8,000 contingent upon the committee's raising the balance of what it needs.

The committee had been urging the mayor to start proceedings towards condemnation of the house. Commenting upon the Mayor's plans not to intervene a representative of the committee said yesterday that it had a new approach, but declined to identify it. Leopold Stokowski is national chairman of the committee. Leonard Altman is its executive chairman.

[From the New York Times, May 7, 1966]
APPEAL BY WAGNER MADE FOR OLD MET

Former Mayor Robert F. Wagner issued a statement yesterday afternoon supporting the Citizen's Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House. Mr. Wagner said:

"The preservation of Carnegie Hall—one of the proud achievements of the Wagner administration—has proved to be a major boon to the expansion of our cultural life. At this time, with the future of the old Metropolitan Opera House hanging in the balance, should like to state that I feel it to be in the best interest of the people of our city and nation that this great and historic building also be saved.

"Time is short. The land has been leased to real-estate developers, who take over on May 10. But, there is now pending in Albany a bill which provides for a six months delay

in demolition, indemnifies the land owners and lease holders for the delay, and provides for condemnation proceedings to insure a fair price for all parties concerned. Public funds will not be involved. I urge the prompt passage of this bill and its immediate signing by the Governor."

Also yesterday, Benjamin M. Zelman, a lawyer for the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., urged the Landmarks Preservation Commission to act for the old Met. Discussing the matter with the commission at 2 Lafayette Street, he said that local law gives it authority over works of art as well as structures. Mr. Zelman argued that the old Met is a work of art, and called for the commission to schedule an immediate hearing of arguments in the case. No immediate action was taken.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 9, 1966]

D.C. GROUP SEEKS TO SAVE THE MET

An emergency appeal on behalf of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City is being made by a group of prominent Washingtonians.

In a message to the directors of the Metropolitan Opera Association and the real estate syndicate of Keystone Associates, the Washingtonians have asked that demolition, scheduled to start tomorrow, be delayed a month.

The organization, Washington Friends of the Metropolitan Opera House, suggests the "possibly of building over and around part of the existing structure. . . ."

Among the listed as signers are Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and ERNEST GRUENING and S. Dillon Ripley of the Smithsonian Institution, according to Sylvia Altman, a coordinator of the group.

[From the New York Times, May 9, 1966]
SIX MORE MONTHS SOUGHT FOR MET—DRIVE TO SAVE OPERA HOUSE FOCUSES ON LEGISLATURE
(By Theodore Strongin)

Efforts to save the old Metropolitan Opera House, which at last stands empty, are aimed at delaying its demolition for six months until money can be raised to buy it.

The Metropolitan Opera Company has almost completed moving to its new home in Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. The final scheduled performance in the old house was given last night by the Bolshoi Ballet while pickets urging the building's preservation marched outside.

Keystone Associates, a group of real estate developers, has leased the site of the old Met; it plans to raze the opera house and put up a 40-story office building. Keystone is expected to take over the old building tomorrow. The exact date for the wrecking ball to swing into action is not known; as of late last week, no demolition permit has been granted by the city Building Department.

The Save the Met Foundation, Inc., and the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street, among other groups, have been urging that proceedings be started to rescue the building. The Citizens Committee proposes to buy it, renovate it and run it as a theater for the performing arts. The group claims it could fill the house with attractions for 31 weeks next season.

DISAGREEMENT ON FIGURE

Under the leadership of Leopold Stokowski, national chairman, and Leonard Altman, executive chairman, the Citizens Committee has been holding a last-minute fund drive to raise the \$8-million it says would be needed to buy the opera house and reimburse the Met company for the money it is to receive under the lease with Keystone. The Met disputes this figure; it says the purchase price would probably have to be \$15-million.

Bronson Binger, secretary of the Citizens Committee, declined to say yesterday how much the fund drive had raised, but indications are that it is small. Mr. Binger explained that efforts lately had been devoted to gaining a demolition delay through the Legislature rather than to raising money.

Mayor Lindsay has declined to begin condemnation proceedings to prevent demolition. But Mr. Binger said an 11th-hour State Senate bill to save the old Met would be reported to the floor tomorrow by the Rules Committee. The bill would set up a nonprofit corporation; demolition would be delayed for six months if the corporation posted a bond to indemnify both the Met company and Keystone for the delay. This would give the Citizens Committee six months to raise the purchase money, Mr. Binger said.

APPEAL FROM WASHINGTON

Yesterday a group of prominent Washingtonians urged a delay in demolition. Their appeal, addressed to the Met company and to Keystone, asked for "a reprieve" of one month to allow "time for further consideration of other alternatives."

Among the signers of the appeal were Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS of Illinois; Senator ERNEST GRUENING of Alaska; Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, head of the Smithsonian Institution; Drew Pearson, the columnist, and Sylvia Altman, chairman of the cultural affairs committee of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council.

In New York, the Council of Actors Equity came out yesterday in support of "the salvation and restoration of this great and historical landmark."

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1966]
STATE SENATORS ACT TO SAVE MET—ADOPT BILL, 61 TO 2—TRAVIA ASKS CHANGE IN ASSEMBLY

(By Sydney H. Schanberg)

ALBANY, May 10.—By a vote of 61 to 2, the Senate today approved a plan designed to save the historic Metropolitan Opera House "before the wrecking ball starts swinging."

The Assembly leader, Speaker Anthony J. Travia, has introduced a different bill to save the Met. But he indicated after the Senate vote late this afternoon that he was amenable to compromise and might accept the Senate bill if it were amended slightly.

As a result, it appeared likely that final action would be taken by the Legislature shortly, perhaps next week.

The Senate bill was championed by Whitney North Seymour, Jr., Manhattan Republican. He said "no one has any illusions that it will be easy" to raise the money to buy the Met. But, he declared, "It is a cultural landmark that, once lost, will be lost forever."

Senator Jerome L. Wilson, Manhattan Democrat, said, "No other culture in the Western world would even consider destroying such a structure as this."

The two lone votes against the bill were cast by Senators Harrison J. Goldin and Archie A. Gorink, both Democrats from the Bronx.

HOW PLAN WOULD WORK

Under the bill—which would go into effect immediately after being signed by Governor—a nonprofit corporation would be created, known as The Old Met Opera House Corporation.

The new corporation would have the power to acquire the opera house site at Broadway and 39th Street by condemnation and then renovate and restore the building for the "public purpose" of operating it as a "facility for the performing arts with special emphasis on music."

Probably the bill's most crucial point is that it would give the new corporation an

opportunity to block any demolition for six months. The measure provides that if the present lessee, Keystone Associates, files for a demolition permit from the city Buildings Department, the Buildings Commissioner could hold up the permit for 180 days if the new Met corporation deposits \$100,000 as security with the county clerk of Manhattan.

If, in that time, the corporation fails to raise enough money to buy the opera house, Keystone would be able to go ahead with its plans to raze the structure and erect a 40-story office building in its place.

PURPOSE OF THE DEPOSIT

Whether the new corporation fails or succeeds in raising the money, owners of the site—the Metropolitan Opera Company, which is moving to the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts—would be compensated from the \$100,000 security for any losses it suffered because of the delay in demolition.

The Senate bill was prepared by the Citizens Committee for the preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, headed by Leopold Stokowski. Reportedly drafted with the help of the New York City corporation counsel, the bill was introduced by Senator Seymour and Senator John J. Marchi, Staten Island Republican.

The Travia bill in the Assembly was proposed by the Save the Met Foundation, Inc.—another citizens' group formed to stave off demolition. This measure would authorize the City of New York to buy the opera house and lease it to the Save the Met Foundation. If necessary, the city could set bonds to buy the building.

What Speaker Travia objects to in particular in the Senate bill is a provision that would permit an office building to be built atop the opera house as a revenue producer.

"I'm for saving the Met, not building an office building," said Mr. Travia, a Brooklyn Democrat. "I'm amenable to compromise, but not with that clause in there."

MOERDLER MAKES REQUEST

Buildings Commissioner Charles G. Moerdler requested the police yesterday to take "vigorous steps" to prevent demolition of the old Metropolitan Opera House because no wrecking permit had been requested or issued.

Under a lease signed in February, 1961, the Metropolitan Opera turned over possession of the building yesterday to Keystone Associates, a group of real estate developers. Keystone plans to tear the opera house down and replace it with an office building. The Met moved the last of its effects yesterday to its new home in Lincoln Center.

Mr. Moerdler said he had received several reports yesterday that parts of the interior of the old Met were being torn down. Richard Caine Striker, a member of the Citizens Committee to Save the Old Metropolitan Opera House, said that on Monday he found workmen unscrewing some of the decorative brass pillars between boxes of the diamond horseshoe. Later he ascertained that the pillars would be sold by the opera company as souvenirs. The Met told him that it could provide the names of the buyers, Mr. Striker said, should legislation saving the house be passed.

MAY 12, 1966.

METROPOLITAN OPERA AMENDMENT PASSES SENATE

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, today expressed hope his amendment concerning the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City "would encounter no difficulties in the House-Senate conference committee when it considers the Department of Interior Appropriations Bill as passed by the House and the Senate."

MUNDT's amendment, added to the fiscal 1967 appropriations bill by the Senate Ap-

propriations Committee at his request, would prevent the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities from making any grant or other payment which would be used directly or indirectly for destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House.

The amendment was included as part of the related agencies portion of the Interior bill which was approved by the Senate today.

MUNDT said through inclusion of the amendment in the bill, he considers the Senate action as "an expression of protest against destruction of the Opera House."

The South Dakota Senator, who will serve as ranking Republican of the Senate Appropriations Committee at the House-Senate conference, said it is his understanding progress is being made in the New York State Legislature to prevent destruction of the Met.

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1966]
LESSEES GET SET TO RAZE MET; SENATE REWRITES A RESCUE BILL
(By Theodore Strongin)

The city Department of Buildings has granted a permit to the leaseholders of the site of the old Metropolitan Opera House to build a construction shed on the property preparatory to obtaining a demolition permit.

The leaseholders—the firm of Swig, Weiler & Arnov, in association with Irwin Chanin, operating as Keystone Associates—plan to replace the old opera house with a 40-story office building.

In Albany yesterday, the Senate passed an amended version of a bill designed to preserve the structure. The amendments were reported to have been introduced to satisfy the objections of Assembly Speaker Anthony J. Travia to the original Senate measure passed last week.

The Assembly passed the measure last night, and it now goes to Governor Rockefeller for signature.

Under the bill as it stands now a nonprofit corporation would be created, known as the Old Met Opera House Corporation. The new corporation would have the power to acquire the site of the opera house at Broadway and 39th Street by condemnation. It would renovate the building for the "public purpose" of operating it as a performing arts theater.

BOND MUST BE POSTED

The bill provides for delaying demolition of the old house up to 180 days, provided the corporation posts a bond of \$200,000. The amount was \$100,000 in the version originally passed. Purpose of the delay would be to allow the corporation to raise the purchase price of the site and building.

The Metropolitan Opera Company is strongly opposed to the bill. The company stands to receive nearly \$25-million from its 50-year lease to Keystone at an average of \$484,000 a year. Company officials declare that the bill would put this money in jeopardy. The 180-day stay in demolition would give Keystone an opportunity to disaffirm the lease, say the officials, since the lease's terms would be frustrated by the bill. If the committee failed to raise the necessary purchase money, the company, say the officials, could be left with the old house on its hands and no money.

The company is counting on the lease money in planning its activities in its new Lincoln Center home, where it opens next Sept. 16. The company also takes exception to the name "Old Met Opera House Corporation," since it considers that the word "Met" belongs to itself.

COMMITTEE SEEKS \$8 MILLION

The Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, a private group, is believed to have helped write

the bill. The committee has been raising money to save the old house. It is aiming at \$8-million, which it considers an amount that, prudently invested, would more than reimburse the Met for the loss of lease money. Met officials say that a fair price would be \$12-million to \$15-million.

Rudolf Bing, general manager of the Met Company, in a speech yesterday accepting the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters from New York University, warned that "certain groups are trying to save an old building and may well succeed, in the process, in killing the company that made the building what it was.

"Politicians who have never darkened the door of the Metropolitan Opera are suddenly throwing around hollow phrases about saving culture, blissfully unaware that they may be about to destroy it."

Mr. Chanin attacked the Senate bill as unconstitutional in that it would give the power of eminent domain "into the hands of a few private citizens who obviously do not have the funds to pay for the rights" of the involved parties.

A representative of the citizens committee has replied that the money is available to enable condemnation proceedings to start within two weeks, if the bill becomes law.

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1966]

COUNCILMAN ASSAILS OPERA ASSOCIATION

City Councilman Woodward Kingman yesterday said he was "shocked by the [Metropolitan Opera] Association's claim that the sum of \$15-million is the (old Met's) true value.

Mr. Kingman, an officer of the First National City Bank, said the old Met land is taxed on the basis of a total assessed valuation of \$4.75 million.

"It would seem to me both in my capacity as a banker and as a councilman," he added, "that more careful consideration should be given to the claims of the Citizen's Committee that the Metropolitan Operation Association will gain, not lose, by selling its land at a fair price rather than by renting it to Keystone Associates."

Mr. Kingman was referring to the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House. The committee asserts that \$8-million is a fair price for the old Met, and that \$8-million, prudently invested, would return more than the 50-year lease the Met has given Keystone, which calls for an annual average rental of \$484,000.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The conference report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 14215, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14215) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$468,000 shall be for assistance to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PROPOSALS TO TURN OVER TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS U.S. FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, when I recently left the Foreign Relations Committee to accept assignment on the Commerce Committee, I did not cease to be interested in the vital national interests which are involved in foreign affairs.

I rise today for the purpose of expressing my opinion on one of the issues which is before the Foreign Relations Committee at the present time. It has been proposed within the committee that our foreign aid programs be turned over to agencies of an international character; that we provide the funds for others to spend in the developing nations of the world.

I am opposed to this suggestion, Mr. President. Although I have often been critical of the foreign aid programs, and have voted against them all on a number of occasions, I have never proposed that they be abolished. My opposition has been directed at what I considered, and still consider, to be the waste and inefficiency with which they have often been administered. There should be foreign aid programs, and considerable sums should be spent in financing them. This is desirable to provide support for the national objectives of the United States in overseas areas.

I do not agree that the United Nations and the many other international organizations which we already support financially can, or would, administer their programs to accomplish our national objectives—regardless of the amount of money we might contribute. In my opinion, we have always contributed more than we should to these organizations, and I believe that we are still doing so at the present time. We should be giving them less, rather than thinking of giving them more.

I have heard it argued many times, and so have all of you, that the very high proportion of the budget which the United States is contributing is not only unfair to the taxpayers of the United States, but undesirable from the point of view of the agencies themselves. I know that the Department of State, and even the President himself, has attempted and is continuing to attempt to increase the contributions of other members, and to reduce ours, at least proportionally. Some progress has been made in that

direction, but the effort would not be assisted by a sudden decision on our part that we were going to toss more money into the pot, willy-nilly.

Yet, this is precisely what we would be required to do, under the proposal. We would, or I at least hope that we would, ask for a greater voice in the operation of the agencies. Let us suppose that we were granted a greater voice. Would this not mean that the same criticisms made of our unilateral programs—namely, that they are serving our purposes—would not then be made against the programs of the international agencies? How then would the situation have been improved?

On the other hand, let us suppose that we were denied a greater voice, and thus truly put into the role of Santa Claus, who just hands out the dough in accordance with somebody else's Christmas list. Would Senators accept such a situation? I, for one, would not, and I do not believe any considerable number of this body would do so either.

It is not just the money alone which would cause the problems of a U.S. or a non-U.S. label on these programs. Increasingly, our own programs are concentrating on the basic fields of health, education, and agriculture, and I am entirely in accord with this emphasis. With much more money to spend, where would these agencies get the specialist and technician personnel to operate the expanded programs?

I am told that, in the numbers which would be required, they can be found only in the United States. What would then be the reaction in the developing countries to being told that the program was not a U.S. program any more—it was just U.S. money being spent by an international organization operated by U.S. personnel? I think we all know the answer to that one.

We would have sold ourselves down the river. We would still have the name, but we would no longer have the game; we would still pick up the check, but we could not select from the menu. We would have to be content with the pot luck that the international kitchen dished out to us insofar as the results of these programs would be concerned.

There are some other points deserve consideration as well. One of the most important of these is the effect on our balance of payments—a problem which the President has often put very near the top of the list of our crucial problems. Very strong efforts have been made recently in the operation of our foreign aid programs to help to stop the drain of our reserves because of the highly unfavorable outflows which have been going on for a number of years.

In fiscal year 1961, only 41 percent of the economic aid funds were spent in the United States, compared with the 88 percent which is estimated for fiscal year 1967. AID reduced its net expenditures abroad from \$947 million in fiscal year 1961 to \$253 million in fiscal year 1965. During this same time, AID assisted directly in boosting U.S. exports through direct financing and other methods.

These actions have been taken specifically at the direction of the Congress. I am certain that all Senators know that international agencies would not take steps to continue these vitally important policies, and I do not believe that they are prepared to toss them aside.

With the expansion of our exports and direct assistance to our balance of payments would go also the emphasis on private enterprise which the Congress has insisted upon. We can be certain that the international agencies are not going to push our economic principles; their Communist and neutralist members will see to that. For myself, I consider this to be one of the most vital issues of all, because I believe that only if the free enterprise system becomes the basis of the economic life of these developing nations will they ever achieve the desires of their people for a better standard of living and the personal freedom on which human happiness is based.

Included with the baby in the tub which we would throw out would be also our desire that the foreign assistance programs be administered with emphasis on self-help. Again, the Congress has given its stamp of approval to this policy, but it has only recently been applied. Its application would surely not be accepted by the international agencies.

I shall mention only one more element which I believe the Congress would regret to lose, before concluding my remarks, with comments on the more general considerations involved in the proposal. So long as the programs are administered by an agency of the U.S. Government, the Congress will have available to it the services of its watchdog, the Comptroller General of the United States. The President has recently appointed to that position a man of rare talents and experiences in all aspects of our national life.

I am certain that during his tenure of office he will do much to find, investigate, and report to the Congress those wastes and extravagances in the foreign aid programs which are, I think, the principal cause of their relative ineffectiveness in the past. We shall not have that assistance, Mr. President, if we turn these responsibilities over to the tender mercies of the international civil servants. Our representatives might have some hope of at least getting a discussion of some of the other policies which I have mentioned; we all know they would never dare to even suggest that Mr. Staats be permitted to audit the books.

Mr. President, one reason advanced for the proposal for multinational control of American expenditures is the assertion that our foreign aid programs have gotten us into armed conflict, and will get us into others. Specifically, statements have been made that our aid programs are responsible for our getting involved in the Vietnam war. If this assertion were indeed true, we should have to disregard the other disadvantages his proposals would have, and give most serious consideration to adopting them.

Fortunately, the assertion is no more than that, Mr. President, I can find no

evidence to support this view, and, most assuredly, not so far as Vietnam is concerned. We are in Vietnam because of what would happen to the people of the area, and to the U.S. interests everywhere, if the Communists took south-east Asia. It was because of these interests that we started an aid program, and it was because the aid program did not prove to be enough that we have had to do more.

We did not send troops to Vietnam to save the aid program; we sent troops to Vietnam to give support to the people of South Vietnam in their crucial battle against the invaders from the north. It is absolutely true, of course, that we have to have an aid program for South Vietnam, and the President has taken the leadership personally in emphasizing its importance. This could hardly have been stressed more than he did in his speech at Johns Hopkins University last year and in his trip to Honolulu a few weeks ago.

I have not heard that it has been specifically proposed that the United Nations should operate all of our aid programs in Vietnam in the midst of the fighting that is going on, and I doubt that anyone will go that far. At the same time, I do not believe that it is being advocated that these programs be abolished. We all know that only if these programs are successful will there be any lasting victory for the free world in Vietnam.

Thus, the logic of these ideas leads clearly to the abandonment of our efforts there, because the United Nations could never be brought to accept responsibility for administering foreign aid programs under the circumstances which exist there now and will certainly exist for some time to come. In other words, we could not accept the proposal without withdrawing our troops from South Vietnam. Even if we did that, there would be no assurance that any agency of this nature would be permitted to operate in South Vietnam; that would be something for the Communists in Hanoi and Peking to decide.

We are fighting to prevent them from forcing their decisions upon the people of South Vietnam, and we are firmly determined to win that fight. There are many ways of abandoning the people there, and the proposal would do exactly that, or so it seems to me. I hope the committee will reject it. If it is approved, I wish to serve notice that I shall be in the forefront of those who will undoubtedly oppose it on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have been interested in the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, with emphasis on the multilateral phases of aid as proposed in the aid program. That is different from unilateral aid, as when the United States gives aid on its own or of its own agreement with an individual country. Then it is just between the two of them.

I am sympathetic with what the Senator has said. The Senator has been of

service in pointing out some of the things that could happen as a result of changing our policy if it should be changed to a so-called multilateral aid program.

The Senator from Louisiana has pointed out very reasonably that most of these countries do not care anything about American interests. If they receive American aid in a multilateral agency, they will use it to their advantage in that area. Any forward looking advantages that the United States might hope for by way of real accomplishment in the interests of the people to be served would be lost.

The Senator also pointed out that under these proposals a great deal of American money would be channeled into Communist hands or the hands of other nations whose activities are completely subversive to those of the United States. It is difficult for me to comprehend how we can swallow that doctrine completely.

The Senator and I have been members of the Foreign Relations Committee for quite some time. The Senator knows that I have supported a certain amount of flexibility in participation with other nations. My support has been motivated in great part by the hope that by such participation in some of these activities, some of the counties involved would do more on their own and relieve us of some of the burden in these areas. But it does not seem to work that way. The same situation prevails: We put up the money and they have the fun of spending it. And as a rule they receive the credit for it, rather than our receiving the credit.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, our foreign aid program was originally envisioned as a program to advance the cause that we considered to be in the interest of the United States. One of the principal purposes of the program was to help nations to maintain their independence. But there were many other aspects that we felt were important. One of these aspects, for which the Senator from Iowa and I fought hard for a number of years, bears the name of "the Hickenlooper amendment." If we are putting our aid money by the hundreds of millions into a country to help assist that country with its problems, we will just have to stop putting the money in and hold it up, if they insist on confiscating honest, legitimate, good faith American investments that exist in that country. If we are attempting to help a country get on its feet, and meanwhile that country seems to go the route of nationalization without compensation—which is nothing but confiscation—the money is held up until they stop these activities and straighten out this situation.

How long do Senators think that principle would survive, once the matter is turned over to the United Nations or to some other international body?

If a large amount of Communist influence were not present in such a situation, then the majority of countries would be the so-called less developed nations. They would stand together on the principle. Whenever a large nation, like the United States, which is in the minority

in the international bodies, wished to withhold money because a country was nationalizing American interests, do Senators not believe that the less developed nations would stand together against the principle involved, the Hickenlooper amendment, for which the Senator from Iowa and I have fought for many years? The purpose of the amendment was to help those countries build themselves up in an honest fashion; and if a country became an international bandit, we would not give it any money.

These people would band together and say, "If this is going to be a multilateral body, we will not agree with that." If one of these nations is confiscating American assets, we would cut off the supply of money.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have seen that situation in at least an incipient stage since the adoption of the amendment. The Senator from Louisiana was a participant in the generation and passage of the amendment. For some reason, it seems to have carried the name "the Hickenlooper amendment," but the name "Long" ought to be in there somewhere. The Senator from Louisiana has been extremely interested in the amendment.

We have seen an incipient movement in many places to do exactly that: let American enterprise or business or money come in, under a pretended friendly arrangement. Once the American interest is so firmly established that it cannot pull up its roots and leave—like writing a check on a bank and taking your money out—and the factories and the installations are built, then the hue and cry goes up in such country to expropriate this property and perhaps settle for it later, or perhaps not settle for it at all.

Of course, it is basic, under the amendment about which the Senator is speaking, that we do not try to tell other countries what they must do. We really say, in effect, "Yes, under your national sovereignty, you may seize anything and everything in your country. We recognize your right of sovereignty. But if you seize, without reasonable compensation, the property of an American company, which you have invited and permitted to enter your country to contribute to your economy, we reserve the right to say what we shall do with the money of our taxpayers. We shall withhold it or give it, depending on how honorably you treat our people whom you have invited to invest in your country."

The provision has worked. The fact that such a provision exists, and is so tight that it does not give the President or anyone else leeway to find some excuse for not enforcing it, has prevented a large amount of that kind of discrimination from being practiced.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have mentioned the principle of self-help. We say that the whole program will become an endless quagmire unless the people of those countries do something to help themselves. As the Senator from Iowa well knows, we have said that we would contribute money if the governments of those countries would do something to

help get themselves on their feet. If American money is placed under the control of an international agency, and that agency is allowed to distribute it as it pleases, how long does the Senator think that principle will stand? Such an agency would say, "If you are going to spend it, we will split it and let everybody decide for himself what he wants to do with it."

Our plan is to help countries to solve their problems now. How long do we think they will stand up under an international agency?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Louisiana has performed a service by raising the issue at this time. As he knows, our committee is now undertaking a review of the foreign aid authorization bill, and that issue is a part of some of the provisions in the economic aid portion of the bill.

I think that we should consider those things more seriously than we have in the past. While I could not go so far as to say that I shall oppose all contributions to international agencies—I have not done so in the past, and I do not expect to do so in the future—I am against moving almost entirely into the field of the dissipation of American funds through international agencies.

As the Senator has so clearly pointed out, these international agencies are invariably controlled in numbers and in votes by a great many foreign nations, most of whom are have-not nations and have not contributed anything.

It is a great deal of fun to spend someone else's money. I suppose that if the Senator from Louisiana would give me \$10,000 or \$15,000 of cash and say: "Go to New York, Chicago, or Paris, and spend this money and have a good time," I could say, "What a good time I will have on the money of the Senator from Louisiana. I can do as I please. The Senator is putting up the money and I shall have a lot of fun." That is what is happening. Uncle Sam puts up the money and they have all the fun of spending it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The problem is that I do not see how we can keep the Communists out of these international bodies if they want to participate. If the Communist bloc countries were involved in making these decisions, we could be sure they would be working 24 hours a day to make sure that we did not accomplish anything with that money.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have \$1 million or \$2 million of American money going into Cuba through one of the international agencies, and some of the money that we have put up is going, through some other agencies, to people whose major purpose is to destroy us. It does not make sense to me to operate fully on this basis.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It has always seemed to me that one of the biggest mistakes of the Communists was that when the Marshall plan was proposed they did not rush in and participate in the plan and insist on getting one-third or one-half of that money for Europe. If they had done that, they could have been sure that that money would not have done our country any

good as far as national policy was concerned.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I can cite a good illustration. I happened to be in one of the middle European nations in 1947 when the Marshall plan was in its formative stages. The plan had been suggested in the Harvard speech. It excited a great many people because Europe was prostrate. It did not know how it was going to recover. Its capital was gone. Many of its installations were destroyed. The Marshall plan was a godsend to them.

The country I refer to was a very capable and sophisticated country. That country is now behind the Iron Curtain. However, the people there were completely jubilant about the prospect of the Marshall plan at the time I was in that country and they were talking about what they were going to do with the aid which they hoped they could receive through the Marshall plan. At that time a message came from the Communists in Russia to the effect that they were to have nothing whatsoever to do with the United States. That country would have taken the money and done the same things with it that England, France, and some of the other sophisticated countries did with the money. The people in that country knew how to use the money and had the skills with which to work.

Some of the countries did not want to do it.

At that time the main influence against that country's participation in the Marshall plan came from the Soviet orders to have nothing to do with the Marshall plan and not to participate because the Soviet Union was going to take care of that country and furnish the financial background to bring them back to prosperity—which the Soviet Union never did.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I commend the Senator from Louisiana for making this speech and making it at this time. The substance of the speech is very good indeed. I have never had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Foreign Relations with the Senator from Louisiana and with the Senator from Iowa. However, I have served on the Committee on Appropriations which passes on these programs. I supported these programs until I became a member of the Committee on Appropriations and learned more about how the money was spent, and I could not support the programs any longer.

I think that we have been going too fast and trying to go too far and spending too much, although this cannot all be stopped at one time.

The Senator has made some very timely and sound remarks in his analysis of this program. I think that his analysis is the correct one. I hope he will continue to pursue this matter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I hope that Senators will take this occasion to read in the RECORD what I have said. In my judgment I have given a number of reasons that the so-called

United Nations control, or the control of some other international body over the expenditures of American foreign aid will do nothing more than to make the program less effectual than it is.

I do not think that can be denied. Someone might make a reasonable argument against some of these points, but I do not think that they can make a reasonable argument against all of them.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN R. "SHORTY" DOSTER

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "John R. 'Shorty' Doster Will Be Honored at Banquet Friday," published in the Brooklyn, Miss., Leader-Advertiser.

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

JOHN R. "SHORTY" DOSTER WILL BE HONORED AT BANQUET FRIDAY

Friday night, March 25, designated as John R. "Shorty" Doster Appreciation Day, Mr. Doster will be honored at a banquet given by John J. Magovern, Jr., president of The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company. Mr. Magovern will present him with an award for his outstanding achievements in 1965. The banquet, being held at the Jackson Country Club, will also be attended by Charles G. Heitzeberg, CLU, vice president in charge of agencies. He too will make a special presentation to Mr. Doster.

A spokesman for the insurance firm pointed out that this will be the first time in at least thirty years that an insurance agent from other than one of the nation's large cities has led the company in sales.

A feature article from "Commentary" magazine describes Shorty's success in the insurance business. It goes into detail on his activities and history and starts out as follows: "By all standards he shouldn't have been a successful life insurance agent. He is a Yankee in the deep South; he failed a life insurance aptitude test; he lives in a small rural town. He is 'Shorty' Doster, the leading agent for mutual benefit in 1965."

The article goes on to say that he married a Mississippi girl and adapted himself completely as a Southerner. Continuing, the feature article says: "Standing about 5'5", this robust, cigar-smoking agent puts about 100,000 miles on his car a year as he completely covers the State of Mississippi and the southern part of Louisiana. Each year he wears out a Cadillac.

In 1957 Shorty qualified for the Million Dollar Round Table for the first time, and every year since he has paid for over a million in Mutual Benefit coverage. He is now a Qualifying and Life Member of MDRT. He made his initial appearance on the rolls of Mutual Benefit's National Associates in 1959 and is now a Life and Qualifying Member of the organization. Shorty was one of the first seven qualifiers for membership in the Mutual Benefit Star Masters Club when the Company initiated the award beginning with 1962 production. He was eligible on the basis of sales of over "two million dollars for the year."

BANK MERGER ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I would like to address my remarks to a subject that has come to my attention since S. 1698 was enacted into Public Law 89-

356 February 21 of this year. When I voted for the bill it seemed to me the plain intention of the committees and the consensus of the floor debates was that the effect of the bill would be to give relief to the three banks that had merged in good faith prior to the Supreme Court decision in the Philadelphia Bank case.

As this is a matter of large interest in Kentucky, I have given this legislation my close study, I think it appropriate at this point to set forth a brief chronological history of the Lexington bank merger decision.

On July 27, 1962, Judge Church Ford, of the U.S. District Court for Eastern Kentucky, handed down his decision and found that the merger of the First National Bank & Trust Co. and the Security Trust Co., did not constitute a combination in unreasonable restraint of interstate trade or commerce in the field of commercial banking in violation of section 1 of the Sherman Act, and was not an unlawful combination to monopolize, or an unlawful attempt to monopolize, interstate trade or commerce in the field of commercial banking in violation of section 2 of the Sherman Act. The Justice Department's complaint was dismissed.

Appeal was taken by the Department to the Supreme Court on the claimed violation of sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act. On April 6, 1964, Justice Douglas, speaking for the majority, held that the merger constituted a violation of section 1 of the Sherman Act and went on to note that "in view of our conclusion under section 1 of the Sherman Act, we do not reach the questions posed under section 2." Thus, having found a violation of section 1, the Court reached no decision on the Department's appeal of the district court's dismissal of the section 2 charges. Judge Ford's ruling that there was no violation of section 2 still stands.

The Senate bill 1698 as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee amended the Bank Merger Act of 1960 by exempting from section 7 of the Clayton Act and both sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act all mergers consummated prior to the enactment of this amendment. The language of the Senate bill prescribed that any merger "which was consummated prior to enactment of this amendment pursuant to the then appropriate regulatory approval or approvals, shall be exempt from the anti-trust laws, including the Sherman Anti-Trust Act and the Clayton Act."

In accepting the House bill, however, the Senate accepted the language of section 2(a) of the bill which provided that mergers consummated prior to June 17, 1963—the date of the Philadelphia bank decision—"shall be conclusively presumed to have not been in violation of any antitrust laws other than section 2 of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act." But the committee reports and the debates expressed the view that all pending litigation should be concluded.

I understand now that the Department of Justice is considering appealing the district court decision of 1962 on the

grounds that the district court erred in holding that the consummated merger was not in violation of section 2 of the Sherman Act.

Senator ROBERTSON, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and I, as well as other Senators who have studied this matter, are surprised to hear that the Department of Justice is intending now to proceed against the Lexington bank on the ground that the merger was a violation of the antimonopoly provisions of section 2 of the Sherman Act. It might very well be that the primary intention of the Department is to make new law in this case in securing a court decision of the application of the monopoly provisions of the Sherman Act to bank mergers. If this is the purpose, it does not seem proper to make the bank a convenient vehicle for the test of new issues when I think it clear that the Congress desired that the litigation be terminated and, in the long run, I doubt that the Department would succeed, but, at the same time, would have created unnecessary hardship on a bank that has been in litigation on this matter now for almost 5 years, and on the community it serves.

I would like to point out that within the past several years, two new banks have been chartered in the Lexington area. I find it very difficult to understand how monopoly charges can be levied against the Security National Bank when two new banks are offering their services in competition.

I make this statement because of the uncertainty that prevails in the community of Lexington and Kentucky. I believe, as I have said, that it was the intention of the Congress to exempt the three banks that had merged in good faith prior to June 17, 1963.

In conclusion, I will say that I cannot know all the facts at issue and I realize, of course, that the final decision will be made by the Department of Justice. But I feel it my duty to give my impression of my understanding and of Senators like myself when we voted for S. 1698 on February 9 of this year. I am sure the Department of Justice will give all these matters its fullest and responsible consideration.

PROPOSED SALE OF STEEL COMPLEX BY WESTERN EUROPE TO RED CHINA

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, in late March, I received word that West Germany and several other European allies were about to authorize the sale of a \$176 million steel complex to Red China. My immediate reaction was one of complete disbelief. I knew that our State Department had been carrying on intensive negotiations with these allies to persuade them to give us more substantial support for our efforts in South Vietnam. And it seemed incredible to me that these same allies would turn around and authorize an action that could very well hamper our efforts to bring peace and stability to southeast Asia.

On March 22, after receiving confirmation that West Germany was about to give its wholehearted approval to this

sale, I expressed my shock and bewilderment here on the floor of the Senate.

I then wrote to President Lyndon B. Johnson, protesting this action and contacted the State Department to see what steps our Government was taking to persuade our European allies that the sale of this steel complex would enhance Peking's ability to produce military weapons and equipment—machinery of war that could very well be used against our own men fighting in South Vietnam.

At a later date, I met with Secretary of State Dean Rusk to discuss this whole matter and see what we could do to persuade West Germany that the sale of a steel complex to Red China was a futile attempt to bring the Peking regime into concert with the rest of the free world.

Fortunately, the contract for the sale of this steel complex has not yet been signed; and it is my hope that West Germany and our other allies will reconsider before any further action is taken.

The sale of one steel complex to Red China will not dramatically upset whatever balance of power now exists in southeast Asia. But this proposal does symbolize the attitude of certain West European nations toward the very serious situation which now exists in South Vietnam. This action also demonstrates the prevalent notion in Europe that what happens in southeast Asia has little bearing on the future course of events in Western Europe.

For Europe has apparently forgotten that the events which transpired in a tiny city in Yugoslavia precipitated the holocaust of World War I; that the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931 helped to bring on the war in the Pacific; and that Hitler's invasion of the small independent nation of Poland ended with German domination of the entire European Continent.

Today, our world is even smaller. Jet airplanes have brought any point on the globe only a few short hours away; and guided missiles—with atomic warheads—can reach any target within minutes.

If events in little Sarajevo could rock the proud capitals of Western Europe in 1914, then, certainly, events in Hanoi and Saigon can have a profound impact on the course of events in Europe in 1966.

But Europe has become fat and lazy. It has forgotten what happened in 1914 and 1939. It continues to make the same fatal mistakes that it made twice before in this century. It ignores the lessons of history.

Today, however, the stakes are much higher. The atomic age has made the destruction of the world a distinct and terrifying possibility. If we are to survive, we must learn the lessons of history; we must use them; and we must profit by them.

But the nations of Western Europe, proud of their rich history and tradition, have never learned the lessons that history should have taught them.

Neville Chamberlain, when told about the invasion of Czechoslovakia, said that it was "a land that is far away and need not concern us." Today, like Chamberlain and his large black umbrella, Europe

hides under our nuclear umbrella, content to wish the world away, confident that the United States will protect her.

And I know that we would come to her aid—for we realize that our own security depends, in part, on the security of Europe. We have learned the lessons of history; and we intend to profit by them. We know that a free Europe means a free America; and we recognize our responsibilities to the rest of the world.

General de Gaulle, however, is a leader who is motivated by the dangerous belief that the Soviet Union would never cross the Iron Curtain and attack Western Europe. The French also believed, back in 1914 and 1939, that Germany would never cross the Rhine.

General de Gaulle may be correct in his view—but this view may also be the same type of fatal blunder that led to the destruction of France in two great wars.

Many Western European nations are unconcerned about providing for their own defense, because they are convinced—and rightly so—that the United States would immediately move to their assistance in case of attack.

Europe's great concern today is not with her defense, but with her pocketbook. For America will come to her aid in case of trouble.

A strong, stable Europe is one of the most important goals of American foreign policy. But we should expect, indeed we should require, that our European allies shoulder their appropriate share of the burden of insuring her own peace and stability.

And, at the same time, she should show an understanding and awareness of the larger objective of world peace that we seek by our resistance to Communist aggression in South Vietnam.

Instead, they propose to provide steel plants for our Communist enemy—on generous and liberal credit terms.

While we fight in South Vietnam, while our soldiers die so that free people everywhere—including Western Europe—may live in peace and security, our allies deny us even a modicum of support. Instead of sending us men or equipment, they plan to furnish weapons of war to Red China—weapons to be sent through the mountain passes of China to Hanoi and then down through the Ho Chi Minh Trail to be used by Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops.

It is high time that Western Europe stopped this nonsense. It is high time that Western Europe started doing its share of the work at hand. It is high time that we get some support from Western Europe—and some recognition that America is paying a heavy price and a heavy toll of young men so that Europe can remain fat and smug—and prosperous.

The sale of a \$176 million steel mill to Red China is but one example of the general attitude of Western Europe. Guided purely by the motive of profit, unmindful of the political consequences their action might take, West Germany, France, and other allies wrap around themselves the mantle of forgetfulness

and blindly proceed to give aid and comfort to the enemy of their defender.

They claim, as justification for their action, that such a sale will help to open the great wall of China to Western influence and establish an open line of communication between the Far East and the West.

But what they fail to realize is that U.S. officials have met with Red China's delegation in both Geneva and Warsaw a total of 129 times—and have made numerous overtures which could end the isolation of Communist China from the rest of the world. But China has declared, each time that we have met, that it will agree to nothing until we consent to the return of the Island of Formosa, Taiwan, to Red Chinese rule. And this is something that we cannot do.

Red China has willingly isolated itself from the rest of the world; we have not isolated China.

And, until such time as Red China decides to forgo its self-imposed isolation, there is little we can do to pry open the wall which separates Peking from the rest of the world.

Mr. President, I strongly urge our European allies to bring politics into their discussions with Red China if they feel they must persist in their efforts to sell their industrial products to this regime. Until now, they have been guided in their discussions purely by factors of profit and economic gain. If they were to use political pressure, as well as economic pressure, when they propose such sales to Red China, they could help rather than hinder the progress of peace and stability in southeast Asia.

When the West Germans, French, and others enter into negotiations looking to the sale of a steel mill to the Communist Chinese, their bargaining should not be confined to price, credit terms, delivery dates, and the like, but such a conference table could be utilized to discuss political matters affecting the free world and the Communist world. Political concessions achieved could mean the beginning, could place the door ajar, so that the way would open wide to negotiations to end the conflict in Vietnam.

And Europe must begin to take her part in the defense of Europe; she must begin to realize that world events will affect the future course of events on her continent; she must begin to help rather than hinder the search for peace throughout the world.

Mr. President, we have carried Europe on our shoulders for the past 20 years; the burden has not been light; and it has not been made any easier of late by leaders like General de Gaulle who attempt to destroy rather than rebuild the strong alliance we have established on that continent.

The present tension within the NATO alliance leads me to believe that it may be necessary for the United States to withdraw its forces from the European Continent.

The decision would not be taken lightly, but it must be considered. It is one avenue that is open to us.

For the United States possesses an impressive fleet of Polaris submarines; and

these could be stationed around the continent of Europe, ready to bring the striking force of the United States to bear if Europe were attacked.

Consideration of this proposal would make it abundantly clear to Western Europe that we can and would withdraw our land forces from Europe, and put them to work in South Vietnam where they are urgently needed to protect the lives of American soldiers who are already there. We have a strong commitment to the South Vietnamese people; and we are ready to honor that commitment. Our commitment to South Vietnam has brought no concrete support from our European allies—and some of these allies even appear unwilling to defend their own nations.

Too often, the nations of Europe are only too willing to have us defend their borders—and then laugh at us behind our backs for paying the high price of keeping our troops and our equipment at their beck and call.

We do not have to play court jester to the governments of our allies any longer. They are prosperous and content and their fears of 1949 have subsided.

The answer to the NATO dilemma may well lie in our chain of Polaris submarines together with a loosely tied Atlantic alliance.

Carrying the rest of the free world on our shoulders is not an easy task—and is one that we did not seek. But we bear the burden and agree to do what we think is right and necessary to maintain peace and stability.

But it is high time that the rest of the world at least acknowledge what we are doing—and do its proper share to insure that the people of the world be able to live in peace and harmony with their neighbors.

NO MORE ODD MAN OUT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in spite of the directives of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, there are still public buildings in Washington and elsewhere that are inaccessible to the handicapped. Substantial improvements have been made, however, and there are more to come.

Until recently, the National Gallery of Art, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution had steps at their entrances. Now these buildings are ramped and accessible to all Americans, not just the physically fit.

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts was to be built with steps, inaccessible washroom facilities, and without provision for the hard of hearing. Now the building will be built so that it may be used by all Americans, including the handicapped.

Hotels and motels, theaters, and concert halls across the country are beginning at last to make provision for the handicapped. These improvements are of help not only to the handicapped but also to their families. Families may travel together, go to the ball game or the theater together, enjoy themselves together, and the handicapped person needs no longer be odd man out.

These advances have not come easily. Many people have donated their time and effort to achieve these results. There are volunteer groups at work all over the country in every State and in many cities working to insure that Government agencies and private enterprise are aware of the need to plan for the handicapped in the construction of buildings and facilities.

On Sunday, an excellent article by Boris Weintraub appeared in the Evening Star. This article summarized some of the steps that have been taken and some of the steps which have been removed as the accessibility program moves forward. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the article may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

GETTING AROUND IN A WHEELCHAIR (By Boris Weintraub)

Hugo Deffner of Oklahoma City was named Handicapped American of the Year a few years ago for his one-man crusade against such architectural barriers to the handicapped as revolving doors and steps. But when he arrived at the Departmental Auditorium here to receive his award they had to call out the Marines—two of them—to carry him in. He couldn't get his wheelchair up the steps.

Since that time, more than one organization has been at work to do something about the problem. In the greater Washington area there are an estimated 200,000 persons with one kind of physical disability or another. And those in wheelchairs—well, there are lots of things they can't do that other people take for granted. Visiting the Lincoln Memorial, the White House or the Jefferson Memorial for the wheelchair-bound is an impossibility. All those steps. Such simple acts as riding a bus are out. Revolving doors might as well be stone walls.

Cities are designed by and for the non-handicapped. "Mostly it's just a question of habit," says Mrs. Allan B. Fay of Bethesda, head of the Architectural Barriers Project for the Metropolitan Washington Area. "Buildings have always been built with stairs, or with revolving doors, or with narrow bathroom stalls. The architects and the builders just don't realize that these things are problems unless they are called to their attention."

Since 1957, some progress has been made to remove architectural barriers here. The D.C. Commissioners Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Mrs. Fay's project and more than 40 other organizations have collaborated on a directory of facilities for the handicapped, and have begun an assault on the attitudes which have made Washington only "an average city" for the handicapped.

Aiding them is a set of specifications approved in 1961 by the American Standards Association to make buildings and public facilities usable by handicapped persons. They take in the needs of all the handicapped: those on crutches or in braces or in wheelchairs, persons with poor sight or hearing, persons with heart trouble, and the elderly.

The standards provide that every building should have at least one wide, level entrance for use by the wheelchair-bound. They provide for public walks at least 48 inches wide. They provide for extra wide spaces in parking lots for persons in wheelchairs or on braces or crutches. They provide for ramps with a rise of no more than one foot in 12 for wheelchairs. And they

provide for at least one stall in every bathroom at least 25 inches wide, to accommodate a wheelchair.

Here is a summary of facilities in the Washington area:

Transportation—"Buses can't be used by persons in wheelchairs," Mrs. Fay says. "They have high steps, they stop suddenly or they go sharply around corners." The Senate District Committee directed that the Washington subway should be "readily accessible for the disabled, elderly and other handicapped persons."

Public buildings—Many of Washington's most prominent buildings are inaccessible to persons in wheelchairs. President Kennedy directed that new federal buildings be built so that the wheelchair-bound could use them, and the District Commissioners did the same last March for new District buildings. A typical situation arose with the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. "There were too many steps in the preliminary sketches, and they were obviously inaccessible," says Joseph Carvajal, executive secretary of the Commissioners Committee. "We wrote and suggested colorful ramps in their place. They are going along with our suggestions."

Entertainment—Many movie theaters provide special areas for persons in wheelchairs, and others permit a disabled person to transfer to a seat. "You have to establish the ground rules beforehand," Mrs. Fay says. "The National Theater permits persons in wheelchairs at the side of the theater. Arena Stage is 'practically impossible.' D.C. Stadium, with its ramps, is fine, but another problem there is the distance from parking lots."

Education—Mrs. Fay says that things are "especially bad" on the college level, that only a few buildings on area campuses are usable by persons in wheelchairs. The ideal is the University of Illinois, which has ramped its entire campus, has provided buses with lift steps and has constructed its buildings with the handicapped in mind. UCLA has similar facilities. The elementary and high schools in this area have the same problems as most public buildings in the area: steps, narrow entrances, and narrow bathroom stalls.

Traffic—A few ramps have been erected in the District to permit wheelchairs to roll up onto sidewalks, notably in the Southwest and around Meridian Hill Park. The Commissioners Committee hopes for ramps in the downtown area when the F Street urban renewal project takes shape. But, on the whole, the ramp situation is bad.

Public telephones—The C&P Telephone Co., in cooperation with the Architectural Barriers Project, has established nine "Drive-up—Walk-up" coin telephone installations. Anyone, including a handicapped person who drives, can use these phones without leaving his car. The phone company plans to expand this service.

"Some of these things that help the handicapped are bound to be a little more expensive," Carvajal says, "like moving ramps in a subway station are a little more expensive than stairways. But they are safer, too, not only for the handicapped, but the general public. You can take it as a rule of thumb: Whatever is better for the handicapped is safer for the average person, too."

MAN IS NOT MADE FOR DEFEAT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on April 29, 1966, I began a journey which I dedicated to the spirit in man which enables him to prevail and to prosper in face of adversity.

The journey took me to Seward, Valdez, and Anchorage, three Alaska cities which suffered extensive earthquake

damage in 1964. At each city I spoke at ceremonies celebrating the winning of All America City Awards, presented by Look magazine and the National Municipal League.

Mr. President, Anchorage and Seward are now two-time winners of this award, making Alaska one of only three States which have two cities which have won two All America City Awards.

The three cities entered the competition as a unit, but the jury, impressed by the energy with which the residents had set about to rebuild after the earthquake, decided to give individual awards. To do that, the jury requested that the number of awards be increased from the traditional 11 to 13.

It is clear that the jury recognized that nature had tested the mettle of the people of Alaska, and had found that some men, women and children may have been destroyed, man could not be defeated.

In honoring the residents of these cities, the jury also honored a national commitment to the belief that man has the right to the opportunity to prevail and to prosper, for without the help of this Congress, without the help of numerous Federal agencies, without the help of countless private organizations and individuals, these awards could not have been won. These awards prove that the national commitment to rebuild Alaska has been carried out in good order. Again, for myself, for the people of my State, thank you.

So that others may share in my tribute to the spirit of the people of Seward, of Valdez, of Anchorage, and of the Nation, I ask unanimous consent that my speeches delivered at the All America City ceremonies be printed in the RECORD.

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

[News from E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Senator from Alaska]

"MAN IS NOT MADE FOR DEFEAT" (SEWARD)—
PART I

Today I start a journey dedicated to that spirit of man which enables him to prevail and to prosper in face of adversity.

From Seward, I go to Valdez, and then to Anchorage. As I do here, I will speak in those cities at ceremonies honoring people who once again have shown "man is not made for defeat."

The journey I start today is one in which all Alaskans and all people of this nation should take pride, for indeed, the rebuilding of our state following the Good Friday earthquake was a national commitment to that spirit.

The late Ernest Hemingway described that spirit so well and so simply when he wrote, "A man can be destroyed, but not defeated."

Men, women and children were destroyed by the terrible force unleashed by nature late that afternoon, but man, the people who remained, was not defeated. He prevailed and rebuilt and now works to prosper.

This journey of dedication will be much different from the one I took very shortly after the earthquake. Then the scene was of land abused, land misplaced, land battered by seas, land seemingly mutilated and scarred for generations to come. But the scene already was one of people planning to needs no longer be odd man out.

In the next few days, the scenes will be the results of that planning. In Seward, I see new buildings and a beautiful new harbor. In Valdez, I will find a city in the midst of a move to new location. And in Anchorage, there will be new skyline, clean and clear cut against the great Chugach mountains.

But while what has been accomplished in the past is important, the past can be nothing more than prologue. So it is we must turn to the future to see if man is to prosper from what he has rebuilt.

It would serve no purpose today if I were to give the impression that Seward is recovered completely from the effects of the earthquake. It is no secret that there has been a serious decrease in port activity here. Let us face facts. If that decrease is permanent, as it might be, people of Seward will have to look to new endeavors on which to build an economy.

To look elsewhere, to break existing patterns is seldom easy and always require imagination, energy and good sense. Receipt of the title of All-America City attests to the imagination and energy of the people of Seward. You and the other people of the Kenai Peninsula demonstrated good sense when you and they formed the Kenai Borough.

Perhaps nowhere else in the United States is a unified, planned economy so important as in Alaska. Our state has vast quantities of valuable natural resources. It also has a high cost of living and geography that makes it difficult and expensive to unlock her great storehouses. In short, Alaska cannot afford the luxury of wasted motion, of inefficient, overlapping economic development projects. In short, areas which are economic units need area-wide planning and cooperation.

Few persons, if any, would argue that the Kenai Peninsula is not an economic unit and one of great potential. Therefore, it was only good sense that the communities of this unit band together to work for the future.

When one thinks of the potential of the Kenai Peninsula one thinks of oil and gas and of the resources of the sea. However, one doesn't often think of the Kenai National Moose Range as a natural resource which could speed economic development of the peninsula. Among those who do are officials of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

I shall not bring to issue here renewal of the debate which has gone on for a quarter of a century as to whether the Moose Range should have ever been established, whether such a large area of land should have been set aside by the federal government without any consultation whatsoever with the people of Alaska. There was none, so here we are.

I hope that the fact that the proposal I am about to discuss is the work of the Sport Fisheries and Wildlife Bureau will still any fears that anyone, least of all this United States Senator, is advocating ruthless exploitation of this magnificent wild reserve.

The Range is home for about 7,500 Alaska moose, the largest antlered animal on earth, and we don't want to lose them.

The Range is home for many other animals, including more than 800 white sheep, and we don't want to lose them.

The Chickaloon Flats is an important waterfowl migration area, and we don't want that destroyed.

More than 40 per cent of Cook Inlet salmon come from the lakes and streams of the Range, and we don't want to harm them.

And no one wishes to scar the unique wild beauty of coastal and interior Alaska which make up the Range.

The beauty of the Range was summed up by a naturalist who, in 1911, wrote, "Were all of Alaska erased from the map except the Kenai Peninsula, and its immediately adjacent waters, there would yet remain in duplicate that which constitutes the more unique and that which typifies the whole of this wonderful country."

No one, least of all this Senator, wants to sacrifice the priceless, age-old area of wild beauty in return for a possible temporary economic gain, a gain which would be dwarfed, in time by the loss of what "constitutes the more unique and that which typifies the whole of this wonderful country."

However, preservation does not mean disutilization.

Certainly it should be possible to continue to tap supplies of gas and oil without erasing the beauty and the wildlife of the area.

Certainly it should be possible to set aside areas for public recreation use without marring the wilderness.

Certainly it would be worthwhile to investigate the possibility of developing a timber industry which would assist rather than hinder preservation of wildlife.

These objectives are the keystones in the Sport Fisheries and Wildlife Bureau's proposal for the Kenai National Moose Range.

The bureau has developed a plan proposing to divide the range for four purposes.

A natural area, named for the late Andrew Simon, the great Alaska guide and conservationist, would run south from Skilak Lake, and west from the Harding Ice Fields to about the mid-point of Tustumena Lake.

A central public-use area, with trails and camp grounds, would be developed north of Skilak Lake. The Chickaloon Flats would remain a waterfowl area.

The remainder of the range would be opened for a well-planned resource-use area, in which development of resources would be balanced with the objectives of a natural preserve.

This proposal, and I stress the word proposal, might well be a starting point for Seward's search for a new economic base.

Development of a public-use-area will bring people to the Peninsula. For example, the bureau reports fishing pressure per mile of road in Alaska is nearly twice the national average, exceeded by only two states. Thought should be given to enterprises which could help attract and serve potential visitors both from within and out of the state.

Establishment of a timber industry for the Peninsula would create new jobs, the key to any economic development program.

The timber resources of the Range are virtually untapped. The bureau estimates that there are 400,000 acres of potential commercial forest within the proposed resource-use zone, enough to support on a continuing basis a moderate size cellulose processing plant. One need only look at the lumber mill operations in Sitka and Ketchikan to see evidence of a stable, long-term industry stimulating economic growth throughout a community.

The preliminary study of timber resource has been done. Next we need to refine resource estimates and set out an operational program. I urge that these planning steps be taken promptly to determine if and when an industry can become a reality on the Kenai Peninsula.

There are a great many problems which must be overcome before any part of the bureau's proposal becomes fact, not the least of which is a reluctance in some quarters to allow the bureau to extend the nature of its activities to include recreational facilities.

Whether or not this proposal for the National Moose Range is accepted, it still will

have served an important purpose if it stimulates ideas on how the people of Kenai Peninsula can best make use of the area's resources and still maintain its unique and priceless wilderness.

I am confident a way will be found.

I am confident that Seward has not rebuilt in vain, and that it will prosper.

The potential is here.

We know the spirit is here, for the people of Seward have twice won All-America City awards. Along with Anchorage, Seward makes Alaska one of only three states which has two two-time winners of the award.

I am confident that Seward will be a candidate at some future time for a third award, for its people have so nobly demonstrated, "Man is not made for defeat."

[News from E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Senator from Alaska]

"MAN IS NOT MADE FOR DEFEAT" (VALDEZ)—PART II

Yesterday I started on a journey dedicated to that spirit in man which enables him to prevail and to prosper in the face of adversity.

This journey, which started in Seward and ends Monday in Anchorage, retraces a trip I took a little more than two years ago. Then the scene was one of destruction and chaos.

Where there had been roads there were holes or rubble from mountain walls. Where there had been land, there was water. Where there had been docks and buildings, there was flattened debris.

Now, two years later, I return to take part in ceremonies honoring the spirit of the people of the three cities of all Alaska and of the nation who banded together to demonstrate once again "man may be destroyed but not defeated." It is most appropriate that the award to be presented to Valdez today is called an All America award, for the rebuilding of Alaska is a tribute to the national belief that "the world is a fine place and worth fighting for."

Perhaps the world is not as fine a place as it could be, but it certainly is worth saving if for no other reason than to have the opportunity to improve it.

Man has prevailed because in times of peril he has put aside individual differences and joined forces to overcome the threat. He has done this when the threat has come from nature and when it has come from within his own ranks.

The threat which has been most sure to unite men to action is the threat of nature or of men to impose by force their will on man or on other men. There is something in our spirit which rebels at such threats, and may it always be so.

In the affairs of men, may we never become so arrogant as to attempt to force our ways on others, nor so indifferent as to ignore the plight of the needy.

In the affairs of nature, may we always dare to answer her challenge. May we always try to find better ways to handle her awesome force. May we ever strive to make sane use of the resources she offers, balancing exploitation with conservation, keeping faith with the past while building for the future.

Nature is at once man's provider and his enemy, his captor and the liberator of his spirit.

Valdez was among the Alaska cities which suffered extensive damage in the Good Friday earthquake. No one who witnessed the awesome power of the land and sea that day will forget the sight of a tanker tossed about like a toy, of huge waves carrying away great chunks of land. Nor will the people of Valdez forget the 31 persons who died in the city that day, more than one-fourth of those officially listed as killed or missing.

But if this city was as target of the fury of nature, it also owes its beginning to the discovery of nature's gold deposits in the interior, its charm to the natural beauty of

mountains and sea, and its future to the resources of the ocean.

It is fitting that Valdez which suffered greatly from the ravages of an ocean unleashed now profit by unlocking the storehouse of the same sea.

Valdez is uniquely situated to reap rewards from the ocean. It has a fine harbor on Prince William Sound, a protected body of water of great potential. By protected, I mean that the Sound is part of this nation's territorial waters.

I am firmly convinced that if this nation's fishery industry is to expand and prosper as it should, it must make excellent use of areas sufficiently large to ensure a continuing and diversified catch, areas which are protected from exploitation by foreign fishermen.

Prince William Sound is one of the larger bodies of water which fall within the boundary of our territorial sea. Foreign vessels may not enter these waters without permission of our government.

These protected areas become increasingly important to the United States fish industry as competition between fishing nations increases on the open seas.

It is well known that the American fishing fleet is falling behind the fleets of other nations both in numbers and in quality of equipment. As our fleet grows older, fleets of competing nations grow younger. As our fishermen continue to operate with outdated equipment, foreign fishermen continue to modernize their vessels.

Even if the United States were competing on equal terms with other fishing nations, just the great numbers of vessels fishing the seas would make the protected water of Prince William Sound extremely valuable. The Sound takes on added value in light of the technical disadvantage under which our fleet operates.

It was with that value in mind that I recently proposed that the federal government undertake a major survey of the fishing resources of Prince William Sound.

I made the proposal at a hearing on a Senate resolution authorizing the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to conduct a survey of the nation's marine and fresh water fishery resources.

The resolution points out that since 1957, the United States has fallen from second place behind Japan to the world's fifth fishing nation. Peru, Red China and the Soviet Union are now ahead of us.

Because of the great potential of Prince William Sound, I urged that large portion of any fund appropriated for a survey be spent in Prince William Sound.

With the information gathered from such a survey, it should be possible to develop a flourishing, year-around fishing operation in Prince William Sound. The operation would not only mean year-around work for the fishermen of Valdez, and other communities, but also year-around employment for persons in related industries, businesses and services. In short, development of the Sound as a major fishing area will benefit Valdez, the state and the nation.

I can't stress enough the importance of efforts to rebuild this nation's fishing and maritime fleet. If the United States is to remain a great power, it must remain a great sea power.

And sea power is more than deck guns and aircraft carriers. It is passenger ships, tankers, tugs, fishing vessels and the capability to repair and build our own ships.

Sea power is the capability for independent action in war and in peace, the capability for freedom of action.

Sea power is also the good sense to investigate and harvest the great potential of the sea. Certainly this nation did not become great by ignoring its vast natural resources. Certainly, it will not remain great if it does not continue to make some use of its resources, resources which can supply food to

feed a growing nation and minerals to supply new and expanding industries, which in turn will offer more jobs to a growing population.

And it is just as certain that Alaska will not realize her potential, and will not be able to meet its full responsibility of statehood unless her resources are exploited fully and sanely.

Only then will the promise that is Alaska's be fully realized.

Only then will the national commitment demonstrated in the unified effort to rebuild our state be fully rewarded.

I am confident that that commitment will be rewarded by a growing, prosperous Alaska.

I am confident because of the spirit shown by you, the people of Valdez. Here, where man has experienced the worst of nature, man has an opportunity to profit from the best in nature, both in beauty and in resources.

I am confident because in the rebuilding of Valdez man once again demonstrated that he is not made for defeat.

[News from E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Senator from Alaska]

"MAN IS NOT MADE FOR DEFEAT" (ANCHORAGE)—PART III

Today I end what for me has been a most happy and inspiring journey.

The journey began Friday in Seward and continued Saturday in Valdez. In those cities, as I do here, I spoke at ceremonies celebrating the winning of All-America City awards.

It has been an inspiring journey because at each stop I have seen again and again proof of that spirit in man which enables him to prevail and to prosper in face of adversity.

I have dedicated this journey to that spirit.

In each of my speeches I took my theme from the late Ernest Hemingway, who said of that spirit, "Man is not made for defeat. A man can be destroyed, but not defeated."

I wish persons doubting the truth of those words or the existence of that spirit could have made this journey with me.

They would have seen a beautiful new harbor open on awe-inspiring Resurrection Bay. They would have seen people moving a city to a new location rather than admit defeat. They would have seen a bright, sparkling city rising from rubble, a city more beautiful, more prosperous than before nature decided to test the mettle of its people.

They would have witnessed the results of a national commitment to the belief that man can and has the right to the opportunity to prevail and to prosper.

The journey ends today here in Anchorage, and I can think of no better place, no better time than this ceremony to sum up the meaning that this journey should have for the future of Alaska.

Anchorage is the proper setting for such a summation because there is a two-way street connecting Alaska and Anchorage with the future. As the state's largest city, Anchorage must prosper if the state is to prosper. However, Anchorage cannot hope to prosper if all sections of Alaska do not. If no man is an island, neither is any group of men or any city.

In Valdez, I said man has prevailed because in time of peril he has put aside individual differences and joined forces to overcome a threat. There is something in man that rebels against nature and other men attempting to impose their will by force.

In Seward, I stated Alaska cannot afford the luxury of wasted motion, of inefficient, overlapping economic development programs. If our state has vast quantities of valuable natural resources, it also has a high cost of living and geography which makes it expen-

sive and difficult to unlock her great storehouses.

In short, Alaska needs coordinated planning, coordinated programs and cooperation between people, between cities, between boroughs, between state and local governments.

Now is the time to blend those two thoughts into one—into a commitment for the future.

If in times of peril man has joined forces against a common threat, it is also true that too often he has been slow in recognizing the threat, slow in forgetting past differences and gearing for action.

However, if Alaska is to realize its full potential as quickly as possible, we, its residents, must retain that same cooperation, that same sense of purpose demonstrated in rebuilding after the earthquake of 1964.

These will not be easy to retain. We all grow tired of sustained effort. We all grow impatient working for long-range solutions. We all become hungry for quick, clear-cut progress. That seems to be part of the American character, in foreign as well as domestic affairs. But patience and long-range thinking is what Alaska needs, not shortsighted selfish gains.

Another factor complicates the road ahead. While the federal government has been generous to Alaska, I don't think we can or should expect as much federal aid as we have been receiving. The federal government will continue to play its part in Alaska, but that part will diminish over the years, and a greater portion of the load will fall on the state and on local governments.

However, new industries are coming to Alaska, industries which will provide the necessary tax base to meet governmental needs of the future.

For example, the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife has proposed establishment of a long-term timber industry in the Kenai National Moose Range. Congress is considering a resolution authorizing a survey of the nation's coastal marine resources, a survey which could provide information leading to the establishment of a year-around fish industry on Prince William Sound and elsewhere. Congress continues to search for a program to assist the mining industry which meets the objections of the administration.

Also, the Air Force is interested in selling the Alaska Communication System. Several firms appear interested. Sale of the system to a private firm, with proper assurance for improvement in rates and services, would be a significant addition to the tax rolls.

And recently the Federal National Mortgage Association, recognizing that special problems exist in Alaska, withdrew a limit it had placed on mortgages, a limit which could have severely damaged the construction industry in our state.

So on these few examples alone, it can be said that the officials in Washington are vitally concerned with and working for the future of our young state.

Alaska needs assistance because it is a young state, but its youth is also its best hope of meeting the challenges of the future. I refer not only to the youthful spirit of her people, but also of the absence of centuries-old patterns which limit fluidity and stifle ingenuity.

I am thinking of how fortunate we are that in a state where unity of purpose and of action is so important, we have a system of political subdivision which should make such unity easier to achieve than in other states.

Consider a moment the plight of Philadelphia, a metropolitan area stretching over five counties. Philadelphia depends on the counties for people to run its industries, to shop in its stores, to visit its theatres. The counties depend on the city to supply their people with jobs. The metropolitan area is

an economic, cultural unit. However, it is not a governmental unit. There are cities and townships within counties. One county has more than 60 townships. Effective area-wide planning is a dream of the future in this section of the county.

In Alaska, we only have cities or boroughs. It is through the latter that area-wide planning can be developed. The Anchorage area should take the lead in making this simplified political subdivision system work, on problems ranging from a safe and adequate water system for all to economic development programs which will benefit all Alaska.

Anchorage is at the heart of the fastest developing portion of Alaska. One need only look down Cook Inlet to see evidence supporting predictions that by 1975 industry will be producing 200,000 barrels of oil a day. Clearly, Alaska is on its way to becoming one of the great oil-producing centers of the world.

However, unless we look and plan ahead, Alaska will remain a source and not a refiner of oil. In an effort to encourage establishment of an oil-refining industry in Alaska, I asked the Department of Defense to consider getting fuel for Alaska-based jets from Alaska sources rather than from outside. The answer was that a recent study by a major refining company found that there was not a large enough market for byproducts of jet-fuel products to make a refinery a profitable operation.

This is a challenge worthy of Alaskans' imagination and ingenuity. We have found ways to make money shipping timber products. We are hopeful that current negotiations will lead to establishment of a liquefied-gas exporting industry. I am sure not too many years ago, such enterprises appeared impractical, if not improbable. It now appears as if a new important industry—the making of fertilizer—can be developed using natural gas. Future opportunities appear staggering. There is no reason why ways cannot be found to make the refining of petroleum profitable in Alaska.

Certainly markets in Alaska will improve as more and more people come north to the future.

Certainly as the attention of the nation swings west, new markets will develop in the Far East. Japan need not be our only customer. When hostilities cease in Southeast Asia, and the task of assisting nations of that area improve their standards of living can begin in earnest, there will be new markets for our resources and for manufactured goods. Alaska is the gateway to the Far East. We must be sure that when the time comes, we are ready to serve the customers that will pass through that gateway.

Some of these nations may have communistic governments. One of the nations may be Red China itself. I say let's trade with them all, not only for the good of Alaska, but for the good of the nation and the world.

I think the types of goods to be traded should be determined by the nature of the government of the country with which we are trading. For example, it would make no sense to supply the current Red China government with strategic material.

However, neither does it make sense not to trade with a nation unless its government is totally committed to our side of the Cold War.

In Asia, our strength is in the air and on the sea. Our policy designed to contain Red China can only succeed if nations on her borders are interested in remaining independent of their huge neighbor. It does not matter if they are committed to the west, neutral or lean toward China. Through trade and sound assistance programs we should, when asked, help them retain their independence.

Also, trade lines are also lines of communications, and communications between powerful nations are needed to reduce chances of a nuclear conflict starting because one nation misunderstands the policy or the resolve of another. No, rather than isolation, the world needs communication so those tempted to act counter to the interest of society as a whole are well aware of the risks they run.

Which way Alaska turns depends a great deal on the leadership Anchorage displays in solving area problems. Alaska cannot look outward unless it builds soundly at home. If Anchorage is at the heart of the fastest developing section of Alaska, Anchorage must also remember it cannot reach its own potential unless the rest of the state does. Too often there has been an Anchorage position and an anti-Anchorage position on an issue. There should only be an Alaska position.

Perhaps it seems that I have wandered far afield from an All-America City award, but I think not, for this award will have greater meaning if it spurs us to the same effort and to the same degree of unity which enabled us to rebuild after the earthquake.

Anchorage has twice won All-America City awards. So has Seward. Alaska is one of only three states with two two-time winners. I think that fact speaks volumes about the spirit of Alaska. It is for that reason I am confident we Alaskans will meet the challenges which lie ahead.

It is for that reason I am confident that Alaska will put aside past differences and work together to give added meaning to the words, "Man is not made for defeat."

CONGRESS HAS PROVIDED FUNDS, WITH COOPERATION OF THE STATES, AREAS, AND CITIES, FOR A VITAL SYSTEM OF AIRPORTS TO SERVE GROWING TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, last Friday was the 20th anniversary of the Federal Airport Act, which was signed into law by President Harry S. Truman on May 13, 1946. It was my responsibility to be an original sponsor of that legislation while serving West Virginia as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. It is gratifying to note the significant degree in which this law has contributed to the growth of the aviation industry and to this Nation's social and economic expansion.

As originally enacted, the law authorized appropriations of \$500 million over a 7-year period, with a limit of \$100 million for any one year for projects within the United States, plus \$20 million for projects in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Federal aid funds might be made available to sponsors of projects, which include any public agency or several public agencies acting as a group, for airport development under requirements set forth in the act. In addition, a discretionary fund was provided for use as deemed most appropriate for carrying out the National Airport plan.

In 1950 the act was extended to a 12-year period, the total amount authorized remaining at \$500 million. In 1958 the Congress passed a bill to continue the program through fiscal year 1963 with an increased minimum level of expenditures; however, the proposal was vetoed by President Eisenhower. Another

measure was passed and approved on June 29, 1959, which extended the time within which grants could be made, to June 30, 1961.

Legislation in 1961 authorized appropriations in the amount of \$199,500,000 over a 3-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962, \$66.5 million to be available beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964, available until expended. Additional separate funds were authorized for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; legislation approved March 11, 1964, authorized appropriations and extended the program for 3 fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965—\$66.5 million annually plus an aggregate of \$4.5 million for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—and a total additional of \$21 million—\$7 million annually—for general aviation airports.

At the present time, the Federal airport program is again being considered by Congress. Hearings have been conducted in the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee. The appropriation of \$75 million proposed for the continuance of the program in each of the fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970, however, could be insufficient to provide matching for local funds. The proposal in the fiscal year 1967 budget to rescind \$21 million of the \$71 million authorized for fiscal year 1967 is opposed by many, who contend that the appropriations should be double the \$75 million figure in the newly reported Senate measure, S. 3096. They point out the need for expanding and improving airports to accommodate short and medium haul jets, which the changeover of local airlines from DC-3's has made necessary. Local airlines now operate under weight restrictions at 252 airports of the 619 served and expect restrictions on jet operations at 113 more. It would seem that even \$150 million per year might be insufficient if the Federal Government were obliged to purchase land near airports to protect citizens from aircraft noise. Existing authorization contemplates \$225 million for the next 3 years, with \$21 million for general aviation airports.

Federal participation in civil aviation has not been confined to airport development. Establishment of the airways systems, traffic direction and control, air safety, accident investigation, and development of safety devices and techniques, and promoting development of new aircraft types are among the many areas within which the various Federal agencies have made and are making contributions to the Nation's air commerce and defense capabilities.

The number of airports and landing fields as of January 1, 1938, was 2,299, nearly 800 of which were municipal airports. In 1946, when the Federal Airport Act came into effect, there were 4,490 airports in the United States, including military. With the inclusion of military fields which are jointly used by civil and military aircraft, the total number in 1965 was 9,940, with 3,644 publicly owned as of January 1 of that year.

As of January 1, 1950, there were 59 airports located in West Virginia, 10 of which were scheduled air service airports. As of December 31, 1965, a total of 54 airports were located within the State, 15 of which were public and 39 private airports. However, in this instance statistics alone cannot convey the entire significance of airport improvements and additions in this period, and the changes in demand for different types of airport services.

A total of 23,498 scheduled and nonscheduled departures from West Virginia airports were reported for the year 1950; 102,318 passengers originated; 422.3 tons of cargo originated and a total of 123.7 tons of U.S. and foreign mail was handled. Ten years later, scheduled and nonscheduled departures were 38,433; passengers enplaned 230,252; air mail amounted to 223.65 tons; and air express and freight total was 805.06 tons. In 1965 West Virginia airports handled 42,159 airline departures, enplaned 335,305 passengers and processed 403.65 tons of mail and 1,917.37 tons of air express and freight.

Growth on a national basis is indicated by records of fixed wing domestic aircraft operations. In 1949, there were a total of 2,023,702 departures, 14,732,687 passengers enplaned, 65,301.4 tons of mail and 211,471.7 tons of air cargo originated. For 1950, aircraft departures were 2,137,294, passengers enplaned 16,937,018, mail 69,672.5 tons and cargo 289,490.6 tons. During 1960 departures totaled 3,343,989, passengers enplaned 50,584,135, mail 183,663.1 tons and air cargo 510,492.5 tons. Latest national data available, for 1964, show 3,417,601 departures, 76,657,102 passengers enplaned, mail 206,152.9 tons and air cargo originated 863,811.4 tons.

The civil air carrier fleet was comprised of approximately 450 aircraft in 1941, and private and charter planes numbered approximately 24,000. By 1958, the civil air carrier fleet had increased to 2,081 and remained at about that level through 1964; however, by 1964, fleet capacity was twice that of 1958. Domestic air cargo tonnage grew about 50 percent between 1955 and 1960 but more than doubled from 1960 to 1965—as reported by the industry.

Growth of air commerce has outstripped projections made at the time the Federal-aid airport program was being considered. However the greatest increase has been in the commercial or air carrier segment, rather than in private flying. In the recent past, expansion in commercial aviation has been reflected in aircraft size, speed, capacity and other changes which have made imperative more sophisticated air traffic and airport traffic control, communications systems, airport facilities and safety measures. As a result, the role of the Federal Government has become even larger and more important to our domestic and foreign air commerce.

Federal assistance is particularly vital in modernizing existing airports to accommodate new aircraft, and in construction of general aviation airports. Personal and business flying increased

from 57,047 aircraft in use in 1955 to 86,788 in 1965. In this area too, numbers only tell part of the story, because the craft have become larger, faster, safer, and more comfortable. Airport access is a factor in location of industry, and thus of concern to the communities involved.

In addition to the considerations of air commerce, the airport program must be considered as a vital part of national defense. During World War II more than half the total airline fleets were used in flying troops and weapons for the Air Transport Command and the Air Transport Service. Airline pilots, mechanics, ticket clerks, and executives in uniform—more than one-third of all airline personnel—provided a cadre of air transportation specialists. Without adequate airports the civil air fleets and services would not have been available for use in defense of the Nation. The FAA reports that in 1964 approximately one-fourth of that Agency's annual appropriation was devoted to responsibilities related to defense.

Non-air-carrier civil aviation could provide "unparalleled" flexibility in vital services in a national emergency. The general aviation fleet is more widely dispersed than the commercial fleet and can operate from fields requiring minimum preparation or restoration. However, in order to have such a fleet of private planes available when needed, the necessary airports must be in existence.

Continued support of the Federal-aid airport program is necessary on all counts. We should not be short-sighted in providing funds for the program and authorized funds should be appropriated. Surveys over the years have shown that even had all the funds authorized been made available they would not have satisfied all the needs. For example, in 1959 a total of \$63 million was available for allocation, while requests for Federal assistance totaled \$192 million. At the close of the reporting period for fiscal year 1966, requests had been received for aid in the total amount of \$161.6 million with only \$75 million programmed for airport assistance.

Mr. President, we have made important advances in aviation since the day in 1893 when a bill was introduced in the U.S. Senate which would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay \$100,000 to any inventor who, before 1900, would "construct a vessel" which could fly at least 30 miles an hour and carry a load of 5 tons while "safely navigating the air." Today, we have aircraft which can exceed 2,000 miles per hour in straight and level flights; we plan the construction of a transport with a payload capacity of more than 100 tons; and, air travel is recognized as among the safest and most dependable means of travel.

I wholeheartedly support the continuation of the Federal aid-to-airports program as conceived under the Federal Airport Act of 1946. Airpower remains as the key to economic expansion and national security. We must continue to utilize its potentials fully as we seek a

better way of life for our citizens in a world of peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

PROPOSED RULE CHANGE TO REQUIRE DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, it has long been my view that Senators should be required to make a complete disclosure of their finances. I have done so voluntarily for the last 4 years, and some of colleagues have likewise made a public financial disclosure in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

When it was revealed in the course of the Bobby Baker investigation that a Senate employee had been guilty of gross improprieties, I introduced a Senate resolution providing for mandatory financial disclosure by Senators and all Senate employees who are compensated at a gross rate in excess of \$10,000.

Regrettably my disclosure proposal was shunted aside, and the Senate adopted the resolution which created the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. I supported that resolution, and I believe that the Senate acted wisely in setting up the Select Committee. But by its very nature, the Select Committee can do its work only after allegations of wrongdoing have been made; it can slam the barn door after the horse has bolted, but it is not so good at keeping the horse in.

Disclosure, on the other hand—compulsory and comprehensive—can effectively deter financial misconduct by requiring Senators and key Senate employees to lay all their cards face up on the table. For the many rewards and satisfactions of public service in the Senate, this seems a small price to pay—particularly when public confidence is at stake.

At this very moment there is on the Senate Calendar a resolution, Senate Resolution 123, duly reported by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which if taken up and adopted, would require a measure of financial disclosure by Senators and higher paid Senate employees. Although it is a move in the right direction, it is seriously weakened by the presence of a number of loopholes. It could however be brought before the Senate, perfected by strengthening amendments, and adopted—and I urge now, as I have urged before—that this be done.

In accordance with my practice of prior years, I intend to make a voluntary disclosure of my own finances, in compliance with the terms of the disclosure rule which I have repeatedly pressed the Senate to adopt.

I ask unanimous consent that my proposed rule XLVII, dealing with the disclosure of financial interests, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RULE XLVII. DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

1. Each individual who at any time during any calendar year serves as a Member of the

Senate, or as an officer or employee of the Senate, compensated at a gross rate in excess of \$10,000 per annum, shall file with the Secretary of the Senate for that calendar year a written report containing the following information:

(a) The fair market value of each asset having a fair market value of \$5,000 or more held by him or by his spouse or by him and his spouse jointly, exclusive of any dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family, at the end of that calendar year;

(b) The amount of each liability in excess of \$5,000 owed by him or by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly at the end of that calendar year;

(c) The total amount of all capital gains realized, and the source and amount of each capital gain realized in any amount exceeding \$5,000, during that calendar year by him or by his spouse, by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on behalf or pursuant to the direction of him or his spouse, or him and his spouse jointly, as a result of any transaction or series of related transactions in securities or commodities, or any purchase or sale of real property or any interest therein other than a dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family;

(d) The source and amount of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from any relative or his spouse) received by or accruing to him, his spouse, or from him and his spouse jointly from any source other than the United States during that calendar year, which exceeds \$100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, or other facilities received by him in kind;

(e) The name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States in which he has a financial interest; and the name, address, and a brief description of the principal business of any client of such firm for whom any services involving representation before any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States which were performed during that calendar year, together with a brief description of the services performed, and the total fees received or receivable by the firm as compensation for such services;

(f) The name, address, and nature of the principal business or activity of each business or financial entity or enterprise with which he was associated at any time during that calendar year as an officer, director, or partner, or in any other managerial capacity.

2. Each asset consisting of an interest in a business or financial entity or enterprise which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name of such entity or enterprise, the location of its principal office, and the nature of the business or activity in which it is principally engaged or with which it is principally concerned, except that an asset which is a security traded on any securities exchange subject to supervision by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States may be identified by a full and complete description of the security and the name of the issuer thereof. Each liability which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in such report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name and the address of the

creditor to whom the obligation of such liability is owed.

3. Except as otherwise hereinafter provided, each individual who is required by paragraph 1 to file a report for any calendar year shall file such report with the Secretary of the Senate not later than January 31 of the next following calendar year. No such report shall be required to be made for any calendar year beginning before January 1, 1964. The requirements of this rule shall apply only with respect to individuals who are Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate on or after the date of adoption of this rule. Any individual who ceases to serve as a Member of the Senate or as an officer or employee of the Senate, before the close of any calendar year shall file such report on the last day of such service, or on such date not more than 3 months thereafter as the Secretary of the Senate may prescribe, and the report so made shall be made for that portion of that calendar year during which such individual so served. Whenever there is on file with the Secretary of the Senate a report made by any individual in compliance with paragraph 1 for any calendar year, the Secretary may accept from that individual for any succeeding calendar year, in lieu of the report required by paragraph 1, a certificate containing an accurate recitation of the changes in such report which are required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year, or a statement to the effect that no change in such report is required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year.

4. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be made upon forms which shall be prepared and provided by the Secretary of the Senate and shall be made in such manner and detail as he shall prescribe. The Secretary may provide for the grouping within such reports and certificate of items which are required by paragraph 1 to be disclosed whenever he determines that separate itemization thereof is not feasible or is not required for accurate disclosure with respect to such items. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be retained by the Secretary as public records for not less than 6 years after the close of the calendar year for which they are made, and while so retained shall be available for inspection by members of the public under such reasonable regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe.

5. As used in this rule—

(a) The term "asset" includes any beneficial interest held or possessed directly or indirectly in any business or financial entity or enterprise, or in any security or evidence of indebtedness, but does not include any interest in any organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code;

(b) The term "liability" includes any liability of any trust in which a beneficial interest is held or possessed directly or indirectly;

(c) The term "income" means gross income as defined by section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(d) The term "security" means any security as defined by section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b).

(e) The term "commodity" means any commodity as defined by section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2).

(f) The term "dealing in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

(g) The term "officer or employee of the Senate" means (1) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate, (2) an employee of the Senate or any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, (3)

the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and employees of his office, (4) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties, (5) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (6) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (7) an employee of a Member of the Senate if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and (8) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, in accordance with the proposed rule, I offer a disclosure of my own financial interests, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS OF SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

(a) The fair market value of each asset owned by me or my spouse, jointly or severally, as at December 31, 1965, was:

43 shares Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.....	\$2,112.37
534 shares American Tel. & Tel.....	32,440.50
170 shares General Electric.....	20,060.00
296 shares General Motors.....	30,636.00
191 shares International Paper.....	5,878.75
138 shares Jewel Tea.....	5,227.00
82 shares National Dairy Products.....	6,970.00
200 shares Philadelphia Electric.....	7,375.00
600 shares Smith, Kline & French.....	48,725.00
600 shares Sterling Drug.....	24,600.00
300 shares Texas Gulf Sulphur.....	27,337.00
76 shares International Business Machines.....	37,924.00
100 shares American Bakeries Co. 5% Cv. Pfd.....	10,800.00
300 shares Standard Oil of Calif. 3.30 Conv. Pfd.....	34,800.00
300 shares Chrysler Corp.....	15,900.00
314 shares Armstrong Cork.....	18,840.00
433 shares Vulcan Material Co.....	9,093.00
119 shares Rohm & Haas.....	18,683.00
400 shares Parke Davis & Co.....	13,200.00
500 shares Allis Chalmers.....	16,500.00
500 shares Massey-Ferguson Ltd.....	16,000.00
490 shares First Pennsylvania Banking & Tr. Co.....	15,347.00
200 shares PepsiCo Inc.....	16,200.00
150 shares Insurance Co. of North America.....	12,750.00
400 shares Pabst Brewing.....	16,400.00
330 shares American Optical.....	16,500.00
500 shares Western Publishing.....	10,500.00
800 shares Avery Island Inc. Cap. Stock.....	40,000.00
10,000 James Talcott CV. Cap. Notes 5% due 12/1/79.....	10,200.00
20,000 Allegheny Co. Pa. 3 3/8% due 7/1/69.....	20,359.00
10,000 Lebanon, Pa. 3.30% due 6/1/73.....	9,999.00
10,000 Penna Hwy. & Bridge Auth. 3 1/2% due 2/15/77.....	10,045.00
25,000 Phila., Pa. 3 1/2% due 1/1/82.....	24,400.00
15,000 Cumberland Co. Pa., 3 1/4% due 11/1/86.....	14,129.00
25,000 Penna. St. Pub. Sch. 3 1/2% due 11/1/86.....	23,030.00
10,000 Philadelphia, Pa. 3 1/4% due 7/1/87.....	9,128.00
25,000 Penna. Turnpike Rev. Bond 3.10% due 6/1/93.....	23,455.00
15,000 New Kensington Pa. S.D. Auth. 3.05% due 4/1/95.....	12,329.00
5,000 City of Bethlehem, Pa., Counties of Northampton & Lehigh School Dist. 2.70% Imp. Bond of 1957, due 4/1/72.....	5,000.00

Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co.—paid-up policy.....	\$15,000.00
Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co.—2 paid-up policies.....	55,951.69
Share of mineral rights under royalty lease with Humble Oil & Refining Co., at Avery Island, La.....	1,292,886.20
Savings Accounts.....	12,929.52
Cash in checking accounts.....	65,387.70

¹ Because of depletion of the field, market value is computed at 3 1/2 times annual income.

(b) Neither my wife nor I owe liabilities, jointly or severally, in excess of \$5,000.

(c) My wife and I realized total net capital gains of \$5,821.34 in 1965.

(d) The source and amount of items of income received or accrued to me or my wife, jointly or severally, from sources other than the United States, which exceed \$100 in amount or value were:

Allis Chalmers.....	\$218.75
American Bakeries.....	375.00
American Telephone & Telegraph.....	1,173.00
Armstrong Cork.....	526.35
Avery Island Inc.....	5,600.00
Chrysler Corp.....	150.00
1st Penna. Banking & Trust Co.....	646.80
Franklin Life Ins. Co.....	21.38
Insurance Co. of North America.....	300.00
International Business Machines Corp.....	456.00
Pabst Brewing Co.....	100.00
Parke Davis Co.....	300.00
Penn Mutual Life Ins. Co.....	125.40
Pepsico.....	310.00
Rohm & Haas.....	179.20
Vulcan Materials.....	346.40
Western Publishing.....	270.00
General Electric.....	391.00
Sterling Drug.....	457.50
Standard Oil of Calif.....	990.00
National Dairy Products.....	213.20
General Motors.....	1,554.00
International Paper.....	238.75
Texas Gulf Sulphur.....	120.00
Smith, Kline & French.....	1,110.00
Phila. Electric.....	288.00
Jewel Tea.....	234.60
Bayhil & Co., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, N.Y.....	865.09
Thelma Spencer Trust—Residual income.....	111.60
Humble Oil & Refining Co.—Oil and gas royalties, lease and rent.....	1,83,681.77
Allegheny County Bonds.....	668.75
City of Lebanon Bonds.....	330.00
City of Philadelphia 3% Bonds.....	150.00
City of Philadelphia 3 1/4% Bonds.....	325.00
City of Philadelphia 3 1/2% Bonds.....	875.00
City of Bethlehem Bonds.....	135.00
Cumberland Co. Bonds.....	487.50
Dayton Rubber Bonds.....	825.00
New Kensington Bonds.....	457.50
Penna. Public School Bonds.....	812.50
Penna. Turnpike Bonds.....	775.00
State Highway & Bridge Bonds.....	350.00
James Talcott 5% Cap. Note.....	500.00

¹ Income from this source will gradually decline as the field was brought in in 1945 and is being depleted.

I was reimbursed for various expenditures incurred in connection with trips made by me during the year to various meetings at institutions and elsewhere where I had been invited to speak. My spouse received no such reimbursement.

The only reimbursement I received which exceeded \$100 was for expenses to Chicago for a speech for the Association of American Law Schools in the amount of \$115.23.

Net fees or other honoraria received by me during the year were as follows:

Smith College, Northampton, Mass., Alice Holden Lectures—Honorarium.....	\$250.00
Mt. Holyoke College, S. Hadley, Mass., Lecture—Honorarium.....	200.00
Wheaton College, Norton, Mass., Otis Lectures—Honorarium.....	750.00
George Washington U., Washington, D.C.—Honorarium.....	150.00
Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C. Honorarium.....	150.00
University of Pennsylvania Connaissance, Philadelphia, Pa.—Honorarium.....	200.00
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.—Honorarium—Lecture.....	100.00
Colorado State U., Fort Collins, Colo.—Honorarium—Commencement Address.....	400.00
Ramparts Magazine, 1182 Chestnut St., Menlo Park, Calif.—Book review.....	50.00
Hill & Wang, Inc., 141 5th Ave., N.Y.—Net royalties on book "The Establishment".....	189.15
Donald MacCampbell, Inc., 12 E. 41st St., N.Y. Net advance on royalties on "Ethics in Government".....	1,800.00

(e) I am not connected with any professional firm engaged in practicing before any instrumentality of the United States.

(f) I am neither an officer, director or partner of any business or financial entity other than Avery Island, Inc., a family corporation, whose principal place of business is at Avery Island, Louisiana, which is engaged in collecting rents and royalties, paying the expenses of upkeep of its property and distributing the balance in dividends to its shareholders, of whom I am one.

(g) Neither my wife nor I received gifts valued at more than \$100 from any individual or corporation.

POLISH MILLENNIUM

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, on Tuesday, May 17, I requested that the excellent address made by Senator MUSKIE to Alliance College in commemoration of the Polish millennium be inserted in the RECORD. At that time I inadvertently neglected to include the text of an article, entitled "Polish Alma Mater in the United States," recently published in America, the USIA magazine we send to Poland. The author, Mr. Jan Kempka, has written eloquently about the fine role played by Alliance College in the preservation of the Polish language and culture in America. 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:

POLISH ALMA MATER IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Jan Kempka)

Huge drilling trucks rumble through the narrow streets of Cambridge Springs, a small town of 2,300 in the State of Pennsylvania. The heavy vehicles pass a railroad crossing and, climbing a hill, unceremoniously draw up on a wide lawn. Taut steel cables and boring pipes contrast sharply with the stately trees, smooth concrete driveways, and red-brick academic buildings which for more than half a century have occupied this hilltop. Here, where trucks noisily make test borings, will rise the new science building of Alliance College, the only institution of higher learn-

ing in America founded to encourage the study of Polish language and culture.

The man behind all this activity, and the moving spirit of Alliance College, is its president, Dr. Henry J. Parcinski, formerly an educational leader in Trenton, New Jersey (see *America* # 28). When he took office in August 1963, Dr. Parcinski brought with him a number of very definite ideas for improvement and expansion.

Alliance was established in 1912 as a four-year high school for children of Polish immigrants who had settled in large numbers in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Buffalo, New York, and Cleveland, Ohio. The immigrants, struggling at hard and low-paying jobs, were anxious to provide their children with a better education than they themselves had had. This would enable them to rise on the economic and social ladder. At the same time, the parents feared their children might drift away from their Polish heritage—hence the decision to support a Polish school through the Polish National Alliance in North America.

In 1912 Alliance opened its doors to a modest enrollment of 326. U.S. President William Howard Taft delivered the main address at the initial ceremonies. Three years later, a vocational school was added to train students in useful mechanical skills, such as auto mechanics and woodwork. In time, more technical subjects, such as draftsmanship and electro-technical training, were added. The next step came in 1924 when Wacław Gąsiorowski, the energetic director of Alliance and a renowned Polish novelist, established a junior college covering the first two years of university study.

After World War II, there was a strenuous effort to convert Alliance into a full-fledged four-year college granting a bachelor's degree in science and the humanities. In 1952, Alliance achieved accreditation and joined the ranks of over 2,000 American colleges.

But the tempo of change was too slow for the new president, Dr. Parcinski. He came to Cambridge Springs with a two-pronged plan for long-range action: As a Polish-American school, Alliance College should concentrate on studies in Slavonic language and culture; as a school with experience in technical education, vocational training should be replaced by a scientific and technological curriculum more in keeping with contemporary American needs.

Currently under construction, the handsome science building will house laboratories, computers, a planetarium, a hothouse, seminar rooms and a lecture hall in the shape of an amphitheater seating more than 200 students. Half the cost of the million-dollar structure is being met by the Polish National Alliance, the college's sponsor; more than one-third is coming from a U.S. government grant; the remainder is being sought from private sources. Dr. Parcinski is sanguine that the science building will be paid for by the time it is ready for occupancy in September of 1966. In addition, he has mapped out with architects a general plan for the college's expansion: new dormitories, buildings with lecture rooms, a new library and a new administrative building.

Although it resembles other American colleges in its curriculum, Alliance has retained a very special character. The vast majority of students (some 80 percent) are of Polish origin—the grandchildren and great-grandchildren of Polish immigrants as indicated by such surnames as Wojtuszewska, Dravecky, Zaleski, Micklewicz, Kozub. Their first names, however, are typically American: Sandra, Irene, Alan, Bruce. A few know and speak Polish well, having learned it at home; some know a little; others made their first acquaintance with the language of their forefathers in the Slavonic courses at Alliance. But, whatever their previous background, most students study Polish history at Alliance College to maintain their Polish

heritage. A choir, led by Professor Malcolm Seagrave, has an extensive repertoire of Polish folksongs and carols. Polish religious and cultural holidays are celebrated with great solemnity. The Christmas Eve Wigilia ceremony is the year's most festive celebration. In the dining hall, sitting at tables loaded with traditional Polish dishes, faculty and students share the oplatki, Christmas wafers; exchange the season's greetings, and sing carols. One out of 10 students belongs to the Polish Club; at a typical meeting members may hear a lecture on Polish literature or history or practice Polish dances.

Some of the students study Polish and Russian to prepare for academic careers. This is true of Wanda Krauz, a 1964 graduate of Alliance who went on to work for her master's degree in Slavonic languages at Syracuse University in New York State. Richard G. Ploszay, another recent graduate, will join the U.S. Foreign Service when he has finished a one-year supplementary language course at Monterey, California. He will be assigned to a post where his linguistic background will be useful. But at Alliance College, as at other American schools, a student's national origin does not determine his field of study. Fred Tripp, specializing in Russian, comes from a family of Irish immigrants; Richard Spillers, an able student of Polish, is of Dutch ancestry.

The faculty, like the student body, is mainly but not exclusively Polish in origin. Dr. Rudolph S. Bremen, the Dean of the College, is a native of France and received his B.A. degree from Allessanno Lyceum in Italy and his M.A. and Ph. D. in modern languages from the University of Pittsburgh. Mrs. Margaret T. Wellington, who is of Anglo-Saxon background, teaches art. Mrs. Danuta Obojska studied Polish language and literature at the University of Lublin, Poland, where she received her first M.A. degree; upon her arrival in the United States she took up Library Science and received an M.A. at the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh. She married an American of Polish extraction, and now both work at Alliance where her husband teaches English. Mrs. Halina Swidzinska studied at the universities of Warsaw, Berlin, Munich and in the United States. She teaches foreign languages at Alliance College.

President Parcinski's chief aim is to expand Alliance's Slavonic department, so that his small Polish college can effectively compete in this field with the best universities in the United States. A few years ago, the college acquired an electronic language laboratory where teachers record magnetic tapes of each lesson. Students, seated in 20 separate booths, hear the lesson through individual earphones; as they repeat what they hear, they record their own voices on tape. Later, the student corrects errors in diction and pronunciation by comparing his recorded voice with that of the instructors.

Eventually, Dr. Parcinski hopes that Alliance will produce scholars capable of important independent research. He anticipates the preparation of a definitive university text on Polish history that would surpass even the excellent *Cambridge History of Poland*. "My dream," says the president, "is to see postgraduate studies in the field of humanities at Alliance College—that is to say, I have a vision of a Polish Alliance University."

For Dr. Parcinski this is no mere dream, but a very realistic and practicable goal. He wants the students of Alliance to enjoy the literature, history and spirit of two languages and two countries—"and in this way become better Americans and better human beings."

CAPTIONS

Caption A: Polish Room of Alliance College library (above) houses more than 4,000 books and periodicals about Poland, among

others such rare publications as Joachim Lelewel's historical work published 135 years ago.

Caption B: Science (New science) building, now being constructed in center of campus, is part of major expansion program.

Caption C: Cafeteria of off-campus men's dormitory is cheerful spot for meeting friends, having a (snack) cup of coffee between classes. Coats-of-arms of Polish cities colorfully decorate the room.

(Text available for USIS use.)

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, with respect to the situation in the Dominican Republic there is good news in the newspaper this morning. Provisional President Hector Garcia Godoy has issued an order to troops of the Dominican Army that they shall be confined to their barracks until after the election, to be held on June 1.

There is also good news that military leaves have been cancelled so that those who were on leave must rejoin their troops.

I am happy that as a result of these two moves Juan Bosch has agreed to continue as a candidate for the presidency of the Dominican Republic. Mr. Bosch now believes that the provisional president has taken the steps necessary to assure a free election without intimidation by the military.

This encouraging development results in a hope that we will honorably get out of the mess that we got into in the Dominican Republic in April of last year.

The point is that despite the presence of the Inter-American Peace Force and despite a U.S. aid program which is almost the sole means of support of the Dominican Republic, it has not yet been possible to enforce upon the Dominican military any sort of decent respect for the opinions—or apparently, the lives—of their fellow countrymen. I would hope that the U.S. Government would adopt a more forthright attitude toward this problem. It sounds a little unrealistic for the State Department to make a plea of nonintervention in this case.

In connection with these remarks, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two recent magazine articles on the Dominican Republic—one by Theodore Draper in the *New Leader* of May 9 and one by Andrew Kopkind in the *New Republic* of May 21.

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

[From the *New Leader* magazine, May 9, 1966]

A CASE OF POLITICAL OBSCURITY

(By Theodore Draper)

The more I study and think about the Dominican crisis of last year, the more I believe it was, in a deeper sense, a United States crisis. And that crisis—our crisis—is still with us. Except for a small force of professional militarists, the Dominican people did something they will long be proud of. They rose against a politically and economically bankrupt regime, born of a military coup, and fought to reestablish a humane, democratic, constitutional government. But I fear that we in the United States will never be able to look back at what we did in April 1965 with pride; indeed, we have not yet

succeeded in even facing up sufficiently to our actions, or at least the actions that were committed by our government.

For the past few months, I have been going over the events of April 1965 on the basis of material not previously available to me. Initially, what we knew of the Dominican revolt came mainly from United States sources. More recently, I have been able to restudy the antecedents and nature of the upheaval on the basis of surprisingly rich and revealing Dominican sources. The two main newspapers in Santo Domingo, *El Caribe* and *Listin Diario*, published editions on April 25, 26, 27, 28, 1965, that contain columns and columns of reports covering nearly every aspect of the first four days. The Dominican magazine, *Ahora!*, put out two numbers in May 1965. I have also been able to obtain a complete file of the various Communist publications. There is much to read, too, in the publications of several political parties, and especially of some Catholic organizations.

In this space, I merely wish to call attention to two or three main points that bear on the latest campaign in this country to convert the revolt into a Communist plot.

To begin with, there is now overwhelming evidence that the revolt was virtually robbed of almost bloodless success on April 25, the second day. At 10:30 that morning, Provisional President Donald Reid Cabral resigned at the demand of a group of officers headed by Colonel Francisco Caamaño Deñó. Up to the time of Reid Cabral's resignation, the death toll, according to the Dominican press, numbered three. Victory seemed so near that, with one exception, the highest military officers, who later turned against the revolt, made friendly overtures to its leaders. The following day, the main headline across the front page of the newspaper closest to the Catholic hierarchy, *Listin Diario*, read: "Military Depose Triumvirate; President of the Chamber Assumes Power." By military, the story made clear that it meant the group headed by Colonel Caamaño; Reid Cabral's regime was known as the Triumvirate; and the Chamber was the Chamber of Deputies. An editorial in the same issue praised the new Provisional President, Dr. José Rafael Molina Urefia, as a man of intelligence, prudence, and good will.¹

Dr. Molina Urefia was sworn in at 5:45 p.m. on April 25. An hour and a quarter earlier, though, at 4:30 p.m., Air Force planes attacked the National Palace where the Dominican Congress was meeting. And early the next morning the Air Force attacks began in deadly earnest.

This was the first turning point in the fortunes of the revolt. From still almost bloodless success—the Dominican press reported only about 10 deaths on April 25—it was plunged into a bloody civil war. Why? Why did the Dominican Air Force decide to attack the National Palace at 4:30 p.m. on April 25? Why did the military officers who saw the handwriting on the wall for most of that day change their minds and oppose the revolt by force?

We know, because he has told us, that the only top officer who actively opposed the revolt from the outset was General Elias Wessin y Wessin, the ringleader of the September 1963 anti-Bosch coup. Wessin has further revealed that he had only 200-250 men at his disposal at this time. He has said the chief of the Air Force, General de los Santos Céspedes, asked him on April 24 to surrender and he responded the following day by sending two aides to de los Santos whom they forced at gun point to order the attack on the National Palace.² But there was more to the story than that.

¹ *Testimony of Brigadier General Elias Wessin y Wessin*: Hearing before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, October 1, 1965, pp. 156-157.

The missing links are provided in a cable from U.S. Chargé d'Affaires William B. Connett Jr., acting as head of the Embassy in Santo Domingo while Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett Jr., was in Georgia visiting his mother. This cable was received in Washington at 5:00 p.m. on April 25, a half hour after the Air Force attack on the National Palace, and the links are to be found in three key sentences.

"All members of the country team feel Bosch's return and resumption of control of the government is against U.S. interests in view of extremists in the coup and Communist advocacy of Bosch return."

Connett continued: "I have reluctantly agreed to the de los Santos-Wessin plan even though it could mean more bloodshed."

And three sentences later, he added: "Our attachés have stressed to the three military leaders, Rivera, de los Santos and Wessin, our strong feeling everything possible should be done to prevent a Communist takeover."²

This cable proves that the United States representatives in Santo Domingo effectively intervened against the revolt on its second day. Chargé d'Affaires Connett was in on the Dominican military decision to drown the revolt in blood and, in effect, the U.S. military attaches urged the Dominican military leaders to get in there and fight. President Johnson ordered in the Marines on the fifth day, April 28, to do the job the Dominican military was unable to do. The President did not need about 25,000 troops to evacuate about 5,000 American civilians, who were being successfully evacuated anyway, and he did not need to keep the troops there indefinitely if the evacuation was his only or even his main purpose.

Thus we are led back to the original and still the only serious long-term rationale for U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic—the alleged tie-up between Juan Bosch and the Communists. Connett's cable, it should be remembered, referred to "Communist advocacy of Bosch return" and to the prevention of a "Communist takeover."

As for the danger of a "Communist takeover" on that day, April 25, the Dominican material is particularly revealing. I mentioned that the two leading Santo Domingo newspapers reported the first four days of the revolt. About a dozen different stories on practically all aspects of the revolt filled three or more full-sized pages daily in both *Listin Diario* and *El Caribe*, which has long been Bosch's journalistic *bête noire*. Yet there is not a line, not a word, in either paper about Communist influence or activity in the constitutionalist ranks, let alone about the threat of a Communist takeover. The only thing the editors thought worth reporting on an inside page on April 26 was a manifesto of the Castroite 14th of June Movement calling for the restoration of the 1963 Constitution, but significantly omitting a demand for Bosch's return to power. The same story carried the text of a pro-revolt statement by the Dominican Lawyers' Association, hardly a revolutionary body. The Dominican press, moreover, knows its Communists and never hesitates to mention them by name.

The "Communist advocacy of Bosch return," to which Connett's cable alluded, apparently referred to a manifesto by the pro-Soviet Communist party, then known as the Popular Socialist Party (psp), of March 16, 1965, about five weeks before the revolt. I have explained the circumstances of this

² The substance of Connett's cable has been known for some time. It was accurately paraphrased as long ago as June 25, 1965, in *The Wall Street Journal* by its Washington correspondent, Philip Geyelin. And Geyelin discusses the cable at some length, with direct quotations, in his forthcoming book, *Lyndon B. Johnson and the World*, to be published by Frederick A. Praeger in June.

manifesto in detail in the *New Republic* of February 19, 1966, and I do not wish to repeat the whole story here. In brief, Bosch's party and the Christian Revolutionary Party, the Dominican version of what is known elsewhere as the Christian Democratic movement, made a pact in January 1965, to restore constitutional government.³ The Communists made overtures to be admitted into this united front, but were turned down. Nevertheless, the Communists recognized that an overwhelming mass movement was building up for the restoration of Bosch's constitutional government, and they tried to identify themselves with this movement, at least nominally, because they did not wish to be completely isolated from what they considered to be the trend of the masses. The Dominican Communist maneuver was not too different from the stand taken by the U.S. Communists in several Presidential elections, including the last one, favoring the Democratic candidate over the Republican.

In any case, if we are going to cite Communist documents, let us cite them honestly and fairly. I have devoted a good deal of time to tracking them down because they have played a key role in the campaign of falsification and vilification which the Dominican revolt has suffered, and is still suffering, in this country.

Back on August 16, 1965, the organ of the Communist psp, *El Popular* published a "self-criticism" of Communist policy before and during the revolt. This document quite explicitly stated that "our party was not prepared for the armed insurrection and for that reason was not capable of directing it."

The able correspondent of the Chicago *Daily News* Georgie Anne Geyer interviewed Cayetano Rodríguez del Prado, leader of the Dominican Popular Movement the pro-Chinese Communist party. He told her: "We were not in on the plans of Caamaño. In the beginning, we thought that it would be a simple reactionary coup. But when we got the opportunity to get arms (on the second day, when the armories were broken open), we started to fight. The Communists never had enough force to put the revolution in danger. The principal force was always Caamaño. The forces of the Left were minimal—less than 10 per cent. Later we got into contact with Caamaño when we formed our commando (one of the fighting units)." (Chicago *Daily News*, November 9, 1965).

Two leaders of the pro-Soviet Dominican Communist party (ex-psp), J. I. Cuello [Cuello] and N. Isa Conde, gave their version

³ Catholic support of the constitutionalist movement deserves far more attention than it has yet received. It was—and is—one of the most significant and hopeful aspects of the entire Dominican phenomenon, and its importance for all Latin America can hardly be exaggerated. While the Dominican Communists have been absurdly overrated, the Dominican Catholics have been unjustly underestimated. There is an authoritative account of the efforts made by the Catholic Church itself to live down its past subservience to the Trujillo despotism and assume a new, politically democratic and socially progressive role in "Chez le Nonce à Saint-Domingue," *Informations Catholiques Internationales*, Paris, April 15, 1966. I have also been informed that Reverend James A. Clark of the Latin American Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference has just completed a book on the role of the Catholic Church in the Dominican crisis. The irony is that Catholic apologists of U.S. intervention and Dominican reaction, (of the type represented by William F. Buckley, Jr.) are doing more serious, long-range damage to the interests of their church than the Communists could ever inflict.

of the revolt in the two-part article in the organ of the pro-Soviet Communist parties, *World Marxist Review* (December 1965 and January 1966). In the first installment they wrote: "We failed to see that an armed uprising was inevitable. Consequently, our party found itself unprepared for the uprising and was unable to head it, although as far as possible it took a firm and resolute part in it." Thus they claim some credit for having joined the fight after it started without them, but they make clear that they played a relatively modest role throughout the April revolt.

The two Communists also criticized their party for its mistaken attitude toward the Dominican Armed Forces: "Besides, our party adopted a sectarian attitude to the Armed Forces, lumping them all together as a group of 'gorillas' in the service of recreation." Consequently: "Our sectarian attitude to the Army . . . prevented us from correctly assessing the changes taking place in it and isolated us from the entire process of preparation of the coup in the barracks. As a result, constitutionalist officers and soldiers established contact with the vacillating and moderate circles of the democratic movement, which were planning armed action merely as a counter-coup."

Yet this article in the *World Marxist Review*, which can be found in many of our larger libraries and could be bought in our larger cities, has been made the pretext for the latest propaganda campaign against the Dominican revolt. This campaign is nothing less than a clean case of political obscenity. It has polluted newspapers, magazines, and both houses of Congress. It shows that there are very strong forces in the United States which are willing to resort to almost any deception to poison the minds of the American people against the Dominican revolt and its leadership.

Here is how this campaign has developed in the past two months:

It seems to have been kicked off by Ernest Conine in the *Los Angeles Times* of February 25, 1965. Conine's article was not the worst of the lot. He at least told his readers that the two Communists had not claimed credit for the initial phase of the revolt, but he pretended that what they had written tallied "on most points" with what the Johnson Administration has said at the time. To bolster this claim, Conine wrote: "Only the landing of American troops, they say, caused the Red power play to fail." This was outright distortion. What the two Communists had said was this: "Only by direct armed intervention was U.S. imperialism able to prevent the Dominican democrats and Constitutionalists from achieving their immediate aims." Indeed, one of the main points in the *World Marxist Review* article was how limited the Communist power had been to make any "power play" or "grab."

But Conine's imaginative little effort was only a foretaste of what was to come. The main dish was served up by William S. White in a nationwide column on March 24 of this year. White took the line that "[Isa] Conde and Quello have now unmistakably and openly identified the Communist party as the ultimately moving force in the Dominican upheaval." As we have seen, Isa Conde and Quello had said nothing of the kind. They had, in fact, said just the opposite, namely that the Communists had not had the foresight or the power to become the "ultimately moving force" at any stage of the revolt.

And now the game of distorting the *World Marxist Review* article really got out of hand. Some of the worst offenders, unfortunately, were members of Congress. William S. White's column was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not once but three times by three different congressmen with their own distortions of his distortions. Peculiarly, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1966, published White's column twice in a single

issue, only three pages apart. Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR. (D.-Ala.) prefaced the column by telling the House of Representatives that the two Dominican Communists had stated, "except for U.S. military intervention the island of Santo Domingo would have become another Red base in the Caribbean."

Representative JOE D. WAGGONER (D.-La.) went Representative SELDEN one better. He told the House that the "hierarchy of international Communism" had now frankly admitted that "they armed and fomented the revolt last April in the Dominican Republic." The following day, March 25, 1966, Senator RUSSELL B. LONG (D.-La.) introduced the same column which showed, he said, that "our Communist opponents in the struggle for the Dominican Republic are blatantly proclaiming their responsibility for the uprising."

Is it not incredible that an article which had explicitly stated that the Dominican Communists had been "unprepared for the uprising" and "unable to head it" should be distorted by one Representative to mean that the Communists had frankly admitted "fomenting" it, and by one Senator to mean that they were "blatantly proclaiming their responsibility" for it? Could members of Congress more blatantly proclaim their own responsibility?

Fortunately, there is a bright side to this political outrage. On March 25, 1966, too, Senator JOSEPH CLARK (D.-Pa.) rose to expose this fantastic hoax on the Senate floor. He introduced the full text of the *World Marxist Review* article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with an accurate commentary of his own.

But this did not stop the propaganda machine. Spanish-language readers were treated to an editorial in the *New York weekly, El Tiempo* of March 27, 1966, by its editor, Stanley Ross, a former journalistic henchman of the late Dominican dictator, Rafael Leonidas Trujillo. Ross told his readers that "we have in the Communists' own words, and right from Moscow, the proof that the revolt which overthrew Donald Reid Cabral was sponsored, financed, armed, and inspired direct from Moscow"—not a word of which was true.⁴

Then a national magazine, *U.S. News & World Report* of April 4, 1966, published excerpts from still the same article with the

⁴ Not long ago, *El Tiempo* published a different version of the revolt, Brazilian Ambassador Imar Penna Marinho, a member of the original oas factfinding committee sent to the Dominican Republic, has frequently been cited to prove that there had been a real Communist threat to justify the U.S. intervention. At that time, he merely said that "the Caamaño movement could be rapidly converted to a Communist insurrection," not that it had been. But this time Penna Marinho gave an interview to Max Alvarez which appeared in *El Tiempo* of *New York*, January 27, 1966. First Alvarez asked the Brazilian whether, in his view, Communism could gain strength if Bosch emerged victorious in the forthcoming elections. Penna Marinho replied: "I do not see this possibility. Santo Domingo is not and will not be Communist, and there does not exist any foundation on which it can develop. Communism is a fantasy in this country." But Alvarez was not satisfied and asked another question—whether, in his opinion, Communism had also been a fantasy in the days of the revolt (of April 1965), Penna Marinho thought for a moment and then replied:

"Always . . . Caamaño's revolution was a popular type of movement. That a number of Communists wanted to profit from it, as is their custom, is something natural and logical but it does not mean that there existed a true threat from the extreme left."

editorial comment that "the Communists now say" that "only armed intervention by the United States" stopped them from taking over the country. And an official State Department publication, *Foreign Policy Briefs* of April 11, 1966, carried some more carefully selected excerpts to get across the message, as the title put it, of "Communist Involvement in the Dominican Republic Crisis," but carefully omitted all those passages which had confessed how late and limited the Communist involvement had been. No doubt more research would turn up other specimens of this peculiar literary genre.

It is clear, I think, that we are dealing here not with a series of coincidences but with a highly orchestrated operation. But who is conducting this orchestra, and who is paying for it? If we knew the answers to these questions, we would know more about the outlook for U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic. For there have been signs of late that the policy may be changing for the better. It remains to be seen, however, whether we are getting a change of rhetoric or of reality.

The people who engage in this kind of shabby deception may justify it on the ground that, against Communism, anything goes. They are wrong, profoundly wrong. This kind of anti-Communism can only end by making anti-Communism a mockery, a scandal, a stench in the nostrils of all decent people. If the Communists were diabolical enough, they would subsidize it.

Even if this clumsy campaign were directed against the Communists, it would backfire. But that it should be aimed at a man whom the Communists have themselves vilified most of his life makes it political suicide as well as a moral swindle. On April 4 and 6 of this year, Juan Bosch delivered two of the most basic, eloquent and moving talks in defense of democracy against Communism that have ever been made, and they were published in full in the *Santo Domingo papers*. But, as far as I know, they went completely unreported in the U.S.

It sometimes helps, however, to know what a thing was not in order to determine what it really was. The falsity and futility of all of the attempts to depict the Dominican revolt as a Communist conspiracy have merely served to bring out more sharply and unmistakably its essentially democratic character. This revolt was, in reality, one of the very rare, usually pure, popular, democratic, constitutional movements in this Hemisphere. The role played by the United States was, in my view, a historic wrong, an unmitigated, indefensible wrong.

But we have now been given that other rarity in foreign affairs—a second chance. There will be an election in the Dominican Republic on June 1, and Juan Bosch is running again. One can only hope that we will find a way to make just as clear this time that his return to power is not against the interest of the United States as we found a way last April to make clear that we thought it was such a danger.

In my first article on the Dominican revolt in *THE NEW LEADER* of May 24, 1965, written about two weeks after the outbreak, I concluded with these words: "I venture to make a prediction: In the end we will need Juan Bosch far more than he ever needed us. When we betray the Juan Bosches of the world we must, in the final reckoning, betray ourselves."

This prediction has now come true beyond my most extravagant expectations.

[From the *New Republic* magazine, May 21, 1966]

THE OUTLOOK FOR BOSCH: A REPORT FROM THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
(By Andrew Kopkind)

SANTO DOMINGO.—There are times when Juan Bosch would rather be almost anything

else than president of the Dominican Republic. "I want not to win this election," he said morosely in the course of a long conversation one rainy afternoon in May. But Bosch is not likely to get his wish. The elections which many people thought impossible now appear inevitable; they are set for June 1; Bosch is the odds-on-favorite.

There is nothing unnatural about Bosch's occasional fits of gloom. If he wins, his troubles begin. Today, he sees his country from the prison that is his own house, which he has left just twice during the campaign—both times for personal emergencies and at night. He spends his days under a palm-thatched pergola in a tiny walled-in patio, receiving callers and taping speeches for the daily radio broadcasts. Campaigners, officials, friends are admitted through a circle of guards, across a sandbagged front yard, through a maze of locked doors leading to sitting rooms, offices and nondescript antechambers. In one of them there is a bookshelf: *Land Reform in Taiwan* and Erich Fromm's *The Heart of Man* stand next to thinly-bound volumes in Spanish. In an alcove next to the pergola, two Dominican women scrub clothes in a soapy tub.

The visitors swirl around Bosch, following as he moves swiftly around the enclosure; he greets them with a warm, open-armed *abrazo*, talks for a few minutes, then sends them off with the same gesture. Just outside the circle, a navy "frogman"—one of the small elite corps fiercely loyal to the pro-Bosch "constitutionalist" rebels in last year's revolution—stands guard in his black uniform, black canvas shoes, and black kepi, with a submachine gun slung over his shoulder.

"If I left this house and went to the city—or any city in the country—thousands of people would surround me," Bosch said, relaxing as best he could in a straight-back kitchen chair. "I want most of all to avoid a disturbance." His opponents put off the guards and the seclusion to personal fear (which is why, they say, he remained in Puerto Rico for five months during and after the revolution), or to an exaggerated sense of indispensability, or to campaign demagoguery designed to dramatize Bosch's persecution by terrorists in the military forces. But Bosch, and most Dominicans, believe the dangers are real. Although there are no more snipers in Santo Domingo and the terrorism has largely subsided in the past few months (after scores, perhaps hundreds were murdered), there is no end to anxiety. "The extreme right might try anything to stop the elections at the last minute," a former government official told me. An attempt on Bosch's life, even if unsuccessful, would provoke mass demonstrations.

It is a small miracle in any case that the election program has proceeded so far without interruption. A year after US military intervention (at one time there were 23,000 troops), politics in the Dominican Republic are hardly "normal," even if the edge of violence has been dulled. The country is still in that condition which McGeorge Bundy called "an interrupted civil war," or more accurately, an interrupted revolution. There is a pervasive expectation of another act to come. Order, such as it is, is maintained by an uneasy and certainly temporary equilibrium of forces. The most obvious component is "La FIP," the 7,447-man Inter-American Peace Force of the Organization of American States. For most purposes, it is a US army of occupation (some Brazilians, Hondurans, Paraguayans and Nicaraguans are included, but there is no doubt about who is in control). La FIP, popularly interchangeable with *los Yanquis*, no longer patrols the main streets with tanks and armed jeeps, or searches citizens "from the head to the foot," as a Dominican engineer complained bitterly, "with no tact at

all." It has been ordered away from the highly political University of Santo Domingo, and FIP soldiers were pulled back from checkpoints late last month—both after the kind of "unfortunate accidents" (natives killed or hurt) which an occupying force cannot easily avoid.

But the army is by no means invisible. Troops inhabit two of the major tourist hotels and part of the third. Convoys rumble through town and helicopters whirl overhead. The best residences have been taken over for such support activities as the "USFORDOMREP Library," the US Army Service Club, and various staff headquarters. There are about 900 people in the official US mission—one of the biggest in the world. There are CIA and FBI agents, and Special Forces soldiers in civilian clothes wander throughout the countryside. There has been the usual sprouting of hamburger stands, black-market cigarettes (sales of the local product dipped 40 percent after the invasion), Coca-Cola. Waiters in the restaurants, as a matter of course, bring "fren' frie" to anyone who looks vaguely *Norte-americano*.

THE CARETAKERS

Exactly what the helicopters and the convoys whirl and rumble for is not at once apparent. By and large, the FIP is here as a symbol of control, as a guarantor of the semblance of order, and as an umbrella for the provisional government of Hector Garcia-Godoy. Installed by the US in early September after the Act of Reconciliation ended the civil war in its rawest form, Garcia-Godoy is provisional in almost every way. He survives (there have been rightist coups attempted) at the sufferance of the FIP. He has had his share of problems with all factions and has only narrowly squeezed through: the US had to remove General Wessin y Wessin bodily from the country and plant him as a military attaché in Miami. When two of Wessin's anti-revolutionist colleagues refused to leave, Garcia-Godoy told the US Embassy he wanted a "Dominican solution," and kicked the military chiefs upstairs to positions in the government. He talked his way out of a widely successful general strike by the revolutionists in February, and finally won peace at the University by granting recognition (and funds) to an "insurgent," pro-revolution administration. Like almost every other Dominican politician, he has called for the removal of the FIP; no doubt he would like the troops to go before his term of office expires in a few weeks, as his parting shot at history.

The FIP and the provisional government are the caretakers; they are the constants in the equilibrium. The other forces—the military, the politicians, the militants in the streets—jockey for advantage underneath the imposed "tranquillity."

The Dominican military, like its counterparts in many Latin American countries, has been traditionally the instrument through which the small industrialist and landed upper classes can maintain their position. Civil government is largely irrelevant to the military's power. The dictator Trujillo appeased his generals and colonels with generous favors, but in the end even he became their victim. He trusted only the air force under his son, Ramfis, and he gave it ground weapons of its own to keep the army in check. Since Trujillo's assassination in 1961, no government has been able to cut into the military's independence. General Wessin (of Trujillo's beefed-up air force) led the coup against Bosch's short "constitutional" government in 1963; Bosch's greatest failure in his seven months in office was his unwillingness—perhaps his inability in face of US pressure to the contrary—to change the structure and command of the armed forces.

The young colonels and the lower officers who overthrew the junta of Donald Reid

Cabral to start the revolution a year ago represented a new and still ill-defined force in the country. Many of them had not been cut in on the benefice distributed to the commanders. "The lower officers are poor, hungry and barefoot," Hector Aristy, the civilian leader of the revolutionary government, explained recently. That is perhaps hyperbole, but in general the lower military officers were an aggrieved class. How "revolutionary" they are is problematic, but their disaffection with the classic role of the armed forces—the support of the *oligarquia*—has been taken into account: most of the rebel military leaders of last year have been sent abroad. Col. Francisco Caamaño Deñó, the head of it all, is in London. Col. Manuel Ramon Montes Arache, the commander of the frogmen, is in Canada. Others have been dispatched to Paris, Brussels, Spain, Mexico, Holland, Guatemala; the cadets are in Chile. Except for Wessin and Navy Chief Francisco J. Rivera Caminero, most of the anti-revolutionist military leaders remain in the Dominican Republic, and for a year the armed forces (now 30,000 strong, counting the paramilitary national police) have been under commanders of the very oldest guard.

It is now an article of faith in pro-Bosch ranks that all the power of that old guard is as nothing compared to the fervor of the people aroused; it is taken for granted that the rebels would have easily defeated the generals if the US had not given Wessin assurances of its support, and if the intervention (on the fifth day of the revolution) had not taken place. There is good internal evidence for such faith. General Wessin himself acknowledged that his junta forces had been virtually defeated in the first few days of the revolt. In any case, the ex-rebels, would-be rebels and potential rebels in Santo Domingo now claim that the old military men are "finished," and that only the FIP gives them the appearance of power.

The people who made the revolution—those in the streets and the huge numbers of urban slum-dwellers, *campesinos*, and idealistic youth—have a new sense of dignity this year and a feeling that they "can do" something about their country. It is difficult to avoid comparisons with the atmosphere in a Southern city after a civil rights demonstration, or for that matter with Watts after last summer's revolt (Bosch told me, in passing: "You had the Dominican revolution in Los Angeles"). But for the moment the interrupted revolution is expressed in the political maneuvering.

There are a dozen or more political parties, movements and groupings, representing every political interest, style and opinion. "Political parties of the Dominican Republic" would make a good subject for a very long doctoral thesis in Latin American studies, but in fact the parties make little difference to what is actually going on. At bottom, there are only three approaches to Dominican problems: return to the paternalistic control of a Trujillo and the juntas; remake Dominican society under a kind of "revolutionary" regime; or try to mediate between the incredibly poor and troubled populace and the small but immensely hostile upper classes by means of a government of the "democratic left."

Juan Bosch is dedicated to trying the third way. He must therefore suffer attack from both sides. The old guard is quite convinced that he is a Communist; the far left says it will vote for him but disagrees with his objectives. He dislikes those in both camps with equal passion. Still, he must grant enough concessions—the economic and political reforms he promises—to keep his large following among the "masses" (as he calls them), and to keep the right-wingers and the military that support them from kicking him out of office.

Americans in Santo Domingo tend to see the Dominican Republic in terms of their own experience—as a slow-moving, slowly improving society. But the Dominicans are in no mood to play Republican and Democrat, the game in which one side can lose and (more or less) good-naturedly hope to come back another day. There is no underlying consensus of interests here. Winner takes all. Bosch seems to understand very well what is happening.

"The right-wing feels that nothing can stop its power, after the US intervention," he told me. "And the intervention has also caused a tremendous increase in Communism in the new generation. You can see it in activity in the unions, in the schools, and on the streets. These are two irreconcilable forces, and they could cause an explosion at any time."

To deal with them, Bosch has been trying to put together a coalition of center forces broad enough to assure the stability of the government he hopes to form. He has held to his pact with the Social Christians, the second largest party of the "non-Communist left" (next to Bosch's own *Partido Revolucionario Dominicano*). The Social Christian leader, Dr. Antonio Rosario, first announced his candidacy for the presidency, then withdrew in favor of Bosch; rather, he was forced to withdraw by younger elements in his party. Bosch turned down an offer of support by the radical 14th of June Movement—called "1J4"—on the reasonable grounds that it might give him 25,000 votes but would lose him perhaps 125,000. He has been outspokenly anti-Communist, has reacted sharply against attempts to form a "united front" (there are also two Communist Parties, one pro-Chinese and the other vaguely pro-Russian). He refused to endorse one general strike, and supported the other, in February, only when it appeared to be a success. His speeches on economic affairs more and more emphasize the need to build the "infrastructure"—roads, dams, schools—before changing the relative standing of the poor and the upper classes by more drastic means. "Bosch is certainly moving to the right," an economist remarked to me. "If he wins, the PRD will be the party of the center and the right."

In the election campaign, Bosch has smooth sailing in the seas of the left. He is the hero of the revolution, and there is no one on the constitutionalist side who will actively oppose him. His two opponents for the presidency both represent the right, and of them Joaquin Balaguer is far and away the stronger. He is a soft-spoken slip of a man, who derives at least some of his strength from the Trujillo era. He was the last puppet president under the old tyrant, but he emerged with much of his "prestige" (a very, very big word here) intact. He left the nastier duties of the dictatorship to others. He is considered to be the "brains" of the government in those days. Balaguer is wooing the *campesinos* who for generations saw Trujillo as a father or at least a rich-uncle figure (there are still pictures of Trujillo on the walls of many a shack in the *campo*). "Who will lower the price of rice for you?" the posters ask. "Balaguer!" Among the anti-Trujillistas, Balaguer's popularity is not helped by the traveling companions he chooses for his campaign caravan—a collection of Trujillo's thugs whom he leads, like George Raft trailing an entourage of movie gangsters. His supporters say that Balaguer, like Bosch, needs whatever protection he can get.

BOSCH'S DILEMMA

Balaguer's party is called *Reformista*, but it is generally thought that reforms are what he will not provide. "Balaguer will win—or else the Communists will take over," a well-

to-do manufacturer told me. "If Bosch wins, my friends say we had better learn to row!" The manufacturer lives in a pleasant house with a swimming pool in a small rural village several miles from the capital. He has two cars and a pack of maids, some land, and a towering television antenna atop a bamboo pole in his back yard.

To win, Balaguer would need the unanimous support of the manufacturer's friends, as well as a very large proportion of the *campesinos*—the unpredictable key to the elections. The First Families of the Republic—the *oligarquia*, in Latin American terms—are now behind a third presidential candidate, Rafael Bonnelly. There are rumors that Bonnelly will withdraw at the last minute and hand his votes (probably not more than 25,000) to Balaguer. But three weeks before the election, it does not seem likely that any combination can defeat Bosch.

Everybody has been told how important the elections are, and they are beginning to believe it. The buses and the *publicos*—usually rattling old cars that serve as jitneys—carry signs announcing that "To vote is to open the road leading to progress." There are billboards and newspaper ads: "The vote means full sovereignty." The radio is full of spot announcements, speeches, endless exhortations. People talk of politics in the *publicos*, in their homes, on the streets. I listened for hours to an emotional political discussion among 50 or more youths on a street corner in the Los Pepines barrio in Santiago de los Caballeros, the second city of the Republic. It is a highly charged country.

From the very first, the new president will be confronted with demands that will be hard to meet. Bosch, particularly, will have his hands full; he must decide whether to chop up the military and install his own commanders—perhaps Caamaño and Montes Arache, if (as expected) they return from exile.

Bosch will then have to tell the *Yanquis* to go home, presuming he wants them to, which is not entirely clear. The FIP could guarantee Bosch's election, and keep him in power during the crucial first few weeks and months of a government. But anti-FIP sentiment is so strong that it will be difficult to keep from making public exhortations against it. Bosch sees the dilemma: "We cannot have democracy against the Americans, and we cannot have it with them."

THE "FOURTEENERS"

The anti-FIP agitation will come largely from the young people in the left-wing parties, and perhaps most of all from 1J4. To a great extent, the *catorcistas*—the "fourteeners"—are the most significant political force in the country, not because of their numbers (in the thousands), but because their movement expresses the hopes of so many of the children of the April revolution. It is difficult to define what 1J4 is, exactly; it does not follow an identifiable ideological line, as the Communist Parties do. It has no national leaders, not very much of a party structure, and little discipline. It is a collection of romantic revolutionaries—inheritors of a small band of guerrillas who started a futile campaign against Trujillo (on the 14th of June, 1959), and then politicked until the next opportunity to take to the hills—after Bosch's overthrow in 1963. In a few months all but a few of the fighters were massacred. One of the survivors, Fidelio Despradel, explained something of the movement: "We are not a liberal party, we are not reformers. Middle-class parties are always more influential in elections. We go to the elections because the people believe in them and they want them. We have time; we are not desperate

for power. We are not alone. There is not only one Vietnam, not only one Santo Domingo. We do not keep quiet. We tell the people here what we want. We fought for the constitution last year, but we could not control the revolution; it was in the hands of the PRD. What we could do was important; what we wanted was not important." What 1J4 wants has not been coherently stated—perhaps it is a kind of Castroism-in-one-country. But it has captured the aspirations of young revolutionaries, and its force will be felt.

How successfully would Bosch juggle the military, the upper classes, the *catorcistas*, the Americans? "We are sure that in the first year or two we will lose popularity," José Francisco Peña Gómez, a brilliant young Bosch adviser suggested. "Those who will be disappointed will go to the 14th of June or the Social Christians. We will have to promote austerity, reduce expenditures of the government in all sectors, increase production, build the infrastructure, reform agriculture. We will begin to redistribute government-owned land first. Then we hope the government will begin to produce results, and our popularity will increase."

There is a general feeling that the only way to encourage such a process is for the US to leave the Dominican Republic alone, giving aid and comfort when the Dominicans ask for it and in the ways they want it. US aid has gone for all the wrong things here—budget supplements, credits for the purchase of expensive US products, and military training. The legacy of the US intervention four decades ago was the Trujillo regime; the legacy of the intervention last year has been equally destructive.

"Now we are less than a colony," Bosch said as our interview was ending. "An underdeveloped people is very hard for you to understand. We have the problems of two hundred years ago in the middle of the problems of the modern world. You do not try to apply the same rules to Mississippi as you do to Connecticut, but in foreign policy you do not understand it. The US should be able to help us out without ruling us; I know it is a very difficult task. I shall die without understanding why the United States did what it did last year. It was natural to defend its interest, but it was not right for the United States to give orders to this government from the Embassy. Well, the damage has been done, and the cost will be high. Our history has been distorted by the invasion. You are strong enough to pay the cost, but we are not. To be a president in this situation is a very sad task."

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, these two articles, in my opinion, make an earnest and sincere effort to write the true history of what happened in the Dominican Republic last year, a history which has been distorted and rewritten in a way far removed from the actual facts, in an effort to justify the unjustifiable action which the Government of the United States took in April of last year, based largely on unnecessary panic.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, in accordance with the previous order, and as a further mark of respect to the former Senator Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes

p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 23, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 19, 1966:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

Delmar R. Carlson, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guyana.

Eugene M. Locke, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan.

Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China.

Elliott P. Skinner, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Upper Volta.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

Glenn W. Sutton, of Georgia, to be a Member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1972. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS

The following-named person to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Hugh E. Gwin, Fairfield, Ala., in place of L. H. Gregory, retired.

ARIZONA

Rhoda C. Diskin, Mayer, Ariz., in place of C. J. Lessard, retired.

ARKANSAS

L. Earl Jackson, Lonoke, Ark., in place of L. E. Rice, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Gerald V. Trimeloni, Nice, Calif., in place of H. B. Bayne, retired.

Glenn F. McColley, Sunnymead, Calif., in place of E. G. Kuhn, retired.

GEORGIA

Charles L. Thweatt, Rockmart, Ga., in place of A. R. Mundy, retired.

Eloise W. Blackwell, Roswell, Ga., in place of C. M. Pelfrey, retired.

ILLINOIS

Byron L. Vance, Bluford, Ill., in place of E. S. Howell, retired.

Donald E. King, Bushnell, Ill., in place of J. P. Mallon, retired.

William G. Caraker, Cobden, Ill., in place of C. H. Rendleman, retired.

Carl E. Cassidy, Smithshire, Ill., in place of O. M. Anderson, retired.

Henry E. Ragus, Wood River, Ill., in place of E. V. Giehl, retired.

INDIANA

Victor C. Kress, Tell City, Ind., in place of G. F. Coyle, retired.

IOWA

Verna M. Smith, Bridgewater, Iowa, in place of R. W. Lents, transferred.

Jessie E. Stroufe, Harris, Iowa, in place of D. D. Holst, transferred.

Donald L. Roberts, Havelock, Iowa, in place of V. U. Waters, retired.

Mary E. Phillips, Montrose, Iowa, in place of W. H. Metzinger, retired.

Harold J. Williams, Union, Iowa, in place of R. G. Hauser, retired.

KENTUCKY

Thomas C. Young, Caneyville, Ky., in place of Fieldon Woosley, retired.

Roy H. Matlick, Middletown, Ky., in place of C. F. Williams, retired.

LOUISIANA

Virgil L. Brown, Gonzales, La., in place of R. J. Rossi, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ralph J. Shea, Osterville, Mass., in place of F. A. Webb, retired.

Louisa C. Waner, Wilkinsonville, Mass., in place of A. H. Vigeant, retired.

MICHIGAN

Thomas M. Ferry, Eau Claire, Mich., in place of C. L. Burns, deceased.

Elwood J. Schubring, Harbor Beach, Mich., in place of R. G. Templeton, retired.

George L. Hood, Holt, Mich., in place of A. R. Farnsworth, retired.

Beverly M. Cunningham, Spring Arbor, Mich., in place of F. L. Lee, retired.

MINNESOTA

Ardell J. Facile, Jasper, Minn., in place of R. J. Meyer, retired.

Lloyd P. Peterson, Kennedy, Minn., in place of E. L. Berg, retired.

Warren O. Glad, Lancaster, Minn., in place of A. R. Ellefson, retired.

MISSOURI

Sharma J. Daugherty, Elvins, Mo., in place of E. P. Goggins, retired.

Gaylord R. Vickers, Harwood, Mo., in place of P. M. True, retired.

MONTANA

Reasy T. Rea, Scobey, Mont., in place of A. W. Schammel, retired.

NEBRASKA

Spencer D. Morgan, Albion, Nebr., in place of W. S. Burrows, retired.

Wendell G. Hovie, Comstock, Nebr., in place of G. G. Rockhold, retired.

Victor C. Shafer, Wymore, Nebr., in place of R. M. Closs, retired.

NEW JERSEY

James F. McMahon, West New York, N.J., in place of Madelyn Swanwick, retired.

Walter A. Forrest, Westwood, N.J., in place of K. H. Schlupp, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Florence B. Lookadoo, Mesilla Park, N. Mex., in place of B. N. Harrelson, retired.

NEW YORK

L. Howard Jacox, Alfred, N.Y., in place of H. G. Gould, retired.

Rita E. Burns, Andover, N.Y., in place of M. A. Burns, retired.

George H. Matteson, Chenango Bridge, N.Y., in place of J. W. Clark, retired.

Roger A. Callahan, Dover Plains, N.Y., in place of T. J. Dolan, deceased.

Grace D. Witbeck, Feura Bush, N.Y., in place of Howard Vadney, deceased.

James R. Hicks, Lowman, N.Y., in place of A. M. Grace, retired.

Raymond C. Grinnell, McConnellsville, N.Y., in place of R. C. Tuttle, retired.

Edward J. McGlade, Otisville, N.Y., in place of H. E. Holley, retired.

John W. J. McCaughin, Ticonderoga, N.Y., in place of T. F. Cunningham, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Charles L. McKaig, Tryon, N.C., in place of G. I. Henderson, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Stanley M. Lund, Bowdon, N. Dak., in place of W. C. Drake, deceased.

Curtis A. Talley, Lansford, N. Dak., in place of D. J. Bagenstoss, removed.

OHIO

Paul C. Barrett, Mineral Ridge, Ohio, in place of R. J. Marlowe, deceased.

Rodger K. Morningstar, South Vienna, Ohio, in place of R. G. Clark, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Melvin L. Turner, Rose, Okla., in place of Howard Troglin, deceased.

Betty F. Carder, Tyron, Okla., in place of I. C. Guinn, transferred.

OREGON

Merle T. Beck, Mapleton, Oreg., in place of D. I. Hoover, deceased.

Robert M. Dort, Riddle, Oreg., in place of P. A. Lawson, retired.

Robert A. Green, West Linn, Oreg., in place of G. W. Doty, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph E. Travasco, Essington, Pa., in place of C. A. Jansen, retired.

Ralph Gill, Fayette City, Pa., in place of J. H. Renstrom, retired.

Marguerite C. Puskar, Imperial, Pa., in place of C. E. Puskar, transferred.

Joseph P. Foley, Mahanoy City, Pa., in place of D. F. Guinan, retired.

George W. Glattacker, Maytown, Pa., in place of M. E. Culp, retired.

E. Louise Goldsboro, Smithfield, Pa., in place of J. W. Sutton, retired.

Paul V. Gibson, Southampton, Pa., in place of I. B. Oberman, resigned.

Martha E. Hontz, Treichlers, Pa., in place of A. E. Mehrer, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND

Vincent Fasano, Bristol, R.I., in place of D. W. Coggeshall, retired.

Norman C. Salvatore, Warren, R.I., in place of R. N. Lombardi, retired.

TENNESSEE

Charles H. Haney, Jr., Minor Hill, Tenn., in place of J. B. Davis, retired.

TEXAS

Olin O. Elliott, Grandview, Texas, in place of G. W. Brockett, retired.

John R. Maddox, Mingus, Texas, in place of W. H. Spratt, retired.

V. Jack Ford, Plainview, Texas, in place of J. O. Bier, retired.

VERMONT

Helen B. Horne, Jeffersonville, Vt., in place of M. M. Hemenway, retired.

Hadley A. McPhetres, Randolph Center, Vt., in place of L. M. Prescott, retired.

WASHINGTON

Arthur K. Lowe, Ashford, Wash., in place of L. G. Von Salzen, retired.

Gerald O. Rhea, Bellingham, Wash., in place of Orland Iverson, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Daniel R. Mace, Elizabeth, W. Va., in place of H. W. Coplin, retired.

WISCONSIN

Patricia F. Tessmer, Junction City, Wis., in place of R. F. Fredrickson, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 19, 1966:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Donald Opie McBride, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 13, 1975.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

William Howard Shaw, of Delaware, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named officer of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be rear admiral

Capt. Leon G. Telsey.

The following-named officer of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be rear admiral

Capt. Chester I. Steele.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Dr. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

This is life eternal, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent.—John 17: 3.

Eternal Father of our spirits, once more we humbly and reverently bow in Thy presence, offering unto Thee the devotion of our hearts. Thou art the source of light and life. Thou art the fountain of flowing love. Thou art in everything that lifts and liberates the human soul. Lift us, we pray Thee, and liberate our spirits that we may be led from the seen to the unseen, from the unreal to the real, from things as they appear to be to the things as they truly are. May each one of us draw the things as we see it, for the God of things as they are: in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO THE HONORABLE PAUL DAGUE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, we do not, as a usual thing, take the floor to acknowledge the birthday anniversaries of our colleagues.

However, today, the 19th of May, is the anniversary of the happy event of the birth of our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative PAUL DAGUE.

I take this unusual notice of this occasion, not only because PAUL is truly an extraordinary human being, but also because, by his own choice, this is the last birthday he will mark as a Member of Congress.

PAUL, you wear your years well, even as you have filled those years with distinguished service and honorable performance.

We all wish you a happy birthday, PAUL, and many, many more to come.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], in a birthday greeting to my good friend, Mr. DAGUE.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] is a gentleman in the true meaning of the word. It is a joy to work with him on the Committee on Agriculture and on the House floor.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight Saturday, May 21, 1966, to file certain reports on H.R. 11087 and H.R. 10744.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, could the distinguished majority whip tell us for what those bills provide?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, those are the two bills listed on the program for next week. The majority leader will explain them later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file two privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have not as yet asked permission to go over, but I intend to do so. However, pending that request, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday, May 23, 1966, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the schedule for the remainder of the week and the program for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] will call up one conference report today. That, insofar as I know now, will conclude the legislative business for the week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District of Columbia day, and there are two bills scheduled for consideration:

H.R. 11087, to exempt from District of Columbia taxes real property investment income for certain foreign corporations; and

H.R. 10744, amending the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 13712, the minimum wage bill, open rule with 4 hours of debate; and

H.R. 9167, narcotic addict rehabilitation, open rule, 3 hours of debate.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be called up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELIMINATION OF CONSCRIPTION IN ALL FORMS

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

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

There was no objection.