little bit, you will also see Langley Field, Little Creek, Oceana, and Yorktown.

Well, I think you see what I mean. You have got an important military complex here and a mighty important industrial complex, and parenthetically, you should be mighty proud of the people you send to Congress. I don't know of a better team in Congress than Tom Downing and Porter Hardy. They think alike, work together, and even exchange constituents.

But while you are expressing your pride in the accomplishments of the Hampton Roads area and your representation, let me share with you my concern over what is happening in America.

While American boys are dying in Vietnam to preserve freedom, beatniks, do-gooders, ultra-liberals, pinkos and others of like ilk, are doing their best to destroy America. Honest criticism is one thing, but I wonder if those who are criticizing our action in Vietnam have so soon forgotten those immortal words of Stephen Decatur: "Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country right or wrong," spoken right here in Norfolk, one hundred fifty one years ago.

What has happened in America to make patriotism so out of date for a new class of pseudo Americans?

What is responsible for an atmosphere which pervades a good part of this country that is frightening? Youngsters from good homes being arrested for destroying public property—pure wanton destruction, just for the sake of destroying.

Crime rates are soaring in all of our large cities; magazines and columnists publish articles aimed at destroying our intelligence collecting activities and take pride in such disclosures; and elected public officials attempt to form the foreign policy of this nation when that responsibility is vested in the President of the United States.

Even some of our courts have lost their sense of duty and honor and patriotism. You cannot even question a suspect without advising him of his rights and checking his psychiatric background. That's all we hear are:

Rights! Rights! Rights!

That is the modern password—what are my rights?

Will somebody remember the word obligation? Will some court in this land express a concern for the victim of a crime instead of bleating about the rights of the accused.

I wrote a law not long ago that made it a crime to willfully destroy or burn a draft card.

One circuit court upheld it as being constitutional. Another circuit court in Boston said that it was unconstitutional.

And the chief argument for that latter decision was that you can destroy a draft card by burning it in a public demonstration because it is symbolic action.

And I presume that this same court would decide that their own court records could be destroyed in this same symbolic action, even though there are federal laws against such action.

And I guess this same court would pat on the back anyone who wants to burn an American flag as a symbolic act.

This is the extent to which freedom of speech has gone, as interpreted by a court which is long on theory and short on practice.

It's time to recall those words of President Johnson, spoken just a few days ago, "We must guard every man's right to speak, but we must defend every man's right to answer."

It is time for the American people to reexamine where we are and where we are going.

In some educational institutions trustees and educators no longer control college policy. The students are seeking to run these schools. Walkouts, boycotts and demonstrations—these are the symbols of our times.

I noticed in the paper the other day that a group of Hampton Institute students have turned in their Reserve Officer Training Corps uniforms as a protest against the compulsory military training program at the school. And I suppose Hampton Institute will, like the rest of the universities in the country, meekly submit to such a demonstration.

We had a similar event at Howard University not long ago, and when the school attempted to discipline the demonstrators, other demonstrators broke into the meeting.

And it is not confined just to Hampton or Howard; it also happened at Harvard and Berkeley.

And if this continues, it may not be long before each regiment, or division, or crew of a ship, will hold an election to decide which battle they will fight or whether they will fight at all.

We even have a case in the courts now where a captain says he is opposed to the war in Vietnam and that he has the right to choose the war in which he wants to fight.

And we have a heavy weight boxer who claims to be a conscientious objector as a member of a religious order which objects to the war. And we are told that final criminal action against him may take as much as two years.

I think it is time to say to those who oppose war in any form and who object to serving their nation "You can demand your rights, but first meet your obligations."

Let's give the sunshine patriot a choice of losing his citizenship or serving his country. I see no reason on God's green earth why your sons and mine should go to Vietnam to protect a fly speck in this country who says "I don't like this war because I worship a flower pot and that pot says I don't have to serve."

Let's put a quid pro quo into citizenship! Let's stop mollycoddling these people.

I read the other day in the Congressional Record a statement by your distinguished Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., quoting from the Staunton, Virginia, Leader, that a magazine has revealed regulations recently issued by the Department of Labor "which permit a convict, solely as the result of work while serving a prison sentence, to establish his eligibility for unemployment benefits and to qualify for Social Security," and that "Civil Service also gives retirement credit for time served in prison."

Say it isn't so!

I hope someone will tell me that that is wrong! I don't want to believe that! I find it almost inconceivable that it could be true.

If it is true, I would like to find the idiot who wrote the regulation, and if the regulation is based on the law, then I will have to accept partial responsibility of being idiotic enough to vote for—or not vote against—a law that permits such a ridiculous result.

Are we heading down the path to our own destruction?

We are giving away our resources to nations who demand our aid. We used to have food surpluses in this nation. Soon there may be shortages.

And there will be no one around to help us when we go down the drain.

I am concerned about America!

I am worried about people who demand their rights with a total disregard for their obligations. I am concerned that people want more pay for less hours of work. I don't like to see this nation running into a constant type of inflation that is going to make life almost unbearable for millions of older people. I am concerned that we have developed a welfare state and that eventually the federal government will control every aspect of your life.

But I am encouraged when I come to an area such as this and see successful businessmen working hand in glove with skilled labor and intelligent labor leaders surrounded by dedicated military personnel who, all working together, can produce this clear example of progress and prosperity.

This is the type of demonstration city the rest of the nation can look to. You have achieved much and I rather suspect that this is only the beginning.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in times heavy with crisis, Thou hast called us, as servants of the people, to play our part in one of the creative hours in human history. In the midst of the startling changes of our day, may we be delivered from the paralysis of pessimism and cynicism.

Strengthen our hearts and minds, that we may worthily measure up to the role we are called to play in these solemn days, as in the name of a free people ours is the high privilege of signing anew, with our own dedication and sacrifice, the immortal declaration crimsoned with the devotion of the Founding Fathers, as for the perpetuity of this Union we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 16, 1967, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PEARSON

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order previously entered, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] for 30 minutes.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

OEO NEWSPAPER

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Office of Economic Opportunity informed me today that a proposal to establish a weekly newspaper and radio station in North Carolina using OEO funds has been withdrawn.

This is a wise decision. But I am disturbed that OEO would even consider such a project.

The newspaper in question was frankly intended to mold the thoughts and beliefs of the individuals it reached—namely, those involved in the so-called poverty program.

In short, it was to be a propaganda sheet serving the purposes of OEO.

In its application for a community action grant of $179,070, the group involved made it very clear that the newspaper would not confine itself to news of OEO activities. It also planned to provide general news coverage and, presumably, to comment editorially on it.

The OEO proposal would have established a dangerous precedent, and would have been the signal for a flood of similar Federal newspapers around the country.

I am unalterably opposed to Government ownership or control of newspapers, because it leads inevitably to Government control of the news. I believe we have too much Government management of the news already, without this additional weapon being put into the hands of Federal officials.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it would be very unwise for the Office of Economic Opportunity to even consider subsidizing the establishment of a newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated May 10, 1967, directed to Hon. Sargent Shriver, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, signed by Stanford Smith, general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

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

AMERICAN NEWSPAPER
PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., May 10, 1967.

HON. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: On January 11, 1966 I wrote to you and set forth in some detail the fundamental reasons why the government through the Office of Economic Opportunity should not under any circumstances subsidize the establishment of a newspaper. I wrote to you then because consideration was being given for the first time to the possible grant of funds for the start of a weekly newspaper in the Cardozo area of Washington.

The decision of the Office of Economic Opportunity in that case was in agreement with our position and was set forth in a letter to me dated February 2, 1966 from Herbert J. Kramer, Director of Public Affairs for the OEO.

In his letter to me Mr. Kramer cited three reasons why the grant was disapproved, the first of which was that "there is very serious doubt as to the propriety of federal funding of a commercial newspaper." The other two reasons were that "the project is not sufficiently innovative" and that "It does not seem . . . the essentially conventional approach of a weekly commercial newspaper will provide the answers to—or even research into—the many unknowns of 'communication'."

I had thought that this declaration of policy settled the matter. However, we now find much public attention being drawn to a proposal for a very similar grant to the W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. of Boone, North Carolina. I have a copy of the 21-page proposal entitled "Demonstration Project Plan and Supporting Data For a Community Action News Demonstration Project in Watauga, Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties, North Carolina," dated April 11, 1967. This document is very well summarized in the enclosed copy of an Associated Press dispatch of May 4, 1967.

I now reiterate all the fundamental points made in my January 11, 1966 letter and confirmed in the OEO letter to me of February 2, 1966, copies of both of which are enclosed herewith.

This particular North Carolina proposal seems to be even more inappropriate than the first Cardozo proposal. The proposed budget is so grossly inflated that it would actually be harmful to the underprivileged persons who would be getting their first journalistic experience on such an enterprise. No taxpaying newspaper could afford to operate under such luxurious conditions. For example, it is proposed that the newspaper would operate 26 Polaroid cameras. One of our members owns a weekly newspaper in Spruce Pine, North Carolina, with which the government subsidized newspaper would compete directly. Our member points out that 26 Polaroid cameras is probably more than are now owned by every weekly newspaper in western North Carolina. It is certainly at least five times as many cameras as are owned by many small city *daily* newspapers.

This seems to be at least the fourth similar proposal for government subsidized newspaper operations under auspices of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Under the circumstances, we hope very much that your office will issue some kind of general policy statement which can have the beneficial effect of making it clear to regional OEO officials that they must devise much more innovative proposals and not waste staff time in preparing such detailed proposals as have been prepared in the case of the W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc.

Representatives of this Association will be glad to consult with you and/or your associates to try to be helpful in this connection in any manner that might be appropriate.

Yours very truly,
STANFORD SMITH,
General Manager.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE ACT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill today, the Campaign Finance Act of 1967, to reform and revitalize the present system of financing campaigns for Federal office.

The problem of securing fair and adequate campaign financing is a most intricate challenge, requiring careful study if a meaningful solution is to be found.

Though the problem is complex, the need for action is clear. The cost of being nominated and elected to high political office has always been great, but it is mounting rapidly, both in absolute and relative terms. Indeed, many feel the point has been reached where a candidate must either be rich himself or have rich friends if he is to seek political office.

The campaign finance statistics in recent years yield evidence of this disturbing fact. For example, in 1964, the 107 Republican and Democratic committees operating at the national level reported spending $34.8 million, more than twice the $17.2 million disbursed in 1956 and 39 percent more than the $25 million spent in 1960.

Though these figures are quite high, they represent only a small portion of total political spending for these election years. For example, they cover only expenditures by national level committees which filed reports with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. They do not reflect State and local expenditures on behalf of the national party tickets; nor do they contain the amounts spent on senatorial and congressional campaigns. Furthermore, these figures also exclude expenditures made in connection with primary or nomination campaigns. Money spent by nonpartisan groups in support of voter registration drives and other political activities is similarly excluded.

It is estimated that $200 million was spent in 1964 on all political races—National, State, and local. In 1960, this figure was between $165 and $175 million. In 1956, the total was $155 million, and in 1952, it was $140 million. Thus, campaign expenditures are rising approximately between $5 and $6 million a year.

Major party national campaign costs in 1964 have been estimated at an average of 41 cents per voter for the two parties combined. In 1960, the average was approximately 32 cents per voter. In 1956, the figure was 19 cents per presidential vote, and just 18 cents in 1952.

Mr. President, these high costs of running for public office have created serious problems affecting the quality of our political life. For example, many talented and well-qualified men of limited means are deterred from seeking elective office by the heavy expenses involved. The cost to the American public of this lost talent cannot be measured.

Perhaps the most serious problem created by the financial demands of political life is the need for candidates to rely upon a few wealthy individuals and pressure groups for their campaign funds. This reliance is unhealthy, for it reduces the importance of citizen participation in campaigns and limits the political independence of candidates.

Large donors, be they individuals or interest groups, often want no more than to contribute to the democratic system under which they live. Others merely wish to insure a full hearing for their

views. Unfortunately, some expect favors for their contributions. The integrity of the candidates may be severely endangered if they are forced to depend upon these special interests for their campaign funds. Even if their principles are not compromised—and I think they are not—the suspicion of collusion remains in the public mind, and respect for our political system is lessened.

Mr. President, the massive amounts of money needed by our political parties must come from a variety of sources if our traditional political principles are to be successfully maintained. The present contributions base is too narrow; it must be broadened. And the Federal Government has a proper and, indeed, necessary role to fulfill in this effort. For the question is not whether the Government should encourage campaign contributions at all, but whether it should encourage all campaign contributions.

The Campaign Finance Act of 1967 is not designed to stimulate political contributions indiscriminately, but instead is aimed at encouraging small donations. The bill provides a 50-percent tax credit for gifts up to $10 to candidates for Federal office and to State and national party committees. A husband and wife filing a joint return would be permitted to claim a credit for up to $20 in contributions.

In addition, the bill provides for a tax deduction of contributions—and I make the distinction here between a credit and a deduction—up to a maximum total of $500 per year per tax return. The measure is a complimentary incentive designed to stimulate medium-sized gifts. These donations are needed, but they must be kept within reasonable limits if we are to be able to control campaign contributions. The $500 ceiling would help provide that control.

Mr. President, these twin benefits would provide a stimulus to contribute, while giving the individual complete freedom of choice as to whom he will support. I emphasize "while giving the individual complete freedom of choice as to whom he will support."

By making these benefits applicable to contributions to State and National committees on a year-round basis, it will be possible to improve the staffing and professional expertise of these political but necessary groups.

The increased donations resulting from these tax incentives would permit candidates for nomination or election to the office of President, Vice President, Senator, or Congressman to draw upon a broad base of citizen support in their campaigns.

As a matter of political principle, it is desirable that these candidates receive as large a percentage of their financing as possible from the central party committees. This helps to isolate them from large donors in search of favors and enables them to choose positions without a sense of obligation.

Mr. President, while the number of political contributors, in both absolute and percentage terms, has risen for the last few years, the difficulties of political fundraising remain formidable.

Charity drives, on the other hand, have consistently been able to recruit the large number of door-to-door solicitors needed for successful fundraising programs. For example, in 1960, the American people donated $8.2 billion in voluntary contributions for charitable, health, welfare, religious, and educational purposes.

Political parties have not been as successful in raising funds; in part, because they lack the social respectability of charity programs. For regrettably, political donations are often viewed with a jaundiced eye and politics is considered a tainted profession that is the exclusive province of the very wealthy and the special interests.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, this attitude often brings about the very situation it decries. For cynicism and disrespect are not the elements upon which to build a sound democracy. Public affairs should be the concern of every citizen and all should participate fully. Any attitude which hinders or discourages the development of this ideal is to be deplored. If our political system is to function equitably and efficiently, political office must not only be regarded as respectable, but it must also be considered as being in the highest tradition of public service and good citizenship.

The Campaign Finance Act allows the Federal Government to give official sanction to the practice of political giving by offering tax benefits for contributions. Political donations may thus gain a measure of respectability they now lack. In addition, if these measures were coupled with an educational campaign, they would go far toward eliminating the cynical view of public life which now denies the campaign contributions the acceptability enjoyed by charitable and educational donations.

The cost of general elections is considerable. But, a fact often overlooked is that the influence of money in primaries is even greater. These expenditures, which do not have to be reported under Federal law, can be tremendous—especially in our larger States. For example, it has been estimated that senatorial primary costs in California and New York alone can reach $1 million to $2 million.

As Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, once remarked:

> Money probably has its greatest impact in the choice of public officials in the shadowland of our politics where it is decided who will be a candidate for a party nomination and who will not. The effect of money in politics is probably more certain in determining who the candidates will be than in determining the outcome of the elections.

Thus, Mr. President, if we are to insure that our highest public offices are to be open to all men of ability and not just to men of means, candidates in primaries or for nomination as well as nominees must be permitted to draw upon the broad base of financial support which hopefully will be created by the tax benefits contained in this bill.

In 1952, approximately 3 million persons gave money to some party or candidate. In 1956, the figure was 8 million; in 1960, 10 million, and in 1964, roughly 12 million people made political contributions.

Projections indicate that between 25 and 33 percent of the 57.3 million American households would contribute if the tax incentive were effectively publicized and full cooperation achieved. Thus, between 14 and 19 million contributions, total a maximum of $140 to $190 million, would be available for campaign use. Of this, the Government in effect—by virtue of the tax incentives—would pay half, or $70 to $95 million.

Mr. President, it is true these estimates are based on current figures and that claims for tax benefits will probably increase as the public becomes more familiar with the program. Nonetheless, it is unlikely that contributions will increase as dramatically as maximum projections would indicate, for many, when polled, who say they will contribute, often do not do so when confronted by a party solicitor.

Thus, the costs to the Federal Government of these incentives will not be prohibitive. Indeed, in terms of the benefits these tax measures will bring, the cost will be quite reasonable. Let us concentrate, therefore, not on the expenses of the benefit, but on the benefits of the expense.

Mr. President, while these benefits will be considerable, greater public campaign support must not be encouraged without also establishing adequate safeguards against its misuse. We must be careful to provide an incentive for political participation, but not an opportunity for illegal gain.

Tax credits may be easily abused by unscrupulous individuals. Thus, some system of verification must be established if we are to avoid creating virtually unlimited possibilities for corruption. This verification can take various forms and the exact procedure can be determined after a thorough review of the alternatives.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. President, merely to funnel large sums of money into the present political structure through a Federal tax stimulus could be self-defeating. It could represent a partial step which would only create far worse evils than those currently besetting our campaign financing system.

A thorough and equitable reform of all facets of campaign spending is needed. It is true that such a measure would be more difficult to achieve than a simple tax incentive for political contributions. Nonetheless, it must be done if our political system is to function as intended. We must not act in haste, but we must hasten to act before public confidence in the electoral process is seriously eroded.

In general, our campaign finance laws are more honored in the breach than in the observance. Indeed, they have become so ineffective that the integrity of our political system itself is often thrown into question. For the fact remains, that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and section 609 of title 18 of the United States Code simply have failed to control campaigning financing.

For example, experience has shown that the present limitation of $3 million imposed by section 609 of title 18 of the United States Code on the annual expenditures of an interstate political com-

mittee in no way limits national campaign spending. It merely leads to a proliferation of such committees, for the law imposes no limit on the number of committees which may receive funds up to the $3 million ceiling.

For example, in 1960, there were 70 national level committees in operation. By 1964, this figure had increased to 107.

In addition, Mr. President, committees which operate exclusively within one State are not subject to any Federal reporting regulations at all. Thus, there is a wide discrepancy between reported campaign expenditures and total disbursements.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act limits a candidate for U.S. Senator to $25,000 in campaign expenses and a candidate for Representative to $5,000. These figures are patently ridiculous and are easily circumvented by establishing a number of ostensibly independent committees to support the candidate's cause.

Similarly, an individual is legally prohibited from giving more than $5,000 to any one committee in a given year. Yet, he may make as many donations as there are committees supporting the candidate.

Mr. President, this bill would establish uniform reporting requirements for all such committees while removing any artificial limits on spending by individuals and committees alike. Past experience would indicate that merely tightening spending limitations would have little or no effect on actual disbursements and would prove to be administratively burdensome.

As the President's Commission on Campaign Costs said in its 1962 report on financing presidential campaigns:

> Full and effective disclosure is the best way to control excessive contributions, on the one hand, and unlimited expenditures on the other. Publicity has a cleansing and policing power far more powerful than that of limitations.

Under the provisions of the bill, every committee which received contributions of $100 or more would be required to report them to a Registry of Election Finance in the General Accounting Office. All committee expenditures of $100 or more would also have to be reported to the Registry. In addition, candidates, whether successful or not, would be required to make full disclosures of their campaign gifts to the Registry.

Mr. President, not only would penalties be levied against anyone who failed to comply with these provisions, but the Registry would also be required to issue periodic reports summarizing the information it received, thus making it available for public consumption.

Moreover, while there would be no limit on the amount of money an individual could contribute to a committee or candidate, any person who donated more than $2,500 would have to file a report on his contributions with the Registry.

In addition, the bill would prohibit groups and organizations now legally barred from making political donations from advertising in campaign publications as a way of disguising illegitimate political contributions.

Mr. President, no man, no matter how humble his means, should be denied the opportunity to hold elective office. Today, this is not the case. The exact nature of the reform needed is a matter of great controversy. Nonetheless, through the swirl of pros and cons, one fact is clear. As Erwin Canham of the Christian Science Monitor phrased it:

> Around the neck of every American candidate hangs the terrible burden of raising money. It is a tin cup that weighs a ton.

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

The bill (S. 1794) to provide for an income tax credit or deduction for certain political contributions, to revise the laws relating to corrupt election practices, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PEARSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to express gratitude to the Senator for his interest in this important subject, and for the able address he has just made. The fact that he has demonstrated a detailed study of the problem and has come forward with concrete and constructive suggestions is a further indication that the climate for action in this vexatious field is perhaps more propitious now than it has ever been.

I hope that when the Committee on Finance begins its hearings, the Senator from Kansas will be willing to come before it and give it the benefit of his study and views, as well as his insight and wisdom on this subject.

The Senator concluded his address with an allusion to a tin cup.

I would hope that we could make it possible for a candidate for Federal office to avoid having to shake a tin cup; more importantly, to avoid the consequences of having that cup filled.

It seems to me that we should and we can provide an example of honest, decent elections to Federal office, setting high standards of conduct to serve as useful examples for the respective States and local political subdivisions.

I hope it will be possible to give to candidates for the Senate, for instance, as well as candidates for President, a choice between the waging of their campaigns for public office at public expense, eschewing all contributions, or seeking public office on the basis of private subsidy of their campaigns.

I do not know how candidates would make this election. I daresay ere long all candidates for membership in this body would choose to engage in public supported campaigns assuming that we could make reasonable provision therefor. If we could achieve that, if the American people could have a U.S. Senate only obligated to and dedicated only to the public interest, it would be the best bargain the American people ever bought, whatever its cost.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I might say, in response to his very generous remarks, that I supported him very recently in the votes involved in the so-called Long Act; but I must say I thought it not all bad. As a matter of fact, I accept the principle of Federal Government participation in the cost of election as a good thing. What I thought disturbing about it was that it applied only to the top level and it cut out the lower level, with the possibility of the centralization of power in some places where it would not be to the best interests of the Nation.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PEARSON. That power would be centralized in some places which would not be to the best interests of the Nation by applying it only at the top, when it ought to apply at the lower level.

What I seek to do is to get at the unrealistic limitation of $3 million for presidential elections, $25,000 for senatorial elections, and $5,000 for elections to the House of Representatives, the proliferation of committees, the lack of reports whatsoever, and so forth. A tax credit of one-half, up to $10, would permit the small donor to participate in elections, or an alternate of a $500 deduction for the larger contribution still leaves a good association between the candidate running for office and the persons who wants to support him. The contact is still there. I think it is a good reform. I throw it open to better minds for suggestions to improve it. What we are trying to do is to have a broader base for the selection of candidates, to permit all the people to run for elective office, and to do it on an honest, open basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield. I ask unanimous consent for time for whatever the Senator has to say.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has been yielded 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I want to join my colleagues in paying our respects to the Senator from Kansas for his thought-provoking analysis of the problem of campaign financing. This subject has long deserved the study of the U.S. Senate and Congress.

Certainly we all recognize that this is an area which needs major reform. The Senator has mentioned the question of full disclosure of all contributions and expenditures, an action which is long overdue by a revision of the Corrupt Practices Act. Certainly the present limitations are unrealistic. The proliferation of committees without any control or requirement for accounting is something which must be stopped. We must require more accurate accounting to the public of the costs of running the elections.

I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator's suggestion that we need some method of encouraging the individual citizen to take part in the election process, to support the candidate in the party of his choice; but, I think it is very important that we preserve the right of a citizen to select and support the party

of his choice and encourage him to take part in the election.

The word "politics" has sometimes been considered a dirty word. There should be no hesitation on the part of any individual to take part in our political system. Ours is the only form of government where the citizenry as a whole selects its public officials, and if public officials are elected who are not worthy of their office it is largely because the good people of the communities have failed to accept their responsibility as citizens to take part in elections.

If we can encourage greater and wider participation on the part of the people as a whole to support their candidates we will go far toward removing many of the problems that have developed.

I commend the Senator from Kansas. I join the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] in expressing the hope that when the Finance Committee starts hearings and consideration of legislation in this field the Senator from Kansas will appear before the committee and give it the benefit of his study and his recommendations. Let us all join in trying to work out a solution to this real problem.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator. I look forward to appearing before the Finance Committee, of which the Senator from Delaware is the ranking member from my party. I wish to say to him that I am extremely grateful for his comments, for I know of no one in the U.S. Senate who has greater knowledge or a greater degree of integrity in this and other fields. I am most grateful to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield. I think I am out of time.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. GORE. Having listened to the able speech of the distinguished Senator from Kansas, perhaps he would not regard it as inappropriate if, as the senior Senator from Tennessee, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the very able and distinguished Senator from Kansas is a native of the State of Tennessee.

Mr. PEARSON. I am honored.

Mr. GORE. And that the people of Tennessee have great pride in his record of accomplishments, and great respect for his ability.

Will the Senator yield further after that?

Mr. PEARSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has suggested two ways of providing public funds, in essence, for political campaigns for federal office: One, a tax credit; the other a tax deduction.

There are at least three more major ways. One is through appropriation. Another is the checkoff, which we recently considered in the Senate. Still another has been advanced by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], a voucher form of certificate with which individual citizens could make contributions. All these deserve careful consideration.

Though each of them have merit, I would be inclined to support direct appropriations. I would not wish to rule out the other methods.

The direct appropriation method has the virtue of being more equitable, it seems to me, than any other; but even more importantly, it has the virtue of permitting the Congress to keep a firm grip upon this new venture in our body politic.

I am not closing my mind to any other, but I am inclined in that direction.

I am very much encouraged that the able Senator has made his speech, introduced his bill, and ventured into this field. I think it augurs well; and I do hope that as soon as the conference on the bill which the Senate passed last week can be concluded, the Committee on Finance, in accordance with the mandate given to it by the Senate, can proceed with hearings and consideration. The fact that the Senate as a whole has given to the Finance Committee a mandate to report an election reform bill appears to me to have solved many of the jurisdictional problems, because all committees are servants of the Senate, and the fact that the Senate itself has mandated a particular committee to report a bill, it seems to me, solves many problems which could be encountered if we follow the usual jurisdictional pattern of legislative committees, in that various aspects of this problem may fall in two, three, or four different committees.

In any event, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance has told the Senate that he will comply, and, as soon as feasible, have hearings. I wish once again, as a member of the committee, to express the hope that the able Senator from Kansas will come before the committee. This is a tremendously important subject. The debate which the Senate has recently had, the difficulties in which some Members of each House of Congress find themselves, and the general awareness of the public of the increasing cost of political campaigns and the dangers to our system of popular government if public officials be beholden to large contributors, have converged to create a political climate more conducive to action than I have heretofore seen in my years in Congress.

Once again I thank the Senator for his elucidation upon this subject.

Mr. PEARSON. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I am most pleased that his mind is open on the subject. I hope I may be able to persuade him to my view.

I am not one who would advocate the direct appropriation. I see nothing wrong with public participation at every level of the electoral process, including contributions, if it can be done under a controlled system designed to assure complete disclosure upon the broadest basis.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEARSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. It seems to me that with the provision of public funds, whether by direct appropriation or tax deduction or tax credit, however we do it, there must be limitations and restrictions on private contributions. The corrupting influence of money in politics must be curbed. It has been creeping up on us, and is now a panther gnawing at the very vitals of our system of government.

The present limitation on a contribution of $5,000 per year per person amounts to very little. A $5,000 limitation per year really means a limitation of six times that amount, because a taxpayer, within 12 months and 2 days, can make a contribution of $15,000, his wife $15,000, and his minor children $15,000 each. So the present limits of the Corrupt Practices Act have very little effect. I think this is one area with which we must treat.

As I understood the Senator, he advanced one idea that I would question, and that is taking off all limits, if I heard him correctly, on the amount of expenditure in a campaign. I think we should proceed in the other direction. We should first establish realistic limits—some of the present limits being utterly unrealistic—but then we should enforce those limits.

I shall not detain the Senator further. He has aroused my interest very much by his very able address.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just 1 minute?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In addition to the so-called loopholes in the Corrupt Practices Act as enumerated by the Senator from Tennessee, whereby individuals can get around the $5,000 limitation, there is one other loophole which should be mentioned. The Senator touched upon it briefly in his comments. That is the situation where an individual of unlimited means can, by not forming a committee, not accepting any contributions, and not making contributions to a committee, but by spending his own money on behalf of a candidate in one State area, spend any amount he chooses, even if it is a million dollars, and does not even have to report it.

Mr. PEARSON. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He can spend an unlimited amount by paying for billboards, television advertising, bumper stickers, or any other type of expenditures he wishes to make on behalf of the candidate. There is no accounting and no limit whatsoever under existing law.

Certainly these are areas which must be examined, and as the Senator from Tennessee has stated, some constructive limit should be adopted. But when we establish these limits we must make sure they are applicable to all facets of contributions or expenditures.

Again I compliment the Senator from Kansas for his suggestions, and while I would not necessarily subscribe to each of them in its entirety, they certainly

do deserve the careful consideration of the Committee on Finance.

As one who is very vitally interested in the subject and has rather definite opinions as to how we could solve the problem, I wish to say that nevertheless I am approaching the matter with an open mind because I think that is the only way we can find a solution to such a problem. We should all get together, each presenting his ideas, and then try to work out a solution to the problem. After all, as was pointed out by the Senator from Tennessee, all of the various suggestions which have been made have but one purpose, and that is to find a correction of the loose manner in which campaigns are presently being financed. I believe that all of us, by working together with the same objective, can find an answer to the problem.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes, to make one further comment.

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

Mr. PEARSON. When I came to this floor today, I thought the most important problem which would probably be discussed was that of taking off all limitations on gifts. The Senator from Tennessee did that very thing in his recent statement. I came persuaded that the limitation on gifts is the very mechanism that branches out into all the ingenuity exercised in developing methods of evading or avoiding whatever law we write, and that complete disclosure, or, as the chancellor of Vanderbilt University, one of the great institutions in the Senator's State, has stated, the cleansing of public information, is the very vital thing it is going to require to provide for the controls and the limitations and the broadening of the base throughout this entire field.

If it would work to push it down, I would be the first to accept it. But I just do not think the practices, the laws, and the experience we have had in this Republic throughout the time that campaign contributions have mounted have provided a workable system at all. I think this approach is in the great gray area of undecided issues.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] on the fine speech he has made today and on the bill which he has introduced.

The problem of financing political campaigns has been subjected to considerable debate already in the 90th Congress. I, for one, agreed that the entire matter should be taken up and carefully studied in the Committee on Finance in the first instance. I sincerely hope that the great interest developed in this vital issue will be maintained.

The Senator from Kansas has done a great service, in my judgment, in keeping the matter before the Senate. He has made a significant contribution to the scope of the range of alternatives before the committee by drafting and introducing a detailed proposal of considerable merit. I commend him for his thoughtful work in following through on this important subject. I hope it will stimulate the Senate conferees to insist upon the Senate version of the Investment Tax Credit Act.

I sincerely hope that our expectations for reforms in the area of campaign financing will be realized. In my judgment, the proper way to proceed is to allow a tax credit or deduction to the individual citizen, and to let the citizen decide where his contribution shall go—whether to local, State, or Federal candidates.

I commend the Senator from Kansas for a well-developed proposal, embodying the basic device, and urge that close consideration be given it by the committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

H.R. 1971. An act for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader;

H.R. 2048. An act for the relief of William John Masterton and Louis Vincent Nanne;

H.R. 3717. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. M. Richwine;

H.R. 4374. An act to remove a cloud on the title of certain real property in the State of Oregon owned by John Johnson;

H.R. 4983. An act to disclaim any right, title, or interest by the United States in certain lands in the State of Arizona;

H.R. 6602. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of such land; and

H.R. 6716. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 42) to amend the National Housing Act, and other laws relating to housing and urban development, to correct certain obsolete references.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 1971. An act for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader;

H.R. 2048. An act for the relief of William John Masterton and Louis Vincent Nanne; and

H.R. 3717. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. M. Richwine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4374. An act to remove a cloud on the title of certain real property in the State of Oregon owned by John Johnson;

H.R. 4983. An act to disclaim any right, title, or interest by the United States in certain lands in the State of Arizona;

H.R. 6602. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of such lands; and

H.R. 6716. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INDIAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1967

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the economic development and management of the resources of individual Indians and Indian tribes, and for other purposes, which with accompanying papers was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 9481. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 237).

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. Res. 121. Resolution to authorize Dean E. Sharp, an assistant counsel, Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Committee on the Judiciary, to appear as a witness in the case of United States against Kitzer and others.

(See reference to the above resolution when reported by Mr. HART, which appears under a separate heading.)

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

S. 281. A bill to increase the amount of real property which may be held by the American Academy in Rome (Rept. No. 238);

S.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution to designate the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day (Rept. No. 239);

S.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week (Rept. No. 240);

S.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution designating February of each year as "American History Month" (Rept. No. 241);

S.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the fourth week in April in every year as National Coin Week (Rept. No. 242);

S.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of July 23 through July 29, 1967, as "Professional Photography Week" (Rept. No. 243);

S.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the first week in October of each year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week", approved August 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 530), so as to broaden the applicability of such resolution to all handicapped workers (Rept. No. 244);

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the month of May 1967, as National Home Improvement Month (Rept. No. 245); and

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week" (Rept. No. 246).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. Con. Res. 15. A concurrent resolution to recognize the 175th anniversary of the admission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky to the Union (Rept. No. 247).

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

S. 61. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Carlos Suarez-Diaz (Rept. No. 253);

S. 62. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pablo E. Tabio (Rept. No. 254);

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Dario Lorenzo Platas-Prohias (Rept. No. 255);

S. 174. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Gonzalez (Rept. No. 256);

S. 221. A bill for the relief of Dr. Armando Perez Simon (Rept. No. 257);

S. 503. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angel Reaud, also known as Angel Reaud Ramos Izeuierdo (Rept. No. 258);

S. 610. A bill for the relief of Lilliana Grasseschi Barnoni (Rept. No. 259);

S. 613. A bill for the relief of Manuel Rodriguez-Fernandez (Rept. No. 260);

S. 809. A bill for the relief of Dr. Youssef (Joseph) Selim Hasbani (Rept. No. 261);

S. 821. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Domingo Hernandez (Rept. No. 262);

S. 906. A bill for the relief of Luis Tapia Davila (Rept. No. 263);

S. 985. A bill for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr. (Rept. No. 264); and

H.R. 1587. An act for the relief of Richard L. Bass (Rept. No. 265).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Dr. Noel O. Gonzalez (Rept. No. 266);

S. 189. A bill for the relief of Juliano Barboza Amado and Manuel Socorro Barboza Amado (Rept. No. 267);

S. 344. A bill for the relief of Louis Beaud (Brother Amable) (Rept. No. 268);

S. 576. A bill for the relief of Magaly Jane (Rept. No. 269); and

S. 1021. A bill for the relief of Antonio Luis Navarro (Rept. No. 270).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 976. A bill for the relief of Zofia Walasek and her daughter, Barbara Walasek (Rept. No. 271); and

S. 1354. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bong Oh Kim (Rept. No. 272).

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

S. 123. A bill for the relief of Kathleen Styles (Rept. No. 252);

S. 653. A bill for the relief of Capt. Robert C. Crips, U.S. Air Force (Rept. No. 249);

H.R. 1646. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Housley (Rept. No. 250); and

H.R. 4064. An act for the relief of Agnes C. Stowe (Rept. No. 251).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 5357. An act to amend section 2552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89-487 (Rept. No. 248).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James Patrick Rielly, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Iowa; and

Don D. Andrews, of the District of Columbia, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frederick M. Strader, of Maryland, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office; and

George A. Gorecki, of Maryland, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Vicente T. Ximenes, of New Mexico, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Dennis L. McElroy, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 1794. A bill to provide for an income tax credit or deduction for certain political contributions, to revise the laws relating to corrupt election practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1795. A bill to exclude any hazardous substance or banned hazardous substance which is unsolicited from interstate commerce and United States mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 1796. A bill to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1797. A bill to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1798. A bill to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1799. A bill to amend chapter 23 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount authorized for funeral and burial expenses of certain veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1800. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to equalize the rates of disability compensation payable to veterans of peacetime and wartime service; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 1801. A bill for the relief of Chayya B. Mhalunkar and Kanalakant M. Kamaskar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1802. A bill for the relief of Kan Tang Zee, Yu Cheng Hai, and Yu Hing Wha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 1803. A bill to strengthen the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1804. A bill for the relief of Miss Ui Soon Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1805. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize assistance to law schools for training programs in the conduct of criminal cases involving indigent persons; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. PELL:

S. 1806. A bill to encourage the preservation and development of a modern and efficient passenger rail transportation service in the northeastern seaboard area by granting the consent and approval of Congress to the State of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York to negotiate and enter into a compact to create their own Northeastern Rail Authority, and by guaranteeing certain loans and other credit to such authority; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1807. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the inclusion of insurance proceeds for destruction or damage to crops in the year following the year in which the damage occurred; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period comprising the first full week in October of each year as "Spring Garden Planting 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

EXPRESSION OF THE SENSE OF THE SENATE RELATING TO CERTAIN SOCIAL SECURITY AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PERCY, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 123) expressing the sense of the Senate that certain social security and railroad retirement benefits shall not be made subject to Federal income taxes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

TO REPRINT PAMPHLET ENTITLED "REBELLION IN RUSSIA'S EUROPE: FACT AND FICTION"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 124); which was

referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 124

Resolved, that there be printed ten thousand additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Rebellion in Russia's Europe: Fact and Fiction," prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session.

TO REPRINT HEARING ENTITLED "COMMUNIST EXPLOITATION OF RELIGION"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 125); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 125

Resolved, that there be printed for use by the Committee on the Judiciary, ten thousand additional copies of the hearing entitled "Communist Exploitation of Religion," held by the Internal Security Subcommittee during the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT REVISED VERSION OF "TECHNIQUES OF SOVIET PROPAGANDA"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 126); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 126

Resolved, that the pamphlet entitled "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda," prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, as revised and updated, be printed as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

EXCLUSION OF ANY HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE OR BANNED HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE WHICH IS UNSOLICITED FROM INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to stop the flow of unsolicited dangerous products in the U.S. mail.

Razor blades, drugs, chemicals, and other free samples have been sent through the mail and could, in the hands of children, constitute a threat to their health and safety.

Several of my constituents have brought to my attention product promotional practices that are hazards in the home.

A mother in Stamford, Conn., reported receiving in the mail sample razor blades. They were contained in a cardboard mailer held together by a single staple. This woman wrote:

> I have two children and the oldest, my daughter, age three, is perfectly capable of opening an item of this kind. She is also capable of unwrapping the razor blades and I leave the possible results to your imagination. I realize it is the parents' responsibility to keep such items out of the hands of children. But any parent can tell you that not every condition in a home can be controlled at all times.

Another mother—this one in Glastonbury—told of receiving a sample of four children's aspirin tablets in the mail. One of her children is allergic to aspirin and reacts violently to them.

It is easy enough to say that parents, not their children, should pick up the mail. But, as the Stamford mother pointed out, there are times when even the best made plans go awry—and an enterprising, curious child gets ahold of something he should not.

Moreover, parents have enough to worry about keeping children out of medicine cabinets, kitchen utensils, tool kits and the like. The mails should not pose another threat.

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

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

The bill (S. 1795) to exclude any hazardous substance or banned hazardous substance which is unsolicited from interstate commerce and U.S. mails, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

S. 1795

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1263) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(l) The introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce or the depositing in the United States mails, of any hazardous substance or banned hazardous substance which was not solicited by the person to whom such substance is, or is to be, delivered."

IMPOSE QUOTAS ON THE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN TEXTILE ARTICLES

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, as a Senator from the State of South Carolina where 75 percent of the people working in industrial jobs are working in textile or textile related industries, I cannot help but be disturbed over reports of substantial tariff reductions on textiles at the Kennedy round of negotiations concluded only yesterday at Geneva.

It would appear, Mr. President, that our representatives have granted further reductions at a time when imports flooding into this country are already causing a serious financial problem for our industry and threatening substantial unemployment, layoffs, short shifts, and a loss of earning power for thousands of Americans.

It is inconceivable to me that our negotiators would make new agreements—granting further tariff cuts to foreign industries—when the agreements we have been working under for years have never even been looked at seriously. The much discussed LTA which is supposed to limit cotton textile imports to 5 percent of what it was the preceding year has been a joke. In 1966 alone these imports were up 39 percent over what they were in 1965. Thirty-nine percent, Mr. President. I know you find that hard to believe. I find it hard to believe. Almost eight times what they were supposed to be under our agreement.

And believe it or not this product—cotton textiles—is better off than the others—manmade fibers and woolens. There has been no protection at all for these two. Manmade fiber imports were increased by 41 percent in 1966 over 1965. Woolen imports decreased during this period by some 3 percent and one might think well that is not so bad. But, Mr. President, if you look a little further you see that even with this decrease the total square yards of woolens imported into the United States from low-wage foreign countries last year was 175 million square yards.

I submit, Mr. President, that our domestic industry cannot sustain such unfair competition. And so what happened at Geneva to help this situation? Nothing. Nothing, Mr. President; woolens received no help whatsoever, and cotton and manmade fibers protection were cut still further.

What does all this mean?

Well, to me it means Americans are losing their jobs. Employment in the textile industry in this country dropped in April for the fifth consecutive month. It is now off some 15,000 jobs over what it was in April of last year. Off, Mr. President, and what do our negotiators do about it? They do their best to make certain that it is off even more in the months and years ahead.

If we have lost 15,000 jobs in 1 year at the existing tariff rates on cotton textiles and with no such controls on manmade fibers and woolens, it is impossible to imagine what will happen now that further reductions have been agreed to.

Just how much of a burden is our domestic textile industry expected to bear? We have already seen foreign textile producers inundate our market. They now own 12 percent of our cotton market; 25 percent of our woolen market; and over 50 percent of our worsteds market. We have seen a steady and unrelenting upward trend in imports which threatens to seriously damage this fifth largest industry in our country. Since 1961, the year before passage of the Trade Expansion Act, imports of textiles have increased threefold, while our domestic production has grown only one-third. In 1961, imports of all textile products were 926 million square yards. The current rate of imports, based on the first 3 months of 1967, is an astronomical 2.8 billion square yards.

The avowed purpose of trade is for one nation to help another, Mr. President. That simply is not happening where the United States is concerned—especially in textiles.

Let us look at our biggest competitor, Japan. Today that nation accounts for 23 percent of our cotton imports, 56 percent of the manmade fiber, and 33 percent of our wool imports. These Japanese imports are equivalent to 53,705 American jobs. This situation has developed at a time when we were supposed to have a trade program which would provide for orderly and reciprocal trade. But our

trade with Japan is, as with most countries, a one-way street. In 1966, our trade deficit with Japan was $319 million.

Because we have no quantitive controls over manmade fiber imports, and Japan is a major producer of manmade fibers and manmade fiber textiles and apparel, we can expect this situation to become worse as a result of the Kennedy round. We will find that Japan and Hong Kong will be major beneficiaries of the new tariff schedules.

The solution, Mr. President, lies in quantitive controls of textile imports. There is no realistic alternative. I believe when the full impact of what has been done at Geneva is made public, the absolute necessity of such limitations on all textiles—whether it be cottons, woolens, or manmade fibers—will be apparent.

It is with this in mind that I introduce for consideration and proper reference a bill to impose such quantitive limitations on textile imports.

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

The bill (S. 1796) to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles, introduced by Mr. HOLLINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT TO AMEND SECTION 4 OF THE FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT OF 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the last session of the 89th Congress I introduced a bill (S. 3743) to "provide credit facilities for the use of fishermen's cooperative associations through establishment of a Bank for Fishermen's Cooperative Associations, and for other purposes."

At the time of introduction I indicated that this bill might not contain adequate language to cover the particular situation. My statement at that time said:

> However, it is put forth at the present time to stimulate thinking on the part of those who will be concerned with such legislation, especially the Executive Departments involved who should look into this particular problem . . . and respond . . . with positive suggestions to improve the text.

The measure being introduced today incorporates the suggestions made since last year. The purpose of the bill is to provide credit facilities for the use of fishermen's cooperative associations by amending section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956.

Fishermen's cooperatives need dependable credit facilities. Lack of such facilities has seriously handicapped these organizations in their efforts to assist fishermen to keep their income at a level that compares favorably with the average individual income for equivalent skilled effort in other areas of the labor market. Due to the peculiar non-profit-oriented nature of co-ops as business enterprises, it is extremely difficult for them to secure loans through conventional credit sources, including the Small Business Administration—SBA.

Heretofore, emphasis in section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 has been placed on vessel financing with scant attention given to the many other capital requirements of the fishery producer, processor, and distributor. The present provisions of the fisheries loan fund regulations are of only very limited value in assisting the financial operation of fishery cooperatives. Thus, while it is possible for fishery cooperatives to qualify as loan applicants, those who borrow from the fund can use the money for only that part of their activities which relate to vessel operations. The present fisheries loan program under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 does not provide funds for use in activities generally considered as "marketing," which is the primary function of cooperatives. However, the proposed amendment would provide loan funds for this purpose, as well as for other purposes, by establishing a separate revolving fund specifically for use in making loans to fishery cooperatives.

There are in the United States over 100 fishery cooperative associations with over 10,000 members. They directly and indirectly account for one-fifth to one-fourth the total dollar volume of fish and shellfish produced each year. Besides processing and marketing the catches of fishermen, they handle at substantial savings the supplies, equipment, and other items used by fishermen in their operations. There are also a few groups which underwrite their own marine insurance. Fishery cooperatives are found in all important producing segments of our domestic fishing industry. They operate in our lobster, groundfish, scallop, clam, shrimp, tuna, and salmon industries, as well as in many other segments. They may be found in coastal areas from Maine to Alaska, as well as in many inland areas.

A cooperative is much the same as any other business; it cannot rely solely on capital funds raised from its membership. Seasonal peak deliveries of fish create excessive strains on its credit structure. A cooperative may want to borrow a portion of the money needed for buildings, equipment, payrolls, supplies, et cetera, from outside sources. A cooperative of primary producers—as a fishery cooperative—frequently finds itself in an unfavorable position when it comes to securing a loan, just as many other small- or medium-sized business enterprises do who must compete in markets characterized by a high risk element. Private lending institutions are more often than not reluctant to grant loans to fishery cooperatives even at interest rates above the norm.

Generally, these public and private lenders refuse to make loans to cooperatives simply because they do not understand these types of business enterprise nor the principles and spirit under which they function. As a result, members of fishery cooperatives have often found it necessary to ask supply houses, dealers, and canners to make cash trip advances or give them credit for essential supplies. Thus, these methods which cooperatives have been forced to use have often stripped them of much of their independent price bargaining power when disposing of their catch, due to the strong obligation they have to these dealers and canners. There is little doubt that this type of financing for cooperatives leaves much to be desired. The absence of adequate credit facilities and the conditions resulting from this inadequacy presents a strong case in favor of providing a public credit source suited to the particular needs of the fishery cooperatives. The procedure, as proposed for amending an existing law, would accomplish this end. Further, the providing of credit facilities in this manner would permit full use of an already successfully established program and would reduce cost and promote efficient handling of loan applications.

Fishery cooperatives materially contribute toward the promotion of effective merchandising of fish and shellfish in domestic and foreign commerce. Their continued prosperity and viability depends on their ability to secure credit at reasonable interest rates. The establishment of credit facilities for the use of fishermen's cooperative associations will assist in bringing about a stable and balanced flow of fishery products in interstate and foreign commerce. Maintaining the economic health of fishermen's cooperative associations will aid in preventing excessive fluctuations or depressions in prices, thus promoting the effective merchandising of fish and shellfish.

As you can see, Mr. President, this measure is a substantial revision of the legislation introduced in the 89th Congress. It will, though, serve to aid in solving the problems faced by our struggling fishermen's cooperatives.

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

The bill (S. 1798) to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to be known as the "National Flood Insurance Act."

For years, the Congress has wrestled with the problem of insurance against damage caused by floods for which there is no commercial insurance available. The problem has received considerable study and in the 84th Congress the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956—Public Law 84–1016—was enacted. Unfortunately, that act was never funded by the Congress and it remains inoperative.

During the 89th Congress, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee considered legislation to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters and the Senate on January 28, 1965, approved the bill by voice vote. The bill, S. 408, was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, which reported it on July 21, 1965. Although it was placed on the Union Calendar of the House of Representatives, no further action was

taken on it and it died with the adjournment of the 89th Congress.

Since that time, Mr. President, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners has considered and approved proposed legislation to fill the very real need which is so evident in the field of flood insurance. The bill which the senior Senator from Montana and I introduce today is the result of the recommendations of a subcommittee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

Essentially, the bill provides a two-pronged approach to the flood insurance problem. It provides, first, for the establishment of a Federal Flood Insurance Corporation wholly owned by the U.S. Government, and it provides, second, for the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to have joint responsibility for the operation of the flood insurance program.

The object and purpose of the Federal Flood Insurance Corporation is to supplement, assist, and encourage private insurers in setting up a flood insurance program and not to compete with them. The Corporation, under the terms of this proposal, is to be managed by a board of directors, the chairman of which shall be the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Four additional directors will serve staggered terms of 8 years for continuity of management.

The Corporation is to have a capital of $150,000,000 subscribed for by the Secretary of the Treasury, and it is authorized to borrow a further $500,000,000 with the Secretary of the Treasury being authorized to lend such an amount.

The Corporation may guarantee and reinsure contracts of insurance written by private insurance companies, and it may employ private insurers, agents, brokers, and adjusters in the issuance of policies and the servicing or adjusting of claims under such policies.

Initially, such insurance is to apply only to dwellings of four families or less, but later, if Congress wished, it can be extended to cover contents.

Under the terms of this bill, contracts may not be guaranteed or reinsured if coverage is available from other sources at an economically feasible premium rate. Such contracts which are written in accordance with the terms of the bill are required to have a deductible feature applicable to the property owner.

The bill further provides that the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, through the Corporation and in cooperation with private insurers is:

Authorized and directed to provide a flood insurance program in the United States;

Authorized to pay as a subsidy on behalf of the insured property owner the difference between an economically feasible premium rate and that which would be actuarially necessary in areas of special flood hazard;

Authorized to cooperate with State and local authorities to assist them in acquiring properties in flood risk areas to restrict or to convert those areas to other uses, such as recreation;

Directed to use the maximum extent practical, the facilities and services of private insurers, agents, brokers, and adjusters and may use the services of other experts in the insurance field such as rating organizations;

Given the authority to acquire by purchase, lease, or donation—other than by eminent domain—certain properties in order to remove them from flood risk areas.

In addition, the bill provides that the Secretary of the Army shall undertake to identify all flood plain areas and to furnish the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with such information.

Mr. President, we offer this bill not with the thought or claim that it is the only or the complete answer to this problem which has faced the Congress and the Nation for so many years. Rather, we offer it with the belief that it represents another approach to finding a workable solution, one which I would hope the appropriate committees of the Congress will seriously consider and improve upon wherever possible.

This is clearly an area in which the Federal Government may appropriately act. We have seen too many cases in recent years where raging floods have inflicted tremendous losses on individual property owners who are unable to insure their property against such ravages simply because insurance is not available. I believe the time has come when we can no longer avoid acting in this area and, as I stated earlier, while I do not claim that this bill is necessarily perfect, it does represent a good starting point.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and myself, I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference.

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

The bill (S. 1797) to provide for a national program of flood insurance, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to be a cosponsor of the bill which has just been presented by the distinguished Senator from Delaware. For the past 3 or 4 years, ever since the floods that affected the Sun River and the Flathead River area of Montana, and before that when other catastrophes of nature affected other parts of the country, the distinguished Senator and I have been discussing ways and means of meeting this problem, over which man has little or no control.

As the Senator has pointed out, this is not a perfect bill, but it is a first step. I would welcome constructive meaningful change or modification to it. But this bill is a start in the right direction; it covers situations such as those which occurred this spring in my own State of Montana. I refer to the deep snow pack in Glacier Park along the high line in my State, and the recent snows which have been quite heavy, up to 45 inches, in that area, creating the possibility of floods along the Sun and Flathead Rivers, over which man has no control, despite all his efforts.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for introducing the bill. As I said, I am delighted to be a cosponsor with him, and along with him, I hope that the committee very shortly will give attention to this most serious matter, which has needed attention and consideration for some years past.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for his kind comments. As I have pointed out in my remarks, in 1956, Congress did approve a somewhat similar bill based on the premise that it would be applicable in a State after that State had agreed to put up a certain percentage of the cost and match it with the Federal Government. I supported that proposal and thought it would be the answer. Later, however, we ran into the problem that States were afraid to implement this legislation for fear of a catastrophe of major importance which could bankrupt the individual State. It has been recognized by most all who supported that proposal that this is a problem which can be dealt with only at the national level, that it cannot work on a State basis.

It is for that reason, as the Senator from Montana has pointed out, that in recent years, particularly in the past several months, we have been trying to work out a formula whereby we could at least initiate a start in this direction. I think that we have a workable proposal which merits the consideration of Congress. It is being presented, as the Senator from Montana has so ably stated, not with the suggestion that it is the perfect answer to the problem, but it is one which, if we start working together, we can probably perfect a little more.

I hope that the Senate will take quick action on the bill.

Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has asked that his name be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

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

HONOR THE FALLEN HEROES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, from our earliest days the veterans of this Nation have given of themselves to defending and preserving the freedom all Americans enjoy today. In a distant land, members of our Armed Forces again risk and give their lives for that freedom and for a just and decent world. Too often, we tend to forget that American soldiers are fighting and dying in the fields and mountains of Vietnam.

Last week, the Defense Department released the distressing tabulation of American war dead—7,826 servicemen killed in action. The heaviest losses were suffered by my own State of California where 683 young Americans were listed among the dead. Even as I speak today, the bodies of American soldiers are returning to their homeland and to their final resting places throughout America.

There is little this Nation can do to fully repay these brave men for the sac-

rifice they have made for their country and for the cause of freedom in the world. But we can, in the very least, bestow upon them in death some measure of respect and honor which they so courageously earned in life. It is America's responsibility to see that her war dead are not forgotten in "Potter's Field," but are given the dignity of a decent burial. To do otherwise would be a national disgrace. And yet, the Government's policy on national cemeteries, coupled with the meager burial allowance now provided veterans, have had the effect of making the fallen American veteran a "forgotten man."

For over 6 years, the administration has opened further expansion of the depleting national cemetery system. It has further opposed the enlargement of the present facilities or the establishment of new ones. I have, in the past, introduced a number of proposals to provide for additional national cemeteries in the State of California, but the administration has consistently opposed each proposal.

It is a shocking fact that of the 98 national cemeteries in existence, 24 are completely filled and 64 have but "some space" remaining. The seriousness of the picture is brought into even sharper focus when we realize that of the four cemeteries which accounted for more than 57 percent of all burials in national cemeteries in fiscal 1965, one—Fort Rosecrans, Calif.—is closed, another—Golden Gate, Calif.—will close soon, a third—Long Island, N.Y.—will close by 1975 and the fourth—Arlington—has been drastically restricted. The recent announcement concerning the limitations on Arlington National Cemetery was particularly distressing to me. I see little justification in permitting certain VIP's to be buried at Arlington when many more distinguished veterans will be barred.

Twenty-one States now are without a national cemetery or without one containing available grave space. California, with more veterans than any other State, will be added to this growing list by the end of 1967. As more and more States and areas become deprived of an active national cemetery, the greater will become the pressure for a reversal of the executive branch's position on national cemeteries.

I believe the Congress must continue the battle to provide for a realistic national cemetery system. At the same time, however, it is equally important to provide for those veterans who must be buried elsewhere.

The families of only one out of four deceased servicemen returning from Vietnam choose burial in the increasingly crowded national cemeteries. On a national basis, only 12 percent of all eligible veterans who die each year are being buried in a national cemetery. The overwhelming majority of this Nation's veterans are being buried in private cemeteries at the family's personal expense.

Mr. President, I have introduced cemetery legislation on a number of occasions. That legislation has never been passed. Today I am introducing a bill which would seek to increase the allowances now available through the Veterans' Administration for burial in private cemeteries and for the purchase of a burial lot.

In order to assist families of veterans to defray the costs of the funeral and burial, the Veterans' Administration now provides a meager burial allowance of $250. This amount is totally inadequate in providing for a decent funeral and a dignified burial. Oftentimes the family is forced to choose a cheap and undignified gravesite in order to pay the expenses of the funeral itself. No family, least of all that of an American veteran, should have to make that choice.

The legislation I introduce today would set aside a certain amount—$100—for purchase of a burial site and would further increase the amount now provided for other expenses from $250 to $300. This would provide a total of $400 as a burial allowance. That is little enough. I believe it is a forward step in honoring fallen American heroes.

Mr. President, I send my bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred, and I ask unanimous consent that the full text be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1799) to amend chapter 23 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount authorized for funeral and burial expenses of certain veterans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1799

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of section 902 (a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$250" and inserting in lieu thereof "$300."

(b) Section 902 (a) of such title is further amended by inserting at the end of the first sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: "Under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe and having due regard to the circumstances in each case, the Administrator may expend not more than $100 to help meet the expense of providing a suitable burial site for the remains of the deceased veteran, such amount to be in addition to any amount paid under the preceding sentence."

SEC. 2. Section 903 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "(not to exceed $250)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(not to exceed $400, including any amount expended by the Administrator under the second sentence of section 902(a))".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall be effective in the case of eligible veterans who die on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

VETERAN PEACETIME COMPENSATION RATES FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, there is perhaps no greater privilege given to any person than the privilege to serve his country. This privilege of service is offered in a variety of ways just as the commensurate service may be rendered in various ways. But, no country is better served than by those who take on their country's military uniform and bear the dangers to life and limb inherent in this act. Many sustain injury or sickness as a result of their devoted service in the Armed Forces. It is on behalf of these magnificent men and their loved ones that this country has historically recognized their noble sacrifices and has attempted to compensate them for their loss because of injury or sickness while in service.

To achieve this aim, a compensation program was established for veterans who suffered illness or injuries in service and whose service-connected disabilities impair their ability to earn a living in civilian life. Under this program, an honorably discharged, disabled veteran can receive a monthly payment up to $300 based on the severity of his impairment. Monthly payments vary according to different ratings ranging from a rating of 10 percent to one of total disability—these ratings are determined in accordance with specified medical standards.

The importance of this program is reflected in the number of veterans and the total amount of payments involved. In fiscal year 1966, $1.8 billion in disability compensation was paid to more than 1,993,000 veterans. It is to the credit of this Nation and its people that we have seen fit to provide for those, who because of military service to their country are less able to make their economic way. But, there is an arbitrary determination in the present-day compensation program which I feel is hard to justify and should be eliminated—namely, that those fine veterans who were injured in service during peacetime, even though they may be as severely disabled as a veteran injured during wartime, are forced to receive less compensation payments than the wartime veteran. Presently, a peacetime veteran, equally disabled as a wartime veteran, receives only 80 percent of monthly compensation rates, which range from $21 for a 10-percent disability to $300 for total disability. Thus, a peacetime veteran, rated as totally disabled because of a service-connected injury, would receive only $240 a month and is denied a full benefit payment. Yet, because of his injury, he is just as impaired in earning a living and providing food and clothing for himself and his family as is the veteran injured during wartime. How he can do with less, when he has the same economic impairment, is a question that does not receive a very good answer. I agree that veterans serving in wartime should be accorded certain preferential treatment in some veterans programs in recognition of the greater risks which they face. However, where two veterans have the same injury with the same degree of impairment, and the disabilities resulted from service to their country, it is harsh to favor one over the other; to give one of them full benefits merely because his injury was sustained at a different time than the injury of his fellow serviceman. This disparity becomes quite clear when one realizes, for example, that the

veteran who on January 31, 1955, was severely disabled in basic training and lost an arm would receive the full compensation benefits for that injury but the veteran sustaining the exact injury in the same manner the following day would receive 20 percent less than his fellow comrade.

To correct this inequity, I am introducing a bill which would equalize the rates of disability compensation for peacetime and wartime service. In effect, my bill removes the different treatment accorded service disabilities occurring during peacetime and recognizes the fact that a veteran who has lost his sight or limb because of service suffers the same terrible burden, regardless of where or when this tragedy occurred. Thus, the full 100-percent rate would be paid to a veteran whether his inservice injury was sustained on battleground or peaceful soil; whether he was stricken with fever in the steaming jungles of Burma or in the swamplands of southeastern United States.

Mr. President, what I seek is not new. The general pension law enacted in 1862, made no distinction between service in war or peacetime for the purposes of compensation. This equitable treatment continued for some 50 years until the First World War when the difference in payment for wartime disabilities was started. I merely wish to reinstate the equitable treatment recognized over a century ago.

In 1956, Congress initiated the dependency and indemnity program, a major change in veterans' service-connected benefits for surviving widows, children and parents. No distinction in rates payable in the DIC program was made between peacetime and wartime service—and that remains true today for that program.

In addition to these legislative precedents for equalizing compensation rates, I am advised that the Veterans' Administration has recommended enactment of legislation along the lines of my proposal, and is in favor of eliminating the present discriminatory treatment. The VA has estimated that my proposal will benefit approximately 179,000 cases in the first year at a cost of $37.8 million—a small amount in comparison to the sacrifices that these disabled men and women have made—sacrifices stemming directly from their military service—sacrifices which have kept us safe and secure; sacrifices which now receive a discount payment, not a full benefit.

Mr. President, where the loss of a man's sight or a limb is involved, wartime or peacetime should be of little concern. Pain does not recognize a distinction nor does economic incapacity allow for any such distinction. Congress should not continue it.

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

The bill (S. 1800) to amend chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to equalize the rates of disability compensation payable to veterans of peacetime and wartime service, introduced by Mr. BOGGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE CIGARETTE LABELING AND ADVERTISING ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and Mr. Moss, for appropriate reference, a bill which will strengthen the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act of 1965, by requiring that all cigarette packages and advertisements disclose the tar and nicotine content of each cigarette as measured by a standard test. This bill is similar to legislation which I introduced late in the last session of Congress.

Two weeks ago the Public Health Service issued a report prepared by the National Center for Health Statistics entitled "Cigarette Smoking and Health Characteristics." The findings of this report were based on a massive survey of about 134,000 persons in approximately 42,000 households. It found that both male and female cigarette smokers reported a higher incidence of chronic conditions—bronchitis, emphysema, sinusitis, heart condition, and peptic ulcer—than did persons who had never smoked, thereby substantiating similar findings made in the Surgeon General's report 3 years earlier. In addition, however, it stated:

> There is a marked increase in the prevalence of chronic conditions as the number of cigarettes smoked per day increases. For example, of the males who smoked a half pack or less at their heaviest amount, 49.5 percent reported one or more chronic conditions while 72.1 percent of those who smoked over two packs a day had one or more chronic conditions, which is 35 percent higher than the percentage for the 'never smokers.' There is a similar increase in the percent of females with chronic conditions as the heaviest smoking amount increases with 57.1 percent of the light smokers and 85.3 percent of the heaviest smokers reporting one or more chronic conditions. Thus, the number of cigarettes smoked appears to be a major factor in the relationship between cigarette smoking and health, with the strongest relationship among the heaviest smokers.

It specifically found, for example, that one pack a day cigarette smokers reported about the same incidence of heart ailments as "never smokers," while those who smoked over two packs a day had a 70-percent higher rate of heart conditions than the "never smokers."

The results of this study are of particular interest to proponents of tar and nicotine disclosure. Last June, a group of 14 prominent scientific investigators met at the invitation of the Surgeon General to review medical knowledge on the significance of the tar and nicotine content of cigarettes. At the conclusion of its meeting, that group unanimously adopted the resolution:

> The preponderance of scientific evidence strongly suggests that the lower the "tar" and nicotine content of cigarette smoke, the less harmful are the effects.

If that group has properly identified tar and nicotine as harmful substances in cigarette smoke—and the Commerce Committee, incidentally, expects to review this finding closely—then the health effects of decreasing a smoker's intake of tar and nicotine from each cigarette would be comparable to his smoking a reduced number of cigarettes. As the Public Health Service study indicates, such a change in smoking habits would greatly increase the likelihood of his living a life free from chronic illness.

Although unquestionably the best solution to the health hazard in smoking is to stop, or better still, to never start; for many people this is not a realistic solution. Studies conducted in Britan as part of a special national survey indicate that there is a sizable group of smokers who have become so habituated to cigarettes that they would never voluntarily give the habit up. Similarly, American researchers, such as Daniel Rosenblatt of the Cambridge Center for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, who have conducted antismoking clinics, find that there is a substantial group of heavy smokers who for reasons of taste, pleasure, or release of tension would not abandon smoking regardless of the health dangers associated with it. If one accepts that a large number of smokers will not respond to antismoking campaigns, they nevertheless may be helped considerably if they can be induced to switch to a low tar and nicotine cigarette.

Are smokers interested in making such a change in their smoking habits? The answer, I believe, is a resounding "yes." Fifteen years ago, the filter cigarette was merely a novelty item. Paralleling the steadily increasing publicity which graphically describes the results of each successive research report relating a higher incidence of serious respiratory, heart, and other disease with cigarette smoking, however came a drastic shift in the smoking habits of the American public. Filter cigarettes gradually increased their share of the market until today they represent nearly 70 percent of all cigarette sales—an increase of more than fiftyfold in 15 years. This indicates to me that consciously or unconsciously the average smoker is turning to the filter cigarette in the hope that filtration will provide some measure of protection against the hazards of smoking.

This bill will make it possible for those smokers who desire to make a meaningful change in their smoking habits to do so. But many smokers who now switch to filter cigarettes may only be deceiving themselves. Studies indicate an extremely wide variation in the effectiveness of different filtration systems. Although all of the cigarettes which are lowest in tar and nicotine are filters, so are several of the highest. In one or two cases, the filter cigarette actually contains more tar and nicotine than its similarly labeled, nonfiltered, counterpart.

Tar and nicotine disclosure will readily provide the information which a health-conscious smoker needs in choosing the dosage of his "poison." Earlier this week, the Federal Trade Commission took the first step toward regularly providing this information by officially opening its special laboratory which will test the tar and nicotine content of cigarettes. At our suggestion, they have agreed to transmit quarterly reports to Congress through the Commerce Committee. Soon we should receive the first of these

reports comparing the quantity of tar and nicotine contained in the different brands of cigarettes, and we shall attempt to give these reports very wide exposure. This is only a partial solution, however. The most meaningful step we can take will be to provide this important information directly to the consumer—on the cigarette package he buys and through the cigarette advertisement he hears or watches.

Thus far in my remarks I have concentrated on the importance to the individual smoker of widely publicizing the vital characteristics of each brand of cigarette. Why is it also important to us that he switch to a brand which is lower in tar and nicotine?

First, it is important in economic terms. Extrapolating from its recent report on "Cigarette Smoking and Health Characteristics," the Public Health Service found:

First. Seventy-seven million workdays were lost in the year 1964–65 because of the higher rate of illness which exists among persons who have smoked as compared to those who never smoked. This is 19 percent of the entire annual work loss in the United States.

Second. Members of the Nation's labor force who smoked cigarettes spend over a third again as much time away from their jobs because of illness as persons who have never smoked.

Third. Eighty-eight million or 10 percent of all days spent sick in bed, either at home or in a hospital, were excess days lost because of the higher rate of illness existing among persons who have ever smoked.

These are startling figures, especially when they are coupled with estimates by Dr. Daniel Horn that as many as 300,000 people may die prematurely each year because they have smoked cigarettes.

What is the annual loss in productive output caused by premature death or excessive illness? What is the cost for medical treatment required and in health benefits paid out as the result of smoking induced illness? Unfortunately, no accurate figures are available to us. On the limited question of the economic cost of days lost through excessive illness, however, industry's salary loss, alone—in other words, the minimum loss—would exceed $3 billion.

Second, legislation which might help induce a smoker to switch to a safer cigarette is also important to us in human terms. How can one estimate the cost to a family in which a father or mother is unable to work, is hospitalized, or has prematurely died? I would not care even to attempt an approximation, but perhaps I can convey some sense of this personal tragedy by reading a short letter which I received from a woman in Pennsylvania.

NOVEMBER 7, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I would like to say how pleasing it is to know of your interest in the cigarette health hazard situation.

I read on July 27, 1966 you introduced a bill to state the tar and nicotine content on package and labels in advertising. This really strikes home for me because on that day my husband Robert M. Frere died of lung cancer that the Doctor said was caused by heavy cigarette smoking. The ironic part is that I sold cigarette stock to help pay medical bills brought on by this disease.

Thank you for being interested in this cause.

In light of the staggering costs to our society, this bill represents a minor restriction on the practices of a particular industry. Yet through its provisions, we may help millions of Americans to help themselves to healthier lives.

In closing, Mr. President, I should point out that although the bulk of the changes in this year's bill are technical ones, I have made one important substantive alteration. This will require that the cautionary label and the tar and nicotine content also appear on cigarette packages exported for sale abroad. At the present time the Department of Agriculture is spending $240,000 annually to promote the export of tobacco products. Last year, for the first time, it spent an additional $22.4 million to subsidize the export of leaf and shredded tobacco. To me, it seems particularly ironic that for fear of being accused of selling products which had not been determined "fit" for domestic consumption, we delayed assistance in providing clearly beneficial, high protein, fish flour to undernourished peoples around the world until after the FDA had cleared it as acceptable for domestic use, while at the same time we actively promote the export of tobacco products, without warning of their possible harmful effects, and advise our own citizens to stop smoking. We have no excuse for perpetuating this double standard. This bill will also cure that defect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the close of my remarks together with a letter endorsing tar and nicotine disclosure from Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Gardner.

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. 1803) to strengthen the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1803

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 3 of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new items:

"(7) The term 'mainstream smoke' means the smoke which would enter the smoker's mouth while smoking a cigarette.

"(8) The term 'incriminated agent' means any substance, other than tar or nicotine, found in cigarette smoke which, as determined by the Federal Trade Commission, tends to contribute to the hazard of smoking to human health."

(b) The first sentence of section 4 of such Act is amended by (1) inserting immediately after "United States" thereof the following: "or abroad"; and (2) striking out all after the word "following" through the end of such sentence and by inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following:

"(1) the statement: 'Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health'; and

"(2) a clear statement of—

"(A) the quantity of tar and nicotine contained in the mainstream smoke of each cigarette of the brand or kind of cigarettes contained in such package, as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Federal Trade Commission under section 6; and

"(B) the identity and quantity of each incriminated agent contained in the mainstream smoke of each cigarette of the brand or kind of cigarettes contained in such package, as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Federal Trade Commission under section 6."

(c) The Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act is further amended by (1) redesignating sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11 thereof as sections 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, and (2) inserting therein, immediately after section 4 thereof, the following new sections:

"ADVERTISEMENTS

"SEC. 5. It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in the manufacturing or importing of cigarettes for sale or distribution in commerce within the United States or for any person (other than a common carrier for hire, a contract carrier for hire, or a freight forwarder for hire) engaged in the distribution of cigarettes in commerce within the United States, to disseminate or cause to be disseminated any advertisement, either in commerce or affecting commerce, designed to promote the sale of cigarettes, unless such advertisement contains a clear and conspicuous statement of—

"(1) the quantity of tar and nicotine contained in the mainstream smoke of each cigarette of the brand or kind of cigarettes named or described in such advertisement, as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Federal Trade Commission under section 6; and

"(2) the identity and quantity of each incriminated agent contained in the mainstream smoke of each cigarette of the brand or kind of cigarettes named or described in such advertisement, as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Federal Trade Commission under section 6.

"REGULATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 6. (a) The Federal Trade Commission shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register regulations which shall specify a uniform test for the measurement of the quantity of tar and nicotine contained in the mainstream smoke of each cigarette and the form of the statement required by paragraph (2)(A) of section 4, and paragraph (1) of section 5.

"(b) The Federal Trade Commission, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register regulations which shall (1) identify each incriminated agent, found commonly in the mainstream smoke of cigarettes, (2) prescribe a uniform test for the quantitative measurement of each such agent, (3) prescribe the method of expressing the quantity of each such agent in terms meaningful to the consumer, and (4) prescribe the form of the statement required by paragraph (2)(B) of section 4 and paragraph (2) of section 5.

"(c) The regulations prescribed pursuant to this section, and any amendments to such regulations, shall become effective no sooner than six months from the date on which such regulations or amendments are published.

"PROCEDURE FOR PRESCRIBING REGULATIONS

"SEC. 7. Regulations prescribed by the Commission under section 6 of this Act shall be prescribed, and shall be subject to judicial review, by proceedings taken in conformity with the provisions of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 701 of the Federal Food,

Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 371 (e), (f), and (g)) in the same manner, and with the same effect, as if such proceedings were taken by the Secretary pursuant to such sections. Hearings authorized or required for the promulgation of any such regulations by the Commission shall be conducted by the Commission or by such officer or employee of the Commission as the Commission may designate for that purpose.

"ENFORCEMENT OF ADVERTISING REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 8. Any violation of any provisions of section 5 of this Act or the regulations relating to advertising prescribed pursuant to section 6 of this Act, with respect to the advertisement of cigarettes shall constitute an unlawful advertisement of drugs for the purpose of sections 12, 13, 14, and 15 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 52, 53, 54, and 55), and such provisions and regulations shall be subject to enforcement under such sections."

(d) Section 9 of such Act, as redesignated in subsection (c) of this section, is amended by (1) striking out "statement" the last time it appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "statements"; (2) inserting immediately after "required" in subsection (b) thereof the following: "by any State or political subdivision thereof"; (3) inserting immediately after "cigarettes" in subsection (b) thereof the following: "which are advertised and"; and (4) striking out "subsections (a) and (b)" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a)".

(e) Section 10 of such Act, as redesignated in subsection (c) of this section, is amended by inserting "section 4 of" immediately before "this Act".

(f) Section 11 of such Act, as redesignated in subsection (c) of this section, is amended by inserting "section 4 of" immediately before "this Act".

(g) Section 10 of such Act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1968.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, January 10, 1967.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: In response to your letter of November 9, 1966, I am pleased to forward to you a copy of a technical report by the Public Health Service reviewing the significance of the "tar" and nicotine content of cigarette smoke. This report was in the process of preparation at the time of my last letter to you in July and I regret this long delay in putting it in your hands. The report reflects the general considerations which went into the thinking of the committee whose recommendations to the Surgeon General were transmitted to you earlier.

In our opinion, requiring the identification of "tar" and nicotine levels on packages and in advertising, as you have proposed, would be an important step and would result in the progressive reduction of "tar" and nicotine levels because of public demand.

On the basis of available evidence regarding the effects of individual constituents of cigarette smoke, their relationship to the overall hazards of cigarette smoking, and the relative precision regarding measurement techniques, the identification of "tar" and nicotine levels can provide valuable information on overall dosage. In considering any labeling requirement, it would be important that such requirement allow for the addition of other components of cigarette smoke as they are identified as a hazard and when agreement is reached on appropriate measurements to be used.

I strongly support your view that these steps relating to the measurement and labeling of "tar" and nicotine in cigarette smoke are only part of our overall approach to this problem. As you have pointed out, until hazardous substances can be removed from cigarette smoke, the only effective means available to eliminate the health hazards associated with smoking is an educational program designed to inform people of the hazard and encourage people to stop or not to start smoking.

I hope that this letter and the attached technical report will prove helpful.

Sincerely,

JOHN W GARDNER,
Secretary.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE TECHNICAL REPORT ON "TAR" AND NICOTINE

It is clear that the overall risk associated with cigarette smoking increases as the average number of cigarettes consumed per day increases (1). In the studies which have reported other measures of exposure such as pack-years, degree of inhalation, and maximum level of cigarette consumption, the same type of relationship holds.

Hammond (2) has shown that users of high "tar" and nicotine cigarettes report significantly more of the symptoms that are characteristic of cigarette smokers in general. Graham et al (3) have shown that appreciable variations in "tar" yield of cigarettes may be achieved by changing the pattern of smoking with maximum yield being obtained when puffing is concentrated toward the end of the cigarettes. The effect of tobacco smoke condensate on the mouse skin has been shown by numerous investigators to be dependent on the dose of tar applied to the skin.

These findings support the existence of a dose-response relationship between exposure to cigarette smoke and the risks most clearly associated with cigarette smoking—lung cancer, chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases, and cardiovascular diseases. Among the factors which may enter into the total exposure are numbers of cigarettes consumed, length of cigarette consumed, pattern of smoking (relative concentration of puffing at beginning, middle, or end of cigarette), frequency and depth of inhalation, and concentration of tobacco smoke which enters the smoker's mouth. The concentration of particulate matter in the mainstream of smoke is reflected in the measurement of the so-called "tars" in tobacco smoke.

The epidemiologic evidence on the effect of cigarette smoking on health is based largely on numbers of cigarettes consumed daily as the measure of exposure. That the degree of risk correlates as high as it does with numbers of cigarettes probably reflect the fact that the various measures of exposure noted above tend to be positively inter-correlated. Those individuals who smoke many cigarettes, and also, who inhale frequently and deeply, take more puffs, use higher "tar" and nicotine content cigarettes, and so on.

Wynder and Hoffmann (4) have shown that the tumorigenicity of cigarette smoke can be reduced by alteration in the cigarette which reduces the "tar" and nicotine content. They use the term "indicator" for "tar" and nicotine content or other measures which reflect this type of gross relationship lacking the identification of specific agents which are responsible for the effect. Bock, Moore, and Clark (5) have independently shown a similar variation in carcinogenic activity of tobacco "tar" obtained from different types of cigarettes.

The ad-hoc group of scientists which reviewed and discussed these data recently at the invitation of the Surgeon General concluded that:

1. The preponderance of scientific evidence strongly suggests that the lower the "tar" and nicotine content of cigarette smoke, the less harmful would be the effect.

2. We recommend to the Surgeon General that action be encouraged which will result in the progressive reduction of the "tar" and nicotine content of cigarette smoke.

This judgment was arrived at with full recognition of the following:

1. It is possible for a cigarette to be altered in such a way that its "tar" and nicotine content is reduced but certain other harmful effects, for example, the effect of the gaseous phase may be increased. Although this is a theoretical possibility, there is no evidence that this has occurred to any serious degree.

2. The potential benefit to the individual consumer who might shift to a lower tar and nicotine cigarette would be negated if this shift were accompanied by an increase in the number of cigarettes consumed, or in the length of each cigarette used. There is evidence that, by-and-large, this does not occur; that the shift to low "tar" and nicotine cigarettes tends to be accompanied by the same level of consumption or an even lower level rather than by an increased consumption (6,7).

3. Promotion of a low "tar" and nicotine cigarette might lull the consumer into believing that he could smoke this kind of cigarette without *any* accompanying risk. The presence of the warning label on the package, control over the advertising statements which are permitted, and the continuing educational efforts of public health agencies on this subject should minimize this likelihood.

REFERENCES

1. *Smoking and Health*, Report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, January 1964, (p. 111).

2. Hammond, E. C., "Smoking In Relation To Physical Complaints," *Arch. Environ. Health*, 3:146–64, 1961.

3. Graham, S., et al, "Variations and Amounts of Tobacco "Tar" Retrieved from Selected Models of Smoking Behavior Simulated by Smoking." *Cancer Research*, 23:1025–30, 1963.

4. Wynder, E. L., Hoffmann, D., "Reduction of Tumorigenicity of Cigarette Smoke; An Experimental Approach." *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 192:88–94, 12 April 1965.

5. Bock, F. G., et al, "Carcinogenic Activity of Cigarette Smoke Condensate." *Journal of National Cancer Institute*, 34:481–93, April 1965.

6. Horn, D., Hammond, E. C., Special Report To The Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health Of The Surgeon General Of The United States Public Health Service (unpub.).

7. Hammond, E. C., Garfinkle, L., The Influence of Health on Smoking Habits, National Cancer Institute Monograph 19, Bethesda, Maryland, p. 269–85, 1966.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, Senator MAGNUSON, has done a great service by pointing out the dangers to the health of the citizens of this Nation if they continue smoking. Despite the dire warnings of the American Cancer Society, despite warnings from doctors, despite the findings of the Surgeon General, and despite the sharp upturn in deaths from lung cancer, the use of cigarettes continues to increase. Today, in an effort to more fully inform the public about the dangers of continued use of cigarettes, I have cosponsored this bill to strengthen the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, introduced by Senator MAGNUSON.

This is not a new effort for me. I began introducing legislation to curtail the consumption of cigarettes in the 86th Congress. But each year the evidence becomes clearer and clearer that people are killing themselves through continued

smoking of cigarettes, and the tobacco and advertising industries are spending millions of dollars encouraging them to do it. More distressing still is the fact that while older people seem to be getting the message of the American Cancer Society—that smoking kills—the young people are not.

Cigarette consumption among young people is steadily increasing. Half of all high school seniors smoke according to the National Education Association. It is equally surprising, and more distressing that 10 to 15 percent of all 13-year-olds are now smoking. The longer that one smokes the greater the effect it will have on his health. Therefore the result of starting to smoke at 13 is self-evident. Those who begin smoking before age 20 have a substantially higher death rate than those who begin after the age of 25. Since few, if any, begin smoking after 25 it is the young people who must be alerted to the dangers of smoking.

I have information from the American Cancer Society that states that smoking 10 cigarettes a day results in 700 percent more lung cancer for men and smoking two packs or more results in 2,000 percent more lung cancer. Lung cancer kills more people than any other cancer and causes more deaths than are caused by automobile accidents. The cost to the Nation in terms of human suffering, medical expenses, and productivity is enormous. The relationship of smoking to heart disease and emphysema needs to be investigated more completely. The results so far are foreboding and leave no doubt as to the causal connection between smoking and these diseases.

The present attitude of many citizens is that they will be one of the lucky ones to escape serious disease if they continue smoking. For some this decision to play a game of Russian roulette with their lives may be made on rational grounds. But is this the case with the youngster in his teens who sees the alluring ads on TV which make smoking the "in" and "cool" thing to do? Compared to the skillful, sophisticated, and expensive advertising appeals which surround the young every day, the innocuous warning on cigarette packages, "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health" is having little effect.

How do you persuade youngsters not to smoke? How do you get to them? From my own experience as a parent of four children, I know that exhortation, moralizing, or even parental authority are not always enough. But I speak generally, and with some feeling, on the problem of getting through to the present crop of teenagers, and those who have recently left their teens, when you would like to sway them from a course which you sincerely believe to be unwise. I am convinced that with smoking the only answer lies in education—continuing education from the kindergarten up, not just one 15-minute lecture, with slides, in one science class at the junior high level, but periodic lectures, well spaced out, with the facts presented in new and fresh ways.

When I speak of education, I am not speaking just of formal education, but of continuing education which will reach everyone. What we need to do is to reach more of our adults with information about cigarette smoking—especially our adults who are parents of young or teenage children, or who teach these children. It is difficult to keep children from smoking until we make further inroads into adult smoking.

I realize also that in many instances the problem is not to convince a person he should quit, but to be able to distinguish types of smoking behavior, and to suggest methods which will improve the ability of different types of smokers to control or give up the habit. I know that social scientists are working on this, and I assure you I will be among the first to hail progress.

I have had a small one-man project of my own underway for several years now which, if successful, I have felt might help curb teenage smoking. I have been engaged in intermittent dialog with the National Association of Broadcasters, and the major TV networks about the special appeal which is made to youth in advertisements which make it appear that the most virile and accomplished of men, and the most attractive and feminine of women, and our leaders in almost every field, are all cigarette smokers. The inference in many of these ads is that success in the business or social world go hand in hand with smoking. I have had many courteous replies from the people to whom I have written, but little else. But I am not giving up, because I am convinced that if we are to make any real headway in discouraging our youth from smoking, we must not only attack the problem on the basis that smoking is hazardous to health, but we must dispel the image so popular on TV and in magazine ads of smoking as a glamorous, sophisticated, "in" thing to do.

Emerson Foote, chairman of the National Interagency Council on Smoking and Health has reported that cigarettes are responsible for at least 125,000 premature deaths each year and, indeed, that such smoking may kill as many as 300,000 annually. He has rightly termed the movement to curb cigarette smoking "the greatest lifesaving and health improving venture of our time."

In view of this, what should be done is to require all cigarette packages to carry a warning that use of the product could induce a fatal illness. This same warning should also accompany all advertisements of cigarettes. It is conceding too much to our free enterprise system to permit the use of advertising to entice people to commit slow suicide. It begins to look more like entrapment—particularly for our youth. I think we must begin to balance the allure and the glamour of cigarette advertising with the cold hard facts. I have yet to meet the parent who after fully digesting the findings of the American Cancer Society, would not discourage their child from smoking. After a person is fully aware of the facts if he chooses to play this grim game of Russian roulette, then it is his privilege. But it is about time our young people began to get both sides of the story.

It is interesting to note that doctors have reduced their own smoking very significantly since the connection between the practice and crippling illness was established. A survey available through the Interagency Council on Smoking and Health found that fewer than 30 percent of the Florida doctors now smoke, although 75 percent were smokers at one time. A similar trend was reported among medical students. It is strongly suggested by these facts that those in the know recognize the dangers in cigarette smoking and are giving it up. This also suggests that the dangers of cigarette smoking are not reaching the American people.

With this in mind, I think the bill introduced today is an absolute minimum that we should do right now. I am not sure it is enough and in cosponsoring it I would like to reserve the right to propose amendments to provide more stringent standards in advertising and promotion.

I do not think it astounding that we should require that the people be warned about what cigarettes will do to them, along with the ads telling of their appeal. You need only consider that, if lung cancer mortality continues at its present rate, there are today—based on statistics of the American Public Health Association—1 million schoolchildren who will die of lung cancer before they reach 70 years of age. The longer one contemplates that figure, the more one feels compelled to do something.

I am pleased that the bill being introduced today requires that the same warning that is now found on cigarettes in this country will be put on those for sale abroad. I commented on our curious double standard last year when the Department of Agriculture was promoting a film, "The World of Pleasure" which depicts the joys of smoking to the foreigner while we were taking steps to emphasize the dangers of smoking in this country. We owe to foreign purchasers of our cigarettes the same protection and warning we provide U.S. citizens. We at least have a duty of making the risks known to them. This bill contains the amendment I asked for last year, and I am hopeful the Senate will recognize the immorality in treating our foreign neighbors' lives as less important than our own.

This is an important bill and Senator MAGNUSON deserves our sincere congratulations for his leadership in introducing it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am glad to cosponsor Senator MAGNUSON's bill again this year. Requiring the disclosure of the tar and nicotine content of cigarettes will, I think, encourage the development of lower tar, lower nicotine cigarettes. And, since the amount of tar in a cigarette is associated with the incidence of cancer, and the amount of nicotine is related to heart disease, encouraging the development of lower tar, lower nicotine cigarettes is a worthwhile endeavor.

I hope that Congress will enact this badly needed legislation this year. And I congratulate the Senator from Washington for his efforts in this important area. I look forward to working with him on other proposals in this field.

For this legislation, while important, is only a first step. As the Senator from Washington indicated in his thoughtful remarks today, this legislation will only help a smoker "in choosing the dosage of his 'poison'."

I believe we must take significantly greater action to discourage people from smoking at all and especially to discourage young people from starting to smoke.

Secretary Gardner testified recently that—

While large numbers of adults are giving up smoking, even larger numbers of young people are taking up the habit.

This observation was confirmed by the president of the American Cancer Society, Dr. Ashbel C. Williams, in a recent speech. Dr. Williams said that 1.5 million American children between the ages of 12 and 16 began smoking last year. That is well over 4,000 youngsters a day. I ask unanimous consent that a news report of that speech be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1967]

CIGARETTE SMOKING BY VERY YOUNG ON INCREASE, CANCER SOCIETY IS TOLD

(By Nate Haseltine)

PALM BEACH, FLA., March 31.—Increasing numbers of adults are quiting smoking, but the opposite is true for youngsters, the president of the American Cancer Society said today.

Dr. Ashbel C. Williams, a Jacksonville cancer surgeon, told the Society's ninth science writers' seminar that cigarette smoking may be the worst, most intimate and dangerous air pollutant of today.

He said studies show that 1.5 million children between the age of 12 to 16 years took up cigarette smoking last year (1966).

But he added that this was partially compensated by the fact that "an impressive and mounting number of Americans have quit smoking cigarettes, and many more have drastically reduced their consumption of nicotine and tars (that is, switched to filter tip cigarettes)."

On the same program, Dr. Eva J. Salber of Harvard University reported her results of a progressive study of cigarette smoking habits of students in public schools of Newton, Mass. Some epidemiologists regard the Salber survey as a national standard of the juvenile habit.

She found that, despite the study and efforts to educate against cigarettes, few had quit smoking in the five and a half years since the survey's start, that more youngsters, the majority of that one third of the nonsmokers at the study's start had by now adopted the habit, and that the group as a whole now had twice the number of its original cigarette smokers.

Dr. Williams said reductions in cigarette smoking by Americans have proved less impressive than reductions in cigarette smoking among Europeans.

In Great Britain, he said, the number of cigarette smokers 16 years of age and older dropped by almost half a million between 1961 and 1965, while the general population rose in the same period by more than 1.25 million.

In Norway, he added, in a recent 5-year period, there was a decrease of about 10 per cent of boy smokers from 13 to 19 years of age.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. And a pioneer study by Dr. Eva J. Salber, of the Harvard School of Public Health, shows that decisions by young people whether or not to smoke are made very early. A recent editorial in the Christian Science Monitor summarizes Dr. Salber's findings and their implications, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

EARLY SMOKERS

Back in 1959, Dr. Eva J. Salber of the Harvard School of Public Health studied the smoking habits of nearly 1,000 tenth-graders at a suburban New England high school. In 1965, she did a follow-up. The results are informative. She found:

Before the age of 15, most youngsters have already decided whether or not they plan to smoke.

Those who are smoking by 15 are likely to still be smoking at 21.

Those teenagers who have tried smoking but stopped are likely to start again. Seventy-one percent of those who said they had stopped at 15 later resumed smoking.

Cigarette consumption shot up between the ages of 15 and 21. By 21, young smokers were averaging 6 to 6.5 packs a week. In addition, the number of young people smoking had nearly doubled in that period. On both scores, girls trailed the men only slightly.

Nonsmokers at age 15 were able to predict with no little accuracy their future smoking habits. Of those who expected to smoke, almost 70 percent did so by age 21 while of those who did not intend to start, fewer than 30 percent took up the habit.

The study, Dr. Salber felt, showed that education to discourage cigarette smoking ought to begin with children as young as 10 years. She felt, further, that youngsters are unimpressed by condemnation of smoking as a major health hazard and that appeals made on aesthetic or moral grounds would probably be more effective. And she stressed that educational efforts directed toward children would accomplish little if parents, whose influence on them is so considerable, were not also reached.

We take seriously these findings by Dr. Salber. Also, her counsel as to how best approach solving the problem. Statistics clearly show that we have not begun to reach the young on this question. To do so will take far more effort than we have as yet expended, a far more persuasive appeal, and a much earlier start.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this matter for the health of millions of Americans.

One physician told me recently that if he had his choice as a matter of health policy between immediately having enough doctors and nurses and hospital beds to remedy our serious national shortages in these areas, and getting every American who smokes cigarettes to stop, he would choose the latter. Far more lives, he told me, would be saved by getting the 48 million Americans who now smoke to stop than would be saved by solving all of our health, manpower, and facility shortages.

That is quite a startling statement. But the facts support it. The Surgeon General's report—based upon thousands of studies over the years and confirmed and supplemented by some 1,500 studies since—told us over 3 years ago that smoking is a lethal activity. The latest report came only 2 weeks ago when the Public Health Service published the results of an ambitious empirical study of the higher incidence of disease and death among smokers than among nonsmokers. Senator MAGNUSON describes the results of the study in his remarks today, and I would only add that Senators may be interested in seeing two news reports of the issuance of the new report, one from the New York Times and the other from United Press International. I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, May 2, 1967]

SMOKING IS LINKED TO LOSS OF TIME FROM WORK AND RECREATION

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 1.—American men who smoke cigarettes lose about 27 per cent more time from jobs and recreation than do nonsmokers, according to a Government report made public today.

The same document showed that smokers and former smokers of both sexes tended to have more of such chronic health problems as heart disease, bronchitis, emphysema, sinusitis and peptic ulcers.

A survey involving interviews in 42,000 American households provided the data for the report.

The findings were based on responses from a sample that was considered representative of the adult civilian population of the United States, the report said. Men and women in institutions were excluded.

The survey was made in 1964 and 1965, when an estimated total of 51 per cent of men over 17 were cigarette smokers and 19 per cent were former smokers.

The report, published today by the National Center for Health Statistics, said the strongest relationship had been found between smoking habits and the presence of chronic bronchitis, emphysema or some combination of the two.

But the data did not prove that smoking was the cause of the higher rates of illness among smokers revealed by the survey, the report said.

"The most these data can do is demonstrate the lack of or the existence of a relationship between cigarette smoking and various health characteristics; it cannot establish any existing relationship as a causal one," the report said.

In several categories the relationship between the physical ailments and smoking was stronger for former smokers than for present smokers.

Thus, men smokers reported 27 per cent more "restricted-activity days" resulting from illness than did nonsmokers. But former smokers reported 44 per cent more days in which their activities were restricted than did men who had never smoked.

"We know from other kinds of evidence that cigarette smoking is closely related to certain causes of death including cardiovascular disease, cancer, chronic respiratory disease and peptic ulcers," said William H. Stewart, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, in a statement.

"This particular study does not seek to explain this association," he continued. "It simply, and for the first time, shows the extent of this relationship as regards illness and disability."

The Surgeon General was quoted in an announcement of the report's publication as saying that it was the latest chapter in the story relating cigarette smoking to the nation's health.

The Tobacco Institute, representing cigarette manufacturers, said a survey of this kind could not be expected to provide mean-

ingful conclusions and could be highly misleading. It appears to be a study based largely on self-diagnosis and secondhand information, the institute said in a statement.

The Government survey found that 72.1 per cent of men who smoked more than two packs a day had at least one chronic condition that impaired health. Such conditions were found in 53.5 per cent of men who never smoked.

In some instances the report distinguished between smokers according to the amount they smoked; in other instances no distinction was made.

The Public Health Service's National Clearinghouse for Smoking and Health used the survey figures to estimate that cigarette smokers lost 77 million more work days than nonsmokers every year. The clearinghouse said that this was almost 19 per cent of the nation's annual work loss from illness.

NEW STUDY CITES SMOKING'S DANGER

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The public health service said Monday that heart disease is about 70% more prevalent among men who smoke two or more packs of cigarets a day than those who do not smoke.

A new study, released by United States Surgeon General William Stewart, also showed a strong statistical relationship between the smoking habit and chronic bronchitis or emphysema—respiratory diseases which often lead to a slow, painful death.

The report was disputed by the cigaret industry.

The Tobacco Institute issued a six page critique asserting that no scientific cause and effect relationship between smoking and disease had been established.

Here are some of the findings:

Among those who are smoking about one pack of cigarets a day, the incidence of heart disease is about the same as it is for nonsmokers.

But the heart disease ratio is about 70% higher among two pack a day smokers. Heart irregularities were found in 44% more cases among smokers than abstainers.

Some 77 million workdays are lost because of illnesses associated with cigaret smoking each year. Persons who smoke spend a third as much as time away from their jobs as those who do not smoke.

Chronic bronchitis or emphysema afflicts two and a half times as many male smokers as it does men who have never smoked. The rate for women smokers is twice that of female nonsmokers.

The Tobacco Institute said the study was "based largely on self-diagnosis and second hand information."

It cited as one contradiction the report's finding that former smokers have higher rates of many diseases than present smokers.

"This does not suggest that giving up smoking is harmful, anymore than it suggests it might be helpful," the institute said.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Smoking only became a national habit after World War I. Beginning in 1930, when there were only 2,500 lung cancer deaths in this country, an alarming rise in lung cancer began. Now, a generation later, 20 times as many people die from lung cancer each year.

Reliable evidence shows that 40,000 of the 50,000 lung cancer deaths every year are associated with cigarette smoking. The Surgeon General, Dr. William Stewart, tells us that 250,000 Americans die before their time each year as a result of diseases associated with cigarette smoking—lung cancer, heart disease, emphysema, bronchitis, and other kinds of cancer. Other reliable estimates put the figure at closer to 300,000 deaths.

These quarter of a million to 300,000 deaths are "excess" deaths. People who do not smoke sometimes die prematurely, of course. But a quarter of a million or more extra premature deaths occur among cigarette smokers every year.

And that is not all. It is not just a question of dying. Cigarette smokers suffer an extra 12 million chronic conditions as opposed to the nonsmoking population, an extra 300,000 heart attacks every year, an extra million cases of chronic respiratory disease.

These diseases are disabling and unpleasant.

Take emphysema, for example.

Emphysema is a condition which occurs when the lungs weaken and fill chronically with fluid after many years of breathing impurities. The person who suffers from emphysema is unable to catch his breath and spends hours at a time gasping for air. It is not a pleasant experience. Emphysema is 13 times more prevalent among cigarette smokers than nonsmokers.

Let us look at it generationally. Over 4,000 schoolchildren start smoking every day. If this rate continues, 1 million children now in school will die of lung cancer, to say nothing of all the premature deaths from other causes and the painful chronic diseases that will result. These are incontrovertible, proven facts. Indeed, if you add up all the figures, 27 million Americans now alive, including infants and children who have not begun to smoke, will die before their time as a result of diseases associated with cigarette smoking.

These, then, are the facts about cigarette smoking. Yet, wherever we go, we are assaulted with invitations and exhortations to smoke—on television, on the radio, in newspapers, and on billboards. In all, nearly $300 million a year is spent to urge us, and particularly young people, to smoke cigarettes. A recent article in the Houston Post described these efforts in graphic terms, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Feb. 5, 1967]

TV'S HOTTEST STAR—HE RIDES THE HIGH COUNTRY AND SAILS THE ROLLING WAVE

(By Mike McGrady)

Television's Star-of-the-Year! Today, with this small salute to the very best the small screen has to offer, we pause and honor a personality of demonstrated durability and versatility.

Though banned from ever appearing on British television, he has dominated this country's video screens longer than Ed Sullivan. Though regularly attacked by a formidable array of critics, he is seen more frequently than Gail Storm. And though a convicted killer, he has managed more major comebacks than Milton Berle.

But an end to suspense. This year's big winner is . . . your ever-popular Cigarette.

And, ironically enough, for a time there it looked like Cigarette might not make it back for another season. The trouble began three years ago when the surgeon general of the U.S. blamed Cigarette for lung cancer—the following year, 18,000,000 people gave up the Cigarette habit. It wasn't long before Cigarette was forced to wear a small disparaging sign ("Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health"). And while the sign was never seen on television, many felt no star could long survive this sort of public humiliation.

But they underestimated Cigarette's well established image. It was known, for one thing, that he was incredibly sexy. He was seen on public beaches with bikini-wearing beauties; he was caressed by glamorous women in low-cut gowns—one still recalls that memorable night he appeared in Julie London's embrace before an open fire as she crooned huskily, "You get a lot to like . . . with a Marlboro. Filter . . . flavor . . . flip-top box."

Miss London's enthusiasm was shared by many, particularly by athletes. If Arnie Palmer walked a mile in those days, it was not a matter of physical conditioning; it was for a Camel. And this held true not just for athletes, but for all the better people. Cigarette was photographed at the better nightclubs, sometimes merely reclining beside a top hat and a silk scarf.

Moreover, Cigarette even seemed to have the approval of . . . scientists. Kent Cigarette had developed this marvelous Micronite filter and was always saying, "No medical evidence or scientific endorsement has proved any other cigarette to be superior to Kent," which was all very reassuring, if meaningless.

However, all this ended in 1964 with Cigarette's self-imposed Cigarette Advertising Code. The code was an attempt to change the image, specifically to make Cigarette less attractive to young people. It banned the mention of nicotine and tar percentages; it barred such pseudo-scientific phrases as "Micronite filter" and "multifilter" and "activated charcoal."

Finally, and most damaging of all, Cigarette could never again—not ever—convey the idea that "smoking is essential to social prominence, distinction, success or sexual attraction." What was left? Time magazine predicted that Cigarette would be able to say nothing more positive than perhaps "a smoke's a smoke."

But somehow Cigarette, even without a Micronite filter to his name, managed to cut a relatively dashing figure, and during 1966, more than 75,000,000 Americans spent more than $8 billion for a record-breaking 542 billion smokes. And manufacturers kept Cigarette on television by spending $170 million for the year.

And though every effort had been taken to dim Cigarette's appeal to the young, 53 per cent of people between the ages of 16 and 19 have taken up the Cigarette habit and now spend $10 million a week for the pleasure. And, interestingly enough, five of the 10 television shows most favored by youngsters feature Cigarette commercials.

By adhering strictly to the code, advertisers can talk about taste and flavor and little else. In truth, there are two basic Cigarette tastes. The first smoke of the day tastes about the way you would expect burning foliage to taste, that is if you were of a mind to taste burning foliage. By the end of the day the taste is measurably closer to that of . . . hot nitric acid. The adjectives used to describe Cigarette flavor convey a somewhat different impression—big, rich, real, smooth, fine, mild, cooler, natural, pleasing, fresh, good, rewarding, right, special, nice, full, best, different, welcome and full-bodied.

But the lasting appeal of Cigarette on television has little to do with words. What is important is image, the visual story. And in the most memorable Cigarette dramas, words do nothing more than paint in a Hemingwayesque backdrop.

Words like, "Head for the high country. There's a new snow and good huntin' up there. Up in Marlboro Country." Words like, "Fall roundup. And a chuck wagon on a chilly morning. A warm fire. And a man's favorite smoke . . ."

As the words are spoken, a helicopter soars down from a nearby hill and lands beside the chuck wagon. Cigarette is carried out by a fellow bearing a striking resemblance to Matt Dillon—the jaw, the cowboy hat, the sheepskin jacket—and he squats on his haunches beside the campfire. He thumbs through the trail boss' report. He lights up the Cigarette made from the Richmond recipe as other cowhands shuffle around in lean, leather-faced silence. Then he mounts his copter and soars off over the hill.

Marlboro Country is not far, as the crow flies, from Camel Country. Which, in turn, is reasonably near Salem Country. Which is just a river and a mountain from Viceroy Country and so on.

One of the current Camel epics opens on the sea. Behind the crest of a large rolling wave, a single mast rises. The wave rolls by and we see the small boat, the crew in windbreakers, the spray crashing over the bow. ("Born rich, rich in real taste . . .") Or we're on a freight train carving a path through forestland while the engineer and the motorman light up. ("Rich in real tobacco flavor. Born with the new Camel so you know it's got a big head start on taste . . .") Or a surfcaster stands before an ocean crashing over black rocks. ("The great Camel heritage of real taste . . .")

Over in Salem Country, the atmosphere is ever one of near-surgical cleanliness. Near-surgical, incidentally, is not a phrase they'd be apt to use here. The opening shot—a towering waterfall tumbling several hundred feet down a mountainside. ("Ever try smoking Salem-style?") At the edge of a pool below, a man has built a campfire. ("Maybe it's time you did.") He lights up with a chunk of log retrieved from the fire—the coffeepot is bubbling and a canoe is seen tethered to the shoreline. ("Not just a different brand, but a different taste.")

Meanwhile, in Viceroy Country, a mammoth skyscraper is being raised. ("Another floor is done, work's goin' great.") And the workmen wearing tin hats are riding an elevator up through the spine of the steel skeleton. ("Now is the time you say, give me a Viceroy smoke. It's got the taste that's right. Right any time of the day.") Then, a closeup of the Viceroy smoker—he wears the tin hat but he also wears a white shirt and necktie and at the end of the drama, he parks his pack beside his blueprints.

The implications are clear. The Viceroy man is a structural engineer, possibly an architect, but definitely not one of your run-of-the-mill Mohawk Indians who specialize in skyscraper construction. The Marlboro man arriving by helicopter instead of faithful steed is clearly no ordinary cowhand with torn jeans. The L&M ad goes still a step further—here Cigarette is seen on a yacht with spinnakers full. Though the code specifically prohibits linking Cigarette with "social prominence" or "distinction" or "success," these factors are always lurking in the background. It's a minimum of 20 grand a year for most smokers and in some instances, make it closer to six figures.

Even when they contrive to put Cigarette in a totally inane setting, there is the hint of affluence, generally affluence coupled with a sense of excitement. The many people who have foolishly vowed to eat their hats if they found a filter that would deliver true tobacco taste, the black-eyed stalwarts who would rather fight than switch—they are movie stars besieged by photographers, ship captains, jazz trumpeters and so forth.

But the emphasis there is basically comedic. In the true Cigarette dramas it is more often a picture of man pitting his strength against elemental forces—wind, wilderness, structural steel. It is man unafraid of storms at sea, heights, sky-diving misadventures and, presumably, lung cancer. It is man armed with little more than Cigarette, and often as not, that's enough.

However, the newer Cigarette tends to be found in a more modern setting and the appeal is to a less active mind. They are invariably observers, not participants. They are seen in football stadiums and at cocktail parties. And the most noticeable quality uniting them all is a tremendous susceptibility to suggestion.

Let one person, for example, whisper, "Harvey's got a good thing going—pass it on," and they all, with unbridled glee, pass that very message along. One lamebrain begins snapping his fingers and before 60 seconds go by, a roomful of people are snapping their fingers, quite frequently with minimal success.

"Another flat tire," says the stunt pilot. "Gave this menthol brand a try. Sure doesn't taste like much."

"Well, have you tried this one?" asked the Kool smoker.

"Hey! This tastes fine!"

Or perhaps the scene is a summer lawn party. Tennis racquets are in evidence. One man, clearly the life of the party, shows everyone how long his Cigarette is. Everyone, naturally, is amazed. "Say, that cigarette is longer; what is it?" His explanation is terse but wordy: "The long cigarette. Long on flavor. Filter-tipped Pall Malls. Try one." The first to try is the lovely blonde, the kind of girl that used to dominate the precode commercials, and says 'Mmmmmm, I like that." And in less than a minute her mind is made up: "I know what I like. And I like Pall Malls."

L&M Cigarette, a brand that tries a new approach every few months, is working on the susceptibility theme. The current L&M hit pictures a bandstand and—"Last year only two members of the band at Anton's smoked L&M. Irving on piano and Charlie on sax. Now Sam the bass player's come over." It would seem, from studying the scene, there are two holdouts. However, the girl vocalist, another precode type, is belting out "Come on over to the L&M side, come on over for the taste of it . . ." and must be reckoned at least sympathetic to the cause.

However, the most co-operative of them all are the Lark smokers. A sound truck drives by and a man is holding up a sign: "Show Us Your Lark Pack" and passersby go into a cold sweat trying to locate a pack to hold up. That's not bad enough. They each insist on relating an incredibly pedestrian little tale—

"My father-in-law was visiting several months ago and while he was here I ran out of cigarettes. And he opened up his suitcase and there was a whole carton. And you know what they were? Larks. Well, we finished off his carton and I had to buy my own then. Been buyin' 'em ever since." And there's a woman: "I'll tell you how I got started with Lark. I was at a party. And someone offered me a cigarette. I liked it. It was a Lark." And the woman shopper: "I can show you my carton. As a matter of fact, I'll show you two cartons. One for me. And one for my husband. You might say we're a two-Lark family.

Lark is a perfectly splendid name for today's Cigarette—no longer are we concerned with athletes, but with fun-lovers. Without actually becoming involved in anything, they enjoy nothing more than watching the others, the doers. In the Ski-Jump Epic, for example, we watch a skier soar gracefully from the high jump. Beautiful. But he's not the smoker. The smoker is standing beside the ski jump taking movie pictures with a hand-held camera he just received from Raleigh's "famous coupons."

The current big Raleigh winners are talking up card tables and cameras and short-wave radios and a tackle box. The men are generally on the far side of 40, but rugged, with beautifully lined faces and hair that takes to flecks of silver nicely. The women are 15 years their junior and they're always at settings that hint at affluence.

They're at the horse show watching the jumpers; they're out watching some skeet shooting; they're at the travel agent's listening to a pitch about Jamaica; they're sitting in the middle of the crowd in a circus tent and they're having this fantastically intimate conversation.

"It's the light touch," the man says.

"Just the right touch of menthol," the woman comes back quickly.

Sometimes, fortunately, we are spared the sweet talk. In the Winston commercials ("Find folks with a knack for having fun, and you'll find Winstons") the young couple is at a country fair—both are wearing their week end tweeds and both are watching the horse race.

Of course, today's young people, so intelligent, would not be tempted by this kind of thing. They've been told repeatedly that Cigarette causes cancer. And they're no longer subjected to all those bogus scientific claims. Even the questionable Lark commercials ("Only Lark's filter has two outer sections, plus an inner chamber of charcoal granules . . .") makes no specific health claims. Nor does the new True commercial that once again lists tar and nicotine ratings before asking solemnly, "For a lot of good reasons, shouldn't your brand be True?" And the other brands that are spending so much time concentrating on science before adding, almost as an afterthought, "No health claim is intended or implied."

No, cigarette wins this year's Star-of-the-Year award on the strength of his own performance. Because—and all due credit here to the Cigarette Advertising Code—these ads are clearly not designed to impress the young. Not unless they enjoy going to horse shows and circuses and ski meets. Not unless they find the idea of movie stars and jazz musicians and stunt pilots appealing. Not unless they respond favorably to an endless progression of nubile women handling Cigarette with infinite and gentle respect. There should be no appeal to young people here—not unless they enjoy the idea of building skyscrapers or piloting their own schooners or perhaps someday being a cowboy with a helicopter.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The cigarette industry and the advertising and broadcasting industries which it helps to support, are a powerful block of economic power in this country. But the fact is that they are dealing in a lethal product. I would wager that if the economic power of the cigarette and related industries were as minuscule as that of the marihuana industry, cigarettes would long ago have been prohibited and their sale saddled with severe penalties as a health hazard. Still, cigarettes are a multibillion dollar industry and we must frame whatever action we take in that practical context.

Some things have already been done. In 1965, Congress passed a law requiring that a warning label be placed on the side of every cigarette package. Also in 1965, the National Clearinghouse for Smoking and Health was established in the Public Health Service. This new agency has begun a variety of educational and other experimental projects in dozens of cities around the country. The American Cancer Society continues its fine efforts to educate the public about the dangers of cigarette smoking. And the Surgeon General's report has had its effect.

The fact is that smoking has not increased at the same astronomical rate in the last few years as it did earlier. Cigarette consumption is about 25 percent below what it would be if the trends of the late 1940's and early 1950's had continued. And, in addition to the 43 million

cigarette smokers in the country there are some 19 million former smokers. Half of the physicians who smoked 10 years ago have stopped. But 542 billion cigarettes were still consumed in the country last year, 4,290 cigarettes for every man and woman over the age of 18. Clearly, our efforts to encourage people to quit smoking and to discourage young people from starting need to be expanded.

Here are some of the things that I think we could do now.

First, we in Congress can pass the legislation which Senator MAGNUSON has introduced today, the importance of which he has described so well. A recent study by Buffalo New York's distinguished Roswell Park Memorial Institute showed that there is already a significant variation in the amount of tar and nicotine in cigarettes, so this legislation could well encourage some of the more lethal brands to reduce their tar and nicotine content. I ask unanimous consent that a news report from the New York Times about the Roswell Park study be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

CIGARETTE BRANDS RATED ON SAFETY—CANCER CENTER STUDY URGES SMOKING OF PRODUCTS WITH LOW TAR AND NICOTINE—56 TYPES ARE ANALYZED—INDUSTRY ASKED TO DEVELOP BETTER FILTERS FOR THOSE WHO CANNOT BREAK HABIT

(By Jane E. Brody)

A leading cancer research institute, reporting yesterday on its analysis of tar and nicotine content of 56 brands of cigarettes, advised smokers who cannot break the habit to switch to brands that contain low quantities of these harmful substances.

It said that "changes in this direction offer appreciable public health gains."

The study was done by Dr. George E. Moore and his associates at Roswell Park Memorial Institute, New York State's cancer research and treatment center in Buffalo. The report was published in the March issue of Cancer, the journal of the American Cancer Society.

The study showed that "some filters on cigarettes are helpful but others are not adequately protecting people," Dr. Moore said in a statement yesterday.

"Our study and information from the tobacco industry itself indicates that more effective filters can be developed," he stated.

"We believe that improved filters would help stop needless and premature loss of life each year from lung cancer, certain other kinds of cancer, emphysema, cardiovascular disease, and other diseases associated with heavy smoking," he said.

Asked about the Roswell Park report, various cigarette manufacturers said they would prefer to reserve comment until they had carefully reviewed the study.

LOWEST IN CONTENT

In the analysis of the 56 brands, Marvel and Cascade, both king-size filter-tip cigarettes manufactured by Stephano Brothers, ranked lowest in tar and nicotine content. The 56 brands represented nearly all those marketed in the United States at the time of the study.

Marvel yielded an average of 8.3 milligrams of tar and 0.32 milligrams of nicotine per cigarette, and Cascade yielded 9.1 milligrams of tar and 0.34 milligrams of nicotine.

The highest tar and nicotine content was found in unfiltered king-size Raleighs, a product of the Brown and Williamson Tobacco Corporation. A typical Raleigh contains 43.4 milligrams of tar and 2.64 milligrams of nicotine, the study showed.

One of the study's most disturbing findings, according to the scientists, was that one filtered cigarette—king-size Pall Mall—yielded more tar and nicotine than the unfiltered king-size cigarette of the same brand.

In tests of Chesterfield, Lucky Strike and Camels, the scientists found that the smoker gets as much or more tar and nicotine from the filter cigarette as from the unfiltered, regular cigarette of the same brand.

The study also showed that some filters are much better than others. The Marvel filter, for instance, was nearly five times more effective in blocking tars than the Pall Mall filter.

Dr. Moore observed in a telephone interview that cigarette advertising had given smokers the impression that filters would protect them from the dangers of smoking.

"Unfortunately, in many cases, they are not being protected," the doctor said.

Numerous studies have shown that cigarette smokers are much more likely than nonsmokers to suffer from lung cancer.

CIGARETTE RATINGS

Following is a table giving the average tar and nicotine per cigarette in milligrams:

[In milligrams]

Brand	Type [1]	Tar	Nicotine
Marvel	KF	8.3	0.32
Cascade	KMF	9.1	.34
Carlton	KF	9.7	.74
King Sano	KFD	12.0	.39
Duke	KF	12.3	.46
Life	KF	13.6	.97
True	KF	15.8	.80
Kent	KF	18.8	1.10
Montclair	KMF	21.1	1.15
Spring	KMF	21.7	1.16
Galaxy	KF	22.1	1.43
Marlboro	KF	22.4	1.24
Winston	KF	22.9	1.32
Old Gold	KF	23.0	1.32
Waterford	KF	23.0	1.40
Lark	KF	23.1	1.26
Philip Morris	KF	23.2	1.46
Newport	KMF	23.3	1.34
Viceroy	KF	23.4	1.68
Salem	KMF	23.6	1.43
Paxton	KMF	23.8	1.43
Parliament	KF	24.0	1.44
L & M	RF	24.9	1.12
Benson & Hedges	RF	25.0	1.55
Tempo	KF	25.1	1.68
Tareyton	KF	25.3	1.35
Alpine	KMF	26.4	1.52
Kool	KMF	26.6	1.88
Chesterfield	R	27.0	1.18
Lucky Strike	R	27.1	1.42
Oasis	KMF	27.1	1.38
Lucky Strike	KF	27.3	1.42
Chesterfield	KF	27.6	1.72
Raleigh	KF	27.8	1.98
Philip Morris	R	28.8	1.37
Belair	KMF	29.7	2.11
Old Gold	R	29.7	1.63
du Maurier	KF	30.0	1.96
Players	R	31.0	1.67
Camels	R	31.3	1.69
Camels	KF	32.4	1.77
York	K	32.4	1.69
Pall Mall	K	33.0	1.75
Half & Half	KF	33.6	1.99
Domino	K	34.1	1.48
Old Gold	K	34.8	1.89
Masterpiece	KF	35.9	2.23
Kool	RM	36.3	2.21
Fatima	K	36.7	1.73
Philip Morris	K	37.2	2.11
Brandon	K	38.5	2.35
Benson & Hedges 100	KF	39.3	2.29
Holiday	K	41.1	2.45
Tareyton	K	41.5	1.97
Pall Mall	KF	41.6	2.20
Raleigh	K	43.4	2.64

[1] K—king (80 to 100 millimeters), R—regular (70 millimeters); F—filter, M—menthol, D—denicotinized.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Second, we simply must begin to regulate cigarette advertising. The advertising and broadcasting industries have, in my judgment, done an unsuccessful job of self-regulation. I believe their respective codes are inadequate. I think it is time the Federal Communications Commission started showing an interest in this matter. There is a strong argument that the FCC has the power, in connection with its power to refuse to renew licenses of stations that do not operate in the public interest, to prevent or limit the advertising of products which are harmful to health. It would also appear that the FCC could—and should—require the acceptance of advertising detailing the hazards of cigarette smoking as a public service under the rubric of the "fairness" doctrine. At the very least, the FCC should begin applying pressure on the broadcasters and the tobacco industry to adopt a more stringent code of self-regulation. Similar action has been effective in keeping hard liquor advertising off the air. If the FCC has not taken any action by the end of this year, and the cigarette companies and the broadcasters have not taken any further self-regulatory action in the same period. I plan to introduce legislation to mandate an experimental 1-year ban on all cigarette advertising on radio and television. I might point out that this is not a drastic step. Great Britain has had exactly such a ban since August 1965, and the figures so far, although still quite tentative, seem to show a steady drop in cigarette consumption since that time.

Third, we must vastly expand our educational activities about the hazards of cigarette smoking. The National Clearinghouse only gets $2 million a year for all of its activities. I plan to seek to amend its appropriation this year in order to at least triple that amount. With such added funds the Clearinghouse could develop a national antismoking campaign which would use radio, television, and newspapers.

Finally, I think it would be useful to have a sliding scale tax on cigarettes so that higher taxes are paid for cigarettes which contain more tar and nicotine. This would effectively encourage the development of relatively less harmful cigarettes. I plan to introduce such legislation in the near future.

All of these efforts are vital. But in the end none will have any effect until Americans—and particularly young people—develop an awareness themselves of the magnitude of the hazard, and act accordingly.

FEDERAL AID TO LAW SCHOOLS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in recent months, the attention of the country has been focused on crime and criminal justice more than ever before. We have had a National Crime Commission report, a special message from the President, and a number of other studies of various aspects of the problem.

One of the most critical problems is the treatment of indigent criminal suspects. The man who is arrested for a crime, who has no lawyer and no money to pay for one—what will society do for such a suspect?

The Supreme Court has given us one answer. In Gideon against Wainwright, a landmark decision of 4 years ago, the

Court said that the State must provide an attorney for indigents accused of serious crimes.

Another response has come from all America, in the war on poverty. Federal, State, and local governments have taken steps to relieve the burden of poverty. The Office of Economic Opportunity has funded "neighborhood legal services" programs across the country. Cities have established and expanded public defender systems. Local bar associations have formed legal aid societies. And this is all to the good.

Some of these programs use full-time, salaried attorneys, like the Legal Aid Agency here in the District of Columbia. Others rely on the part-time services of lawyers who take time off from their regular practice to handle occasional criminal cases.

But in both situations, there is one persistent problem: Many attorneys are simply not well trained in trial practice. Frequently the same is true of the prosecuting attorneys on the other side.

I am not so concerned about the full-time public defenders; after a few months' experience, they are bound to become effective trial attorneys. But it does not make much sense to pay a private attorney $25 per hour if he is not trained to try a case properly. After all, the whole point of the program is to give the defendant effective "assistance of counsel," as the Constitution provides.

Now we cannot place the whole blame on the law schools. There are undoubtedly many law school graduates who are not physically or psychologically equipped to be good trial lawyers. Their abilities lie in other areas. But certainly the law schools could, and should, do a great deal to train their students as advocates. This is an essential part of their legal education.

Moreover, unless the law student is taught something about the problems—and the rewards—of criminal trial practice while he is in law school, he will be more reluctant to represent indigent clients, even on a part-time basis, after he hangs out his shingle.

For this reason, I am introducing legislation to authorize the Office of Education to give $800,000 in assistance to the Nation's law schools. The funds would be used to develop courses and training programs in the conduct of criminal cases involving indigent persons. Emphasis would be placed on the actual conduct of a trial. Wherever possible, students would work in existing public defender programs and prosecutors' offices.

What I envision as a possible program, therefore, might involve a combination of three elements: There would be courses on substantive criminal law, criminal procedure, and the special problems in dealing with the poor.

There would be trial practice, in which trained attorneys might come in to coach the students on their technique. And finally, there would be practical experience, under proper supervision. Some programs would have the students working in public defender or legal aid offices. Others might have the students in prosecutors' offices.

Just last week, I received a letter from the director of the Harvard Law School district attorney project. He told me that Harvard arranges for its law students to participate in the work of the local district attorneys, under proper supervision. I would hope that such projects would be encouraged under this legislation. Certainly it is just as important to train competent prosecutors as competent defense attorneys. And, as Prof. Robinson Everett of Duke University Law School wrote me about his school's trial project:

> We felt that the students learned much more by viewing criminal justice from both sides, instead of only one.

My idea, of course, is not a completely novel one. A number of law schools have already begun projects along these lines, mostly through the assistance of the Ford Foundation or other private funds. These small but effective projects are an excellent beginning. The success of such programs as Harvard, Boston University, the University of Wyoming, and the University of Kansas gives us an indication of what can be done.

The budgets of these privately financed programs have run from $8,000 to $30,000 and higher, depending on the type of project and number of students involved. But there are 140 law schools in this country. Many of them simply cannot afford to initiate programs like these—although they might be able to absorb them into the regular school budget if the Federal Government gets them started.

So here, in essence, is what I want to do: To get these programs started at a wide variety of schools. The Commissioner of Education, under my bill, would allow each school wide scope in developing its own arrangements. But dozens of law schools would begin—many for the first time—to train their students to be effective prosecutors and defense attorneys.

Mr. President, I have received enthusiastic support for this idea from Justices Brennan and Clark of the Supreme Court. Chief Justice Roger Trayor of the California Supreme Court, among the finest State judges in the country, has also sent me a letter of support. So have attorneys and law professors around the country. Two subcommittees of the American Bar Association have indicated their support of the proposal. So has the annual convention of the Association of American Law Schools. I think that the idea has received widespread endorsement because it fills a long-existing gap in our system of legal education.

I offered this legislation as an amendment last year to the higher education bill of 1966. Because the amendment was offered on the floor, without sufficient time for the committee to study its provisions, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], said that he could not accept my amendment, and I, accordingly, withdrew it. But I certainly hope that the committee will have occasion to study the bill carefully this year, and act favorably. It would be a productive investment which would pay off many times in improvements in our system of criminal justice.

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 1805) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize assistance to law schools for training programs in the conduct of criminal cases involving indigent persons, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NEW HAVEN RAILROAD

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to applaud President Johnson's action Monday in meeting with the New England Governors, and, in particular, his assurance that the Federal Government will take an initiative to help resolve the problems of the New Haven Railroad. As a first step, a meeting is to be held here in Washington tomorrow between officers of the Department of Transportation and representatives of the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York, to explore the possible areas of fruitful collaboration.

Mr. President, the woes of the New Haven Railroad do not need elaboration here today. The railroad, which provides essential commuter and interstate service for all of southern New England and for the city of New York, has been in receivership since 1961. Its future survival has been pinned largely on inclusion in the Penn-Central merger, which while still a lively possibility, may occur too late to save the railroad from liquidation. The merger has been delayed for an indeterminant length of time, and the New Haven reportedly only has enough cash to continue operations until the end of this year.

In these circumstances, it is becoming increasingly clear that steps need to be taken now, in the public interest, to accomplish what would have had to be done within the framework of the merger, and that is reorganization of the New Haven into an economically viable operation. It is clear, too, that the initiative can best and most appropriately be taken at the Federal level, for three reasons. First is the interstate nature of nearly all the New Haven's operations, including the commuter service. Second is the fact that the Federal Government has a major claim as a creditor against the railroad, having guaranteed $51.6 million in loans to the New Haven since 1955, of which some $30 million has been defaulted. And third, the Federal Government alone can offer the widest possible range of adjustment support and assistance in any reorganization of the railroad.

It seems to me that the course the Federal Government must take in its discussions with the States beginning here tomorrow must center about one simple theme. What is needed first and foremost is a basic reorganization of the railroad which will assure that any future public support, whether from the Federal Government, the States or municipalities, is wisely and properly used. The Federal

Government should take a prompt lead in initiating such a plan of reorganization, in proposing it to the Federal court which has jurisdiction over the railroad and in working for its prompt implementation.

There is no doubt but that such a reorganization would be unsettling and would cause some painful readjustments. The railroad in receivership has fallen into management which because of its fiduciary responsibilities, understandably was unwilling to make bold, expensive innovations needed to change the property into a dynamic operation. Half of the New Haven's commuter equipment is more than 30 years old and thus is subject to inordinate and costly breakdowns. The railroad still maintains an unduly high percentage of low-revenue trackage, one recent study having showed that 25 percent of its trackage produced less than 3 percent of its freight revenues. As a result of these circumstances, combined with the special nature of the commuter service, the New Haven has been burdened with extremely high labor costs, and any rational plan for reorganization would have to make fair and equitable arrangements for readjustments in the work force.

The Federal Government, it seems to me, could make such provisions as part of its reorganization plan. The combined resources of the Economic Development Administration in the Department of Commerce and the manpower retraining programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could be brought to bear on the problem along with the resources of the Department of Labor and the Small Business Administration. In addition, the Department of Transportation, already is planning experimental service on the New Haven with new turbine trains built under the auspices of the High Speed Ground Transportation Act, which I am proud to have originated, and these demonstrations, it seems to me, may have considerable bearing on the technological rejuvenation of the line.

Part of any rational reorganization plan, whether or not it emanates from the Federal Government or not, may well be the separation and special treatment of those elements of the service which cannot be supported by revenues. This may mean that the passenger service, or the commuter portion of the passenger service, may have to be separated from the rest of the New Haven's operations and treated as a separate entity with some form of public support. To achieve this result, it will be necessary to have some kind of legal structure to receive and account for the public support and to administer the separated service in the public interest. It has for some time appeared to me that the most suitable form for this purpose is the interstate public authority which allows maximum room for participation by the States involved.

Mr. President, I introduce at this time, and send to the desk for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York to create a Northeast Rail Authority to own, lease, or otherwise acquire the right to operate a passenger rail transportation system within the Northeastern States. This bill is offered as a plan for the kind of legal structure which might be needed to operate the separate passenger service within the framework of a reorganized New Haven Railroad. I might note that I offered this bill in the 89th Congress and it served, along with three other proposals, as a basis for extensive hearings in the Commerce Committee, chaired by my distinguished senior colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. As a result of these hearings, the States entered into some very profitable discussions with the railroads and agreed, on an ad hoc basis, to a plan of temporary public support of the New Haven's passenger service. The time is now at hand to formalize that plan and for that reason I resubmit this bill today.

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

The bill (S. 1806) to encourage the preservation and development of a modern and efficient passenger rail transportation service in the northeastern seaboard area by granting the consent and approval of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York to negotiate and enter into a compact to create their own Northeastern Rail Authority, and by guaranteeing certain loans and other credit to such authority, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CROP INSURANCE PROCEEDS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there is a deep inequity in the present income tax laws with respect to the insurance proceeds received by our farmers on account of losses to their crops.

This occurs in the case of all cash basis farmers. Most farmers out in my part of the country harvest their crops in the fall of the year, but they do not sell them until the following year.

Should their crops be destroyed, they receive insurance proceeds in that year, and the farmer has to report his income in that year on his income tax return. Since in the early part of that same year he will have received income from the crop raised in the previous year, this results in a doubling up of income in 1 year.

This is an artificial result which arises only because of a catastrophe in the form of damage by weather to crops.

I have a bill which would amend the Internal Revenue Code to give farmers the option of either reporting the insurance proceeds in the year in which received or to report it in the following year when the crop would normally have occurred.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the inclusion of insurance proceeds for destruction or damage to crops in the year following the occurrence, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD, and be appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 1807) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the inclusion of insurance proceeds for destruction or damage to crops in the year following the year in which the damage occurred, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1807

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

CROP INSURANCE PROCEEDS

Section 451 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended (relating to general rule for taxable year of inclusion), is amended by adding the following subparagraph:

"(c) In the case of insurance proceeds received as a result of destruction or damage to crops, a taxpayer reporting on the cash basis of accounting may elect to include such proceeds in income for the year following the year of destruction or damage provided he establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that, under his practice, income from such crops would not have been reported in the year in which raised."

SPRING GARDEN PLANTING WEEK

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it was approximately a year ago that a very distinguished group of organizations interested in the national beautification program approached me with the idea of creating a Spring Garden Planting Week during the first full week of October each year.

The idea intrigued me because of my interest in preserving the natural beauty of our country. I listened with interest to their plan, which was inspired by the leadership so ably given by President and Mrs. Johnson.

The plan so captured my imagination that I felt I must share the thoughts with my wife, Jermaine, who is a great lover of nature and things of beauty. Her reaction was exactly as mine. She became enthusiastic about the idea of a special week in October, aimed at focusing the efforts of people everywhere to beautify their homes, parks, streets, and communities.

This is the key ingredient to this program: the individual action of people, in and around their homes, whether it be a formal garden, a large bed of flowers, a small parking strip, or a window box in an apartment.

If every household in America just spent a few cents for a package of seeds, or a few bulbs, the impact upon our American landscape and city scene would be beyond the capabilities of any artist to capture on canvas.

And, I might add, Mr. President, this is not a program which calls for the expenditure of millions in tax dollars. In fact, there is not any obligation here for the expenditure of any Federal, State, or local funds.

My wife joined me in this crusade, and accepted the position of chairman of the National Spring Garden Planting Week Committee. Membership of this

committee includes the "who's who" of the horticulture and floriculture fields.

In addition to Mrs. Magnuson, the committee includes:

Miss Ernesta Ballard, executive secretary, the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society; Mr. Richard Beatty, editor, House Beautiful's special publications division; Mr. Clifford W. Benson, executive secretary, the American Iris Society; Mr. Alfred W. Bessesen, horticultural editor, Ohio State University; Mr. John Burton Brimer, garden editor, the Macmillan Co.; Miss Minnie Hall Brown, garden writer; Mr. Kenneth A. Bryant, editor, Florist & Nursery Exchange; Mr. Carroll C. Calkins, associate editor, House Beautiful magazine; Mrs. Morgan A. Casey, president, International Garden Club, Inc.; Mr. A. R. Crooks, garden writer; Mr. Ben Arthur Davis, Hope Haven Garden Service; Mr. Douglas M. Fellowes, garden writer; Mrs. Marshall E. Ford, garden writer; Miss Jean Foster, garden writer; Mrs. Earl H. Hath, executive secretary, National Council of State Garden Clubs, Inc.; Mr. W. Ray Hastings, executive secretary, All-American Selections; Mr. Paul E. Jones, garden writer, Spokane Daily Chronicle; Mr. Robert F. Lederer, executive vice president, the American Association of Nurserymen; Mr. Gustave Springer, Netherlands Flower-Bulb Institute; Mr. Alfred B. La Gasse, executive director, National Recreation & Park Association; Mr. C. H. Lewis, president, American Rose Society; Mr. Richard L. Nowadnick, secretary and treasurer, Northwest Bulb Growers Association; Miss Mary O'Brien, editor, Beautiful Gardening & Living Outdoors magazine; Mr. C. Dan Pennell, secretary, American Peony Society; Mr. Ted Sabelis, chairman, Washington State Bulb Commission; Mr. Robert W. Schery, director, Lawn Institute; Mrs. Raymond T. Schmelzele, Town & Country Garden Club; Miss Rachel Snyder, editor in chief, Flower & Garden magazine; Mr. George Spader, executive secretary, Men's Garden Clubs of America; Mrs. C. Powers Taylor, president, Landscape Nursery Council; Mr. Felix R. Taylor, president, National Tulip Society; Dr. Cynthia Wescott, The Plant Doctor; Dr. Thomas W. Whitaker, executive secretary, American Plant Life Society; Dr. Richad P. White, director, Horticulture Research Institute, Inc.; Dr. Donald Wyman, the Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University.

The joint resolution I introduced in the Senate at that time—1 year ago—was unanimously adopted by my colleagues.

In the House, my good friend and fellow Washingtonian, FLOYD V. HICKS, introduced a companion resolution. Several of his colleagues submitted like resolutions.

Unfortunately, the 89th Congress adjourned before the House could take action. Although we in Congress could not stop the clock to give the week the official sanction it deserved, many Governors nevertheless proclaimed in their States the first full week in October, National Spring Garden Planting Week.

The idea has caught fire and swept the country with an enthusiastic desire to beautify our Nation.

The "seed" of beautification was planted by President Johnson when he said in his special message on national beauty to the Congress February 8, 1965:

> To deal with these problems will require a new conservation. We must not only protect the countryside and save it from destruction, we must restore what has been destroyed and salvage the beauty and charm of our cities. Our conservation must not just be the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its object is not just man's welfare but the dignity of man's spirit.

This challenge resulted in the first White House Conference on National Beauty, headed by a distinguished New Yorker and one of America's greatest conservation statesmen, Laurance S. Rockefeller.

From it evolved the First Lady's Committee for a More Beautiful Capital, which is enlarging the beauty of our beloved Nation's Capital.

Out of this came the first National Youth Conference on Natural Beauty, which brought together 500 of the Nation's outstanding teenagers from 4–H Clubs, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, and other youth groups.

Because of this concern for our environment, the President by Executive order last year established the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty. At the same time, the President established the Citizen's Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty, and appointed Laurance S. Rockefeller as Chairman.

National Spring Garden Planting Week is a logical and necessary step to actively involve citizens in this program in their own homes and communities. Natural beauty is no longer something we merely talk about. It is a matter of national concern, even of law.

Hundreds of communities throughout the Nation have established local beautification committees. We in Congress must give them the moral support they need to continue in this noble effort.

In Washington State, for example, a great deal has been done through local initiative—on the part of individual business concerns as well as communities, and citizens.

Our Skagit Valley Junior College at Mount Vernon launched a public campaign to plant 159 trees on the campus. In the Puyallup Valley, which provides many of the bulbs for our Nation's gardeners, selected flowering plum trees were sold to property owners at the low price of $4.50 per tree to stimulate interest in further beautifying their area.

In Pullman, a commercial tree grower offered the mayor's beautification committee 5,000 Douglas-fir trees and 2,000 Scotch pines to line the bank of the Palouse River. The chamber of commerce there solicited weekend help to help to do the planting. The whole job was done in 4 weekends.

So in the name of those hundreds of thousands across the Nation who have done so much personally toward our beautification program, I therefore introduce a joint resolution to create a National Spring Garden Planting Week during the first full week in October each year.

By setting aside 1 week each fall, in which each homeowner in America can beautify his yard, his neighborhood, and his town, we will be taking a giant step toward a goal that represents our Nation's best.

The national beautification program is one in which all of us must play a role if it is to succeed on a national level. The seed has begun to grow and with our support will play a significant part in making our Nation a better place to live.

To exemplify the way beautification has begun to catch hold in our country, I refer to these examples:

In Arkansas, an Extension Homemaker's Club plowed under an old junkyard that marred a scenic turnoff to a vacation area and planted the site with flowers, shrubs, and trees.

In Georgia, more than 700,000 trees and shrubs were planted during Make Georgia Beautiful Month.

In Illinois, the Extension Service produced 13 half-hour TV programs on home landscaping that were later shown in three other States.

Just a few miles from here, the Arlington Home Demonstration Club learned through the Nurserymen's Association that a nurseryman in California had a surplus supply of crepe myrtle trees. Last summer arrangements were made to buy the entire lot, 600 trees, at a bargain price. The club arranged for the sale and distribution of the trees, and the county agent printed planting instructions.

The project was so successful that the Beautification Committee of Arlington contracted to have 6,000 crepe myrtles especially grown for sale in Arlington next spring.

These are just a few examples of the wonderful things being done in the name of beautification by people everywhere. We owe to them as much support as we in Congress can give in order to see that beautification becomes a way of life for our own and future generations.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 85) to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period comprising the first full week in October of each year as "Spring Garden Planting Week," introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, about 7 or 8 weeks ago, the Republican National Coordinating Committee made a recommendation to the effect that social security benefits and those paid under the Railroad Retirement Act should be exempted from Federal income tax.

I present a resolution and ask that it be printed in the RECORD, including all the names—and there are 36 sponsors of this resolution.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 123), submitted

by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PERCY, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota), was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. RES. 123

Whereas it has been proposed to the House of Representatives by the United States Department of the Treasury that old-age insurance monthly benefits provided under the program established by title II of the Social Security Act and railroad retirement benefits provided under the program established by the Railroad Retirement Act shall be made subject to Federal income taxes;

Whereas inflation, which in itself is a form of hidden taxation, imposes especially heavy burdens on persons living on fixed incomes;

Whereas beneficiaries of these Federal programs rely on fixed incomes for their basic necessities;

Whereas adoption of the proposal to tax social security and railroad retirement benefits would involve double taxation; and

Whereas there are certain questions as to the constitutionality of this proposal to tax such benefits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that such social security and railroad retirement benefits shall not be made subject to Federal income taxes.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. PASTORE submitted the following notice in writing:

AMENDMENT NO. 198

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 12, line 6, insert the following:

"HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount for 'Higher education facilities construction', $2,122,775, for payments under section 408 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended: *Provided*, That the Federal contribution shall not exceed 50 per centum of the eligible costs: *Provided further*, That section 408(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after the parenthetical phrase '(subject to the provisions of this section)' the following ', but not to exceed one-half of the costs of such restoration or replacement,'."

Mr. PASTORE also submitted an amendment (No. 198), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 9481, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES FOR TAX PURPOSES TO DIVORCED OR SEPARATED PARENT REGARDING A DEPENDENT CHILD'S SUPPORT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 194

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, last year, the 89th Congress had occasion to consider what has become an irritating and almost insoluble tax problem that arises between estranged parents; namely, which of them is properly entitled to claim their children as exemptions for income tax purposes.

Presently, a parent who contributes more than one-half of the child's support for a taxable year is entitled to claim the child as a dependent and receive a $600 income exemption. When parents are separated or divorced and both contribute to the child's support, the determination of which parent receives the exemption, the one having custody of the child or the one contributing to the child's support, is a vexing and sometimes impossible task. Where each parent honestly believes that he or she has contributed more than half the support; where the estrangement is at a high pitch; and where the Internal Revenue Service is prohibited to disclose to either parent any information regarding the other parent's alleged support—the Internal Revenue Service finds itself caught in the middle as an arbiter with its hands tied and the parents are in no better a position.

In response to this continual irritant to taxpayers and to relieve what has become an administrative headache to the Internal Revenue Service, the House of Representatives, in the last Congress, passed H.R. 14363, which would have provided rules under which the determination of the parent entitled to the claimed exemption could be made on a more satisfactory basis. Subsequently, the Committee on Finance favorably reported this bill without amendment. Due to the heavy legislative load in the closing days of the 89th Congress, H.R. 14363 was not called up and died on the Senate Calendar.

However, I was heartened to see that the House, again this Congress, passed a bill, H.R. 6056, which is identical to H.R. 14363. This measure is presently pending before the Committee on Finance and I hope it will receive the same favorable consideration that it did last Congress.

The procedural rules which would be established by H.R. 6056 would become effective after 1966 and should go far in resolving a great many dependency cases arising in the future. However, the fact that the bill does nothing to resolve or relieve the many pending cases involving parents' claims for child dependents is a great drawback. It is these very cases upon which the bill is based and to which the bill gives no assistance. Literally thousands of cases involving the dependency issue are pending before the Internal Revenue Service at various stages of administrative review. Many other similar cases are before the U.S. Tax Court and Federal district courts. In fact, just last month, the Tax Court of the United States was forced to issue an opinion in a dependency case where it had to state "that the ends of justice are not served by the present situation." In that case, a father contributed over $3,800 to the support of his four children who were living with his divorced wife. Most of this amount was paid pursuant to a divorce decree which had included an agreement between him and his wife that he would be entitled to claim the children as dependents for income tax purposes. In spite of the large amount of support paid by the father and the parties' agreement, the court was forced, and quite properly under present law, to deny these tax exemptions to the father. This conclusion was reached since the father was unable to show the total support of his children. Why had he failed to show this total support? Because he was apparently not able to obtain this essential information from his previous wife. Thus, he could not show the entire picture of support. His was indeed an impossible task—which led the court in its opinion to allude to H.R. 6056 and to indicate its hope that this bill would be enacted.

Not only do I share this expression of the court, but, in my opinion, a far more satisfactory result can well be reached in present cases, if the prior spouse or the Internal Revenue Service is required to furnish a parent with a statement indicating the nature and amount of support furnished and upon which the competing spouse equally claims the children as dependents. Then the parent would be able to determine if his contribution did constitute more than half of his child's support. If they did, he would be entitled to the exemption; would pursue his claim with the tax authorities, and would assuredly prevail. If the information supplied, coupled with his own facts, demonstrated that he did not contribute over half the support, he could abandon his present claim, not be forced into court, and thus save himself and the court a great deal of time and expense, as well as not have to undergo the strain and anxiety connected with any litigation. He would also be spared the bitter disappointment of being denied his children as dependents on the basis of a technical rule of evidence which requires him to bear the burden of proof.

In order for taxpayers to reach a proper decision and to avoid the harsh results experienced by parents because of lack of available evidence, I am proposing an amendment to H.R. 6056 which would provide a parent, faced with this problem today, with necessary information to determine if he has contributed more than one-half to the support of his child during the year. In effect, my amendment merely extends the exchange of information relief provided by H.R. 6056 for years after 1967, including that year, to cases that have already arisen or may arise for years prior to 1967. Under my amendment, a divorced or separated parent would be entitled to receive an itemized statement of expenditures upon which the other parent's claim for dependency exemption is based. If the other parent has not claimed the child, then the parent claiming the exemption would not be entitled to be furnished any such statement from another person, or from the IRS—my proposal applies only to

divorced or separated parents where both are presently claiming the child or children as dependents for taxable years prior to 1967 and neither will cooperate in determining what the total annual support for each child is for the prior year in question.

The relief provided by my proposal will only be available to such parents for taxable years prior to 1967 and whose tax years have not expired under the statute of limitations. Generally, the IRS has 3 years from when the return is filed in which to question a taxpayer's claimed exemptions or deductions. After that period of time has expired, unless fraud or a substantial tax underpayment is involved, the taxpayer's return cannot be questioned.

It is, therefore, not unlikely for a parent who filed his 1965 return and feels that his claimed exemptions for his children have been approved, to be contacted by IRS and have these exemptions challenged. He must then go about the trying task of showing his children's total support and when they are in custody of a spiteful spouse who has also claimed these children, his efforts are generally frustrated. My proposal would facilitate his attempts to arrive at a proper determination. It would also apply to the myriad of pending tax cases involving dependency credits, whether these cases are before the IRS or a court of law.

Subsequent dependency cases involving taxable year 1967 and thereafter will have available the general rule and relief provisions of H.R. 6056.

I think it is only fair that a taxpayer, in discharging his parental duty by contributing to his child's support, should have sufficient information made available when his dependency claim has been challenged by the IRS, particularly since this challenge generally arises because the former spouse is also claiming the child as a dependent for tax purposes. He should be able to determine if his support payments or other expenditures for his child are over 50 percent of the child's support. This can only be achieved if the amount of the other parent's support, upon which that parent's claim is based, is known or furnished to the competing parent. Of course, both parents would be equally entitled to such statements and, perhaps, this availability of information to each will provide the incentive for them to get together in the first place and resolve the matter. It should certainly prove so for future cases and for those cases that have already arisen, may well spur the competing parents to reach some solution without further wasting their own, the Service's and the court's time.

In today's tax arena, a parent cannot obtain any information from the IRS, and gets little or no data from his former spouse. He is left to his own devices and after many meetings with the IRS and even costly court action, he ends up being denied the exemptions—as in the case I mentioned above—and sometimes the parent may well have been entitled to the exemption. My proposed amendment goes a long way in helping those parents already engaged in this frustrating task of proving support by affording them the information required for them to present their entire case. This certainly serves the ends of justice which is not the case today. I therefore intend to propose my amendment when the Committee on Finance reports H.R. 6056.

I ask unanimous consent that the Tax Court decision to which I referred, *Robert I. Brown* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* (48 T.C. No. 5), and my amendment, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Tax Court decision in the case of Robert I. Brown against Commissioner of Internal Revenue, will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) If, for a taxable year described in subsection (b)—

"(1) the parents of a child (as defined in section 151(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) were divorced or legally separated under a decree of divorce or separate maintenance, or were separated under a separation agreement to which section 71(a)(2) of such Code applied, and

"(2) both of such parents claimed an exemption for such child under section 151(e) of such Code on his income tax return,

each such parent shall be entitled to receive, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, an itemized statement of the expenditures upon which the other parent's claim of such exemption is based.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply, in the case of any parent described in such subsection, only to taxable years beginning before January 1, 1967, with respect to which the period for filing by such parent of a claim for credit or refund of an overpayment of the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 has not expired on the date of the enactment of this Act."

The Robert J. Brown against Commissioner of Internal Revenue decision is as follows:

[Tax Court of the United States]

ROBERT I. BROWN, PETITIONER v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, RESPONDENT, 48 T. C. No. 5

[Docket No. 113–65, filed April 19, 1967]

Held, the evidence herein does not permit a determination either of a range or maximum amount expended for the total support of petitioner's children and petitioner is therefore not entitled to dependency exemptions.

John A. Wiethe, for the petitioner.

Richard M. Schwartz, for the respondent.

Tannenwald, *Judge:* Respondent determined a deficiency in petitioner's Federal income tax for 1962 in the amount of $817.22. After petitioner's concession of various issues raised by the notice of deficiency, the sole remaining issue is whether petitioner is entitled to dependency exemptions under section 151 [1] for his four children in 1962.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Petitioner was a legal resident of Lima, Ohio, at the time of filing the petition herein. He filed his 1962 Federal income tax return with the district director of internal revenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

Petitioner and Norma Peene Brown were married in 1957, separated in November 1961, and divorced on February 21, 1962. Petitioner and Norma had four children:

Child:	Born
Robert D	October 17, 1957.
David M	February 21, 1959.
Diana J	April 2, 1960.
Darryl P	August 18, 1961.

On February 14, 1962, petitioner and Norma entered into an agreement which was incorporated into the divorce decree and which provided, among other things, the following: (7) that Norma would have custody of the children, (2) that Norma would receive sole title to the house in Lima and the family automobile, (3) that petitioner would pay to her $300 per month for support of the children, (4) that petitioner would be entitled to "claim the minor children for Internal Revenue purposes," and (5) that petitioner would remain liable on all outstanding debts and obligations.

Until June 15, 1962, the four children continued to live with Norma in the house in Lima. On or about June 15, 1962, Norma and the children moved into the spacious home of Norma's parents in Coral Gables, Florida.

During 1962, petitioner contributed the following amounts toward the support of the children:

Payments to the clerk of the Allen County, Ohio, courts	$1,125.00
Payment via Norma's attorneys	1,765.00
Payment by petitioner's attorney	300.00
Payment directly to Norma	120.00
Medical insurance	70.00
Airplane tickets for David and Diana [1]	75.00
Payments by petitioner's mother:	
Clothing and shoes	48.85
Toys	15.49
Medical [2]	235.00
Utilities and laundry (four-fifths of $91.75)	73.40
Total	3,827.74

[1] Since these amounts represented bona fide loans from petitioner's mother, we have credited him with having paid these expenses.

[2] In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, we have assumed the utilities and laundry were used equally by each member of the household, i.e., Norma and the four children.

OPINION

This is another in a long series of cases in which the taxpayer husband is faced with a difficult and often impossible task. An essential prerequisite to sustaining his position is the proof that the amount he furnished for the support of his children constituted more than half of the total amount expended for their support. Section 152(a); *Bernard C. Rivers*, 33 T.C. 935 (1960). In attempting to satisfy this requirement, he usually starts with the handicap that his wife or her relatives are not likely to provide him with any information as to what they may have expended. The mountain which he must climb is made steeper by virtue of the adversary rules of a tax proceeding which make respondent's determination presumptively correct and place the burden of proof on the taxpayer. Added to this impediment is the further inhibiting factor that respondent is restricted by law from disclosing to the taxpayer information in his possession as to the amount of support which may have been provided by others (section 7213(a)), although, if a subpoena is served and the Court directs compliance therewith, respondent may be required to furnish such information. See *Blair* v. *Oesterlein Co.*, 275 U.S. 220, 227 (1927). The frustration thus generated is greater for the taxpayer than for the Court

[1] All references are to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

only because it is the taxpayer who has to lay out hard cash to pay any deficiency.

As to the period prior to June 15, 1962, the children lived in a house owned during the early part of 1962 by petitioner and Norma jointly and later by Norma singly. They had some use of the automobile, which was apparently similarly owned. However, no fair rental value for either the house or the automobile was shown. Moreover, although petitioner testified that Norma did not work, the record is silent as to whether she had any other income. But even if we assume that, during this period, petitioner was the sole support of the children and that everything he expended was for the support of the children, including amounts for mortgage and repair payments on the house and purchase and repair payments on the automobile (which we have not counted in view of the ownership interest involved), petitioner must still fail because of the state of the record as to the amount expended for the total support of the children after June 15.

Petitioner testified that he did not know how much was expended on his children in Florida subsequent to their moving into Norma's parents' house. However, he did visit them in Florida at Christmas time in 1962 and testified that their standard of living was "very good," although he also stated that it was not any different than what they had been accustomed to before. The parents appear to have been persons of means and their home was substantial. We recognize that a determination of the precise amount of total support of the children is not necessary. *Theodore Milgroom*, 31 T.C. 1256 (1959); *E. R. Cobb, Sr.*, 28 T.C. 595 (1957). But the unfortunate fact is that we are not able even to infer from the evidence presented herein either a range or an outside amount which was spent for the support of the children by people other than petitioner. As a consequence, *Commissioner* v. *Mendel*, 351 F. 2d 580 (C.A. 4, 1965), reversing 41 T.C. 32 (1963), so heavily relied on by petitioner, is clearly distinguishable. Cf. *Edward J. Pillis*, 47 T.C. —— (Mar. 31, 1967).

Nor is the agreement between petitioner and Norma that he was entitled to claim the children for Internal Revenue purposes binding upon the respondent, although legislation is pending which would so permit. See H.R. 6056, which passed the House of Representatives on March 14, 1967; see also H. Rept. No. 102, 90th Cong., 1st Sess., (1967). Similarly, we cannot presume that the circumstances in Coral Gables were the same as in Lima. Indeed, what evidence there is indicates the contrary. Moreover, unfair as it may seem, the mere fact that the support scenario was changed from that originally contemplated does not justify a holding for petitioner. Section 152(a) requires that we make our determination in terms of actual support expenditures rather than contemplated support arrangements.

We have no alternative but to hold that petitioner has failed to sustain his burden of proof. In so doing, we are constrained to comment that the ends of justice are not served by the present situation and to express our hope that the above-mentioned ameliorating legislation will be enacted.

Decision will be entered for the respondent.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill—S. 1681—to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished Senators from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and from Texas [Mr. TOWER] be added as cosponsors to S. 1668, a bill granting a Federal charter to Pop Warner Junior League Football, at its next printing.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of Senate Joint Resolution 80, the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors: Senators CLARK, BIBLE, and MONDALE.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. At the request of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on May 8, 1967, I introduced Senate bill 1700, to amend the Adult Education Act of 1966 in order to revise the allotment formula under the provisions of the act.

I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 1700, the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors: Senators MANSFIELD, BARTLETT, BENNETT, BOGGS, MCGEE, METCALF, MOSS, MUNDT, PROUTY, and SMITH.

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

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Isaac G. Stone, of Massachusetts, to be an examiner-in-chief, U.S. Patent Office, vice Joseph C. Manian, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, May 24, 1967, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HIRAM R. CANCIO, OF PUERTO RICO, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 24, 1967, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Hiram R. Cancio, of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. district judge, district of Puerto Rico, vice Clemente Ruiz-Nazario, resigned.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FURTHER HEARINGS ON BILINGUAL AMERICAN EDUCATION ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will hold a series of hearings in Texas during the latter part of May on S. 428, the Bilingual American Education Act.

Hearings on this bill begin tomorrow, May 18, and continue through Friday, May 19. Then on Friday, May 26, the subcommittee will go to Corpus Christi for a day of hearings at Memorial Coliseum. On May 29 it will meet at the Edinburg High School in Edinburg, and on May 31 it holds its final Texas hearing in San Antonio, at the probate courtroom of the Bexar County Courthouse.

Hearings in California and New York will be announced at a latter date.

Those wishing to testify or submit statements are asked to contact Allan Mandel or Gene Godley in room 4228 New Senate Office Building or at extension 5922.

NOTICE OF HEARING

EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS ON S. 382 AND SECTIONS 111–119 OF S. 1125

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on Thursday, May 25, 1967, in room 4230, New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m. the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare plans to take testimony on S. 382, introduced on January 17, 1967, by Senator CHURCH to amend Public Law 874 with respect to the amount to be deducted from payments pursuant to such law on account of certain Federal contributions. It is my understanding that he is joined in support of this measure by Senator JORDAN of Idaho.

In addition, the subcommittee will take testimony from administration witnesses on sections 111 through 119 of S. 1125, which I had the honor to introduce on behalf of the administration on February 28, 1967. These sections of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967 relate to the Teacher Corps program originally established under title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

At later dates, hearings will be held for public witnesses on all aspects of S. 1125. Those public witnesses who wish to be

heard on S. 382 on May 25, 1967, are urged to write the subcommittee at their earliest convenience at room 4226, New Senate Office Building, indicating their desire to be heard or to submit statements for the hearings record.

THE AMERICAN ERA ENDS IN GERMANY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President—

The American Era in Germany is dead. From now on, Germany will think and speak for itself.

These are the words of Charles W. Thayer, former American diplomat who knows West Germany well. In an article in the May 2 issue of Look magazine, entitled "The American Era Ends in Germany," Mr. Thayer describes the mood in Germany today. He also looks into the future with great perception and lists the three alternatives confronting Germany in foreign policy: a French alliance with an eventual unified Western European federation of fatherlands, neutralization, and the continuation of the Atlantic alliance with the United States. He discusses these three alternatives and concludes that while the relations between Washington and Bonn will never be the same again:

The passing of the American Era calls for no lamentations. Properly assessed, it will be a gain for all.

Mr. President, so that my colleagues interested in our relations with West Germany can read a most perceptive article, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article be inserted in the RECORD.

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

THE AMERICAN ERA ENDS IN GERMANY

(NOTE.—A former U.S. diplomat, who saw the West German republic born in 1949 and wrote a book called *The Unquiet Germans*, takes a bold look at the new regime in Bonn. He reports a growing wave of anti-Americanism. And he predicts: The Germans will in time swing back to their American friends, but their relationship to us will never be the same again.)

(By Charles W. Thayer)

I have just crisscrossed West Germany from the North Sea to the Alps. I talked with Germans of all ranks, from cabinet members to shopkeepers, and all political persuasions, from Socialists to radicals of the right. Many of them I had known 18 years ago, when I was U.S. liaison representative to the brand-new German government.

I come home convinced that the American Era in Germany is dead. From now on, Germany will think and speak for itself.

"We are sensitive people," Rainer Barzel, the floor leader of the dominant CDU party, complained to me impatiently. "We are sick and tired of your endless inquisitions."

The American Era began during the Occupation, with its American reeducators and food relief. After the educators had gone and the hunger had abated, the simple fact of American military power remained. Every German recognized that German security depended almost exclusively on our troops and nuclear weapons.

We came to regard Germany as an apt and willing pupil. When we called for troops, the Germans readily supplied them. When the gold drain struck, they agreed to offset purchases to help compensate for the gold losses. When we needed a claque to support measures unpopular abroad, the Bonn government dutifully applauded.

The pupil came to rely on the teacher. When a Bonn politician ran for election, his first move was a pilgrimage to Washington. If he was received in the White House, he was a shoo-in. If he got as far as the Secretary of State, he was at least a favorite. Whenever he had problems, the chancellor flew to Washington. If things went badly, he was subjected to various degrees of scolding by American officials; the worst punishment of all—a lecture by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

As time went on, the U.S. forgot that its pupil was growing up, and Germany in turn forgot that the teacher had problems elsewhere. The Germans began to notice that American-advocated policies did not always bring the hoped-for results. Despite NATO's buildup, reunification became more remote than ever. When the men of Bonn, at our urging, whipped up German enthusiasm for a United Europe, the plan failed, leaving Germany alone and frustrated. And after the Germans eagerly agreed to a Washington plan for sharing nuclear strategy, President Johnson, bowing to objections elsewhere, abandoned the scheme.

When the Germans accepted the so-called McNamara Committee as a means of sharing in NATO defense planning, they now claim all they got were more lectures from the U.S. Secretary of Defense.

Every time the U.S. made an effort to temper the cold war in negotiations with the Russians, the Germans became afraid that their interests were being sold behind their backs. Usually, their fears were groundless; sometimes, not. When the American President last October launched a new plea for conciliation with the Soviet Union, the West German Government learned of it from the newspapers.

And from time to time, self-appointed American inquisitors appeared to ask the Germans whether they had really confessed their guilt for Hitler's crimes, 20 years after the war.

American businessmen have not helped the situation. From Hamburg to Munich, I was bombarded with complaints about Texas millionaires buying into German firms and sending ambitious young American executives to make a fast profit. Overnight, old German officials of these firms find themselves replaced by outsiders, their careers destroyed. A British businessman summed it up bluntly: "The Germans may lack social grace, but you Americans lack business grace."

The accumulation of disappointments and hurt feelings has recently become acute. Older German leaders are disillusioned. The younger politicians are openly indignant. Their reaction has been to cheer a rapprochement with France, if only as a demonstration that they have cut loose from America's apron strings. "We can deal with the French, despite De Gaulle," a senior official said. "They know what they want. You Americans don't."

The climax of Germany's frustration has been the nonproliferation treaty to limit the spread of nuclear weapons. Most Bonners have been led to believe that the United States, after long secret negotiations with the Soviet Union, abruptly presented the Bonn government with the text of a treaty Germany would be expected to sign. In the opinion of German scientific experts, it would permanently cripple Germany's future peaceful nuclear industries. Along with the text, according to officials, came an American note saying that it would be extremely difficult if not impossible to make any amendments to meet possible German objections. This version is denied by American officials, but at this stage, denials seemed irrelevant.

Long before the text was known, a storm of angry denunciation against the U.S. broke out. A longtime British political observer in Bonn told me he had never experienced such a wave of anti-American feeling. When Prime Minister Harold Wilson visited the capital, he was treated to such a torrent of anti-American abuse from Finance Minister Franz Josef Strauss, once the Pentagon's darling, that he thought Strauss must be drunk. But next morning at breakfast, Strauss repeated the performance. To dispel any lingering doubts about his feelings, Strauss published a letter to Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger, threatening to resign if the treaty in its present form were signed.

Other ministers, acknowledging that Germany must sign or once again be branded as a warmonger—this time a nuclear warmonger—charged it had been tricked into a suicidal *fait accompli*. "A death warrant," aged ex-Chancellor Konrad Adenauer cried. One minister, with exaggerated, bone-chilling coldness, said to me: "We deeply regret your methods." Another, almost speechless with indignation, said to me privately that the United States was a common blackmailer.

If one were to take their denunciations at face value, one might suppose that not just the American Era but the entire American-German alliance was dead. But the hypersensitive, insecure regime in Bonn is panic-prone and predisposed to fits of hysteria. Few Germans understand the issue.

There is more than the frustration of the teacher-pupil relationship behind the great change that has now taken place in Germany. In the summer of 1966, a recession began. Coal mines shut down, consumption dropped, unemployment rose. Government tax revenues fell sharply, and the federal budget showed an alarming deficit.

Ten years ago, in my book *The Unquiet Germans*, I speculated on what would happen when the spectacular boom that Germany was enjoying gave way to the inevitable recession. Would the fragile young parliamentary regime survive, or would the Germans again seek a strong man to lead them out of hard times and into a place in the sun?

When the recession began last summer, the political machine began to creak almost at once. New voices, reminiscent of the Nazis, began to be heard in the provinces. I went back to see an answer to the question I had posed ten years earlier.

The recession that sparked Germany's current political crisis gave Chancellor Ludwig Erhard two equally unpopular alternatives: cut the lavish welfare payments of the affluent years or raise taxes.

For a fleeting moment, there seemed to be a third alternative. A substantial item in the budget was for purchases of arms in the U.S. to offset the cost of American troops in Germany. Erhard flew to Washington to request at least a temporary pause in these payments. President Johnson refused, and Erhard resigned. I asked Chancellor Erhard whether Johnson's rebuff was the cause of his downfall; he said no, adding ruefully: "But it certainly didn't help."

The new government, "the Grand Coalition," promptly cut welfare payments, balanced its budget and won at least initial approval from the press and the public. But the tension had already spread. All across the country, those strange voices so reminiscent of Hitler were being heard, angrily denouncing the Bonn Establishment. In its place, they offered a new party—the National Democratic party of Germany (NPD). Early in November, to the astonishment of political pollsters, the NPN won 7.9 percent of the votes in the Hessian state elections and placed eight members in the state parliament. Three weeks later, it won 7.4 percent of the votes in Bavaria and placed 15 members in its parliament. Immediately, alarmed cries went up in Bonn, in New York and Washington and even in Moscow that the Nazis were coming again.

Is the NPD really a revival of Hitler's Nazis? Its leaders have put out a "Manifesto" containing glib resolutions to all of Ger-

many's problems. Some are reasonable, some Utopian, some patently crackpot. Cleverly worded to stay within the constitutional definition of democracy, the Manifesto is ultrationalistic and, especially, anti-American. It demands protection of German youth from American gangster films; protection of the German character from undermining by "American Morgenthau-minded reeducators"; protection of German industry from American carpetbaggers; protection of Germany's treasury from American demands for the offset purchase of American "junk."

The NDP deplores "restitution gifts" to Israel, but carefully avoids any manifestations of anti-Semitism. It invites Jews to join the party and cautions its members not even to whisper anti-Semitic jokes in party gatherings.

Its members, numbering about 25,000, come largely from the lower middle class, with incomes between $150 and $250 per month (national average, about $125). They are also somewhat better educated than the average and are most numerous in the 45- to 60-year-old group. They are weakest in the younger age groups.

To find out what stands behind these statistics, I met with Adolf von Thadden and Otto Hess at the party headquarters in Hanover. "Hess and I run the party," Thadden told me. "No one else has anything to say." This was dramatically confirmed in March when the figurehead party chairman tried to fire Thadden, who moved to sack his boss.

I first met "Bubi" von Thadden in 1949. At a cocktail party I gave at that time, Thadden, who had obviously had a few martinis too many, sidled up to me and confided: "I'm going to be Germany's next Führer. At the moment, I'm too young, and Germany isn't yet ready. But in ten years, I'll be forty and then. . . ." He raised his eyebrows archly and tottered away.

Today, Thadden's indiscretion, which I published ten years ago, is frequently cited by analysts of the NPD as evidence of its real goals. "Our opponents make the most of it," Thadden admitted as soon as we had sat down in his spacious new office. But it did not seem to disturb him unduly.

"What Thadden really objects to," Hess said, "is your implication that he can't hold his liquor."

As though to demonstrate his prowess, Thadden reached into a cabinet behind him and pulled out a bottle of Scotch. For the next six hours, through innumerable Scotches and sodas, martinis and brandies, we sparred, usually civilly, sometimes more grimly, occasionally angrily.

Thadden is a tall, handsome, graying blond today—a little stouter than when we first met—with the polished, almost courtly, manners of a Prussian aristocrat. He likes to hold forth, particularly on world affairs. He is supremely self-confident.

Hess, in contrast, is a short, thickset man of 59, though he looks younger. His big head, set on powerful shoulders, is dominated by a wide, high forehead. His eyes are small but sharp, his mouth is long, straight and thin, as though cut by a sharp knife. His jaw is square and aggressive. I could not help thinking what a thug he must have been in the SA uniform he wore for 15 years.

Nazi party records show Thadden joined the party in 1939, at the age of 18. Possibly, he was enrolled en masse as a student without his knowledge, for he vigorously denies ever having been a member. He says his mother was strongly anti-Nazi and would have thrown him out of the house if he had joined. One of his half sisters was the only woman hanged after the July 20 revolt. A half brother was the first postwar president of the Protestant Church Council (*Kirchentag*).

Hess, however, admits he joined the party in 1930—three years before Hitler came to power. He worked in it till 1932, and then, after a personal quarrel, he quit the party apparatus but not the party and devoted his life to the Brownshirt SA, reaching the rank of *Obersturmbannführer* (equivalent to lieutenant colonel).

The blackest day of his life, he told me, was June 30, 1934, when the leader he revered, Ernst Roehm, chief of staff of the Brownshirt bullies, was murdered on Hitler's orders.

My impression is that Hess is the real brain of the NPD and Thadden its manager. Thadden's skill as an organizer is obviously considerable. While every other new radical party in Germany has dwindled to oblivion, the NPD, since its founding in 1964, has grown steadily.

"In 1966, we doubled our membership, and we'll double it again this year," Thadden said. "We could grow faster, but I don't want it to get out of hand. I've already had to expel a couple of dozen members for breaches of discipline—like making anti-Semitic remarks in public."

During our first few hours, Thadden's main theme was that the country should husband its rich industrial power to bargain with Russia. Also, the Munich Treaty of 1938, which ceded the Sudetenland to Germany, is still valid; the Oder-Neisse eastern boundary is illegal; and Red China should be recognized to demonstrate to Russia that a third great power is rising on her eastern flank.

The American Army in Germany could not hold off the Russians more than a day, says Thadden. Furthermore, only nuclear arms can stop the Russians, and what assurances does Germany have, he asks, that America would risk the destruction of New York to defend the Federal Republic? Germany should build its defenses around a bilateral treaty with De Gaulle, a man you can rely on. He made France strong by defying the United States. Germany's leaders should do the same.

Late in the evening, the conversation turned to Germany's Nazi past. By then, Thadden and Hess were more relaxed and outspoken. Hess said he had first heard of the extermination camp at Auschwitz in 1943. Not until 1945 had he discovered the full horror of the Nazis' treatment of the Jews. At last, he had realized what crimes had been committed with his unwitting support. He says that he repeatedly confessed those crimes and acknowledged his guilt to Allied inquisitors.

"But I can't go on confessing forever. I can't wear out my shinbones kneeling before the Jews for the rest of my life," he said, his voice rising. "I am human, too, and I have my self-respect to preserve like anyone else. Yet you Americans keep demanding that I, that we Germans confess our guilt again and again and again. You demand more than a man can endure," he cried, his fists clenched, his wide brow glistening with sweat.

Thadden broke in: "Recently, a friend in New York suggested to me that I take an oath on the Bible and on *The Diary of Anne Frank* to the American Rabbi Prinz that I would never again harm a Jew. How can I do that when I never harmed a Jew in my life?"

"It is demands like that," Hess said passionately, "that drive Germans to despair. It is the Jews themselves who are provoking anti-Semitism. You Americans should confess your own sins for the bombing of Dresden and Munich and Frankfurt."

I suggested that by his long complicity in Hitler's criminal movements, he had forfeited any right to pose as a leader or proclaim his brand of salvation. Hess's heavy shoulders hunched across the table, his nose inches from mine, his eyes flashing with fury: "What right have you Americans to preach your brand of salvation to us Germans? You are the Nazis of today, trying to impose on the whole world your so-called American-way-of-life." The last words were in English, his voice trembling.

Barring another cataclysm on the order of 1933, most politicians believe an NPD bid for power within the foreseeable future would be a farce. But security officials who are watching it hawklike are more cautious. If the economy does not soon improve, if the leadership falters, the NPD may easily win enough seats in the federal parliament in the next election to make itself a nuisance.

Another realistic danger is that nationalist-minded politicians, hearing the thunder on the Right, may try to steal some of it, if only to prevent their supporters from slipping away. Already, the tendency to strike ultranationalistic poses and urge ultranationalistic policies is evident among ambitious politicians even within the coalition.

Just how stable and how strong are the leaders of the Bonn Establishment? Chancellor Kiesinger, in 1933, was a 28-year-old law graduate in Berlin when he joined the Nazi party—a step he was to regret for the rest of his life. One of his former pupils has told me that he was an enthusiastic but unaggressive Nazi at the time. Unlike many, he had no material incentive for joining.

After the Roehm murder, which so upset Herr Hess, Kiesinger says he withdrew from the party, though he did not resign, and during the war did his utmost in a minor Foreign Office job to thwart or sabotage the party's directives. His foes allege that he continued in a high-level policy position throughout the war.

More relevant are Kiesinger's qualifications for his present key post. His friends, including some Americans, insist that there is not the slightest trace of authoritarianism in his character and that he is a confirmed believer in democracy. Others who know him well are unimpressed by his silver hair and sonorous oratory and find him vain, sensitive and moody. He dislikes reading long memorandums and making difficult decisions and is apt to lack force in a crisis. Thus far, he has proven forceful and adept at harmonizing the divergent views of the two parties in his coalition.

Willy Brandt, the new vice chancellor and foreign minister and leader of the coalition's Social Democrats, also has a past that gives him trouble. A Socialist from youth, he took refuge in Norway when Hitler's Gestapo got on his trail. His critics, alleging that he bore arms against his country, charge he was a renegade. More just and courageous colleagues, including his rival Kiesinger, reject the charge, saying that in the circumstances, they would have acted as Brandt did.

Brandt is less bouncy and more poised than when he was the boy-wonder of the Socialists in 1949. But he has lost none of his charm, his infectious enthusiasm and his sense of humor. A sound, if not profound, diplomatist, he does not suffer glady the nitpicking lawyers who infest his ministry and confuse legalisms with foreign policy.

If, as some critics claim, Brandt lacks depth as a politician, his deputy party leader, Herbert Wehner, also a cabinet member, more than makes up for it. Wehner, too, is a man with a past. An active Communist in the thirties, he became the youngest member of the German Communist Politburo, then in exile in Moscow. During the purges, threatened with liquidation by Stalin, Wehner fled to Sweden and renounced communism. After the war, he returned to Germany and promptly joined the Social Democratic party. When I first met him in Bonn in 1949, he was the party's specialist on Communist affairs. I worked closely with him for several years on East-West problems and found him by far the best informed and soundest expert on the Soviet Union in Germany.

Trained in the roughest, toughest, most subtle school of politics—the Communist party apparatus—Wehner is a master political strategist. He is not an easy man to know or deal with. Sensitive to the point of neurosis, intolerant of stupidity, he has no time for amateurs. Usually grim, with flashes of

biting humor, he is passionately committed to his party and, as an apostate Communist, is a fierce champion of the parliamentary system.

The fourth leader of the coalition, Franz Josef Strauss, has no prewar past, but his postwar record makes him the most controversial of them all. Brilliant, frighteningly ambitious, the bullnecked young Bavarian has frequently been in trouble because of his arrogant behavior. Once, as Adenauer's defense minister, he chastised a policeman who assumed that ministers were not exempt from traffic rules. The German press and public sided with the policeman. In a more serious affray, he charged a magazine critical of him, *Der Spiegel*, with treasonable conduct, connived at the arrest of its responsible editor and then blandly denied all in parliament. When the truth emerged, Strauss was out of the cabinet.

As leader of the CSU, the Bavarian ally of Kiesinger's CDU, Strauss is politically powerful. Thanks to the CSU's support, Kiesinger wes elected chancellor; Strauss won the title of kingmaker and regained a cabinet post.

While his friends claim that he has learned his lesson in deportment, others, including many north Germans, suspect that his ruthless ambition still prevails over his political principles. Some years ago, I bet Erich Mende, now leader of the tiny FDP (Free Democratic Party) opposition, $100 that Strauss would be chancellor by 1972. Mende still thinks he will win the bet, but admits the odds on Strauss are once again rising.

Some observers have doubts about the stability of this Bonn government because of the conspicuous absence of leaders trained in business or intellectual pursuits. One of the immediate causes of the collapse of the Weimar Republic was the alienation and treachery of some of Germany's industrial leaders, who threw their support to Hitler. How do today's big businessmen regard the Bonn Establishment? To get an answer, I talked to Berthold Beitz, managing director of Krupp, to Dr. Fischer-Czernin of DEMAG and to an old friend, Gunter Henle, who runs and, with his family, owns Klöckner, one of the largest steel concerns after Krupp and DEMAG.

I asked all three why so few industrialists entered government either as managers in the administration or as elected representatives. They all denied that the businessmen's absence from Bonn indicates any basic antagonism between business and government. Some are too involved in their family firms. Others cannot afford to give up top jobs because in Germany, unlike the United States, industry will not hold positions open or offer new jobs when government service comes to an end.

Another group conspicuous by their absence from the Bonn regime, as they were from the Weimar government, are the intellectuals. Rarely can you find a college professor, a writer or historian in government service. When I asked one of the exceptions, Professor Herbert Weichmann, mayor of Hamburg, about this, he deplored their absence and explained that, like businessmen, professors who leave their chairs to go into government find it extremely difficult to get reemployed academically when their public service is finished. The yawning chasm between the intellectual community and the government—except perhaps in scientific fields—the most knowledgeable foreign observers told me, is probably the gravest flaw in Germany's political structure today.

When I questioned Chancellor Kiesinger about this, he first said, "The oft-cited gap between the government and the intellectuals is a cliché which will not withstand close examination.

"However," he went on, "it is the case that a large number of German men of letters do have a negative relationship to the present state."

I asked what he, himself an intellectual, proposed to do about the problem, and he answered, "One can only interpret policy convincingly and draw intellectuals in some unconventional manner into collaboration." At least in this instance, I did not find his policy too convincing.

Where will the Kiesinger-led Grand Coalition lead Germany? As behooves any new foreign minister, Willy Brandt, with much fanfare, proclaimed two innovations in his foreign policy. As a starter came diplomatic relations with the Eastern European countries, to improve the atmosphere for eventual reunification of Germany. The first step in implementing the eastern move was the opening of relations with Rumania. Originally, the Adenauer regime had accepted the American thesis that only through strength in the West could reunification in the East be accomplished. The thesis proved false, and even John Foster Dulles of "roll-back-the-Communists" fame urged Adenauer to extend his contacts with his Communist neighbors. The new eastern policy therefore implies no conflict with U.S. views.

The second innovation was rapprochement with France. Erhard argued that the U.S., not France, was the key to German defense and that, politically and economically, France had little or nothing to offer. When the new government was formed, the Erhard policy was reversed. Kiesinger and Brandt went to Paris, talked with De Gaulle and returned triumphantly, proclaiming that De Gaulle had agreed to help sponsor Germany's new advances in the East. What fruits the new French rapprochement will bring remain to be seen.

Unlike the eastern approach, the Paris-Bonn rapprochement was, I believe, a deliberate signal that the American Era has ended and a new era in German foreign policy has begun.

Veteran German diplomats are not all enthusiastic about the Kiesinger-Brandt debut in foreign policy. It is, they say, a public relations campaign under the slogan "Be nice": Be nice to France, but stick to NATO, which France deplores; be nice to Britain and support her entry into the Common Market, which France opposes; be nice to the Eastern European states, but stand firm against the Oder-Neisse line.

Germany, the veterans believe, has three alternatives among which she must one day choose:

1. A French alliance and perhaps, at some time, a unified Western European Third Force in a federation of fatherlands.

2. Neutralization and peace with the U.S.S.R.

3. The Atlantic Alliance with the U.S.

The first would fulfill the German moral need for French reconciliation and would at least partially satisfy a longing to crawl back into the womb of Mother Europe. The second would mean the loss of the Oder-Neisse territories and even East Germany. But it would take West Germany out of the cold war and into an idyllic Swiss form of neutrality, in which to make money and prosper. This alternative is rejected by the present leaders, who regard it as the start of a slow, relentless slide down a slippery slope that ends in Russia's lap. But many Germans to whom I talked spoke forcefully of the need for realism.

Seated in the directors' dining room of a well-known Frankfurt international banking house, a young, keen and pro-American German said to me: "The eastern territories, we all know, are gone. East Germany is a separate state, growing more self-reliant every day. Let us be honest and recognize these facts and get on with our business."

Many young people find the division of their country not too exorbitant a price if it means a tranquil future in which to pursue their careers. Many older people, too, I believe, are tired to death of living on the front line facing the Communist camp. To them, peace is worth almost any price.

The third alternative, to maintain the Atlantic Alliance with America, has never lived up to its promise of peace and reunification. It has, as we have seen, produced irritation, frustration and disappointment. But it is the only alternative that provides security against eventual absorption by the Soviet Union, Germany's permanent nightmare. My impression is that, at present, it is the prevailing choice of the German public outside the Bonn hothouse.

Behind the current wave of outraged anti-Americanism, I suspect, are elements of a lovers' quarrel. Considering itself neglected by us, Germany, in a fit of pique, has ostentatiously turned to our rival, De Gaulle. But when, as seems likely, the new beau fails to live up to expectations, and America, less absorbed in Asia, pays a little more attention to its European relations, Germany will return to its old partner.

"For the first time in Germany's history, we have a great power as a friend," Gen. Adolph Heusinger, retired head of the defense force, told me. "We cannot afford to relinquish that alliance."

But the relations between Washington and Bonn will never be the same again. In the future, when the German Federal Republic speaks for itself, it will speak independently and occasionally forcefully, but hopefully, with restraint. Hopefully, too, the United States, freed from its self-imposed parental responsibilities, will have learned to treat its sensitive ally with becoming tact and to consider Germany's claims not—as the Soviet Union whines with mock timidity—the war whoops of resurgent neo-Nazi nationalism but the legitimate aspirations of a nation grown up. The passing of the American Era calls for no lamentations. Properly assessed, it will be a gain for all.

TRUTH-IN-LENDING LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL SHOULD BE ENACTED INTO LAW

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, while most American families try to avoid personal debt, more and more Americans have become accustomed to making installment payments on practically every sort of purchase from home mortgages to department store revolving charge accounts. Consumer debt now totals $312 billion and the annual interest payments alone amount to $22 billion. Because of inadequate regulations, consumers are frequently unaware of the amount they are paying in interest charges, which are often stated in confusing or misleading terms. For example, a customer may be told that the finance rate is 1½ percent per month when the actual yearly rate of interest may be as high as 36 percent. In many instances consumers involved in long-term installment plans end up paying more in accumulated interest payments than the original price of the product itself.

Unfortunately, it is not possible for every housewife and family breadwinner to be a financial expert or mathematical genius. In fact the junior Senator from Ohio never won acclaim in school or college for proficiency in mathematics. Thus, most people are often at the mercy of experts who have spend long years devising means of confusing them. Consumers should not find it necessary to be actuaries or mathematicians in order to understand the exact rates of interest they are charged.

The cost of credit should be disclosed fully, simply, and clearly. For that reason, I have cosponsored the truth-in-

lending bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] which is now being considered in the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

This beneficent legislative proposal which would require that a seller or lender disclose the complete interest cost in dollars and cents on a loan or purchase and also the exact rate of interest stated as an annual percentage rate is most definitely in the public interest. It should be noted by critics of the bill that it does not provide for any Federal regulation of the amount of interest that could be charged; only that the actual amount must be disclosed to the consumer or borrower. It would permit the cost of credit to be freely determined by informed borrowers and responsible lenders. It would strengthen the efficiency of our credit markets without restraining them. It would in no way affect businessmen or lenders who are presently being entirely candid with borrowers.

Mr. President, 8 years ago the first truth-in-lending bill was introduced in the Senate by one of the great Senators of all time, former Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, who introduced it in every succeeding Congress. In his testimony earlier this year before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Senator Douglas, in his usual concise manner, summarized the need for this legislation when he said:

> The basic philosophy behind truth-in-lending is a belief in free enterprise and in the price system. But if markets are to function properly, there must be a free flow of information. Perfect competition requires perfect information. Of course, perfect competition does not exist anywhere in our economy. Nevertheless, it is an ideal towards which public policy should work. By removing imperfections and frictions we permit free markets to achieve their maximum effect. By increasing the amount of information on consumer credit, we will remove a major imperfection in the market place.

For 8 years this legislative proposal has been languishing in Congress. It is high time for it to be enacted into law and that American families be given the break they deserve. There is crying need in behalf of the consuming public that this greatly needed legislative proposal be enacted into law without delay.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

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

INDEFENSIBLE TAX LOOPHOLE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the biggest loophole in our tax laws is the 27.5 percent depletion allowance for the oil and gas industry, which costs taxpayers $4 billion annually. While ordinary taxpayers willingly pay their taxes, incredible as it may seem, the total legal tax avoidance of the petroleum industry through this and other methods of favoritism has been estimated to exceed $10 billion a year.

It is amazing, but often the cost of an oil well is deducted not once or twice, but often as many as 19 times over again. If this is proper, why not permit businessmen to write off for tax purposes the cost of their equipment and factories and then repeat that process. Furthermore, this special privilege is granted to oil- and gas-producing companies on the claim that sometime their assets will be depleted, hence a 27.5-percent tax exemption bonus. Working men and women now heavily taxed may have 45 or 50 years at most to accumulate savings. No depletion allowance is given them as the years lengthen and perhaps their earnings decrease.

Huge oil-producing companies have been reaping rich harvests due to this tax loophole. Recently, in a 2-year period one oil corporation with a net income after taxes of $40 million paid only $175,000 in taxes. In 1964, another oil corporation with a net profit of $5 million paid only $43,000 in taxes. In other words, less than 1 percent. Here is a tax privilege not enjoyed by other corporations or any individuals. The total income taxes paid over the past 4 years by the seven greatest oil-producing companies averaged only 4 percent of net profits. The average corporation pays 48 percent annually on its net profits. If the average American family paid only 4 percent of income, we might feel we were bearing no tax burden whatever, but our Nation would soon be bankrupt.

Years ago as Congressman at Large from Ohio, and since my election to the Senate, I have spoken out and voted in favor of abolishing this depletion allowance altogether and plugging this tax loophole. When these efforts failed, I have voted for reducing the depletion allowance to 15 percent for the great oil- and gas-producing corporations and permitting somewhat larger allowances for smaller corporations.

Mr. President, continuing the 27½-percent allowance for oil- and gas-producing companies is an affront to every taxpayer. I fervently hope that it will soon be buried unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

LACK OF UNITED NATIONS ROLE IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, on Monday, the distinguished majority leader spoke with regard to the United Nations and its possible role in the struggle in which the United States finds itself in Vietnam.

I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Montana for his remarks in that regard and, for the most part, associate myself with his remarks.

For some time I have been deeply concerned about the lack of support to the United States from the United Nations.

On January 4, I addressed a letter to the American representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Goldberg:

I put to him a series of questions as to the United Nations attitude toward the Vietnam war, and also as to the attitude of the American delegation to the United Nations toward the United Nations role in the Vietnam war.

In the communication, I asked Mr. Goldberg this question:

> Is the war in Vietnam a United Nations war, or is it a United States war only?

Ambassador Goldberg replied:

> The war in Vietnam is neither a United Nations war nor a "United States only war."

Then he added:

> While we are making the major contribution, substantial contributions have been made by a number of South Vietnam's closest neighbors who are most directly concerned with the conflict. Some 50,000 men are in the field from five of these nations.

But in analyzing this figure of 50,000 troops of what Mr. Goldberg calls "South Vietnam's closest neighbors who are most directly concerned with the conflict," we find that of all the troops aside from those being supplied by the United States and by South Vietnam, 47,000 come from Korea.

The others involved, in the way of sending troops to Vietnam, are Australia, with at the present time some 6,000 or 7,000—at that time it was less; the Philippines, with about 4,000; and New Zealand, with only a token force.

But with respect to combat troops, only the United States and Korea are involved in Vietnam.

This is the second question I put to Mr. Goldberg:

> Does the United Nations consider North Vietnam an aggressor nation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Ambassador Goldberg replied:

> The United Nations has taken no formal position on the Vietnam war.

The chief purpose of the United Nations is to be a force to maintain peace or to obtain peace. Yet, it has taken no formal position on the Vietnam war.

My next question to Ambassador Goldberg was this:

> Has the delegation of the United States to the United Nations officially sought United Nations military help in Vietnam?

We are more heavily committed at this time than we were then, but at that time we had roughly 400,000 ground troops involved in Vietnam. So it seems to me appropriate to ask, "Has the delegation of the United States to the United Nations officially sought United Nations military help in Vietnam?"

Ambassador Goldberg replied:

> Because of the sharply divided opinions of United Nations members, it is not realistic to seek a United Nations military role.

So the U.S. Government, while committing hundreds of thousands of troops to Vietnam, and while paying 31 percent of the cost of the United Nations, has not persisted in efforts to brand North Vietnam an aggressor nation, saying it is not

realistic to seek military help from the United Nations.

Our representative does not even ask for United Nations help. He does not take the floor of the United Nations Assembly or stand in the councils of the United Nations Security Council and officially demand that this world organization, which was designed to keep the peace, give some help to the United States.

The next question I asked Ambassador Goldberg was this:

Has the United Nations Delegation advocated economic sanctions against North Vietnam?

Ambassador Goldberg's reply amounted to one word—"No."

The U.S. representative to the United Nations has, however, demanded economic sanctions against Rhodesia. Our Government has not sought sanctions against North Vietnam, through whose ports flow many of the war materials killing Americans in South Vietnam. No, we have not done that. But our representative in the United Nations has demanded sanctions against the peaceful little country of Rhodesia. This was done, of course, at the request of Great Britain. In discussing this matter, Ambassador Goldberg said:

The United Kingdom, which has primary responsibility for this problem—

The problem of Rhodesia—

has turned to the U.N. for assistance.

Because the United Kingdom turned to the United Nations for assistance, the U.S. representative took the floor of the Security Council and demanded economic sanctions against Rhodesia, a country at peace with the United States.

Yet Ambassador Goldberg has consistently refused to demand economic sanctions against North Vietnam, a country which is at war with the United States; a country at whose hands the United States suffered 35,000 casualties in 1966; a country at whose hands the casualty rate, if it continues as it has for the first 4 months—let us pray to God that it will not—will mean 65,000 casualties for the year 1967.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has made a speech which has arrested the attention of the Senate. I congratulate him upon contributing his wisdom and eloquence upon this subject. The able Senator has just cited the tragic losses of 1966 and has projected the possible further tragedy for 1967.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. GORE. The senior Senator from Tennessee recalls how with a chill and a sadness he heard that the Chinese hordes were crossing the Yalu River in the Korean war. The Senator from Virginia has raised his voice and is raising it now, as I understand the thrust of his speech, in the hope that such a dangerous potentiality will not pose itself in stark reality again. If, unfortunately—which God forbid—a war between the United States and China resulted from the conflict in Southeast Asia, can the Senator from Virginia foresee what the casualties might be in that event?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I do not think that anyone can foresee what the casualties would be in that event. I do not think that anyone can foresee with too much accuracy what the casualties would be if we continue as we have in the past 2 years in Vietnam.

Mr. GORE. They would be incalculable.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. In either event they would be very severe and devastating.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it seems to me that the other nations of the world and this great world organization, which was designed to keep the peace, have an obligation to the United States, and not only to the United States, but also to the rest of the world to take an active role in settling the grave struggle in which the United States is now involved in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I have been a strong supporter of the United Nations. I returned from Okinawa to San Francisco on the same day that the United Nations came into being in May 1945. It was my hope at that time that this world organization would make it unnecessary for other Americans—and for that matter, persons from other parts of the world—to have to leave their homes and their shores again to go overseas to fight.

Mr. President, I think all of us would agree that the great hope which so many people held for the establishment of an effective world organization has not been borne out, but the time is not too late, as I see it. The United Nations, if it has a will, still could play an effective role.

On January 31, 1966, the United States introduced a resolution before the Security Council calling for a conference among appropriate governments to consider the establishment of durable peace in Southeast Asia based on the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962. The resolution recommended that the first order of business at such a conference be a suspension of hostilities in Vietnam under effective supervision.

This U.S. resolution was placed on the Security Council agenda by a vote of 9 to 2, with 4 abstentions. The Soviet Union and Bulgaria opposed; France, Mali, Uganda, and Nigeria abstained.

Because of the Soviet opposition expressed in that vote and in subsequent informal discussions, the United States did not press the matter further.

It did not force the Soviet Union, which has time and again told the world that it desired peace in Vietnam and endorsed the Geneva accords, to go on record as opposing our resolution which would provide just that.

Nor has the United States made any effort to bring this resolution before the General Assembly where the Soviet veto has no force.

Instead it has allowed the United States to be unjustly accused by such United Nations spokesman as Secretary General U Thant of obstructing negotiations and chances for peace in Southeast Asia.

I submit that if the activity of the United Nations is to be obtained in helping in Vietnam, the U.S. Government must show greater interest and activity along this line than it has in the past.

I hope that under the prodding, and as a result of the able address made on Monday by the distinguished majority leader, that the State Department, Ambassador Goldberg, and the President will determine to seek effective action and effective help from the United Nations.

If the United Nations is to be a force for peace, the place to start is where the action is, and the action is in Vietnam, and the time to start is now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letter of January 4, 1967, to Ambassador Goldberg and his reply of January 18, 1967.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
January 4, 1967.

HON. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
U.S. Representative to the United Nations, United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y.

MY DEAR AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG: This could, and should, be brief. But I feel I should first say this: The facts show that your appointment to the United States Supreme Court and to the United Nations had my approval. My feeling about the United Nations has been recorded many times: Having returned from Okinawa to San Francisco at the time the United Nations was formed, it held for me high hopes that another generation of Americans would not be called upon to serve their country in war.

I assume we are in agreement that the United States is at war in Viet Nam. On that assumption, may I seek your candid judgment on the following:

1. Is the war in Viet Nam a United Nations war, or is it a United States war only?

2. Does the United Nations consider North Viet Nam an aggressor nation?

3. Has the delegation of the United States to the United Nations officially sought United Nations military help in Viet Nam?

4. Has the United States delegation advocated economic sanctions against North Viet Nam? I note that you, as the United States representative to the United Nations, advocated economic sanctions against Rhodesia.

5. Does the United States delegation to the United Nations think the United Nations should adopt sanctions against North Viet Nam?

6. Has the United States delegation officially protested the support given Hanoi by Poland which is shipping weapons to North Viet Nam in increasing quantities?

A forthright reply from you would be most helpful to me in seeking to carry out my responsibilities as a United States Senator from Virginia. Our nation has suffered 40,000 casualties in Viet Nam. Nearly 400,000 Americans are now in South Viet Nam and nearly 300,000 have returned from Service there. The lives of all young Americans (and their parents) are being seriously affected by the Viet Nam war.

Cordially,

HARRY F. BYRD.

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS,

January 18, 1967.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, Jr.,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Thank you for your letter of January 4. Although the questions you have raised are closely interrelated, I shall endeavor to give separate answers to them.

1. The war in Viet Nam is neither a United Nations war nor a "United States only" war. It is a war in which we and others are assisting the South Vietnamese Government and people to defend themselves against forcible interference by the North, pursued both through external intervention and promotion of internal conflict. The request of the Government of South Viet Nam for our current military assistance was made in response to increasing North Vietnamese military involvement in the South. This appeal was answered properly and legally by several nations, including the United States.

While we are making the major contribution, substantial contributions have been made by a number of South Viet Nam's closest neighbors who are most directly concerned with the conflict. Some 50,000 men are in the field from five of these nations.

2. The United Nations has taken no formal position on the Vietnamese war. The United States has made several efforts to obtain United Nations action on the Viet Nam conflict, but our efforts have consistently been obstructed by the Soviet Union which, as you know, has a veto in the Security Council. The United States would be willing, indeed delighted, to see the United Nations assume a more active role, particularly in the task of reaching a solution which would allow the South Vietnamese to express their own views about their own future free of any external pressures.

3. Because of the sharply divided opinions of United Nations members, it is not realistic to seek a United Nations military role. It may, of course, be possible for the United Nations to contribute in a peacekeeping capacity to help ensure implementation of any final solution. In the meantime, we believe the most practical use we can make of the UN is to encourage the Secretary-General to take whatever steps he can to bring about a peaceful settlement. I did this most recently in my letter to him of December 31, a copy of which I enclose.

4. Mandatory economic sanctions can be imposed only by the United Nations Security Council. It is perfectly clear that any request for the imposition of such sanctions against North Viet Nam would be vetoed by the Soviet Union. Therefore, while we would naturally welcome a decision by the United Nations to impose sanctions against North Viet Nam, as a practical matter we know that this cannot be done. For our part, we have unilaterally undertaken numerous high-level approaches to various countries in an effort to limit trade and shipping with North Viet Nam.

5. You have also noted that the United States supported economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. I appreciate this opportunity to tell you why I think the United Nasions decision to invoke selective mandatory sanctions was both feasible and right. The United Kingdom, which has primary responsibility for this problem, has turned to the UN for assistance. In contrast to the case of Viet Nam, the attitude of the other permanent members of the Security Council made it possible to adopt measures to deal with the Rhodesian situation. We supported this UN action because we concluded it was in our national interest to do so. What is happening in Rhodesia now is an effort to perpetuate the control of six per cent of the population over the other ninety-four per cent, and to do so on racial lines. To condone such a denial of self-determination by an illegal regime and to permit extension of racial domination in a new state in Africa could turn the current tide of moderation in other parts of Africa and create a situation in which extremism, racism and irresponsibility would thrive. I have long been convinced—and this conviction has geen reinforced by my experience at the United Nations—that we, as a great power, must be concerned with the great crises of the world—or risk losing respect and influence among other nations. Because Rhodesia is an enormous problem for many countries, because those countries look to the United States to assume a position of just and wise leadership when such problems are discussed, because the United Nations was in a position to help, and because our own policies and interest accorded, I believe we were right to support United Nations sanctions.

6. As for the final matter which you raise, the United States has on a number of occasions in Washington, New York and Warsaw raised the question of Polish support for North Viet Nam and urged the Poles to exert their efforts on behalf of a peaceful settlement. Those efforts with Poland and many other countries have not so far been fruitful.

I hope these comments will help to answer the questions which are troubling you. If you desire any further clarifications, I should be glad to hear from you again.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG.

IMPROVED BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES SERVING IN HIGH-RISK SITUATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as long as the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is on the floor, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 226, Senate bill 1785. It was because of his great interest and perspicacity in this matter—a matter into which he dug into facts, in large part, overlooked by the committee—that it was referred back to the committee for further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1785) to improve certain benefits for employees who serve in high-risk situations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I endorse the bill and urge its enactment in the form in which it is now before the Senate.

I did raise objections to the bill previously because when it was reported it contained a section which would have allowed special combat pay running as high as $6,000 per year for civilians in the Vietnam area. I felt that the first bill with such a recommendation was preposterous. I called the attention of the committee to the fact that under the mathematical consequences that provision—which has now been eliminated—would have provided up to 50 percent extra compensation for civilian employees in the Vietnam area.

The mathematics of that would be as follows: Class 1 Foreign Service officers presently have a base pay of $25,890. Under the 50-percent clause under the earlier bill they could have received $12,945 extra.

Under existing law they can now get up to 25 percent extra for their overseas assignment. This would give to that class 1 Foreign Service officer $12,945, half of which was the so-called combat pay.

Class 2 Foreign Service officers would have received $5,840 extra so-called combat pay over and above their regular overseas allowance.

These extra payments would have brought these class 1 and class 2 Foreign Service officers a total amount, respectively, of $38,835 and $35,040. Significantly this is substantially more than General Westmoreland receives for directing the military service in Vietnam.

As a comparison, our military personnel in Vietnam, from General Westmoreland on down to private, first class, get $65 a month hostile fire pay.

The men on the frontlines get $65 a month hostile fire pay. It seems ridiculous that civil service employees serving in Saigon or other areas there would be drawing so-called combat pay of $500 a month.

When I called these examples to the attention of the committee they unanimously agreed to delete this section.

With that deletion I support the remaining parts of the bill in its present form.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart outlining the various pay scales which would have been effective had this section not been deleted be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SALARIES OF TOP CIVILIAN OFFICIALS IN VIETNAM

STATE DEPARTMENT

Ambassador: $30,000.
Deputy Ambassador: $25,890(?).
Director, Pacification Program: $25,890(?).
Deputy Director, Office of Civilian Operations: $23,935+$5,983(25%)+$2,900 (family maintenance allowance)=$32,773.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Director: $27,000 + $6,750(25%) + $3,300 (family maintenance allowance)=$37,050.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Director: $25,890 + $6,472(25%) + $3,300 (family maintenance)=$35,362.
Deputy Director: $25,890+$6,472(25%)+$3,900 (family maintenance allowance)=$36,262.

Foreign Service officers	50 percent	Total
Class 1, $23,935 to $25,890	$12,945	$38,835
Class 2, $19,333 to $23,360	11,680	35,040
Class 3, $15,841 to $19,141	9,570	28,711
Class 4, $12,873 to $15,561	7,780	23,341
Class 5, $10,602 to $12,810	6,405	19,215
Class 6, $8,843 to $10,667	5,333	16,000
Class 7, $7,473 to $8,979	4,489	13,468
Class 8, $6,451 to $7,729	3,864	11,593

BASIC PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF SELECTED MILITARY PERSONNEL IN VIETNAM

General Westmoreland (four stars)

Basic pay—$2,001.60.
Quarters allowance—$201.00.
Separation allowance—$30.00.
Subsistence allowance—$47.88.
Personal money allowance—$183.33.
Hostile fire pay—$65.00.
Total monthly: $2,528.81=$30,345.72 per year.

Westmoreland's deputy (three stars)

Basic pay—$1,766.10.
Quarters allowance—$201.00.
Separation allowance—$30.00.
Subsistence allowance—$47.88.
Personal money allowance—$41.67.
Hostile fire pay—$65.00.
Total monthly: $2,151.65=$25,819.80 per year.

Major general (over 20 years' service)

Basic pay—$1,592.40.
Quarters allowance—$201.00.
Separation allowance—$30.00.
Subsistence allowance—$47.88.
Hostile fire pay—$65.00.
Total monthly: $1,936.28=$23,235.36 per year.

Colonel (over 20 years' service)

Basic pay—$1,059.90.
Quarters allowance—$170.10.
Separation allowance—$30.00.
Subsistence allowance—$47.88.
Hostile fire pay—$65.00.
Total monthly: $1,372.88=$16,474.56 per year.

Captain (over 6 years' service)

Basic pay—$441.60.
Quarters allowance—$130.05.
Separation allowance—$30.00.
Subsistence allowance—$47.88.
Hostile fire pay—$65.00.
Total monthly: $714.53=$8,574.36 per year.

Sergeant first class (over 16 years' service)

Basic pay—$442.70.
Quarters allowance—$114.90.
Separation allowance—$30.00.
Foreign duty pay—$22.50.
Hostile fire pay—$65.00.
Total monthly: $655.10=$7,861.20 per year.

Private first class (under 2 years' service)

Basic pay—$121.80.
Foreign duty pay—$9.00.
Hostile fire pay—$65.00.
Total monthly: $195.80=$2,349.60 per year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a report by the State Department, as furnished to the chairman of the committee, showing the rates of the various overseas allowances under existing law be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR INTERSTATE DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1967.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity of appearing before your committee yesterday in support of S. 1209.

In response to your request I attach a list of the overseas differential posts and the rates prescribed for such posts as of April 1, 1967.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM O. HALL,
Assistant Administrator for Administration.

Attachment: (1) Foreign Service Differential Post.

Foreign service differential posts

Abidjan, Ivory Coast	15
Accra, Ghana	15
Adana, Turkey	10
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	15
Aden, Aden	25
Aleppo, Syrian Arab Republic	10
Algiers, Algeria	15
Amman, Jordan	10
Baghdad, Iraq	25
Baida-Cirene	20
Bamako, Mali	25
Bangkok, Thailand	15
Bangui, Central African Republic	25
Barranquilla, Colombia	10
Basra, Iraq	25
Bathurst, the Gambia	10
Belem, Brazil	25
Belize, British Honduras	15
Benghazi Libya	10
Blantyre, Malawi	10
Bogota, Colombia	10
Bombay, India	10
Brazzaville, Congo	20
Bucharest, Rumania	15
Budapest, Hungary	10
Bujumbura, Burundi	25
Bukavu, Democratic Republic of the Congo	25
Calcutta, India	20
Cali, Colombia	10
Caracas, Venezuela	10
Cebu, Philippines	15
Chiengmai, Thailand	20
Cochabamba, Bolivia	20
Colombo, Ceylon	15
Conakry, Guinea	25
Constantine, Algeria	20
Cotonou, Dahomey	25
Dacca, Pakistan	25
Dakar, Senegal	10
Damascus, Syrian Arab Republic	10
Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania	15
David, Panama	10
Dhahran, Saudi Arabia	25
Djakarta, Indonesia	25
Douala, Cameroon	20
Enugu, Nigeria	20
Fort Lamy, Chad	25
Freetown, Sierra Leone	25
Gaberones, Botswana	10
Georgetown, Guyana	25
Guayaquil, Ecuador	20
Hargeisa, Somali Republic	25
Ibadan, Nigeria	20
Isfahan, Iran	15
Jidda, Saudi Arabia	25
Kabul, Afghanistan	25
Kaduna, Nigeria	15
Kampala, Uganda	20
Karachi, Pakistan	15
Katmandu, Nepal	20
Khartoum, Sudan	20
Khorramshahr, Iran	15
Kigali, Rwanda	25
Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo	25
Kisangani, Democratic Republic of the Congo	25
Kuching, Malaysia	20
Kuwait, Kuwait	10
Lagos, Nigeria	15
Lahore, Pakistan	15
La Paz, Bolivia	25
Libreville, Gabon	25
Lome, Togo	25
Luanda, Angola	10
Lubumbashi, Democratic Republic of the Congo	25
Madras, India	15
Managua, Nicaragua	20
Mandalay, Burma	25
Manila, Philippines	10
Maracaibo, Venezuela	15
Martinique, French West Indies	20
Maseru, Lesotho	10
Medan, Indonesia	25
Medellin, Colombia	10
Merida, Mexico	10
Meshed, Iran	15
Mogadiscio, Somali Republic	20
Monrovia, Liberia	25
Moscow, U.S.S.R.	15
New Delhi, India	10
Niamey, Niger	20
Nicosia, Cyprus	15
Nouakchott, Mauritania	20
Oran, Algeria	20
Ouagadougou, Upper Volta	25
Paramaribo, Surinam	10
Peshawar, Pakistan	15
Ponta Delgada, Azores	10
Port-au-Prince, Haiti	15
Port Said, United Arab Republic	10
Poznan, Poland	10
Prague, Czechoslovakia	10
Puerto La Cruz, Venezuela	20
Quito, Ecuador	15
Rangoon, Burma	20
Rawalpindi (Islamabad), Pakistan	15
Recife, Brazil	10
Reykjavik, Iceland	10
Saigon, Vietnam	25
San Pedro Sula, Honduras	15
Sana'a, Yemen	25
Santiago de los Caballeros, Dominican Republic	25
Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic	20
Seoul, Korea	10
Sofia, Bulgaria	20
Surabaya, Indonesia	25
Suva, Fiji Islands	15
Tabriz, Iran	20
Taiz, Yemen	25
Tampico, Mexico	10
Tegucigalpa, Honduras	10
Udorn, Thailand	25
Veracruz, Mexico	10
Vientiane, Laos	25
Warsaw, Poland	10
Yaounde, Cameroon	15
Zagreb, Yugoslavia	10
Zanzibar, Tanzania	25
Zomba, Malawi	10

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the committee went along with the suggestion to delete this item. I should point out that the matter was raised in committee by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and myself. When the committee saw the mathematical statistics and how the pay would be affected, it unanimously supported us in having that section deleted.

I yield now to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, when this subject came before the Foreign Relations Committee, two issues were primarily presented: First, the Foreign Service employees of the U.S. Government asked that their rights as employees be lifted to the level of the rights of other civilian employees of the Government. In other words, they said they were getting less in certain fields than other civilian employees were getting, and all they wanted was equality of treatment. That was a very effective argument. It was accepted by me without hesitation.

Then came the aspect of the issue that was submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee. The Foreign Service workers in the State Department asked that, in addition to the payment which they normally would receive as employees of the U.S. Government, there be given to them a 50-percent increase because they were serving in South Vietnam, where dangers surrounded them in the performance of their work.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I interrogated the member of the State Department who, on the one hand, was asking that their rights be lifted up to the level of the rights of other civilian employees, and in the next breath was asking that they be given rights that were not given to others employed by the U.S. Government.

In the interrogation, the Senator from Delaware and I began making probes

about what increase in salary was given to the members of the military—privates, second lieutenants, lieutenants, captains, generals, and otherwise—compared with the 50-percent increase that was asked by the Foreign Service workers of the State Department.

In that questioning—understandable by me, but to those who were listening, it was a bit mysterious—the representative of the State Department was not able to tell us whether there would be equality of treatment for the fighter in the trenches in South Vietnam with that of employees of the State Department in the ambassadorial office in Saigon.

When the meeting had been concluded, the Senator from Delaware and I asked that reports be submitted showing how much more salary the Government is paying to the soldiers in Vietnam because of the danger that surrounds them, as compared with the 50-percent increase that was to be paid to the Foreign Service workers.

No answer being obtainable at that time, the Senator from Delaware, with his usual persistence, insisted that there be submitted to him documents showing the comparison.

Mr. President, the committee report, on page 5, contains the text of a letter answering a letter that I wrote to the State Department asking for information on the subject I have just discussed. The answer to my letter came from Mr. William O. Hall. It was dated April 14.

Again, to my great astonishment, the State Department said that the comparisons were so complicated that they could not be made. The true answer is that the Department did not want to state that the members of the Foreign Service would be given a 50-percent increase in their salary, while the members of the military would be given an additional $65 a month.

I ask the Senator from Delaware if that is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us look to where that position leads. An ambassador receives $30,000 a year. He would be given a 50-percent increase because of hazardous work, bringing the salary up to $45,000.

A soldier in the trenches—and General Westmoreland, and all of his deputies, as well—would receive an additional $65 a month because of hazardous duty. One Washington newspaper described this, in the words of Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, as "outrageous."

I ask the Senator from Delaware if I am correct in that statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And I think it is outrageous.

When a military man in the jaws of fire and death is asked to accept $65 a month additional pay because of hazardous occupation, and members of the State Department are given a 50-percent increase, the ordinary individual would ask, Why? I commend the Senator from Delaware for his persistence in obtaining the information. I tried to get it and could not. I did not intend to stop, but to my great satisfaction, I learned that the Senator from Delaware did have a complete tabulation showing this indefensible disparity.

To make sure that my statement is absolutely correct, the employees of the State Department serving in Vietnam now receive a 25-percent increase because of hazards in foreign service; and the increase they requested would have increased the original 25 percent by another 25 percent; is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill, as it has finally come back to the Senate, meets with my entire approval. But I wish to make one final statement: I have been a Member of the Senate for 10 years. Repeatedly, Mr. President, I have found that various segments of the employees of the Federal Government follow this principle—and this is especially true of the employees in the State Department: We want equality of treatment in all instances where we are getting less than others are getting. We want inequality of treatment where others are getting equal to what we are getting; in such instances, we want more.

I cannot subscribe to that principle. I commend the Senator from Delaware for his effective work on this subject, and I take a bit of pride in my own efforts early in the hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations to extract—literally pull out and drag out—honest information relating to this issue. I was not able to drag it out. The Senator from Delaware was, and I commend him for doing so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Ohio. He has related the circumstances correctly. I have a copy of the letter to which he referred as having received from the State Department, wherein they said the subject was so complicated that they could not give him the exact comparison.

That, in my book, was an utterly ridiculous excuse, as will be shown by the report which I have placed in the RECORD. The statistics show, for example, that the AID Director for Vietnam is presently drawing a base salary of $27,000 a year. He receives an extra $6,750 under the existing 25-percent overseas allowance. He receives $3,300 as a family maintenance allowance, or a total of $37,050 now. This amendment would have given him another $6,750 as combat pay, as compared to the $65 a month all members of the military forces in Vietnam receive.

That differential would have applied right on down the line for all the civilian employees in that area. The average extra so-called combat pay requested for the civilian employees in that area would be in excess of $4,000 per employee per year. That is the additional so-called "combat pay" which they wanted allowed to civilian employees.

As a comparison, the private first class who is serving in Vietnam receives a basic payment of $121.80 per month. He receives foreign duty pay of $9 a month. He receives hostile fire pay of $65 a month, or a total monthly pay of $195.80, equivalent to $2,349.60 annual pay for his service on the frontlines in Vietnam. His total pay is only one-half of the "combat pay" they wanted allowed to the civilian employees who are serving in Vietnam.

I say again, it is preposterous and utterly ridiculous that any agency of the Government could find the nerve to make any such suggestion. The fact that in reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Ohio, they said that they were unable to figure this out would indicate that they had better go back to the old-fashioned method of mathematics. Perhaps they did not want to figure it out—once they looked at the answer it was too embarrassing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I completely concur in the statement of the Senator from Delaware.

I have the deepest and utmost respect for Secretary Rusk. He is giving of himself unstintingly for his country. He is being attacked and lambasted from all sides. I feel certain that if Secretary Rusk had been fully acquainted with what was sought to be done, that proposal would never have come to our committee. The most shocking phase of it is that when the matter did come to the Senate floor—I was not here when it was originally brought up, but the Senator from Delaware pointed out the inequities—those in control of the Senate, the leaders, immediately recognized that what was asked was so shocking and indefensible that they did not bring the bill up for consideration, but sent it back to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, there is in control of the State Department a group of employees who have succeeded in obtaining for themselves benefits far in excess of those given to other employees of the Federal Government. I hope that the action on this latest request will, in a measure, bring to an end their boldness in asking for relief to which they are not entitled.

I have one final question of the Senator from Delaware:

What would be the maximum normal pay that General Westmoreland would receive, including the additions to which he would be allowed by reason of his hazardous position?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. With all the allowances, including the $65 a month hostile fire pay, General Westmoreland's salary would be $30,345.72 a year. Compare that with around $40,000 to $45,000 that would be allowed some of the top civilian directors, such as the director of AID, had the bill passed as it was originally proposed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If I may repeat: General Westmoreland's total pay, including all additions for the hazards of being in war, would be $30,345.72?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What would have been the pay of the highest administrator in the State Department, who was in his office, not on the battlefield, for the supreme services rendered by him?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The AID director, had the bill passed as it was originally proposed, would have drawn $43,800 a year including his combat pay of $6,750.

The director of the USIA would have drawn around $42,000, and his deputies, in proportion, would each have been re-

ceiving better than $6,000 extra pay for hazardous duty.

Class 1 and class 2 Foreign Service Officers, had the bill passed as was first proposed, would have been drawing salaries from $5,000 to $8,000 in excess of the total pay of General Westmoreland.

The so-called combat pay proposed to be allowed for civilian officers in Vietnam would have amounted to twice the total pay received by privates on the front line of battle in Vietnam. Likewise, the pay received by such civilian officers would have been out of all proportion to that received by captains and other military officers in that area.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I conclude my remarks by saying that in the question I put to the representatives of the State Department, I asked:

If you are to receive 50 percent additional compensation for hazardous work, how will Congress answer the military men if they ask for a 50-percent increase?

There was no answer given to that question.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I suppose I should know the answer to this question myself, but does the Senator recall during the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee on the pending bill, whether there was any testimony indicating the number of American civilians that had been killed or wounded as a result of enemy action in South Vietnam?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not recall those figures.

The pending bill does—and I support this provision—provide special allowances for those who are killed in that area. However, the point we are talking about deleting is only that part which would have paid civilians in Saigon and other areas an average of $4,000 per year for so-called extra combat pay. This extra pay ran as high as $6,750 per individual.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any testimony which indicates how hazardous the conditions are?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Questions were asked. The answer was that most of them worked in the security of their offices in Saigon. There were some who were injured, but they were very negligible in number. I am quite certain that that is what the record will show, although there is no transcript of testimony accompanying the pending bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. They already get 25 percent overseas allowance for being in that hazardous area. They are also compensated in other ways.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I recall it, 3 or 4 years ago, when the American Embassy was bombed, there may have been some injuries and loss of life. However, it is also my recollection that our civilian workers appeared to have pretty good protection while they are working throughout South Vietnam, wherever it happens to be.

I believe the testimony shows that the trucks of oil companies incur very little risk while being driven into the country, so that their products may be delivered.

They are required to pay what is called tolls, but within the United States it would be called protection money. Apparently when the enemy collects the protection money, they are pretty good at protecting the civilian workers there. However, the protected workers do run the hazard of stepping on mines or being mistaken for somebody else.

If one is in uniform, it is not safe to get very far away from the base. However, if one is a protected civilian, according to the reports which we had before the committee, it is probably no more hazardous than it might be in some parts of the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We are providing in the pending bill for compensation to those civilians who may be injured in one manner or another.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. And I support wholeheartedly that provision.

It was the extra so-called combat pay at the approximate average annual rate of $4,000 for serving in the offices in Vietnam, as compared with $65 a month for the private on the front line, that I was complaining about.

When these statistics were called to the attention of the committee, as the Senator knows, the committee unanimously rejected the proposal and the State Department hurriedly withdrew its request for this so-called combat pay for civilian personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

S. 1785

A bill to improve certain benefits for employees who serve in high-risk situations, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 911 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1136), is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) the travel expenses of officers and employees of the Service for up to two round trips each year for purposes of family visitation in situations where the family of the officer or employee is prevented by official order from accompanying such officer or employee to, or has been ordered evacuated from, his assigned post because of danger from hostile activity, and the travel expenses of officers or employees stationed abroad, for purposes of family visitation in emergency situations involving personal hardship: *Provided,* That the facilities of the Military Air Transport Service shall be ultilized whenever possible for travel authorized under this section."

SEC. 3. Immediately after section 943 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, add the following new section:

"SEC. 944. Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Secretary is authorized to provide medical services under part E of this title beyond the date of death or separation of an officer or employee."

SEC. 3. (a) Subchapter II of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code (which relates to leave), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 6325. Absence resulting from hostile action abroad

"No leave shall be charged to the account of any officer or employee for absence, not to exceed one year, due to any injury incurred while serving abroad and resulting from war, insurgency, mob violence, or similar hostile action: *Provided,* That the injury shall not have been due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on the part of the officer or employee."

(b) The analysis at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding the following item at the end thereof:

"6325. Absence resulting from hostile action abroad."

(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1965.

MESSAGES OF SUPPORT FOR SENATE RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTION—LXXIII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, after more than 4 months of daily speeches in support of Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery, I am both impressed and gratified by the wide base of individual support among American citizens for Senate ratification.

The hundreds of letters which I have received endorsing my own campaign for ratification should be a real source of encouragement for all supporters of ratification as well as very revealing to my colleagues of the deep concern of many Americans over the Senate's failure to ratify a single Human Rights Convention.

I read excerpts from a few representative messages which I have received:

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I want to express my sincere appreciation for the effort you have made in the Senate to arouse interest in the importance of ratification of the Human Rights Conventions by the United States.

I find it singularly distressing that our country has been so reluctant to give official support to these Conventions.

Sincerely,

MARGARET SHEETS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: How happy I was to learn today that you are daily making a speech urging ratification of the U.N. Human Rights Covenants!

This is indeed in the tradition of the Golden Rule—and only by one step at a time in this direction, will the world and humanity work its way toward peace and social justice.

Very Sincerely,

Mrs. ANN SANCHEZ.

SHAWNEE MISSION, KANS.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I have just become aware of your efforts in behalf of the Human Rights Covenants.

I want to send my appreciation and encouragement for this very important proposal.

It is a positive proposal—to affirm the rights of all human beings everywhere.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARJIE SWOMLEY.

DEARBORN, MICH.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Blessings on you for speaking daily on the Human Rights Covenants.

It's about time the U.S. ratified them.

Sincerely,

Mrs. EUNICE WAHLBERG.

MADISON, WIS.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I am writing, quite tardily, to commend you for your actions on behalf of the four United Nation's conventions which have never been ratified by the Senate.

It is a disgrace that the country in the world which most prides itself on the belief in and practice of freedom and political rights for its citizens and its belief in the sanctity of human life, should be one of the few nations which have not approved these conventions.

Please keep up the pressure for approval of all of them.

Sincerely,

MRS. WALTER GRENGG.

Mr. President, these are just a very few of the letters which I have received. There are many, many more from all people all over the United States.

I cite them today to emphasize as strongly as possible that the American people are aware of the Senate's failure.

The American people do want the Senate to ratify the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

REALISM ABOUT GOLD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in 1965 the Congress repealed the gold cover requirement for Federal Reserve deposit liabilities. At that time the amount of gold over and above the amount required as backing for Federal Reserve notes and deposit liabilities was at a dangerously low level. There was real danger that this low level would cause a disruptive run on the dollar as foreign holders sought to redeem dollars for gold.

We are rapidly approaching a similar problem with respect to the amount of gold available to meet foreign obligations. Today our stock of gold is $13.1 billion, whereas $10 billion of this must be held as backing for Federal Reserve notes. This leaves only $3 billion to meet foreign obligations. If our money supply continues to grow at the rate it has during the past few years, we will soon run out of free gold to meet foreign claims. This point could be reached even sooner if further gold losses due to the balance-of-payments deficit continues.

There has been considerable thought given to repealing the gold cover requirement for Federal Reserve notes so that our entire stock of gold can be available to protect the dollar abroad. Recently the First National City Bank of New York, in its May 1967 Newsletter, published an informative article about the gold situation.

Mr. President, 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:

PRACTICAL REALISM ABOUT GOLD

In the wake of the discussions that flared up last month, the need of the moment is for practical realism about gold. The markets, here and abroad, have kept their nerve and, perhaps as an incidental benefit, some delicate and difficult issues of international monetary policies have come more into the open. These issues must be faced squarely in an emotion-free atmosphere.

It is important to avoid an escalating war of words. The part of financial statesmanship today is to emphasize the common interest of all the leading financial countries in maintaining an open, integrated international financial system, not to emphasize the differences which divide us.

This article accordingly reviews the facts of international financial life today to end with three pragmatic conclusions: First, the United States could not, as a practical policy, cut loose from gold—through steps like suspending gold sales to foreign governments and central banks—without at the same time disrupting the present structure of exchange rates among the principal currencies. For the breakdown of this structure would damage—perhaps beyond repair for years to come—the substantial degree of convertibility at fixed exchange rates among the leading currencies and the basically free, multilateral and nondiscriminatory world trade that nations have, with imaginative and determined efforts, endeavored to rebuild over the past twenty years. Such developments, reminiscent of the beggar-my-neighbor practices of the 1930s, would hurt the dollar and harm the markets and profits of many individual American firms and industries.

Second, the thought that the United States could seek to relieve its balance-of-payments position merely by changing the present gold arrangements, policies and practices has been advanced as if everything would be all right if only Europe would not insist on receiving gold rather than dollars in the settlement of its payments surpluses that are, directly or indirectly, the counterparts of the U.S. deficit. This is simply not so. Looking beyond gold technicalities, the real problem for the United States is to reduce the payments deficit so as to provide dollars in amounts that the surplus nations are willing to retain voluntarily without conversion into gold.

Third, in view of the likelihood of a payments deficit in the next year or two, partly because of Vietnam—some of which may well have to be paid out in gold—and also in view of the need for normal expansion in notes in circulation, the removal of the 25 per cent legal reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes in circulation will have to be considered soon by the administration. Nevertheless, the removal of the gold cover can be successfully undertaken only if confidence prevails in our own country, as well as throughout the world, in the judgments and acts of those responsible for economic and financial policymaking.

CUTTING LOOSE FROM GOLD INTERNATIONALLY?

Lifting the gold reserve requirement for domestic note circulation does not mean that the United States could dispense with gold internationally. Even with all its productive capacity to give real value to money, the United States, as an international banker, requires a strong gold reserve. Foreign governments and central banks holding large dollar deposits and other short-term assets in the United States are fully aware of the intrinsic strength of the U.S. economy as well as of the fact that the dollar has, throughout the years, lost less of its purchasing power than any other major currency. Nevertheless, they expect us to maintain a suitable gold stock to provide what in their eyes is an assurance that the dollar will remain at all times a reliable and freely usable currency. Surely, the U.S. gold stock need not be so large as to cover all of our liabilities to foreign governments and central banks, not to mention those to foreign private bankers, merchants and investors. But the United States cannot alone sever the links to gold that make it the cornerstone of the international monetary structure; there is, of course, no prospect that gold might be demonetized by international agreement.

The thought has been advanced that the U.S. Treasury under certain conditions should sell gold only at its discretion or stop selling it altogether. Such action—a breach of the IMF Articles of Agreement—conveys serious implications for the world's exchange rate structure. Advocates of such a step imply that the United States would, in such an eventuality, be so strong as to virtually compel the governments and central banks of other large industrial nations to buy and hold dollars even if these were not convertible into gold. For, so runs the argument, these nations would have to prevent a rise in the price of their currencies in terms of the dollar in order to protect themselves from being undersold in their own or third markets by the United States, a very productive and competitive country which already has a large export surplus. They also would be eager to maintain their own exports to the United States.

There is, however, a rub. For the thought of the United States embargoing gold rests on the assumption that other large industrial nations would, in such an eventuality, remain passive. Yet, given all the circumstances, the governments and central banks of some of the large trading nations might well react—among other ways, by imposing countervailing duties on U.S. exports or by declining to buy all dollars for which there was no spontaneous demand in the market and thus to support the official exchange rates. In this context, an historical episode may be worth recalling. During World War II and up through late 1949, the Swiss National Bank reduced inflows of unwanted dollars by buying, at the official rate, only such dollars as were generated by the country's exports—thus stabilizing the one exchange rate that mattered most to it. Dollars accruing from other sources, above all, capital imports—the so-called "financial" dollars—were allowed to find their own level in a free exchange market where the dollar stood at an appreciable discount.

The emergence of multiple exchange practices and fluctuating exchange rates among the leading currencies could create monetary disorders. To differentiate commercial from "financial" dollars would require strict exchange controls—controls that, over the past decade, have been liberalized and simplified but the framework for which remains, except in a very few countries. Such a state of affairs might, it must be feared, become an open invitation to protectionism and restrictionism—practices that in the 1930s seriously inhibited world trade and investment. For these reasons, a departure from our existing gold arrangements, policies and practices would be fraught with uncertainties and pitfalls. The outcome is unpredictable. There is thus no escape for the United States from the necessity of bringing its balance of payments into sustainable order.

REAL PROBLEMS BEYOND GOLD TECHNICALITIES

Those who are deeply concerned about gold rightly emphasize that the tiny tail of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit—$1–2 billion a year—cannot be allowed to wag the whole dog of the U.S. economy—approaching $800 billion annually. Surely, the need for a more nearly sustainable balance in our international payments cannot mean that the United States could not be able to take reasonable measures, including easier money, to help counter a business recession. Indeed, in such circumstances, other nations would expect us to take expansionary steps. They themselves have a large stake in the maintenance of high and rising levels of business in the country that provides the largest import market in the world.

And yet, precisely because its economic and financial trends, developments, and policies (and also, what may appear to some as lack of policies) are being watched closely and appraised critically throughout the world, the United States may well have to exercise more discretion in the use of economic stimulants than it has at various times in the past.

Some Continental European nations also hold the view that the United States is living

beyond its international financial means in that the foreign exchange costs of its military spending and the ultimate foreign exchange impact of its foreign aid greatly exceed the surplus generated by the private economy, after allowing for funds flowing into U.S. private investments abroad. Views like these are, of course, also held by many Americans who have reached the conclusion that lasting relief to our balance of payments will have to come, in part, from a major overhaul of government spending abroad. Some people in Europe are also critical of U.S. private investments.

As a matter of fact, almost all governments and central banks of Continental Europe have over the past two years reduced their reserves of dollars substantially—by $1.6 billion during 1965 and 1966, of which approximately half was accounted for by France. Practically the whole U.S. payments deficit in 1965 and 1966 was settled through sales of gold and borrowings from the International Monetary Fund. By and large, therefore, the governments and central banks of Continental European countries have ceased to finance the U.S. payments deficit. Of late, Germany has reportedly agreed to hold dollars acquired through local expenditures by U.S. troops and to regard them as being, in effect, inconvertible into gold.

The governments of several Continental European countries are also reluctant to commit themselves to any far-reaching innovations in the present international monetary system. For creating international money involves, by its very nature and whatever its form, the power to take tangible goods from some countries and to give them to others. Such power must, understandably, be circumscribed both in amount and time. To command confidence and acceptability, therefore, the new money would have to be created in rather limited amounts—something like $1–2 billion a year, judging from what has become generally known of the discussions among government experts. Of this amount created for the entire community of nations, the United States could obviously be allotted only a few hundred million dollars, a sum too small to be of much material difference in financing U.S. payments deficits of the order of those of the past ten years.

PRACTICAL NECESSITY OF REMOVING THE GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENT

All things considered, therefore, the United States may well have to draw on its still large but not inexhaustible gold stock. Today, of the $13.1 billion of U.S. Treasury gold stock, about $10 billion must be held as backing for paper currency issued by the Federal Reserve. There remains, therefore, only something like $3 billion to protect the position of the dollar internationally.

The ratio of gold to Federal Reserve notes is at present around 32 per cent, as against the legal minimum of 25 per cent. At the rate of monetary expansion during the past few years, the 25 per cent legal limit would be reached in a few years even if there were no further gold outflows; with further gold losses, the limit would be reached much sooner. The gold reserve requirement will, of necessity, have to be reconsidered. Federal Reserve notes make up the bulk of our circulating paper currency. Increases in this medium of exchange are needed for an expanding economy and a rapidly growing working-age population.

While removal of the gold reserve requirement is to some extent a mechanical step, it understandably has an ominous ring. For this reason, it is best to undertake such a change at a time when people are confident of meaningful progress in our efforts to reduce our balance-of-payments deficit. But confidence in our domestic financial arrangements must also be considered. The present steep rise in Federal spending, against the background of today's credit environment, does not serve to bolster such confidence.

This is the third time that reconsideration of the gold cover has been brought about by the force of circumstances. Early in 1965, as losses of gold had reduced the leeway of the Federal Reserve to accommodate the money and credit needs of a growing economy, President Johnson submitted to Congress a proposal for legislation to free Federal Reserve deposit liabilities—cash reserves of the banking system—from the 25 per cent gold cover requirement. Congress approved the proposal in a matter of weeks. In 1945, legislation had been passed to reduce the gold reserve requirements from 40 per cent on Federal Reserve notes and 35 per cent on the Federal Reserve deposits to 25 per cent on both note and deposit liabilities.

NEED FOR FINANCIAL DISCIPLINE

There is, of course, a profound difference between the mid-1940s and today. In 1945, the Federal Reserve gold cover requirement was reduced because of the need, following the very large increases in money and credit brought about by World War II, to provide room for the postwar expansion of money supplies. This need was critical since even the very large gold stock at the time—$20 billion, representing almost two thirds of world monetary gold reserves—could not accommodate the growth of money and credit under the gold cover requirement as provided for by the Federal Reserve Act of 1913. In contrast, the leeway available under the existing gold legislation is too narrow both to allow for a normal expansion of note circulation and to make gold available for the settling of international balances.

Another difference is that in 1945, and also in 1965, the Administration sought only to reduce the gold reserve requirement. This time, it will presumably have to recommend the removal of the gold cover altogether.

Under the circumstances, it is obviously essential that the Federal Reserve be able to assure a normal expansion in note circulation. This does not, however, mean that the United States can, with impunity, inflate money supplies and disregard the consequences for domestic prices and for the balance of payments. The need for financial discipline will be all the greater since, in the absence of the gold reserve requirement, the strength of the dollar will depend even more than today on the broad base of confidence, in our country as well as throughout the world, in the conduct of our economic and financial policies.

RESERVE BOARD BACKS TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently Gov. J. L. Robertson, of the Federal Reserve Board, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee and gave new impetus to the truth in lending bill. Governor Robertson is one of the most respected men in government, and his conclusion that the bill is both practical and workable should receive great weight both on the committee and in the Senate. Thursday, May 11, the Wall Street Journal published an excellent article concerning Governor Robertson's testimony. I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the RECORD.

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

RESERVE BOARD BACKS TRUTH-IN-LENDING—SENATE COMMITTEE SEEN VOTING A MEASURE

WASHINGTON.—Federal Reserve Board members unanimously recommended enactment of pending "truth-in-lending" legislation, giving the controversial measures a powerful push.

The Reserve Board's announcement was made before a Senate subcommittee that was winding up public hearings.

The bill's sponsor, Sen. Proxmire (D., Wis.), declared that he was "sure" that legislation would be recommended by the Senate Banking Committee, which for six years had bottled up previous bills. But he said "there obviously will be substantial changes" in the draft bill to meet some objections.

The legislation, strongly opposed by most lenders and retailers, basically would require disclosure of finance charges on all consumer credit in terms of an "approximate" annual interest percentage and total dollar cost.

The Reserve Board's strong endorsement of the fundamentals of the Proxmire bill was considered particularly significant. The draft bill calls for the board to administer the law, and previously the board had been reluctant to assume that task. Hence, it had limited itself to a mere endorsement of the truth-in-lending concept, but hadn't endorsed specific bills.

But J. L. Robertson, Reserve Board vice chairman, said the board believed the need for truth-in-lending legislation was so great that its members had unanimously decided it would be worthwhile for the board to take on the administrative task. He urged, however, that the law's enforcement be left to the Justice Department or another agency so the board staff wouldn't have to investigate and prosecute complaints.

BOARD MEMBER'S TESTIMONY

Mr. Robertson's testimony before the Senate subcommittee in financial institutions suggested the types of revisions that may be made in the draft bill. In some cases, the Reserve Board would ease the bill's requirements but in other respects it recommends a broadening of the legislation. The subcommittee expects to meet in early June to try to work out revisions.

One Reserve Board proposal attempts to satisfy objections to requiring annual interest rate disclosure on department store "revolving" credit accounts. This is one of the most difficult problems because such charge accounts typically allow a buyer a "free" period before interest is charged, and many buyers pay up within a brief time. Critics contend that it would be misleading to force department stores to state interest on an annual basis for these accounts.

Mr. Robertson proposed a compromise that essentially would require retailers offering revolving accounts to inform buyers of all options under the plan. For example, the store would be required to state on the monthly bill the length of the "free" period under various conditions, the monthly interest charge and the fact that a monthly charge of, say, 1½% is "equivalent to a rate of 18% a year."

EXEMPTION OF SMALL LOANS URGED

Mr. Robertson recommended exemption of small credit transactions from the bill's disclosure requirements. For example, he said loans under $100 with a total charge of less than $10 might be excluded. In such a case, he acknowledged, repayment terms may result in an annual interest rate of 50% or more, but he said the charge may be justified by the high cost of handling small loans.

Requiring disclosure of high "true" annual interest could result in lenders abandoning the small-loan market, Mr. Robertson said.

He also recommended that first-mortgage loans be excluded from disclosure requirements because most are repaid well in advance of the original maturity. He said insurance premiums should be excluded from disclosure of finance charges when insurance is required for a loan. However, he said, the board believes second mortgages should be subject to disclosure requirements because they usually are for relatively short terms.

On the more stringent side, Mr. Robertson said disclosure requirements should cover credit to corporations and partnerships when the amount is less than $20,00, or perhaps a

lower figure. The draft bill would exempt all business loans, but Mr. Robertson argued that many small businessmen and farmers need the protection of full dsclosure of credit costs as much as consumers.

The Reserve Board official also said credit purchases of securities and commodities should be covered by interest-disclosure legislation. He said the board could see "no reason" for the exemption provided by the draft bill for these transactions.

Mr. Robertson said he hoped enactment of Federal "truth-in-lending" legislation would encourage states to pass similar laws. If the states did follow, he suggested that Federal legislation be couched to that state laws would take precedence over it if they were "substantially similar" to Federal law.

BRITAIN AND THE COMMON MARKET

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to President de Gaulle's statements during his press conference yesterday concerning Britain's application to join the Common Market.

This statement has been interpreted by some as a "stunning blow" to British hopes that its application will be accepted, or that negotiations will be concluded within a reasonable time.

As I consider this to be a matter of major concern to the United States, since the question of Britain's admittance to the EEC will have a great effect on Britain's future and therefore on the future of the peace and prosperity of the world, I feel it is my duty to speak to the subject.

Having carefully reviewed President de Gaulle's statement, I conclude that while his statement is by no means encouraging to Britain's application, neither is it by any means a veto or a rejection of the application.

Instead, I would characterize the statement as being an appraisal—perhaps a rather harsh one—of Britain's intent and capability to join the Common Market at the present time in view of what President de Gaulle calls Britain's Atlantic rather than European outlook.

Prime Minister Wilson, himself, is fully aware that France continues to take a dim view toward Britain's entry into the Common Market, and that while Britain is ready to accept the Treaty of Rome and all that it implies, problems remain so far as Britain's agriculture is concerned, with its future role in the sterling bloc, in the Commonwealth, and so forth.

In my judgment, Britain has no reason for dismay. What it must do now, as I see it, is to roll up its sleeves and stand ready to answer President de Gaulle's accusations, and be prepared for some very tough negotiations. The British Government is perfectly capable of handling the tough negotiations and of answering President de Gaulle's accusations.

So far as the United States is concerned, I strongly urge the President to state again, within the present framework of Britain's pending application to join the European Economic Community, that the United States strongly favors Britain's entry into the EEC, and that we subscribe to the Europeanization of Britain; for Britain's entry into the Common Market has been the longstanding policy of the United States, and we should not be too diffident to say so now.

We have repeatedly said that we want a strong Europe which would be in a position to play a strong and constructive role in world affairs; and to effectuate that objective, we said, beginning with the Marshall Plan—which I helped bring about as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee—that to do that, Britain should get into the Common Market. We should reiterate this now, and underscore the fact that Britain's desire to join Europe has our full support.

A great power such as the United States should not leave its desires and intentions subject to false interpretation, but should be ready to state a clear position at critical moments such as the present one. We should declare our position that it is in our interest, as it is in Europe's interest, that Great Britain should be a member, because we believe British entry into the Common Market is vital both to Britain's interests and to the security, peace, and prosperity of the world.

I am convinced that the United Kingdom genuinely wishes to join the EEC, and that Prime Minister Wilson is ready for it to assume the full obligations of the Treaty of Rome.

I do not believe that Britain is required to assume any more or less obligations than the other members of the EEC, or to join the market at any price, or to participate in negotiations for a very long time—once they may appear fruitless.

I believe that Britain's biggest proof of "Europeanness" is its readiness to accept the Treaty of Rome, and it has shown other proofs by collaborating with France on the supersonic transport Concorde and in its development, its offer of technological cooperation with the other countries in the EEC, its call to the European Free Trade Association also to join the European Economic Community, and its participation in European space activities.

Finally, should it, after some months, become clear to the United Kingdom that its application will be rejected, the friends of peace and security in the world—and especially the United States—must be prepared to offer Britain an alternative, to enable Britain to secure its economy, and to enable it to continue a major role in world affairs. But in the interim, we must do everything we can to encourage and to assist the United Kingdom in its present endeavor to join the EEC.

THE CASE OF FRANZ PAUL STANGL, ACCUSED WAR CRIMINAL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Franz Paul Stangl, identified as the Nazi commandant of the infamous Treblinka and Sobibor death camps in Poland, is now under arrest in Brazil. He was taken into custody at the request of the Austrian Government, which asked for his extradition in order to place him on trial as a war criminal. Subsequently, the Polish and West German Governments also requested that Stangl be extradited to their countries to stand trial.

Stangl is charged as having first supervised the building of the Treblinka and Sobibor camps, where hundreds of thousands of Jews and others were put to death, and then became commandant, and as being known and dreaded as a "specialist" in finding and persecuting Jews in hiding. According to the Public Prosecutor of Poland, Stangl was described by one of his Nazi superiors as "the best of the camp commandants." The Polish Government also has a document, allegedly signed by Stangl, dealing with the shipment of 52 boxcars of clothing collected from persons killed at the Treblinka camps.

The Supreme Court of Brazil is now considering the requests for extradition, which were accompanied by literally thousands of pages of documents concerning Stangl's charged complicity in some of the most dastardly crimes in history. Austria, West Germany, and Poland have all agreed to abide by Brazilian law, which forbids capital punishment or prison sentences of more than 30 years. The Government of the Netherlands, 80,000 of whose Jewish citizens were murdered in the camps, and the Government of Israel have urged the Brazilian Government to accede to the extradition applications.

It is essential that Franz Paul Stangl be extradited and tried so that justice may be done in his case. According to the charges, he is one of the many Nazi officials and functionaries who still have not been brought to account for deeds which are almost beyond human comprehension.

The Brazilian Government should grant one of the extradition requests. Justice demands it. It is the least that can be done in memory of the millions of innocent men, women, and children who were ruthlessly destroyed by Nazi genocide during the years when they held Europe in their bloody grip.

ANNUAL DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in accordance with my practice of many years, and following the precedent of disclosure laws in New York State, I hereby publish this list of companies subject to regulation by the Federal Government, in which I have an interest—direct or indirect—in an amount exceeding $5,000. These are normal investments in publicly owned corporations and constitute no element of control alone or in combination with others, directly or indirectly:

American & Foreign Securties Corp.
Cities Service Corp.
Criterion Insurance Co.
General Telephone.
Government Employees Corp.
Government Employees Financial Corp.
Government Employees Insurance Co.
Government Employees Life Insurance Co.
South Carolina Electric & Gas Co.
Southern Co.
Storer Broadcasting.

Transamerica Corp. of Delaware.
First National City Bank of New York.
Western Airlines.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, freedom of speech is one of our fundamental rights—cherished, defended, and enjoyed nowhere more vigorously than in this Senate—and enjoyed by all of us in our oratorical forays into the outside world. Discussion and dissent are distinctions of democracy.

They are not tolerated in Hanoi or Peking. Our problems with Hanoi and Peking have precipitated discussion, differences, dissent.

There are those who vehemently disagree with administration policies in Vietnam. They are most articulate. They speak, and they are heard. That is their right. They are irritated by those whose interpretation of history varies from theirs. That is their privilege. They are violently irritated if contra views are expressed by men in uniform—especially by men with service in Vietnam. In this they see a plot of the administration to destroy their freedoms—beginning with the freedom of speech.

Expressions along this line in recent RECORDS came to my mind when in last Friday's Providence Journal I say this letter to the editor describing "A Soldier's Feelings."

Now I happen to believe that a private first class has as good a right to express his opinion as has any general or any Member of the Congress. And I believe the newspaper has a perfect right to print his views.

I shall read the letter:

A SOLDIER'S FEELINGS

I guess the papers back home were full of news about the demonstrations in New York and San Francisco. I'd like to express the thoughts and feelings of one of the many soldiers in Vietnam who are hurt when they hear of demonstrations like those in New York and San Francisco.

We are all over here to protect the rights every human being is entitled to. If we weren't here, maybe in ten years those people wouldn't have any right to demonstrate.

Most of us here in Vietnam aren't here because we want to be. "Uncle Sam" took us from our homes and sent us here.

We are here, though, and we will fight and maybe die to preserve the rights of our country.

In my opinion these demonstrators are not only turning their backs on their fathers, brothers and friends serving in Vietnam, but also turning their backs on their country.

Pfc. GEORGE L. PORTER III.

VIETNAM.

I am sure that Private First Class Porter's opinion will not dampen the ardor or the oratory of those who charge the administration with a deliberate misrepresentation of history in its policies in Vietnam.

I certainly would not curb their freedom of expression, but I would correct the fantasy that to contradict their views is to confiscate their freedoms.

They are men who sincerely believe that the honest interpretation of history has been entrusted to them alone; surely not to the administration, and not even to their fellow Republicans.

But when they accuse this administration of threatening their freedoms by using, as they say, "the tactics of tyrants with little understanding or respect for the constitutional rights of men"—then I feel that they are the ones who misinterpret history as we of the Senate have known it—and helped to make it—in these years of Lyndon B. Johnson's responsibility.

Their view is not history as a competent observer comments.

Ralph McGill in the Atlanta Journal of May 7 restates the Republican's complaint:

"We are losing our freedoms," they say—and he challenges them.

"Name one".

Who in America has lost the freedom of self determination—self perfection—self realization.

And I ask: In whose Presidency did more of the rights of man come to greater fruition than in the Presidency of Lyndon B. Johnson.

I could use the words of Ralph McGill when he says:

It is a record of progress in human and individual rights not achieved since the adoption of the first 10 Amendments and the later enactment of the 13th and 14th Amendments.

It is one of the ironies of history that neither the full meaning of the Bill of Rights Amendments nor that of the 14th were attained until the Johnson administration managed it.

Andrew Johnson, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy all made some progress. But the record of Congressional implementation of the first 10 Amendments and the 14th had to wait for the Johnson administration.

That is the language of Ralph McGill writing in criticism of critics who "wish to have the sanctuary and luxury of criticism without rebuke."

I speak—perhaps more in sorrow than in anger—in criticism of those who permit themselves to become so irrational that they talk at the top of their lungs about being deprived of the freedom of speech as the beginning of the loss of all their freedoms.

They invoke the shades of Washington, Madison, and Daniel Webster to indict a President who has led the fight to improve the quality of American society by upgrading education, restoring civil rights, and expanding human rights and the horizons of full economic opportunity to all Americans.

We, in our time, have achieved more freedoms than Washington imagined or Madison conceived; more liberty than Daniel Webster would have settled for.

I would like to quote a more modern authority. This man said:

Freedom of speech can never harm us if we remember that freedom of speech is a two-way street. We must guard every man's right to speak, but we must defend every man's right to answer.

These are the words—this is the spoken philosophy of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

LAW DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR ERVIN AT MARSHALL-WYTHE SCHOOL OF LAW, COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, WILLIAMSBURG, VA.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] at the Law Day observance at the Marshall-Wythe School of Law, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va., Saturday, May 6, 1967.

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

A LAW DAY MEDITATION UPON THE DUTIES OF A CITIZEN, THE LAWYER, AND THE JUDGE IN A GOVERNMENT OF LAWS

(Remarks of U.S. Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., Democrat, of North Carolina, at Law Day observance at the Marshall-Wythe School of Law at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va., May 6, 1967)

I am grateful to you for the privilege of being in your great State, which is so ably represented in the Senate by my good friends, Harry Byrd, Jr. and Bill Spong.

The Founding Fathers, who drew the Constitution of the United States, entertained the abiding conviction that the freedom of the individual is the supreme value of civilization. As positive testimony of this conviction, they stated in its preamble that they drafted the Constitution to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity.

The Founding Fathers performed their task with complete consciousness of the everlasting political truth subsequently embodied by Daniel Webster in these words: "Whatever government is not a government of laws is a despotism, let it be called what it may." As a consequence, they were determined above all things to establish a government of laws, i.e., a government in which certain and constant laws rather than the uncertain and inconstant wills of men would govern all the officers of government as well as all the people at all times and under all circumstances.

Their purpose to establish a government of laws is disclosed by the mode in which the Constitution was fashioned as well as by its contents. The best description of how the Constitution actually came into being as a written document appears in the argument of one of the ablest advocates of all time, Jeremiah S. Black, Chief Counsel for the petitioner in *Ex Parte Milligan* (4 Wall. 2). He said:

"But our fathers were not absurd enough to put unlimited power in the hands of the ruler and take away the protection of law from the rights of individuals. It was not thus that they meant to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity. They determined that not one drop of the blood which had been shed on the other side of the Atlantic, during seven centuries of contest with arbitrary power, should sink into the ground; but the fruits of every popular victory should be garnered up in this new government. Of all the great rights already won they threw not an atom away. They went over Magna Carta, the Petition of Right, the Bill of Rights, and the rules of the common law, and whatever was found there to favor individual liberty they carefully inserted in their own system."

Law Day is customarily used as an occasion to extol the liberties secured by the government of laws which the Constitution establishes. It seems to me that it would be well for us to vary the theme for once, and

meditate upon some of the obligations which a government of laws imposes. For this reason, I wish to talk to you about the duties of the citizen, the lawyer, and the Judge in a government of laws.

THE DUTY OF THE CITIZEN IN A GOVERNMENT OF LAWS

The duty of the citizen in a government of laws is quite simple. It is to obey all laws without regard to whether he deems them just or unjust.

This statement seems to constitute absolute and incontrovertible truth. Nevertheless, its validity has been disputed by some clergymen and some civil rights agitators.

Their position was stated with eloquence by the report of the Committee on Christian Social Concerns, which was adopted by the General Conference of the Methodist Church at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, May 4, 1964. I quote from this report:

"There are certain circumstances when arbitrary authority is sought to be imposed under laws which are neither just nor valid as law. Even under such imposition the salutary principle of the rule of law requires that in all but the most extreme circumstances the individual confronting such authority must resort to legal processes for the redress of his grievances. However, Christians have long recognized that after exhausting every reasonable legal means for redress of his grievances, the individual is faced with the moral and legal dilemma of whether his peculiar circumstances require obedience to "God rather than to men." There are instances in the current struggle for racial justice when responsible Christians cannot avoid such a decision. Wherever legal recourse for the redress of grievances exists, the responsible Christian will obtain the best available legal and religious counsel for his dilemma. In rare instances, where legal recourse is unavailable or inadequate for redress of grievances from laws or their application that, on their face, are unjust or immoral, the Christian conscience will obey God rather than man."

This report enables one to understand what the Angel Gabriel meant when he spoke this line to the Lord in the play entitled "Green Pastures":

"Everything what's nailed down is coming loose."

The Methodist Church has always been a bulwark of government by law. For this reason, I have been deeply distressed by what this report says. I cannot believe it reflects the minds and hearts of the thousands of Methodists I have known and loved since my earliest years.

When it is stripped of its surplus words, the report declares that professing Christians have a God-given right to disobey laws they deem unjust. This declaration cannot be reconciled with government by law. It is, indeed, the stuff of which anarchy is made.

I do not believe, moreover, that this attempt to make God an aider and abettor in crime finds support in the teachings of Christianity. I do not claim to be a theologian. I am merely a sinner who looks to the King James version of the Bible for religious guidance.

I find these plain words in I Peter, Chapter 2, verses 13–15:

"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake—for so is the will of God."

The report asserts in substance that some groups have already exhausted "every reasonable legal means for redress of grievances," and consequently are now entitled to engage in what the report calls civil disobedience. It is impatience rather than reason which makes this assertion in a land where laws are made by legislative bodies chosen by the people, and where the right to petition these bodies "for a redress of grievances" belongs to all men.

I make an affirmation which is subject to no exception or modification. The right of clergymen and civil rights agitators to disobey laws they deem unjust is exactly the same as the right of the arsonist, the burglar, the murderer, the rapist, and the thief to disobey the laws forbidding arson, burglary, murder, rape and theft.

THE DUTY OF THE LAWYER IN A GOVERNMENT OF LAWS

The lawyer plays an indispensable part in a government of laws. He serves justice. Paradoxical as it may seem, he serves justice by serving his clients. In serving his clients, he may enact the role of the counselor or that of the advocate.

The counselor undertakes to guide his clients along legal pathways in their business and personal affairs.

The role of the advocate arises out of the dedication of our society to the principle that the surest way to truth and justice in legal controversies is an adversary proceeding before a judicial tribunal, which hears each litigant present his cause in its most favorable light and after hearing all judges the merits of the controversy according to rules of law. Since the litigant is not ordinarily skilled in law or advocacy, he presents his cause to the judicial tribunal through an advocate of his own choosing, who invokes the rules of law and the testimony which tends to sustain his client's claim or to defeat that of his opponent.

These considerations reveal that the duty of the lawyer in a government of laws is three-fold in nature, regardless of whether he plays the part of the counselor or that of the advocate. He must know law, be loyal to his client, and maintain his own integrity.

If one is to know law, he must master it by earnest, protracted, and sacrificial study; for there is nothing truer than the trite saying that law "is a jealous mistress, and requires a long and constant courtship."

When I say the lawyer must know law, I do not mean to imply that he must carry in his cranium or on the tip of his tongue all laws and their interpretations. That is a manifest impossibility in a law-ridden country like ours.

I mean that the lawyer should know basic legal principles and do the legal research necessary to safeguard his clients' right. To do this research, he must first acquaint himself with the facts on which those rights depend; for, as the ancient maximum proclaims, out of the facts the law arises. My father, who was an active practitioner at the North Carolina Bar for 65 years, gave me this sage advice on this point when I entered his law office many years ago: "Salt down the facts; the law will keep."

The lawyer should expand his study to fields outside the law, even though sufficient study of law will make him a good legal craftsman. This is so for the reason stated by Sir Walter Scott, a member of the Scottish Bar, in his novel *Guy Mannering:*

"A lawyer without history or literature is a mechanic, a mere working mason; if he possesses some knowledge of these, he may venture to call himself an architect."

In discussing the loyalty the lawyer owes to his clients, I deem it not amiss to say something about the kind of clients the lawyer ought to have.

Sometimes wise men say silly things. Horace Mann, the great educator, gave a young lawyer this advice: "Never take a case unless you believe your client is right and his cause just."

I disagree most emphatically with Horace Mann. If he had merely said that a lawyer should never bring a civil case in behalf of a plaintiff when he is convinced after thorough investigation and research that the case is without warrant in fact and in law, I would agree with him.

But I reject the implication of his advice that a lawyer should refuse to accept as a client an accused in a criminal action or a defendant in a civil case merely because he believes the client to be in the wrong in respect to the event giving rise to the prosecution or the litigation.

As I have stated, our system of jurisprudence is based on the conviction that truth is most likely to be revealed and justice is most likely to be done in adversary judicial proceedings. It is of the very essence of the system that every man shall have his day in court and be represented by a lawyer learned in the law and trained in the art of advocacy.

If lawyers generally took Horace Mann's advice literally, they would cast upon the judge the sole responsibility for safeguarding the rights of the litigants they refused to represent, and would thus make it impossible for our system of jurisprudence to function effectively or justly.

Many questions arise in litigation in addition to whether the accused in a criminal prosecution or the defendant in a civil action was in the wrong in respect to the event which prompted the prosecution or the law suit. For example, a criminal prosecution may be concerned with questions as to the intent of the accused, or the degree of his offense, or the punishment he deserves; and a civil case may involve questions as to the damages recoverable, or the relief which ought to be granted.

Judge David Schenck, a North Carolina lawyer of a by-gone generation, was once asked how he justified pleading for a guilty client. His answer merits preservation. He said: "Someday I shall stand before the Bar of Eternal Justice to answer for deeds done by me in the flesh. I shall then have an advocate in the person of Our Lord, who will certainly be pleading for a very guilty client."

Few relationships of life involve a higher confidence and trust than that which exists between the lawyer and the client he accepts. The client entrusts to the keeping of his lawyer his claim or his property or his reputation or his liberty or his life, and the lawyer pledges to his client the loyal use of his professional ability and legal learning to secure for the client every right or defense afforded by the applicable rules of law, properly applied.

What has been said makes it plain that there is no inconsistency between the loyalty which the lawyer owes to his client and his obligation to maintain his own integrity. Apart from ethical and religious considerations, the integrity of the lawyer has important practical values in the administration of justice in a government of laws.

One of them arises out of the reality that integrity in those who participate in its administration is essential to the doing of justice according to law. Another originates in the truth that all people instinctively put their faith in a man of integrity. As a consequence, the integrity of the lawyer wins for him the confidence of clients, judges, jurors, other practitioners, witnesses, and the public generally, and thus constitutes his most potent professional attribute. No amount of intellectual brilliance or erudition can supply its lack.

When the French Philosopher, Alexis De Tocqueville, visited America and wrote his famous *Democracy in America*, he observed the American Bar and paid it this compliment:

"The profession of the law is the only aristocracy that can exist in a democracy without doing violence to its nature."

Hence, the lawyer who knows law, serves his clients loyally, and maintains his own integrity can justly claim to be a member of "the only aristocracy" which has a rightful place in a democracy.

THE DUTY OF THE JUDGE IN A GOVERNMENT OF LAWS

The judge is the cornerstone of the temple of justice. Upon him rests the most serious responsibility imposed upon any public officer in a government of laws. It is his duty

to judge "his fellow travelers to the tomb" with absolute fairness according to rules of law prescribed by the lawmakers of the State.

If the judge is to perform this duty aright, he must put off all his relations except his relation to the law when he puts on his robes, try each case according to law with what Edmund Burke called the "cold neutrality of the impartial judge," and convince his hearers when he speaks that the law rather than an individual is speaking.

The burden of insuring a fair trial to every litigant rests upon the judge. If a litigant is to receive a fair trial, he must have his cause heard and determined according to rules of law by an impartial judge and an unbiased jury, if it be a jury matter, in an atmosphere of judicial calm and an open courtroom, where he is loyally represented by a lawyer possessing adequate knowledge of law and skill in advocacy.

It sometimes requires high courage and deep wisdom for the judge to insure a fair trial to a litigant. This is certainly true in cases where the government seeks to make the litigant a victim of political purpose, or an angry mob clamors for his blood.

Let me recount an event of a by-gone generation. William Alexander Hoke, who afterwards served as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, was presiding over a one-week term of Superior Court in one of the State's counties.

A capital crime of an atrocious character had been committed on the eve of the convening of the court, and the passions of the community were much inflamed against an impoverished prisoner, who had been arrested and charged with the offense.

After investigation, the lawyer, whom Judge Hoke had appointed to defend the prisoner, moved for a continuance and a change of venue, assigning as reasons that the prisoner had an alibi, but the witnesses necessary to prove it were at a distance and could not be procured during the existing term and that in any event trial of the case should not be had in a community whose passions were inflamed against the prisoner. The Solicitor, who headed the prosecution, strongly resisted both motions, upon the ground that the prisoner might be lynched by the mob if he were not immediately tried.

Judge Hoke made this response to the Solicitor's argument: "Mr. Solicitor, if this court has no choice other than to have the prisoner lynched by the mob or mobbed by the court, it prefers to let the mob deal with him. However, it believes there is a third choice. The trial is continued, and a change of venue is granted."

Since I am a lawyer in heart, I will cite a precedent, which defines in eloquent words the duty of the judge in a government of laws. It is Section 11–11 of the General Statutes of North Carolina, which sets out the oath that Superior Court Judges have taken for many generations. I invite attention to three pledges which each Superior Court Judge makes in the first person:

"1. I will do equal law and right to all persons, rich and poor, without having regard to any person.

"2. I will not delay any person of common right by reason of any letter or command from any person or persons in authority to me directed, or for any other cause whatsoever; and in case such letters or orders come to me contrary to law, I will proceed to enforce the law, such letters or order notwithstanding.

"3. And finally, in all things belonging to my office, during my continuance therein, I will faithfully, truly and justly, according to the best of my skill and judgment, do equal and impartial justice to the public and to individuals."

Despite the fact that it is the office of the judge to interpret law, and not to make law, a theory wholly incompatible with government by law is coming into increasing vogue in the United States. It is that judges are at liberty to substitute their personal notions for law while professing to interpret law. I regret to note that judicial activists are now overworking this theory.

I will exercise at this point a right vouchsafed to all Americans by these words of Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone: "Where the courts deal, as ours do, with great public questions, the only protection against unwise decisions, and even judicial usurpation, is careful scrutiny of their action, and fearless comment upon it."

As one who reveres government by law and abhors tyranny on the bench as much as tyranny on the throne, I was astounded by the recent case of *Harper v. Virginia State Board of Elections*, when a majority of the Supreme Court of the United States overruled two sound decisions to the contrary, *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U.S. 277), and *Butler* v. *Thompson* (341 U.S. 937), and adjudged unconstitutional under the Equal Protection Clause, the Virginia poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in State elections.

I hold no brief for the legislative policy of a State which imposes a tax of this nature. But I do hold a brief for the proposition that under the Constitution rightly interpreted such a poll tax is just as constitutional as the Supreme Court itself. The Supreme Court so held in the *Breedlove* and *Butler Cases*, and Congress and the States agreed when they adopted the Twenty-Fourth Amendment. Justices Black, Harlan, and Stewart expressed views to this effect in their dissents in the *Harper Case*.

When one analyzes the majority opinion in the *Harper Case*, he cannot escape the conclusion that its writer, Justice Douglas, used the Equal Protection Clause without constitutional or intellectual justification to invalidate the Virginia poll tax simply because a majority of the Justices did not personally approve of Virginia's action in requiring a citizen to pay $1.50 a year—his earnings at the minimum wage for 72 minutes—to the State which educates his children and secures due process of law to him for the privilege of voting in elections held by it.

Justice Douglas came very close to making a candid admission to this effect. He gives no reason of substance to justify the decision of the majority beyond this bare declaration: "Notions of what constitutes equal treatment for purposes of the Equal Protection Clause *do* change."

What this statement means in plain English is merely this: When the "notions" of Supreme Court Justices change, the meaning of constitutional provisions change accordingly.

If this theory becomes the norm of the judiciary in the United States, government by laws will become as extinct as the dodo in our land, and Americans will be ruled by the nebulous notions of judges, which the dictionary says are "more or less general, vague, or imperfect conceptions or ideas."

My view finds corroboration in the writing of one of America's wisest judges of all time, Benjamin N. Cardozo, who affirmed that if judges substitute their notions for law, their action "might result in a benevolent despotism if the judges are benevolent men," but that "it would put an end to the reign of law."

As I close this Law Day meditation, I make a prayer. May citizens, lawyers, and judges consecrate themselves anew to the preservation of our government of laws. This is a task of supreme moment, for if our government of laws perishes, liberty perishes.

A DOWN-TO-EARTH APPROACH TO TRANSPORTATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HARRISON A. WILLIAMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] recently delivered in Chicago an address which provided some informative insights into the immediate, down-to-earth problems of surface transportation. It seems ironic that in traveling between eastern cities we now must spend the majority of our travel time on the ground getting to and from the airports. Senator WILLIAMS highlights this predicament.

Mr. President, the cost of the badly needed improvements is very small when compared with the SST or Apollo appropriations, yet the need for them is at least as great. I commend the able Senator from New Jersey for his thought-provoking insights and constructive recommendations.

I ask unanimous consent that his recent speech be entered in the RECORD in its entirety.

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

A DOWN-TO-EARTH APPROACH TO TRANSPORTATION

(Address by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., May 7, 1967, Chicago, Ill.)

I'd like to talk a little bit today about what I choose to call the "sky is the limit" approach to transportation and how it has derailed a "down to earth" approach to our very real and very serious problems.

Perhaps I had better define my terms. When I speak of the "sky is the limit" approach, I mean the thinking which seems to say that if its airborne, there virtually is no limit to the amount of money which can and should be spent on it.

When I speak of the "down to earth" approach, I mean taking advantage of the network of railroad lines which already exists to build intra-metropolitan transit systems and high speed inter-city systems.

The most recent "sky is the limit" venture was announced just last weekend. President Johnson gave the go-ahead for development of an 1800-mile-an-hour, 300-passenger jetliner. It is estimated that the Federal Government will invest well over a billion dollars in this project in the next four years.

What will we have when we are done? Two prototype new airplanes.

Of course, that is only one example of how the Federal Government subsidizes the aircraft and airline industry. I could cite many more . . . millions upon millions of dollars in airport construction . . . mail contracts which are a substantial subsidy . . . and, of course, the enormous sums which the Defense Department pours into research and development of military aircraft.

What is the basis for these expenditures? What is the justification? Simply this: That it is in the national interest to develop air transport.

What have these expenditures brought us? A marvelous network of air transport—which is remarkably fast and efficient from takeoff to touchdown.

It has also made it possible to go from downtown Chicago to downtown St. Louis in three hours—two of which are spent on the ground.

It has made it possible to go from midtown New York to downtown Washington in two hours—an hour and 15 minutes of that time on the ground—unless you land at Dulles Airport, instead of National, in which case you can add another half hour of ground travel time.

Most grotesque of all, it has caused the Port of New York Authority to call for construction of a fourth jetport in the densely populated suburban area of Northern New Jersey at a cost of several hundred million dollars and incalculable damage to the peace and tranquility of thousands upon thou-

sands of families who moved to the suburbs to escape exactly this sort of thing.

And, it is to be noted in passing, we have as another example of "the sky is the limit" thinking, the five billion dollars a year we pay as our entry fee in the race to the moon.

Let me interject at this point that I think it is fine to be able to fly from New York to Washington in 45 minutes. It happens that I use that service frequently and find it very convenient. I think the Port of New York Authority is a wonderful efficient organization which knows how to make a profit as well or better than any of our major corporations—although that wasn't what it was established for.

I do not mean to imply that we should not develop air transportation to its maximum potential, including the development of a practical supersonic transport. But, if some of these billions that have been sent into orbit had, instead, been used to conserve and improve existing rail facilities, I think we would be moving more people more efficiently at less cost.

We might, for instance, already have in operation the Northeast Corridor rail service which we anticipate will cut the time between midtown New York and downtown Washington to two or two-and-a-half hours—without ripping ten thousand acres out of suburban New Jersey for a new jetport.

We might, for instance, have a high-speed service between Chicago and St. Louis which, it is estimated, would cut the time between the business districts of the two cities to three hours.

Perhaps even more important than the inter-city service—after all, the airplanes are filling the gap which is being created by the erosion of long-haul railroad passenger service—is service within the metropolitan area.

Here is where the deterioration has been most marked. Here is where the need is greatest. Here is where the failure in federal leadership is most visible. And here is where, as has been demonstrated in Chicago and Philadelphia, the potential is greatest.

The Chicago and Northwestern story doesn't need repeating in any detail before this audience. It is a classic example. A decade ago its equipment was old and worn out; it was losing passengers and running in the red.

With the delivery of 16 new cars this Fall, the line will have a fleet of 247 bi-level commuter coaches. Terminal and other passenger facilities have been completely refurbished. It is operating more and faster trains. Since 1961, the number of daily riders has nearly doubled. And the company is making money.

That is one railroad. What can be done with an entire regional network of commuter lines has been demonstrated by the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority—SEPTA.

The revitalization of commuter railroad service in Philadelphia began on an experimental basis in 1958 and was put on a firm, permanent basis in 1963, with the establishment of SEPTA. Six different commuter lines have spruced up their equipment, added trains and cut fares.

This has required a substantial contribution of public funds.

It has resulted in increased use of these commuter lines ranging up to 300 per cent over a six-year period. It has also helped to prevent the Philadelphia metropolitan area from strangling in traffic. And the Pennsylvania Railroad, one of the lines involved, is quoted as saying that it hopeful that the increasing use of the commuter lines, and operating economies effected with new equipment, may eventually eliminate the need for a subsidy.

It should be added that the yearly subsidy wouldn't pay for the landing gear on that billion dollar brace of airplanes.

The success of the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad was accomplished without one cent of public money. I am frank to say that I don't see much prospect of this happening elsewhere around the country.

But I think the prospects are excellent that, with a contribution from the federal government, we can revive the commuter railroads in many metropolitan areas. I am convinced that if we do not revive the commuter railroads, the physical and financial impact of road-building programs on our cities and suburbs is going to be so staggering as to be almost inconceivable.

Look at just two examples of what has already happened:

Boston recently had a five-hour traffic jam. Three-quarters of the real estate in the City of Los Angeles is devoted to automobiles, principally in the form of roads.

To revive the commuter railroads will require imaginative and determined leadership. And it will require money.

Some of the leadership and some of the money, I am convinced, must come from the federal government.

We made a start on providing the money with the passage in 1961 of the mass transit demonstration program and in 1964 of the mass transit capital grant program. These programs have worked well. But they are not going to be enough.

Even while taking advantage of this capital grant program, commuter lines are going into bankruptcy because of the continuing losses on their passenger operations.

I have introduced what I call a "Commuter Service" bill. Very simply, it would authorize the federal government to pay up to two-thirds of out-of-pocket operating losses attributed to commuter service.

This would not be a permanent subsidy. It would not be given directly to the company operating the commuter line. And it would not be dealt out to just anyone with his hand out.

To qualify for this payment, the commuter line would have to submit a plan showing how it could and would put its service on a break-even basis within 10 years. The plan would have to detail the improvements in equipment and service which would be undertaken in order to attract more fare-paying passengers and cut costs to accomplish this.

The payments would be made to a public authority which would administer the money and supervise the implementation of the plan for putting the service on a break-even basis.

In operation, I believe that this legislation would spur the establishment of transportation authorities such as SEPTA and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, which are charged with looking at the transit needs of entire metropolitan areas.

It would give railroad managements which have thrown up their hands in despair a new interest in making the commuter business pay.

It would bring forth leaders, both in government and in the railroad industry who would supply the imagination and drive required to get people off the highways and into railroad cars.

I believe it would enable us to breathe new life into sick and dying commuter railroads.

And the whole 10-year program wouldn't cost as much as those two airplanes.

Having delivered what may seem to some a tirade against the development of a Supersonic Transport, let me sum up.

I am not objecting to the development of this airplane. I am saying that our sense of value is warped and our allocation of money is off kilter.

If we can afford more than a billion dollars to find a way to move a relatively few people long distances quickly and in comfort, we should be able to afford the $750 million the Commuter Service Bill would cost to move a great many people relatively short distances quickly and in comfort.

GUIDELINES FOR DEBATE ON VIETNAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, in an article which appeared in the Washington Post of May 14, suggested possible guidelines and ground rules for the national debate on Vietnam.

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:

GRAY IS THE COLOR OF THE COMPLEX TRUTH—GUIDELINES FOR DEBATE ON VIETNAM

(By McGeorge Bundy)

(NOTE.—The following is excerpted from a talk to the Cosmos Club last week by the president of the Ford Foundation, a former White House aide, in which he discussed the roles of politicians, professors and communicators in the Vietnam debate:)

I would like to talk with you about the great debate over Vietnam, which will clearly continue among us as long as the struggle itself. We have come two years from Pleiku and Baltimore. Indeed, it seems much more likely than not that there will be no effective truce and not even any real negotiations in the 18 months that remain before our own next national election. It is hard not to share the view that their own past experience and their present assessment of the American scene must combine to persuade the men in Hanoi that they should keep going, at all costs, until they see what the American Government is like in 1969.

As we gird ourselves for another 18 months at least, we have reason to consider the quality and the shape of the national debate. There are hard months ahead at best, but they may be somewhat less difficult and destructive for all of us if there can be some agreement on some ground rules.

I recognize that no one has appointed me field judge in these matters, and I have my own well-developed beliefs about the war, but still it may help us to have a look at some possible guidelines.

RIGHT OF DISSENT

First (and most obviously), the rights of all must be respected. The right of dissent is fundamental. It includes the right to dissent even at the cost of misunderstanding and ill feeling. It emphatically includes the right of a man who is a leader in one field to express his views in another.

Dr. King, for example, has every right to a public view on the war, and if he had roundly endorsed it I doubt if anyone would have raised the question against him.

(Some of his arguments seem to me greatly overstated, and for myself I wholly reject the contention that the war is now a major block to the progress of Negroes; but we are talking here about rights, and Dr. King's right to state his own strong views seems to me beyond discussion.)

There is a parallel right of reply, and there are also other rights of citizens which dissenters are bound to respect. It is one thing to speak one's mind and quite another to prevent the speech of others. I have the impression that these rules are better understood in the press and among politicians than they are in some of our academies. It is therefore a special service when these reciprocal requirements of freedom are emphasized—as they often have been in these recent months—by those who align themselves, on the merits, among the dissenters.

UNDERSTAND THE YOUNG

My second rule is less obvious but almost equally important over the long run. It is that the old owe understanding to the young. When feelings become intense—as they often must in war and debates on war—

a special requirement of sympathy and forbearance falls on the older generation.

This rule first came home to me at a time when I was young and the debate was between the advocates of isolation and intervention. By and large, the most intelligent and articulate of my friends and contemporaries were isolationists. I thought they were wrong. But I also thought they met with little human sympathy from older men who disagreed.

For reasons that are as powerful as they are sensitive, young men and women feel an almost pre-emptive concern with the privacy and the independence of their judgments on matters of war and peace. Their lives and futures are more open and more immediately vulnerable; their sense of distance from those who seem to decide is wider; their sense of outrage at all destruction less tempered by the hard experience of the daily necessity to settle for the lesser evil.

We do not have to agree with them, but we do need to try to understand. I must add that a parallel obligation of understanding from old to young exists also from older dissenters among us to the younger men whose courage serves us all in South Vietnam today. The frustration and anger of these young men, as and when it appears, may well be felt far over on the side of more and greater force. If they in turn are to understand and to accept a course that is slower and more restrained, they will need the kind of understanding and respect for their efforts that the young dissenters on the other side can claim for their most honorable doubts.

The proper home of understanding between young and old should be the university. And even in this time of campus turmoil, I think we can rightly assign this task to the universities first of all.

Yet the forbearance of politicians is a great force for civic peace in its own right, and one may plead a little with communicators too for understanding here. The young are not to be judged by their most violent representatives, and those who control the access to the headline and the screen have much to answer for if they appear to reward wildness in the young as they once appeared to reward the wildness of McCarthy.

THE TRUTH IS GRAY

My third rule may be the hardest of all. It is that gray is the color of truth. If one word more than another is fitting to Vietnam, it is "complex." The origins of the struggle, its current shape, the implications of alternative courses, the relation of one act to another, the influence of time and space—not one of these is simple.

And yet the pressures for simplification are overwhelming. This is always the case when a political campaign is in the making. The pressures are heaviest on those who have or seek political responsibility. The politician may recognize complexity well enough—and perhaps better than the next man; but he is under insistent public pressure to take a stand.

In recent months, this pressure has fallen most cruelly on those who may become candidates. In other times in recent years, it has pressed with particular force upon those already holding office. It will bear down upon both groups as the months go by.

In this situation one may ask for special attention to the grayness of truth from scholars and from commentators. Their feelings may be deeply engaged on one side or the other, but unlike the politician, it is not their calling to fight for life and death in a contest for votes. It is their calling to get things straight and to state them just as clearly and as fairly as they can.

It is evident from the record of recent months that there is a pressure toward polarization among men of good will both in the world of communication and in the world of the professors. Those who are most worthy of their calling will be most wary of such pressure.

THE PRESENT IS PARAMOUNT

My fourth rule is a practical counsel as well as a test for use on the arguments of others. We must start from where we are. The choices before our nation are not what they were at any earlier point. We are not now in 1954 or 1956 or 1961 or even 1964. There is much to be learned from those earlier years but there is no return to them. The real center of debate must be on the present and on the future, and this rule applies to all three groups—but I think with a special force to politicians.

EXAMINE THE CONSEQUENCES

The fifth rule grows from the fourth. Choices have consequences, and a man must examine the consequences of what he favors as well as those of what he is against. This rule, again, should apply primarily to politicians, but I would suggest a watchful role for communicators and professors as well. In all really hard situations—and Vietnam is surely one of them—no choice of action will seem easy or pleasant; all will have painful consequences.

In such cases there is a heavy temptation to focus attention upon the painful results of what the other man is doing or proposing to do, and to glide past the difficulties in the option one prefers. We have all seen this happen in the years behind us. We shall do well to be watchful against it in the months ahead.

The danger, in my judgment, can be found in all schools of thought. Among those who would use much more force, there is a most dangerous tendency to neglect the risks of wider conflict. Among those who believe in a considerable reduction of our current levels of effort, there is a similar disposition to be blind to the encouragement that such a course might give the enemy.

I have always thought, for example, that the advocates of the enclave gave only the most fragmentary attention to the real consequences of their proposal. I believe they have hit on a sure-fire way to lose first the countryside and then the country, and if I am unfair to them it is only because they themselves have never taken the trouble to tell just how they would apply their notion on the ground.

POINTS OF AGREEMENT

My sixth rule runs against our whole concept of debating, and so much the worse for debating. The points of agreement are worth attention too. For most of us, however strong our feelings, there is a lot more common ground on Vietnam than the tone of the debate suggests.

At the extremes, of course, there are men who could not agree with each other on anything. But in the arena of general public discussion—where perhaps 80 per cent of us would find ourselves—the case is different.

I think, for example, that the margin of difference between the public positions of Sen. Robert Kennedy and of the Administration may not be more than 10 per cent of all that matters on Vietnam. It is an important 10 per cent, of course, but it is not the whole of the matter.

I have friends among the dissenters whose statements of our necessary objectives in Vietnam do not differ at all from my own. Differences among means and differences of diplomatic timing, I deeply believe, are often smaller than they seem in the heat of immediate argument. I for one accept the view of the most prominent dissenters that they intend no hasty pullout from Vietnam and that they will accept no settlement that gives that country to the Communists by force.

I think they are sometimes overoptimistic about the value of particular diplomatic proposals and I have no doubt they suppose me to be rigid in such skepticism. There is another difference on the value and danger and the cost of different levels of bombing in the North. But this difference, too, important as it is, is not at the very center of the meaning of Vietnam.

If the efforts to establish areas of agreement were half as intense among all parties as the intention to find differences, we should understand each other better and the day of success would be brought closer.

WE DON'T SPEAK FOR HANOI

My seventh rule takes us to the question of the real prospect of negotiation and settlement. It is simply that no one of us speaks for Hanoi. This reminder I offer with evenhandedness to doves and hawks alike.

Those who tell us that certain kinds of pressure will bring the enemy to the table too easily assume that the men in Hanoi think just like them—and the same is true of those who propose their own terms for reasonable settlement. Their tacit assumption is that what seems reasonable to them will be reasonable also to Ho Chi Minh.

The leaders in North Vietnam are not Western professional military men and they are not distinguished Senators either. They are guerrilla fighters and dedicated Communists who believe that they can overcome the weapons of strategic bombardment and who have no interest in the peaceful accommodations of liberal democracy.

So nothing could be more futile than to play games with ourselves by offering either the stick or the carrot which is shaped to our own preferences and not theirs.

BOTH VIETNAMS LISTEN

The eighth rule is painful to those who believe in debate, but I do not see how we can forget it. Hanoi and Saigon are both listening. It does no good to pretend that our arguments do not affect the decisions of others beyond our shores. They do. That is no reason for the end of debate, and the right of free comment should not be confined by this concern. Yet those who exercise this right are fooling themselves if they suppose that what they say has no consequences abroad.

I was astonished to find my friend Arthur Schlesinger has so low an opinion of his own importance as to think that his words are not weighed in Hanoi by decision makers. And in different ways on different wave-lengths attention is tuned to our words in the South as well.

It is therefore helpful if those who support our policy can consistently emphasize the need for parallel action in the South, while those who criticize it can help a lot by reminding the listeners in the North of the fact, if they think it a fact, as I do, that there is just no prospect of success for Communists by force in South Vietnam, whatever is said and done in American debates and elections.

ONLY ONE PRESIDENT

My ninth rule I will assert without proof, because I am too close to it. It is that we can have only one President at a time. If you accept this rule, it applies to questions of diplomatic negotiation, of command decision and of national political leadership. It confers no immunity from criticism and no requirement of support. Yet it does set the President apart—in our interest, not his own.

WE NEED EACH OTHER

My tenth and final rule grows from the fact that all great debates come to an end, while the United States of America goes on: We shall all need each other again. The passions of political commitment can run strong in the most placid of seasons. They have a special heat in time of war, and a special ferocity when the value and meaning of that war are under question. But they are only partial passions.

Wars end and the passions fade. And the work of the Nation goes on again both inside our border and around the world. Indeed, in

this strange contest, this work goes forward even while the war is at its height.

Does it not follow that our war of words should have its limits too? It is not the American tradition that dissent, dispute, debate and defiance are ends in themselves. Human sympathy across political difference, magnanimity in the face of division and temperance in assessment and calmness in conviction—these moderating qualities can help us in our necessary battles and beyond them.

OEO GRANTS FUNDS TO SWAFCA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the Office of Economic Opportunity recently funded an innovative demonstration program for the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association—SWAFCA—which encompasses many of the poor rural farmers in a 10-county area.

It is my understanding that much of the nearly $400,000 grant will be used to employ agricultural, marketing, and business specialists to provide technical assistance and make certain that sound management exists throughout the program. Should this experimental project, which aims to involve the rural poor in solving their own local problems, guided by specialized experts, be successful, it could well prove to be a useful model for reducing the migration of the rural poor into slum-infested sections of major cities.

In view of the importance of this program, I ask unanimous consent that a press release describing this grant be printed in the RECORD.

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

FARM COOPERATIVE GRANT TO 10 ALABAMA COUNTIES

The Office of Economic Opportunity today announced a comprehensive demonstration grant of $399,967 to the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association (SWAFCA), a 10-county cooperative in one of the Nation's most depressed rural areas.

The grant is designed to test ways by which poor farmers can significantly raise their income, become self-sufficient and develop farm-related programs.

The Cooperative originally requested $503,460, but it was determined by OEO that a lesser amount would be adequate to successfully implement the proposed program. The project has been endorsed as economically feasible by the Department of Agriculture and the Economic Development Agency, both of whom will provide expert assistance to the Cooperative. Both agencies have agreed that SWAFCA is an innovative demonstration program which will not in any way duplicate existing services and programs.

The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association cooperative will initially include 800 farm families in 10 Blackbelt counties of Alabama. It is anticipated that the co-op's membership will expand to 1,500 families during the first year of production. Membership is open to all low-income farmers in the 10-county area. Nine of these counties are among the poorest in the country. Most of the farm families involved earn less than $1,000 per year.

Because of mechanization, reduced cotton allotments, falling farm prices, and other factors, more than 300 former local farmers have been identified by SWAFCA as ready to leave the land. Without alternatives, these farmers and their families, and many others will also find it necessary to relocate into cities, thus repeating the pattern of migration to city slums that has continued over recent years.

The grant announced today aims at reversing this trend, to better the plight of these farmers with a self-help program of economic development, crop and livestock diversification, and experimentation with higher profit and yield farming.

The project will test new concepts in OEO's programs of assistance to low-income farm families in the Southern blackbelt. There is no equivalent in the existing OEO programs in the area. A large part of the grant will be allocated for agricultural, marketing and business specialists to provide necessary technical assistance, and insure sound management practices.

The first crops that will be marketed through the co-op will be okra, peas, cucumbers and corn. Additional crops and farm products are to be added in the fall season and during the next year. A special feature of this grant is a provision for a "loan insurance" fund which will enable the cooperative to provide security for loans from private sources for basic farm supplies and equipment.

Questions raised concerning the SWAFCA proposal have been answered by a thorough investigation and re-evaluation by OEO in consultation with other Federal agencies. The examination showed that the program is structurally and economically sound, that SWAFCA's Board has been democratically elected by its member farmers, and that the potential staff members are fully competent. As in the original proposal, OEO will provide a liaison project manager and on-going evaluations of the project.

Joseph Johnson, of Dallas County, is President of SWAFCA. Calvin S. Orsborn, a business man in Selma, has been named as Co-op (business) Manager, SWAFCA will employ a comptroller and an accountant. Additionally, periodic audits will be performed by an independent firm. OEO must approve the Co-op's appointment of all key personnel.

Among those supporting the project are the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., the Southern Regional Council, the National Sharecroppers Fund, and the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. Dr. B. D. Mayberry, Dean of the School of Agriculture, Tuskegee Institute; James Patton, Past President of the National Farmers' Union; John Baker, Assistant Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture, and Ross Davis, Director of the Economic Development Agency are among those who have reviewed the proposal and believe it to be an economically sound and promising pilot program.

SWAFCA will operate in the Southwest Alabama counties of Dallas, Lowndes, Wilcox, Perry, Hale, Greene, Monroe, Marengo, Choctaw, and Sumter.

ANTI-VIETNAM WAR DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, our country has been assaulted in recent weeks by a wave of anti-American demonstrations against our involvement in Vietnam.

Agitators and demonstrators have taken to the streets to march and parrot leftwing slogans, and in some instances there have been desecrations of the American flag and draft-card burnings.

Last week's edition of the Warner Robins Reporter contained an excellent editorial on this shameful conduct in general, with particular reference to the refusal of the boxer Cassius Clay to be inducted into the U.S. Army. This article raises the question of whether Clay and others like him are fit to wear the uniform of the Army of the United States. I personally do not think that Clay is any great loss to our Army, and I do not think that he is qualified to serve alongside our patriotic fighting men in Vietnam.

I believe the editorial reflects the feelings of most Americans. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

PHENOMENON OF CLAY AND MEDAL, BRINGS THOUGHTS OF SHAME FOR SO-CALLED CHAMP

The medal was there on my desk. It was a familiar one, giving off a warm, yellow glow from the gold of it and the silhouette of George Washington sparkled with its newness.

Only recently it had been presented to a young Warner Robins man, half-way across the world in South Viet Nam. Even as his mother brought it proudly to our offices, her son lay in a far-away hospital, recuperating from the wounds which had won him the medal.

It was a Purple Heart and we felt strangely humble even in its presence. We have seen men earn them and cried for them as they won them. They are not come by easily.

They are presented only after your own life-blood has been spilled on behalf of your country.

It is a medal which says for all eternity that this man, this hero, has stood firm between America and her enemies during a time of conflict, and that those enemies have wounded him.

And that medal lay on the desk, glinting in the afternoon sun, which streamed through a nearby window.

We glanced toward the corner of the desk and there lay the afternoon's newspaper, with a picture, face up, of one Cassius Clay, so-called heavyweight boxing champion of the world.

Suddenly, it seemed the very desk itself had been defiled and was not worthy of holding that honored medal. We quickly gathered up the newspaper and tossed it into the nearest trash can.

But throwing away a printed page cannot erase the thoughts, which all of us must be having in these troubled times.

What kind of society can produce these two phenomena at one and the same time?

On the one hand is the youngster, barely fresh from his crib, fighting, without whimpers or pleadings, and taking wounds on his young body from a relentless enemy, who would enslave us.

On the other, a clown, who says he will sit in a jail cell before he will take his place beside the youngster.

And this clown is a direct product of the free society for which the young man from Warner Robins lies hurt and wounded.

What a strange and unfathomable thing it is.

This clown, by the name of Clay, has become wealthy through his ability and willingness to beat other men senseless with his fists.

A member of a minority in the polyglot of groups, which make up this America, he could have reached his present heights nowhere else in the world.

By the grace of God he was, along with the rest of us, fortunate enough to be born in a land where he could truly *"lift himself by the boot straps."*

It is true that his race has, in many ways, been poorly used by many of us, and for that we must all bear the shame and guilt.

It is, however, just as true that his race enjoys nowhere else on earth the opportunity, rights and privileges he enjoys here.

And for this nation, he says he will not wear the uniform or fight.

He says it is because of his religion, which is supposed to be Muslim or something.

And so he joins the ranks of the beatniks, draft-card burners, border-crossers and that ilk.

While others, such as the youngster from Warner Robins, defend our very liberty in one of the most vicious wars of all history, they hide behind mealy-mouthing and excuses.

This clown's case is now expected to be in the courts for at least a couple of years. And what the final outcome will be is anybody's guess.

Meanwhile there have been many suggestions as to what should be done with, and to, this so-called boxing champion.

The most often heard suggestion is that *"he should be drafted immediately and sent straight to Viet Nam along with all those other beatniks."*

At first blush this seems like a reasonable punishment to be desired.

This writer learned the other afternoon, however, that this is not the answer.

The uniform of the various armed forces of the United States of America is a beautiful, and honored, and respected thing.

It has been worn proudly by such giants among us as Eisenhower, York, MacArthur, Diamond, Jones, Kelly, Wainright and Sullivan, just to mention a few.

To put it on the likes of this clown would only be to soil and degrade it.

Instead, let us do with them as this writer did with the old newspaper.

Let us consign them to the trash can of our disdain and contempt and let honorable men turn away when they pass our way, and let us not look upon them, or speak their names ever again.

Let us make sure that nothing about them, not even their names, come in even the remotest proximity to those who are now protecting us with their very lives.

NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, today marks the 153d anniversary of Norwegian independence, and it is an appropriate day for Congress to recall the many contributions of Norwegian people and their descendants to the world and to the United States.

On May 17, 1814, the Norwegian people set sail on uncharted seas after a long struggle for independence. The strength which these people have developed from their land, their toil, and their faith has been transferred to the United States by the many who have made the journey westward to the New World and the United States, and by their descendants.

In the half century preceding World War II the immigration of these fine people to the United States was at its peak, and those who were arriving were concentrated in Dakota Territory, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. In 1910, the U.S. census returns showed that Norwegians were the most closely concentrated nationality in the Union, and Norwegian, the language of the smallest independent people in Europe, ranked ninth in the number of its users in America.

Norwegian Lutheran Churches were rapidly set up in America. Norwegians took an interest in some other Protestant faiths, an interest which also made itself felt in Norway.

Norway and the United States share a spirit of independence, dedication to freedom, and a sense of national responsibility. The Norwegian settlers who bought land in the United States under the Homestead Act displayed the sense of initiative which has made our country great.

Today Norway and the United States defend the ideals of freedom in a common alliance. In the thinking of Norwegians, the idea of an Atlantic alliance dates back much earlier than the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949. Our common traits as democratic and peace-loving peoples made this a natural idea as early as the Second World War. Trygve Lie, a distinguished Norwegian and citizen of the world, stressed in December 1940 that "the Atlantic does not divide us, on the contrary it unites us," and a year later he set his Atlantic Alliance within the framework of a "community of nations."

The Norwegian Government in exile actively promoted the formation of the United Nations, and Trygve Lie became its first Secretary General.

Her greatest contribution, of course, has come from the thousands upon thousands of immigrants who came to our shores in the past century to carve a life and create a civilization out of the American frontier. The Norwegian influence has been especially great in the upper Midwest area of the Dakotas, Minnesota, and Montana. In this land of temperate climate, rugged terrain, and sparkling lakes, the Norwegian immigrant found an environment almost identical to his native land, and it was only natural that he chose to settle here. The saga of that historic era in American history has been told lucidly by Ole Rolvaag, the father of the former Governor of Minnesota, in his book "Giants of the Earth," and also by Hamlin Garland in his "A Son of the Middle Border."

Both books tell how the dauntless and indefatigable Norwegians challenged the raw frontier, met it in the crucible of the prairie wilderness, and tamed it to their will so that its land now feeds half the world and its iron, coal, and timber provide the energy for countless forms of industry.

Today Norwegians have taken their rightful place among the melting pot of America and contribute to the welfare of our Government from the Halls of Congress to the local city council, and from Main Street to Madison Avenue.

As we celebrate the 153d anniversary of Norwegian independence, we salute the Norwegian people all over the world as well qualified as ever to pioneer stormy and uncharted seas.

THE PRESIDENT, THE PRESS, DISSENT, AND WAR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, pity the President: despised by the press at home and abroad, his honesty and integrity attacked in most world capitals, his ability to find peace ridiculed, his direction of the war severely criticized.

The President was Abraham Lincoln.

The moral is that most of our great Presidents who deal with the crucial issues of our time are subject to unfair, and often outrageous, vilification and abuse.

Now it is President Johnson's turn. But history will eradicate most of the irresponsible dissent directed at him, just as it has in the case of Lincoln.

This is the central point of an article by J. R. Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post, which reveals the uncanny parallels between the criticisms directed at Abraham Lincoln 100 years ago, and those directed at President Johnson. The tune played by professional doom-and-gloom journalists has not changed much in a century. Nor has the kind of abuse heaped upon a President leading his people through perilous years.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Wiggins' article into the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENT, PRESS, DISSENT, AND WAR

(By J. R. Wiggins)

The President, from the outset, displeased much of the press at home and abroad. A leading French newspaper was the first to isolate as one of these factors in newspaper discontent his lack of candor. "Just when people are looking to him for a frank, clear statement he finds nothing more explicit to say to the waiting world than that he will do his duty," this journal commented.[1] The same newspaper bluntly criticized him for putting 400,000 men in the field. It said that "much blood was being spilled and immense sums expended only to achieve in the end, a negative result! This is the prospect which the American conflict offers today."[2]

The President's character as a politician also annoyed the French press. A French paper, very early in the President's term said: "Once more he has allowed himself to be led astray by the sad habit which the contests of party have made a second nature with him, and which consists in bringing to the government of the whole country the same expedients for keeping an equilibrium as suffice for the management of an electoral campaign."[3]

The tendency to launch new military campaigns with excessive optimism and boasting distressed other French newspapers. La Patrie of Paris spoke of the army setting out accompanied with "dithyrambs in honor of this invincible army (better equipped than any in the world)." And it asked, "But what avail is brute force . . . when it must contend against intelligent men defending their independence?"[4]

He did not suit the British press any better. The London Times, annoyed at the President's stubborn pursuit of military objectives, said, "This helpless and blind pertinacity would be excusable and harmless in him (personally) but it is inexcusable and disastrous in the President of the United States. It makes him useless, and worse than useless, for that which ought to be his great purpose, the guiding and controlling of the vast forces of passion and interest and ideas which sway the unsettled nation he presides over."[5]

Conscription aroused British complaint. A London magazine expressed English horror at the use of conscripted Negro soldiers, and in one cartoon pictured the President with a gun at the head of a Negro in uniform.[6] Another London magazine, in a cartoon, pictured Columbia drastically saying to the President: "You have swollen the earth with the blood of my children. Show me what I am to gain by this or look for my dire vengeance in the future."[7]

The Chicago *Times* deplored the President's bad taste in bringing up controversial matters while paying tribute to war dead. It said that convention and custom precluded this practice. It pointed out that "an Indian in eulogizing the memories of warriors who

[1] La Patrie, Paris, March 29, 1861.
[2] Ibid, July 21, 1861.
[3] The French Courier des Etats-Unis, Oct. 8, 1862.
[4] La Patrie, Paris, May 25, 1864.
[5] The London Times, Sept. 18, 1863.
[6] London Punch, Nov. 19, 1864.
[7] London Fun, Dec. 3, 1864.

had fallen in battle would avoid allusion to differences in the tribe which had no connection with the prevailing circumstances and which he knew would excite unnecessarily the bitter prejudices of his hearers." "Is the President no better than a savage?" it asked.[8]

The President's efforts to obtain peace were almost as much criticized as his management of the war. The Richmond *Sentinel* spoke for many when it said he "demanded terms that he knew to be utterly inadmissable and which were intended to be so, terms which no people, worthy of being associated with by persons who respect themselves, ever did or ever could accept."[9]

Many noted that this war differed from early patriotic wars in the sense of popular support, and they pointed out than many men, of the sort who would have volunteered in earlier combats, did not shrink from hiring substitutes to do military service for them in this one.[10]

There is no doubt that comment of this kind reflected a long standing and profound unhappiness with the President that began almost the very day he was elected to office. The country and its press, from the start, found fault with the war he directed, with the way he directed it, with his domestic program, with the style of his public papers, the manner of his speech, his ungainly appearance and his frequent disregard of properties hitherto respected in public conduct.

A VOLUNTEER ARMY—DESIRABLE BUT DIFFICULT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the following facts are interesting with respect to the circumstances incident to a possible volunteer army today, and in 1960.

The following table gives the Army figures on the dates in question:

June 30, 1960	873,087
June 30, 1966	1,199,878
June 30, 1967 (anticipated level)	1,454,200

The following comparisons are significant with respect to the new enlistments and new inductions for the years indicated:

	New enlistments (volunteers)	Inductions	Total	Percent inductions
Fiscal year ending June 30, 1961	116,000	60,000	176,000	33
Fiscal year ending June 30, 1967	170,000	318,000	478,000	67

The above figures show that during the Army buildup, it has been necessary to resort to the draft to a larger extent in order to meet military manpower requirements.

The fact is that while an all-volunteer force is a commendable ideal, reality demonstrates that where we have a shooting war, and no real civilian unemployment, there is no feasible way to maintain an all-volunteer force.

The Department of Defense has estimated that even to maintain the pre-Vietnam strength level for the Department of Defense of around 2,700,000 according to some Defense statements would require an additional cost of from $4 to $17 billion per year. To maintain an all-volunteer force for the June 30, 1967, strength level of 3,387,000 would involve well over an additional $20 billion per year.

Aside from the economic factors, an all-volunteer force today would be feasible only if a number of "if's" were resolved.

If we knew that volunteers would come forth in sufficient numbers to meet rapidly expanding requirements.

If we knew that, after a buildup, volunteers would come forth in sufficient numbers to replace battle casualties and meet all other manpower requirements.

If we had some means of preventing an Army from becoming overaged by being able to tell a sizable percentage of the volunteers that, after their first enlistment, they would no longer be needed.

As the above figures illustrate, we have a sizable percentage of volunteers in the service today. Without the draft, however, all directly connected with this question agree that much of the present incentive for enlistment would be absent.

[8] The Chicago Times, Nov. 23, 1863, commenting on the Gettysburg Address.

[9] The Richmond Sentinel, Feb. 13, 1865, after the failure of negotiations with the Confederate delegation.

[10] Catton, This Hallowed Ground, p. 317.

AMENDMENT OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on March 16, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. MAGNUSON] introduced S. 1314, a bill to modernize certain restrictions upon the application and scope of the exemptions applying to inland barge lines. On March 30, the Pittsburgh, Pa., Press published an analysis of the problem facing the inland waterway industry. The article quotes a leading barge executive, Charles E. Walker, president of Union Barge Line Corp., a subsidiary of Dravo Corp. Mr. Walker points out that one sentence now in section 300(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act could upset much of the advantage Pittsburgh has as a river port.

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:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Mar. 30, 1967]

ONE SENTENCE MAKES 40 RIVER BARGES A "SINGLE VESSEL"—LEGISLATION BEFORE SENATE SUPPORTED BY UNION BARGE

(By William Allan)

The U.S. Supreme Court has rocked the boat again—in the river transportation industry, this time—and it will take an act of Congress to right the keel.

. . . At least Charles E. Walker, president of Union Barge Line (a Dravo subsidiary) here, hopes an act will straighten out things.

Pittsburgh, because it is a center of the river transportation industry, is very much affected.

The court has ruled that a flotilla, a tow boat and its barges, is a "single vessel." This can involve a tow boat and up to 40 barges.

"What is a vessel" is a mighty important question down on the river. The Interstate Commerce Act specifically states that no one can carry more than three bulk commodities in a single vessel without publishing tariffs and conforming to the rest of a myriad of regulations.

Thus, the way the situation stands today, Union Barge Line, et al, can't carry more than three bulk cargoes in a tow of 40 barges at bulk rates.

Ridiculous, you say?

To Charles E. Walker, this could upset much of the advantage Pittsburgh has as a river port.

He points out that Union Barge has increased its volume 500 times (from 800 million to 3.8 billion cargo ton miles) in the past 25 years while its rates have gone up only 10 per cent. Union is a common carrier and is regulated, but much of the low cost of shipping by river comes from the big tows, it says.

When the act was passed a quarter century ago, many river tows involved only one commodity—four to six barges loaded with coal and pushed by a 700-horsepower sternwheeler—but today a river tow can involve 40 barges, 40,000 tons (four times as much as the old Liberty ships used to carry) all pushed by a 6400-horsepower diesel.

What's being carried?

Coal, steel, stone, grain, oil, asphalt, tars, chemicals, salt and just everything else you can think of, according to Mr. Walker.

This all is important to Pittsburgh because the cheaper the transportation—be it by rail, plane, truck or foot—the further Pittsburgh's steel can go and still be competitive with that being made in Chicago, the Delaware Valley and, soon, Houston.

U.S. Senator Warren Magnuson, Washington Democrat and chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, has introduced the legislation to clear up the whole situation. Union Barge is all for it.

Amazingly, it merely deletes one sentence from the act—the one that says "For the purposes of this subsection, two or more vessels while navigated as a unit shall be considered to be a single vessel."

That one sentence is enough Government red tape to tie up a whole flotilla.

"WE ARE CONCERNED": THE PROTEST OF 319 COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY FACULTY MEMBERS AGAINST U.S. POLICIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a vigorous and forthright statement critical of the U.S. military role in Southeast Asia has been issued by 319 members of the faculties of Columbia University. The list includes men and women eminent in their fields—history, political science, economics, and other disciplines. It is a distinguished list of scholars and the import of their protest should be appreciated by those who are responsible for our ill-advised, disastrous military adventures on the continent of Asia, although to date they have appeared impervious to the mounting expressions of distress at their folly.

The statement makes clear the devastating nature of U.S. performance and the hollowness of the allegation that we are there to combat foreign aggression.

The Columbia faculty signers state clearly:

We are unable to see any necessity in this war, or any legitimate national interest that would not be much better served by diplomacy than by destruction.

Most properly they refer to it as both a "detestable" and a "monstrous" war. It is.

I congratulate the signers on the soundness of their appraisal, and ask unanimous consent that their statement which has had relatively scant attention in the press, togther with a list of the signers, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

A STATEMENT

We, members of the Faculties of Columbia University, sign this statement as individuals. Few of us claim special professional knowledge concerning the tragic events in Vietnam, but all of us are occupationally committed to critical thought. We do not address ourselves to any foreign government or group—as Americans we cannot control their policies. We address ourselves to our countrymen because we believe that the present war is a grave danger to the peace and well-being of the entire world, because we feel morally involved in the course adopted by our country in the name of its citizens, and because we have concluded that this course is tragically wrong. We now join in urging new directions in national policy.

We are concerned by the gradual but steady escalation of the war. Over 7000 young Americans have already died in Vietnam, and many more Vietnamese have been killed, combatants on both sides as well as civilians; the number of wounded is in the hundreds of thousands. Each day the war continues increases the possibility of world wide involvement and nuclear destruction on a global scale.

We are concerned by our government's persistence in treating the problem of Vietnam mainly as one of foreign aggression. We believe that the fighting there was, until our large scale intervention, primarily a civil war.

We are concerned about the methods used to wage this allegedly limited war, about the destruction of villages, about civilian casualties, about the use of napalm and chemicals, about the million new refugees, most of whom are seeking to escape our fire power.

We are concerned by the huge share of our country's resources consumed by the war in Vietnam. Surely the honorable purposes of the United States as they relate to the world at large would be better served by devoting the same resources to economic development, better education, improved medical facilities. To spend billions of dollars to devastate a country that does not threaten its neighbors, let alone us, is a poor way to begin building a better world.

We are concerned about the continued bombing of North Vietnam. Opportunities have been lost to stop the bombing in circumstances that would have enhanced our national honor. We reject the view that our country should take no step toward abating the war until our adversaries demonstrate indisputable readiness to match each step.

We are concerned about the lack of "decent respect for the opinions of mankind" shown by our government's unresponsiveness to the entreaties by the Secretary General of the United Nations, many foreign statesmen, and many religious spokesmen.

We are concerned about the plight of young fellow citizens, our students among them, who may be forced to participate in a military action that many of them consider illegal and immoral.

We are unable to see any necessity in this war, or any legitimate national interest that would not be much better served by diplomacy than by destruction. American leadership in stopping the war and an American generosity aimed at healing the Vietnamese wounds, both local and national, would earn the respect and admiration of the Vietnamese people and the world at large.

We urgently call on the President and the Congress to extricate the nation from a detestable war. This will require bold and decisive actions. One of these should be to stop the bombing in the North. We commend courageous persons in public life who speak out against this monstrous war, and pledge them our support.

SIGNERS OF STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

Alexander Alland, Jr., Chester G. Anderson, Theodore Wilbur Anderson, Jr., Harry A. Anthony, William W. Appleton, Nathaniel Arbiter, Robert Austerlitz.

Dean H. Baker, Harold Barger, Erik Barnouw, Hyman Bass, James H. Beck, Bernard Beckerman, Charles O. Beckmann, Jack Beeson, Sam M. Beiser, Daniel Bell*, Reinhold Benesch, William R. Bennett, Eric Bentley, Ivar E. Berg, Jr., Curtis J. Berger, Lipman Bers, Richard Bersohn, Frank Beube, Sherman Beychok, Rudolph Binion, Gordon C. Bjork, Harlan M. Blake, Joseph L. Blau, Alan F. Blum, Charles R. Blyth, Gene S. Boolos, Trudy Bradley, Gerald P. Brady, George Brager, Ronald C. D. Breslow, Otto J. Brendel, David L. Brown, Harold W. Brown, Homer O. Brown, Craig B. Brush, Justus Buchler.

Charles Cantor, Theodore Caplow, Dean C. Carson, Vittorio Castelli, Robert Hugh Chapman, Erwin Chargaff, Victor Christ-Janer, Richard Christie, C.-K. Chu, Eloise E. Clark, James A. Clifford, Richard A. Cloward, Gerson D. Cohen, Lawrence B. Cohen, Thomas S. Colahan, Arthur W. Collins, George R. Collins, Miriam Conant, Mason Cooley, George Cooper, William A. Corpe, James A. Coulter, Robert Dougherty Cross, Robert D. Cumming.

Phyllis Dain, Alexander Dallin, Arthur C. Danto, Howard McP. Davis, Robert Gorham Davis, Istvan Deak, Herbert A. Deane, Paul A. Delaney, Leonardo C. DeMorelos, Stephen Paul Denker, Cyrus Derman*, Sigmun Diamond, Vernon K. Dibble, Daniel B. Dodson, Frederick Dupee.

Nathan Edelman, Dan J. Ehrlich, Max Aaron Eisenberg, Ainslee T. Embree, John E. Englund, Bernard F. Erlanger, Alexander Erlich, Amitai Etzioni.

David Fanshel, Tom J. Farer, Otic Edward Fellows, Samuel Finestone, George Fischer, Angus S. Fletcher, James Marston Fitch, Robert Fogelson, Henry M. Foley.

George K. Fraenkel, Margaret Frank, Murray Frank, Julian H. Franklin, Alfred Knox Frazer, Alice G. Fredman, Morton H. Fried, Alan Friedman.

Erwin Yvan Galantay, James W. Galligan, Francisco Garcia-Lorca, John A. Garraty, Peter Gay, Alfred Gellhorn, Walter Gellhorn, Mason J. Gentzler, Romaldo Giurgola, Leon Goldin, Michael Goldman, Fred H. Goldner, Leonard J. Goldwater, Maurice Goldsmith, William J. Goode, Percival Goodman, Frederic D. Grab, Loren O. Graham, Wallace Allison Gray, Stephen Greene, Robert K. Greenawalt, Robert A. Gross.

James O. F. Hackshaw, Leopold Henry Haimson, Christos D. Halkias, William E. Harkins, Cyril M. Harris, Marvin Harris, Evelyn B. Harrison, Sven R. Hartmann, William W. Havens, Jr., Allen T. Hazen, Louis Hawes, Jr., John E. Heliker, Shirley Hellenbrund, Frances E. Henne, Howard Hibbard, Kent A. Hieatt, Dale L. Hiestand, Alfred Hill, Richard Hofstadter, Florence Hollis, Ralph L. Holloway, Terrence K. Hopkins, Carl F. Hovde, John R. Humphreys, Herbert Hyman.

John Imbrie.

Shirley Jenkins, Samuel F. Johnson.

Richard A. Katz, Thomas J. Katz, Edgar Kaufmann, Jr., G. Marshall Kay, Frederick M. Keener, Mark Kesselman, J. Kenneth Koch, Ellis R. Kolchin, Alexander Kouzmanoff, Richard F. Kuhns, Jr., Polykarp Kusch.

William Labov, Edward P. Lanning, Serge Lang, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Lewis Leary, Leon M. Lederman, Gari K. Ledyard, Tsung-Dao Lee, Paul Lerman, William E. Leuchtenburg, Howard Levene, Seymour Lieberman, Raymond Lifchez, Edward A. Lippman, S. B. Littauer, James P. Logan, Maristella de P. Lorch, Barbara W. Low, Ian A. Lowson, Otto C. Luening, Louis Lusky, Joaquin M. Luttinger.

J. Philip McAleer, Peter S. McHugh, Eric L. McKitrick, Paul J. McNulty.

Eugene S. Machlin, Edward E. Malefakis, Andrew L. March, Stephen P. Marcus, Rufus W. Mathewson, Jr.

Seymour Melman, Melvin Mencher, Robbert K. Merten, Carol Meyer, Louis T. Milic, David W. Miller, Irving Miller, J. Malcolm Miller, Jacob Millman, Gary Mitchell, J. George Moore, Councilman Morgan, Sidney Morgenbesser, John N. Morris, Lloyd Motz, John H. Munday, and Robert F. Murphy.

David Nachmansohn, Carl L. Nelson, William Nelson, Joel Newman, William H. Newman, Warren D. Noakes, and Dorothea Nyberg.

Justin M. O'Brien, Lindsay S. Olive, Herman P. Otte, and Alfred R. Oxenfeldt.

Antonia Pantoja, Charles D. Parsons, L. P. G. Peckham, Lawrence D. Pinkham, Jan H. Pokorny, Frances Piven, Howard N. Porter, Peter Prangnell, and Kevin Prendergast.

Gregary Rabassa, Andre Racz, Marc Raeff, John H. Randall, Jr., Orest A. Ranum, Allen Walker Read, David Redfield, Theodore F. Reff, Wallard Rhodes, Dustin Rice, Leah M. Rich, Richard R. Ritti, and Blanca Rosenberg.

John D. Rosenberg, David J. Rothman, Leon S. Roudiez, Lewis P. Rowland, Maurice V. Russell, and Marleigh Ryan.

Reynold M. Sachs, Edward Said, Mario G. Salvadori, Ernest Sanders, William T. Sanders, Meyer Schapiro, Stanley Schachter, S. Perry Schlesinger, Howard H. Schless, Dean Morgan Schmitter, Ralph J. Schwarz, William Schwartz, Robert Serber, Stephen Sharff, Robert P. Shay, David Shemin, James P. Shenton, Vera Shlakman, Abraham Shuchman, Allan A. Silver, William A. Silverman, Simon Slavin, Michael A. Slote, Burton M. Slotnick, Kenneth A. Smith, Paul A. Smith, Ralph S. Solecki, Hans B. C. Spiegel, David B. Sprinson, George Stade, Harold M. Stahmer, Jr., Isabel Stamm, Jack Steinberger, Stanley J. Sterling, Fritz R. Stern, Charles P. Stewart, Robert L. Stigler, Jr., Leon Stilman, Dorothy H. Sumner, and Marshall E. Suther, Jr.

Stuart W. Tanenbaum, Edward W. Tayler, Richard B. Tannant, Herbert S. Terrace, Ray L. Trautman, and Leonard M. Trawick.

Stephen H. Ungar, John E. Unterecker, Everard M. Upjohn, and William Spencer Vickrey.

Charles Wagley, Immanuel M. Wallerstein, Kempton E. Webb, Robert K. Webb, Jerome H. Weiner, George H. Wiedeman, Preston R. Wilcox, Omar Wing, Eugene Winograd, Robert P. Wolff, Francis Michael W. Wong, Carl R. Woodring.

Jack Zwick, and Harriet Zuckerman.

* Messers. Bell and Derman dissent from the third paragraph of the statement.

BRIEFING ON AGRICULTURAL ASPECTS OF TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on Friday morning, May 19, at 10 a.m., the Secretary and Under Secretary of Agricul-

ture will appear before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which subcommittee I am chairman, in room 318, the Caucus Room, Old Senate Office Building, for a briefing on agricultural aspects of the trade agreement which has been under negotiation in Geneva for the past several years. This briefing is being held in conjunction with the subcommittee's consideration of S. 612 which would control the import of dairy products. However, the briefing is not limited to dairy products.

Much interest in the details as they relate to the different agricultural commodities has been shown by Senators and others who are interested in agriculture. Therefore, I am inviting, in addition to the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, all Members of the Senate who have such an interest and all other persons to attend.

The meeting will be a public one, and I believe it will be of interest to all who are interested in agriculture.

A DOOR-TO-DOOR SALES ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in March of this year a committee of the California Assembly held hearings on a proposed Door-to-Door Sales Act. Although the bill did not successfully pass that committee, the California Attorney General's Office has advised me that it has received more complaints about the unethical sales techniques used by door-to-door salesmen than about any other consumer problem. Deputy Attorney General Herschel Elkins, in testifying on behalf of Attorney General Lynch before the assembly committee, delivered an exceptionally fine and concise outline of the various types of schemes frequently employed by the unethical door-to-door salesman to lure consumers into making unwanted purchases. Since Mr. Elkins' summary may contribute to the discussion and consideration of the Door-to-Door Sales Act (S. 1599), I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of his statement appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

ASSEMBLY BILL 209

A major problem has developed in regard to house-to-house sales. Some homeowners, normally careful buyers, awake to realize that the previous evening they had purchased unwanted merchandise, often at inflated prices. They have made these purchases from salesmen who have made unsolicited appearances at their door.

Why have they made such purchases?

1. *Fatigue.*

We have many complaints from homeowners who have purchased encyclopedias, cameras, vacuum cleaners and aluminum siding at 2:00 a.m., 3:00 a.m., and 4:00 a.m., after many hours of high-pressure sales techniques. Most people are too polite, embarrassed or afraid to throw a salesman out of their house. The salesman is an expert at his trade. It is an unequal struggle. Worn-out by the salesman, they wearily sign the contract just to get rid of him. One camera salesman sold a $400.00 package to a family at 2:00 a.m., and then proceeded to sell a 70 year old frail woman visitor another $400.00 package with the homeowner as a co-signer. The family and the woman visitor on the following day, attempted without success to rescind the contracts. The company, however, had protected itself in the contract by reserving up to seven days during which it could check credit and determine whether it wished to avoid the contract. In fact, the company informs us that it rejects 30–40% of the contracts after a credit check. The customers are not afforded a similar privilege.

We have complaints of aluminum siding being sold at 4:00 a.m., hours after the salesman had been asked to leave. Upon awakening, the homeowner realized the debt he had just contracted for and soon discovered that he was to pay almost double the going market price.

2. *Referral Sales.*

Products are being sold on referral contracts. Salesmen convince the homeowner that he need not concern himself with the price of the product. His referrals would no doubt pay for everything and probably result in a profit for the customer. The customer is convinced and signs the contract without realizing the cost involved. The next morning the homeowner realizes he may have to pay, almost always at a grossly inflated price, for a product he doesn't really need and that the only way he might be able to reduce his debt is to stick his friends with the same grossly inflated product.

3. *Last Opportunity.*

The salesman usually misrepresents to the customer that this is his last chance to buy the product or group of products at a special price. The customer, not having been in the market for such a product or products, usually does not know the going price and is informed by the salesman that he must purchase that night or lose the benefit of the bargain. Almost always the product is being offered at the salesman's usual price and often at a price much higher than a similar or identical product as found in the regular retail store. It is not until the next day that the customer discovers this and by this time it is too late.

4. *Combination Offer.*

Many house-to-house sales involve a combination of products, such as (a) a sewing machine or a vacuum cleaner, (b) pots and pans, (c) glassware and (d) flatware or, (a) an encyclopedia, (b) year books, (c) a bookcase, (d) reference service, (e) children's books and, (f) a dictionary.

Rarely is the customer in the market for these products at the time the salesman approaches. Perhaps he knows the approximate value of one item. Rarely, if ever, does he know the value of each item and they are not presented to him singly. He is suddenly, apparently safe in his home, confronted by a salesman who presents a combination offer and usually tells the customer that (a) this is a special sale, (b) his last opportunity, (c) almost free, (d) an advertising device, or (e) a method of introducing the product in this area. The customer is given little or no time to determine how much he is really paying for each item. He is not the willing customer entering a store to buy. The salesman's approach is sudden, usually unexpected, persuasive and often successful. The next morning or sometimes just after the salesman has left, the customer realizes what he has done.

5. *Right To Cancel.*

Too often salesmen tell the customer that if he decides he doesn't want the product he can cancel. Even when the contract says "non-cancellable", some salesmen tell the customer that it usually takes several days to process the contract and in the interim, he may cancel.

A few days ago we received a complaint from a young couple expecting a baby. The complaint, with the product and salesman's names eliminated, is attached as Exhibit A.

This techniques, with variations, appears frequently. The salesman almost always denies that he told the customer he could cancel and the contract referred to in Exhibit A says in small print:

"In the absence of the conditions as shown above, under Item 1 [miscarriage or stillbirth], this order is not subject to cancellation for any reason and the deposit will not be refunded, credited or transferred."

6. *The Non-contract.*

A number of commercial contacts are being made by telephone. After there is a promise of a free gift or a prize for answering a question such as, "Who is the Governor of California?", the caller then states that a company representative will come to the home of the recipient of the call and deliver a guarantee slip or a receipt or other documents. A salesman then calls and the customer signs what he later realizes to be a contract. He is not expecting to sign a contract and is less than careful when signing the documents presented to him.

7. *The Contract Switch.*

We have recently brought an injunctive action against a company which, among other devices, uses the following method of operation:

An advertisement states that a complete roofing job can be obtained for $200.00. A homeowner answers the ad and a salesman appears and has the homeowner sign a $200.00 contract. The salesman asks whether the customer has seen the company's product at a Home Show. The customer says, "No", and the salesman goes to his car and produces a mangy, horrible looking sample. The customer is horrified and the salesman admits the product is pretty bad. He then proceeds to sell the homeowner the "good" product at $900.00, $1,200.00 or more. The salesman, of course, had no intention of selling the $200.00 product but the customer now has his name on an irrevocable $200.00 contract and rather than lose this money, he signs the higher contract. If the first contract gave him notice that he could rescind, he could cancel the contract and renegotiate without the threat of being stuck with the inferior product.

8. *The Overpriced Product.*

We have complaints that salesmen, making unsolicited calls, have represented that their product is unique and cannot be bought elsewhere. Many of these complaints concern so-called "commercial grade" carpets. The customer is discouraged from comparing prices and since he was not in the market for the product, is unlikely to have compared prices. After the salesman has left, the customer discovers that the same product or one quite similar to it is available at most stores at a fraction of the price charged him. Often carpets are sold house-to-house at so much *per unit* instead of per yard. It is not until the following day that the customer discovers that a unit is a third of a yard. By that time he has purchased a carpet and is amazed to find he has a trust deed on his house.

9. *The Offer Subject to Acceptance.*

Attached as Exhibits B, C and D, are typical contracts used in house-to-house sales. Most of these contracts are either subject to acceptance by the company or subject to cancellation by the company within seven days if the company determines the credit to be inadequate. Thus, the company may rescind but the customer may not. Of course, the customer is informed, if he calls to cancel, that the contract has already been accepted.

Some of the larger and older companies have a company policy under which a customer will be relieved of contractual liability if he notifies the company within a reasonable period of time of his desire to cancel the contract. This is a forward-looking policy and

is to be commended. However, Assembly Bill 209 is needed to make this a uniform policy.

EXHIBIT A

At a time when my wife was in her fourth month of pregnancy or shortly before December 21, 1966, she answered an ad in the TV Guide for baby food, powder, etc. The company then called to see if we would be home that night so that they could personally deliver the baby food, powder, etc., to us. They did not tell us that they were sending a salesman of any kind.

A salesman came to our home that evening with the products and displayed them to us. He then asked if we would like to see a motion picture on safety, stating that his company was actually primarily interested in the safety of children in the home. We said yes. He showed us the movie which turned out to be a film: devoted to showing the advantages of the company products. He asked my wife if she would use these products if I bought them for her. She said that she would. We explained that we couldn't afford the products. He stated that we could get them on a layaway plan that would allow us simply to pay what we could, when we could, with no obligation of any kind. If we paid the full amount at any time, we could then get the products. My wife stated that she didn't see any need for a stroller, but that she could use the crib. The salesman explained that we could not get the crib in his package offer ordinarily, but that if we signed up that evening for the layaway plan we could get the crib instead of the stroller, *but only if we signed up for the layaway plan that evening.* We told him that we didn't have any money even for a deposit. He drew up the layaway plan agreement and put on it that we had paid a $22.00 deposit. He advised us not to tell his company because they wouldn't like his doing that since we hadn't actually put up any money. We still didn't sign it. He told us that if we signed it we could simply call the next day or within a week or so and tell them that we didn't want it and that we would be under no obligation whatsoever, since it was only a layaway plan. He again advised us not to tell his company that he told us we could cancel it over the phone, because they would not like it if they knew their salesman was telling the customers how easy it was to get out of this plan.

Wanting to take advantage of this stated opportunity for one night only to get the crib instead of the stroller, and having been told that it would take simply a telephone call to get out of this arrangement should we decide in the next couple of days that we just couldn't afford it, I signed the agreement.

After discussing it further with my wife, I did call the next day and told the company that we would not be able to pay for these items and that we would not go ahead with the layaway agreement.

I received the final attached notice to debtor from the company stating that I was in default in the sum of $101.25, that they were charging me a storage charge of $2.50 per day, and that unless I paid the entire amount due, on or before April 1, 1967, the account would be turned over for collection through legal procedures. I feel this is unfair practice because the salesman assured us that this was merely a layaway plan which could be cancelled at any time and which if not cancelled would permit us to pay as we could without obligation at any time.

LUD ANDOLSEK, VICE CHAIRMAN, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Duluth Sunday News-Tribune recently published a fine feature article about Lud Andolsek, Vice Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

I believe that the story, entitled "Horatio Alger: Civil Service Official, Andolsek, Tells His Own Story," speaks for itself. It tells of an immigrant who made it the hard way in Minnesota and is dedicated to the kind of opportunity for others which he experienced himself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Albert A. Eisele be printed in the RECORD.

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

HORATIO ALGER: CIVIL SERVICE OFFICIAL, ANDOLSEK, TELLS HIS STORY

(by Albert A. Eisele)

WASHINGTON.—Lud Andolsek doesn't have to look far for a convincing illustration when he tells people that Uncle Sam still offers plenty of opportunity for everyone—including minority groups.

Andolsek, vice chairman and one of three members of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, can point to his own life as the best example of what he's talking about.

It's a story with Horatio Alger overtones, of how a 'bohunk' kid from the wrong side of the tracks back in Chisholm, Minn., climbed to one of the most powerful positions in Washington.

Ludwig J. Andolsek, 56, talked about that life last week as he began the fifth year of his six-year term on the three-member commission which helps control the destinies of 2.8 million federal employes.

He smokes Dutch Masters cigars now and wears well-tailored suits and French cuff shirts, but he hasn't forgotten how it was after his immigrant parents settled in the iron mining country of Northern Minnesota in the early 1920's to seek the opportunity they had heard about in their native Austria-Hungary.

They soon found out that while America might be the land of opportunity, nobody was handing it out on a silver platter, especially to an immigrant family who spoke poor English.

"I think you can recognize a great deal of similarity between the problems that my family encountered and the problems that Negroes and other minority groups are encountering today," Andolsek commented, as he sat in his spacious carpeted office in the new Civil Service Building.

"We were called 'Bohunks' at a time when it was a fighting word—an insult. We lived on the wrong side of the tracks, in a company-owned house, and later we shared a tarpaper shack which my father and his partner at the mines built in their spare time. We bought our groceries at a company-owned store.

"My father soon found out that immigrants were expected to remain 'in their place.' It was made very clear to him what would happen if he joined a union or 'stuck his neck out' too far. I learned at a very tender age what discrimination and poverty and prejudice can be like."

But his parents didn't give up. His father worked 14 hours a day for $1.25 and his mother took in boarders—22 of them at one point. And they decided that if they couldn't realize the American dream their children would.

His mother recognized that education was the key to a better life for her children, and she had an effective if not very gentle way of reminding them of it.

"My mother told me repeatedly, 'if you quit school, I'll kill you' and I believed her," Andolsek recalled. "Thank God they kept me in school and that the mining companies paid taxes for good schools."

From Chisholm, Andolsek entered Eveleth Junior College, where his skill as a goalie on the Chisholm High School hockey team had been noticed. He rose before classes to clean up a restaurant in exchange for his meals and came back at noon to wash dishes. After school he stocked shelves at the local Woolworth store for 20 cents an hour squeezing in hockey practice when he could find time.

When he completed the two-year program at Eveleth in 1933 Andolsek was offered the job of hockey coach at St. Cloud Teachers College (now St. Cloud State). He took the job and bought his first suit, getting $30 credit from a Chisholm store owner.

At St. Cloud, Andolsek was a success as a hockey coach and earned a bachelor of education degree in 1935. The following year, at about the same time that a young man named Lyndon Johnson joined the National Youth Administration in Texas, Andolsek became an NYA project supervisor in Northern Minnesota.

The NYA job marked his entry in government service, and sent him on the path of the career civil servant. He left the NYA in 1942 to join the Army as a private, and was discharged a captain in 1946.

Returning to Chisholm Andolsek helped a boyhood friend, John Blatnik, in a successful campaign for Congress. In 1947, he became personnel officer at the St. Cloud Veterans Hospital and in 1950, took the same position at Ellsworth Air Force Base, S.D.

Andolsek finally made it to Washington in 1951, when Blatnik appointed him an administrative assistant. In January, 1963, largely because of his experience working with Blatnik on the Public Works Committee, Andolsek was appointed the committee's chief clerk.

But he wasn't to remain in that job for long. During his years on Capitol Hill, the friendly, outgoing Andolsek made many friends, including two special assistants to President Kennedy, Larry O'Brien and Kenny O'Donnell.

It isn't generally known, but Andolsek had advised O'Brien and O'Donnell during the 1960 campaign that Kennedy would carry the Eighth District by 40,000 votes if he would only visit the Iron Range.

Kennedy did and carried the Eighth District by 38,430 votes and the entire state by just 22,000. When an Eisenhower appointee's term ran out on the Civil Service Commission in March, 1963, it wasn't exactly a coincidence that Andolsek's name turned up as a deserving Democrat.

He was sworn in for the $27,000-a-year job on April 30, 1963, the birthday of his wife, Regina.

Andolsek tells the story of his own life because he believes it has meaning for Negroes and other minority groups who have been denied full opportunity.

This is the message Andolsek tries to get across. "The federal government, as the nation's largest single employer, isn't looking at the color of anybody's skin or their national origins or their religion, but we're looking for skills, for competent, trained, trainable people for federal jobs."

Andolsek believes the federal government can offer "all the opportunity and more that there is in the private sector of the "economy" for people "who are dedicated to public service."

Andolsek lives with his wife and daughter, Kathryn, 14, in their suburban Bethesda, Md., home, where he pursues his lone hobby, working around the yard.

DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE, IND.—$2,000,000 FOR LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senate Appropriations Committee, the members of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, and the

senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], for H.R. 9029, the Interior Department and related agencies appropriations bill, 1968.

H.R. 9029 shows the people that we are a Congress in the mood to save, since the total appropriations are $73,475,950 under the Bureau of the Budget request. The committee action is pleasing to me and the people of my State, not only because it is "saving," but because my colleagues have given them the Dunes National Lakeshore. The committee has provided $2,000,000 to begin land acquisition, which the Department of Interior assures me shall commence with the undeveloped property within the area, with preference given to that land granting access to the Lake Michigan shoreline. I want the committee to know of my gratitude, and that all Hoosiers, who look toward the future of northern Indiana, and pleased that they have provided a recreation area for millions to enjoy, thank them.

The Dunes National Lakeshore was authorized by the Congress last year. It is a unique sand dunes area with several miles of beach on Lake Michigan. The battle "to save the dunes" as a national landmark and recreation area was an arduous one. Only when a majority of northern Indiana residents agreed that the Indiana lakeshore—zoned properly—could support both an industrial complex and a park in the dunes area, were we able to pass the authorization.

Again I thank my colleagues of the committee and urge the Senate to accept H.R. 9029—retaining the $2,000,000 to begin land acquisition for the Dunes National Lakeshore, Indiana's third national park.

THE VIEW FROM MOUNT VERNON—THE PROPOSED PISCATAWAY PARK

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I invite attention to an editorial entitled "The View From Mount Vernon," published in the New York Times of May 9, 1967. In endorsing the proposed Piscataway Park, which includes the view from Mount Vernon, the editorial points out that a threat to the scenery across the Potomac from Mount Vernon should be regarded as a threat to the historic home of George Washington himself.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended $2,000,000 for the acquisition of land on the Potomac shore across from Mount Vernon. I hope the Senate will approve this recommendation and that the full amount recommended by the Senate committee will be held in conference. This appropriation, even though it is less than the Interior Department requested, should enable the Federal Government to proceed with its land acquisition program, and thereby keep faith with the private individuals and foundations who have offered donations of land and scenic easements to add to the Federal park.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE VIEW FROM MOUNT VERNON

If George Washington's home were in danger of being turned into a pizza parlor or torn down for a high-rise apartment, every patriotic organization in the country and every member of Congress would be thundering in protest. Yet as everyone knows who has visited Mount Vernon, much of its charm and one of the principal reasons that Washington loved it is its serene view across the Potomac River toward the green, rolling fields of Maryland.

What most tourists do not know and what the House of Representatives knew but chose to ignore is that most of the land on the Maryland side is in private hands. Only the farsightedness of the two private foundations and the unselfishness of private owners have prevented the desecration of the view from Mount Vernon. But every year those flashing neon lights and those hamburger "palaces" creep a little closer.

In 1961 Congress authorized the purchase of private land which together with lands and scenic easements donated by private individuals would protect the area forever. However, Piscataway Park, as the area is called in memory of an Indian tribe that lived there in colonial times, is not yet a reality. The House Appropriations Committee sliced away the $2.7 million necessary to complete the Federal purchase. If the Government does not acquire the land by August, the matching gifts of land and scenic easements will revert to the donors. With development pressures steadily intensifying, the present agreement among all parties may break down.

Since the members of the House apparently do not have the backbone to overrule the petty tyrants on their Appropriations Committee even when George Washington is involved, it is up to the Senate Appropriations Committee to put a stop to this purblind, penny-pinching foolishness.

While the Senate Committee is at it, it should restore the funds for the acquisition of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. Congress authorized the park in 1966 after years of bitter controversy, but the enemies of this project never give up. With land prices escalating, delay in purchasing the land would be a costly mistake.

LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE FAVORABLE REPORTS OUT AMENDMENTS TO COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee this morning favorably reported out, by unanimous vote, amendments to the cold war GI bill, as contained in bill S. 9. Since over 50 of my colleagues in the Senate have cosponsored these amendments, I am sure that they will be interested to know that the bill has now been reported out of committee.

Basically, the bill does two things: First, the scope of training has been increased to include on-the-job training, on-the-farm training, and flight training. Secondly, the basic allowance rates have been increased to $130 for a single veteran, $155 for a married veteran, and $180 for a veteran with two or more dependents—all increases of $30 a month over present allowances. An additional $10 a month is provided for each dependent over two.

The need for these amendments is self-evident. Our hearings have proved the need for expanding the scope of benefits to include on-the-job training, on-the-farm training, and flight training—all of which were in the Korean GI bill. The need for expanded benefits is also obvious, as testimony conclusively showed the expanded costs of education. Yet, even these amendments merely bring the levels of allowances up to the Korean GI bill level.

The bill which this body passed during the 89th Congress included almost all of these provisions, but many were cut back when practicality forced to yield to the reduced House version or have nothing for these deserving veterans. Justice, as it comes in this bill, is a year late if judged by what this body was willing to do last year. I urge prompt consideration of these amendments to show these veterans our support for adequate educational benefits.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill—S. 1160—to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. 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. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe that on this 17th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1967, we have reached a significant moment in the history of the Senate and in the history of our Nation.

In my opinion, the bill before the Senate today, S. 1160, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, is one of the most important bills to be considered in Congress this year.

In the public hearings on this bill before the Subcommittee on Communications, which I had the privilege to chair, I believe there has been developed a record which fully explores and discusses the issues presented by this legislation. Repeatedly, dramatically, and forcefully, reflecting many diverse viewpoints of American society, its record emphasizes this country's present and

growing needs for a system of noncommercial broadcasting.

Enough progress has been made in the field of noncommercial broadcasting over a relatively short span of time to reveal the promise of its potential. But the fulfillment of that promise has been seriously impeded by chronic underfinancing, understaffing, and underprograming.

The beginnings which have been made in Federal support of these activities, while modest, are also encouraging. The gains we have made in the past 4 years in the establishment and strengthening of educational television broadcast stations under the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962 have been gratifying indeed. The present bill would extend the effectiveness of that program, and make possible a full noncommercial broadcast service to all U.S. families.

But hardware is not enough. The extension of coverage through support of new and existing facilities is not enough. In the face of mounting evidence that television commands a great deal of public attention, the time has come to take steps to help create higher quality and more diverse programs. Approximately one and a half billion man-hours per week are spent with these media by the people of this country. Television viewing alone occupies nearly one-fourth of the waking hours of the average American. We must help to provide the means by which noncommercial educational broadcasting can realize President Johnson's conviction, expressed in his message to Congress of February 28, "that a vital and self-sufficient noncommercial television system will not only instruct, but inspire and uplift our people."

Briefly summarized, this bill has three parts. Title I has to do with increasing the coverage of noncommercial educational broadcasting by extending Federal support for construction of facilities.

Title II is a proposal to establish a nonprofit, private corporation to improve the quality of educational and cultural programs and make them available to local stations.

Title III would authorize a study of instructional television and other communications technology in relation to the broad needs of formal education.

Mr. President, I shall describe these various titles but I would prefer to do it when more of my colleagues are in the Chamber, in the event they wish to ask me questions.

Mr. President, we have had extensive hearings on this bill. We listened to about 80 witnesses. We sat in the hearing room from 10 o'clock in the morning until about 5:30 in the afternoon, under glaring lights of television, where one could not move or go out. We explored in every possible detail the bill that was presented to the committee. We listened attentively to all witnesses. We took note of the suggestions that were made. We accepted those suggestions that were constructive; we rejected those suggestions which were not so constructive or objectionable. We reported a bill, I dare say, Mr. President, that is a model bill. There was not a dissenting vote on the entire committee.

TITLE I

Under the provisions of title I, this bill will extend and improve the provisions of the Educational Television Facilities Act, due to expire at the end of this fiscal year.

This measure, in less than 5 years has proved its worth. Where there were but 80 educational TV stations in operation or under construction when the act became effective, today there are 130 on the air, 46 under construction, and 25 more represented by requests for grants.

The principal provisions of title I of S. 1160 will extend the ETV Facilities Act for 5 years through fiscal 1972. It will replace the $1,000,000-per-State limit with an annual State limit of 12½ percent of the total appropriation for a given fiscal year. It will increase the maximum allowable Federal share in project costs from 50 percent to 75 percent.

For the first time, it will authorize grants to be made for construction of noncommercial radio broadcast facilities. The testimony in the record shows emphatically that in many ways, noncommercial radio has made educational achievements fully as significant as those in television. Especially when our needs are increasing beyond the ability of the TV broadcast spectrum to accommodate them, we must provide for effective use of all the broadcast channels available to us.

TITLE II

Title II of S. 1160 authorizes the establishment of a nongovernmental, nonprofit, private corporation. I believe this imaginative proposal will lead not only to an uplifting of noncommercial broadcast programing, but will also have a salutary effect on the programs of commercial broadcasters.

Among its functions, the corporation will provide operational and program support, through grants and contracts, to improve and strengthen local stations and to encourage diverse and high quality programing of regional and national interest. Although it could neither own nor operate transmission or program production facilities, the corporation would be empowered to provide for interconnection among stations. This would allow noncommercial stations to share in the advantages of networking; would enable stations to receive and store programs for future use at the station's discretion.

The bill will authorize the amount of $9,000,000 to the corporation for fiscal 1968, and such amounts as may be necessary for the next fiscal year. In consideration of the variety of methods which have been proposed to supply a steady flow of Federal funds into the corporation, the President has indicated that following careful study and review he will make further proposals next year for the continued financing of the corporation. We will await those proposals with keen interest, and in the meantime concur in the interim technique of direct appropriation. It should also be pointed out that the legislation authorizes the corporation to accept support from local, State, and private sources to achieve its purposes, and that in time it will develop a broad based pattern of financial support in which Federal funds will be but one element.

The bill sets out guidelines to aid the corporation in achieving its objectives and purposes. In an effort to strengthen the objectives of the legislation, a number of amendments to this title of the bill were adopted by the committee. Two of these are matters of nomenclature. As originally submitted, the bill was titled the "Public Television Act" and the agency established by title II was to be known as "The Corporation for Public Television." Since all the purposes of the bill, as described in its particulars, are intended to assist noncommercial radio as well as television, we believe it is desirable to include both concepts in the titles. Thus, it is proposed by amendment that the act be known as "The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967" and the corporation as "The Corporation for Public Broadcasting."

Another amendment proposed by the committee relates to the method of appointment of the Corporation's Board of Directors. Originally, S. 1160 proposed a 15-man Board, all to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, with appropriate safeguards with respect to equitable geographic and occupational representation, conflict of interest, and the staggering of Board member terms of office. The committee's amendment proposes to retain the essential safeguards, but to modify the determination of Board members so that nine members will be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, and six members to be elected by the appointees, according to criteria otherwise contained in the bill. Throughout the hearings, universal determination has been expressed that the Corporation have maximum possible freedom from governmental or political interference or control. President Johnson voiced this concern when he said:

> Noncommercial television and radio in America, even though supported by Federal funds, must be absolutely free from any Federal Government interference over programing.

Dr. James Killian, who headed the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, to which group this Nation is heavily indebted for much of the vision in these proposals, came to the same conclusions when he said:

> The Commission categorically affirmed that the Corporation . . . must be private and nongovernmental and that it must be insulated to the greatest possible degree from the threat of political control.

Other witnesses expressed the same concerns.

We believe that incorporation as a private nonprofit corporation, the appointment of responsible Board members, and other provisions relating to funding and reporting will assure the necessary insulation of the Corporation from governmental or political pressures.

Similarly, since the fundamental purpose of the bill is to strengthen local noncommercial stations, the powers of the Corporation itself must not impinge on the autonomy of local stations.

Local or regional educational broadcast stations must be free to accept or reject the programs and services which the Corporation will make available. This freedom is also implicit in the station's license from the FCC. We believe such assurance of local autonomy in determination of broadcast programs is essentially provided in such provisions of the bill as will restrict the Corporation to grant-and-contract authority to develop programs, and the restriction that the Corporation may not own or operate any type of program production or transmission facility. We also believe such assurance can be strengthened through several amendments to the language of the bill as originally submitted:

First. The first of these occurs in—section 396(g)(1)(b)—that portion of the bill which refers to the power of the Corporation to "assist in the establishment of a system of interconnection" for educational broadcast stations. Our amendment modifies that statement to make this authority refer to "systems of interconnection" to be consistent with other sections of the legislation and to assure the diversity of interconnection capability which will be necessary to effective usage as well as autonomy of local stations.

Second. Among the activities of the Corporation—section 396(g)(2)(d)—in the original wording, was the authority of the Corporation to establish and maintain a library and archives of noncommercial radio and television programs and "develop public awareness of and disseminate information about noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting by various means, including publication of a journal." The committee's amendment would restrict the Corporation's authority to disseminate information to the publication of a journal.

Third. One of the most complex questions raised during the hearing involved the function of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—CPB—with respect to a national system of interconnection for local noncommercial stations. Under the provisions of the original proposal in section 396(g)(2)(E), the Corporation was prohibited from dealing directly with common carriers who normally provide interconnection facilities; instead the Corporation was limited to providing contracts or grants to an intermediary organization that would undertake to contract for the interconnection.

Dr. James Killian, speaking for the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, urged that if a viable system of public television was to be brought into being authority must be given to the Corporation to provide interconnection facilities directly where the circumstances warrant. He viewed interconnection primarily as a means of program distribution but not as a means of establishing a fixed schedule network organization. The Corporation would use the interconnection facilities to distribute and transmit programs at all hours, but each station would be required to make its own decision as to what program it accepts and broadcasts and at what time. In addition, the Corporation needed flexibility for those special occasions when live or simultaneous broadcasts were desirable. Fears were expressed that if the Corporation was given this authority it would tend to develop a fixed schedule, network-type operation and thus the local station would be placed in a difficult position to control effectively its broadcast schedule.

The heads of the three commercial television network systems—Dr. Frank Stanton, Columbia Broadcasting System, Mr. Julian Goodman, National Broadcasting Co., and Leonard Goldenson, American Broadcasting Co.—agreed with Dr. Killian with regard to authorizing the Corporation to deal directly with the common carriers on the issue of interconnection facilities. In fact, Mr. Julian Goodman, of NBC, who was asked to study and submit his observations with regard to this issue as it involved the problem of interconnection, stated:

> I do not see what affirmative values would be gained by making it necessary for the Corporation to make interconnection arrangements through an intermediary organization; on the contrary, I believe efficiency, sensible administration, and simplicity of operations would be served by enabling the Corporation to make these arrangements directly with the carriers providing the service.

The Corporation needs this authority not to establish a fixed-schedule network operation but to take advantage of special or unusual opportunities that warrant the Corporation directly contracting for interconnection facilities. Even under these circumstances, however, it should be made clear that the decision to broadcast such a program remains with the local station. This section, therefore, has been amended so as to give the Corporation the flexibility and discretion to arrange for interconnection directly with common carriers, as well as with other appropriate agencies when the circumstances warrant. This authority will be particularly important as the improvement of future transmission technology makes possible the use of domestic satellite interconnection systems for interconnection of educational broadcast stations.

In this connection, I should observe that the record developed by the subcommittee hearings contains substantial reference to the future of domestic satellite systems and their possible relevance to the potential and problems of noncommercial educational television and radio. We are all aware of the proposal which has been advanced by the Ford Foundation which would establish a nonprofit corporation for the control and operation of a satellite interconnection system for television and radio, the proceeds of which might, under certain circumstances, benefit public broadcasting. We are also aware of the counterproposals which have been made by Comsat, A.T. & T., and similarly interested parties.

Although it is clear that the future of satellite communications systems for domestic interconnection may have a high degree of relevance to noncommercial public broadcasting, it is equally clear that the issues and problems of satellite systems are matters for technical experimentation and research, as well as policy discussion and debate, which will take time to resolve. It is my conviction that the needs which this legislation is designed to meet are of urgent importance, and should not wait upon the resolution of problems involved in domestic satellite communications systems.

TITLE III

Title III of S. 1160 authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct or to contract for a study of instructional television, with an authorized amount of not more than $500,000.

It is clear that public television and radio broadcasting holds out the promise of educational and cultural advantage for the American public which warrants the establishment of national policy and financial assistance reflected in the preceding provisions of this bill. However, it is also clear that the role of television in relation to instruction requires a much broader assessment than has thus far been possible of the relation between our rapidly expanding communications technology and the full range of our educational needs.

It is increasingly evident that the total needs of our educational system—and the total potential of communications technology to serve those needs—transcend the uses of conventional broadcast transmission.

The development of television systems utilizing closed-circuit and 2,500-megacycle frequencies for instructional purposes is already under development in many schools and colleges. But this cannot be viewed in isolation. The enormous possibilities of the new technology for information storage and retrieval, the relationship of radio and television to computer-assisted instruction, and the possibilities in interconnection of such devices are among the technological phenomena which are only dimly understood at present in the context of instructional need and purpose.

While concurring in the need for the study proposed in title III, the committee feels the original language of the authorization may be insufficiently broad, with the result that important facets of the problem may be omitted. Therefore, as an amendment, we have proposed rewording of section 301 as follows:

> The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to conduct, directly or by contract, and in consultation with other interested Federal agencies, a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio (including broadcast, closed circuit and instructional television fixed services) and their relationship to each other and to instructional materials such as videotapes, films, discs, computers and other educational materials or devices, and such other aspects thereof as may be of assistance in determining what Federal aid should be provided for instructional radio and television and the form that aid should take, and which may aid communities, institutions, or agencies in determining whether and to what extent such activities should be used.

We also propose this title be amended to delete section 302, entitled "Content of Study." With the amended wording

and broadened objectives of section 301, we believe this section to be unnecessary, and that the exact method of undertaking the study should be left to the Secretary and the research experts who will conduct the study.

Mr. President, in summary, I believe it is worth noting that in our hearings on this measure, these propositions were supported by all witnesses, representing many facets of the American society and economy. Although many variants of detail were proposed and discussed, some of which have been incorporated in amendments offered by the committee, all who testified concurred that the needs to which this bill is responsive are urgent and that the time to make a significant beginning toward serving those needs is now.

In urging the enactment of S. 1160, as amended, I should like to repeat a statement I made in opening the subcommittee hearings, and which I believe still to be relevant:

> The opportunity before the Congress and the challenge of this issue are of paramount importance for the future growth of this Nation. It is an opportunity and a challenge that may be forever lost if we turn our backs against the propositions outlined in this legislation.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing now to answer any questions on any title, at any time, in any way; and for that reason I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. 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. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and, if agreed to, be considered original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. 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. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. I should like to ask him about the possibilities of the FCC taking action which is not related to this particular bill, but which is closely related to a subject which has deeply concerned the Senate for the past month to 6 weeks; namely, the enormous cost of political advertising on television and the tremendous advantage this gives to candidates who have money or to candidates who are supported with big money.

We all know the devastating impact which a television campaign can have. We have seen many instances of it. It is getting to the point that money can prevail, especially in a very close race.

We are also aware that, as Herbert Hoover asserted 40 years ago, the public owns the airwaves and that the Federal Government is the only agency which can act in this interstate area to lay down guidelines to make certain that the airwaves are used in the public interest.

We are also aware that television stations are peculiarly profitable and do not need this political advertising revenue, having a return which is excellent and gives every prospect of continuing to be very good.

Many owners of television stations have told me that political broadcasting, even if the revenue is substantial, is a headache for them, something they would like to get rid of; something they do not want.

Under these circumstances, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island whether, in his judgment, it would be possible to consider a provision in the law or, whether the FCC could act on its own in connection with television stations and networks, to persuade them not to sell time for political campaign purposes but to provide free time to a limited extent, say, for 2 or 3 weeks before an election. To begin with, this provision might apply only to general elections where there are just two legally qualified candidates. In primaries or three-party races this proposal would not apply. We might start with congressional and gubernatorial elections.

For example, one-half hour free time to a candidate for the Senate; one-half hour to a candidate for Governor, in a general election; perhaps five 1-minute spots and ten 20- or 10-second spots, to each candidate 2 weeks before the election. No other time allowed.

What I am getting at is that this would be a legal requirement and give a candidate for election the opportunity to get his message across to the public on prime time—in a limited, not an excessive amount of time. Big money working through the electronic media of today has come to dominate many political campaigns. Big money can literally buy an election through television.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, let me preface my remarks by saying that the radio spectrum belongs in the public domain. The airwaves belong to all the people of this country. They cannot take full advantage of this radio spectrum unless someone explores it and utilizes it. That, of course, is the reason why we began the system of licensing certain broadcasting stations and networks which are under the control of the FCC. The Senate Commerce Committee, of course, has legislative responsibility in this area.

The commercial networks own five broadcasting stations in five of the best areas in the United States of America. When I say the best areas, I mean populated areas which provide large audiences. I am talking about New York, Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., Miami, and Chicago—places of that kind.

ABC owns five TV stations. It cannot own more than five VHF stations, under the FCC rules. NBC owns five, and CBS owns five. But the broadcasting stations which they own are under Federal regulation. Therefore, by indirection, the networks are also controlled. In testimony, given from time to time, it has been developed, in so far as opportunities for the networks are concerned, that their profits are rather meager in comparison to the profits they earn from their broadcasting station. There, of course, the profits are astronomical, especially if one has the good fortune to get a VHF station in a city such as Providence, Atlanta, or Richmond. In that case, I think we could go to bed and begin to count our money. I mean, it is a boon. It is like discovering the pot of gold.

Mr. President, under the Communications Act, we have what is known as section 315. Section 315 is a paradox.

In the first place, while it protects the candidate in that case where his opponent is given broadcast time, he has a perfect right to claim equal time, and he usually gets it. It is what happens every time the President makes an appearance on TV when he is a candidate. The Republicans ask for equal time, and they get it.

That was true when President Eisenhower was in the White House and we Democrats thought he was getting on the fringes of politics. We asked for time and got it. There is nothing that a politician is more sensitive to than that when it is getting near election time.

The point is that, because of section 315, the broadcasters and networks would have to give equal time to every possible candidate. Sometimes there are 15 or 20 legally qualified candidates running for the same office. The minute we begin giving them all equal time, there will be a stampede. Some people will want to go on television just so folks back home can see how nice they look. Each legally qualified candidate is entitled to free time once time is made available to one candidate. So it poses a dilemma.

In 1960 a bill was introduced in Congress whereby the networks and licensees would be compelled to give a certain number of hours a certain number of weeks before election to the candidates for election to the office of the Presidency.

We had hearings on that bill. Finally, in conjunction and with the support of my colleagues, I reported a resolution to the effect that the networks in the presidential campaigns would be relieved from the provisions of section 315, so that they would not be obliged to give equal time to all candidates. Thus candidates on the Communist ticket, candidates on the Prohibition ticket, or other candidates were not entitled to equal time. Complete discretion was given to the broadcaster. That law led to the famous television debate between Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon, which I think Mr. Nixon regrets to this day.

To make a long story short, the next year, or sometime after that, I suggested a proposal that would relieve the licensees from the effect of section 315 in congressional and gubernatorial elections, as a starter, in order to bring about what the Senator from Wisconsin is suggesting.

I think he has a marvelous idea. One trouble is that we run up against a stone wall, which is section 315. I will tell the Senator frankly, when I came on the floor with a proposal to modify section 315, most of the opposition came from Members of Congress who were fearful that if we give discretion to the licensee, a broadcaster could begin allotting time as he pleased. He could give time to the candidate of his choice. He could stress one candidate, thereby leaving his opponent out in the cold.

If we can work out a system whereby we can cut down the confusion which naturally occurs in situations like this, we would be making progress.

There is a gentleman in Chicago by the name of Lar Daly who went around dressed in an Uncle Sam suit. He is a perennial candidate and is dressed up in this regalia. As a matter of fact, one time the Ambassador from a foreign country was received by the mayor of Chicago. Lar Daly wanted equal time. Under the law, the Commission ruled that, since he was a candidate for the same office, equal time should be granted to him because there were some political connotations involved in the reception or ceremony. So Lar Daly was given equal time.

My answer to the Senator from Wisconsin is this. I would hope we could work out a system whereby some of this burden could be shared by the public. How we do it is the dilemma of our time. We have struggled with it and have been unable to reach a conclusion. The only solution invented thus far is that we relieve the broadcasters from section 315, which would give them tremendous power, and the Congress of the United States is reluctant to do it. Does that answer the question of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has answered it very well, but I would like to ask if it would not be possible to confine this proposal to general elections. I wonder if it would be possible to have the provision prohibiting political TV ads confined to the regular nominees of the Democratic and Republican Parties in the general elections, and provide limited free time 2 or 3 weeks before the general election.

Second, I wonder, if, in the judgment of the Senator from Rhode Island, chairman of the Communications Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, it would be possible to prevent, proscribe, or prohibit other paid political broadcasts on television, so the big impact of money, which has so distorted our campaigns in the past, and promises to do so even more in the future, could be prevented?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. I am willing to wager that there are Members of the Senate who would want to give Mr. Wallace equal time. I do not think there is, but there might be a member of the Prohibition Party in the Senate, who would want to have equal time. Something ought to be worked out. I will tell the Senator that the American people are dismayed when they hear that someone has spent $500,000 to win a senatorial campaign when the position pays a salary of $30,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. How about the possibility of starting in an area where it would work? I realize the difficulties we face. How about with respect to those senatorial and gubernatorial races where there are only two candidates?

Mr. PASTORE. I introduced a bill to relieve the effects of the provisions of section 315 in senatorial campaigns. It did not get through the committee. Many Senators believe it is too broad an authority. The Senator will remember our good friend from California, Clair Engle. The Senator will remember how he made a fine speech on the floor, imploring us not to remove the provisions of section 315, because of what could happen.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree whole heartedly that section 315 should not be completely removed. There is no question that if it is removed, it would have to be replaced with something.

Mr. PASTORE. If it is removed, it means that every candidate has the right——

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would be removed only in general elections where there are, for instance, regular candidates in the Democratic and Republican Parties, and no other candidates.

Mr. PASTORE. Under our two-party system, that is logical. The trouble is that there are many other candidates who have the same right, and, I am afraid, under our Constitution they could enforce that right. The public has the right to hear dissenting views; the candidate does not have to be the popular candidate of the Republican or Democratic Party.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course the public has that right. In those cases my proposal simply would not apply.

Mr. PASTORE. I know it was——

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not want to pursue it, but I wanted to put the idea across to the Senator from Rhode Island. I would like to have it discussed by the chairman of the subcommittee and the full committee to see if we could make some progress in this area. I hope one day soon we will find an answer to the problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Another aspect of this problem is that most television stations today are using the authority they have to editorialize. If we give them the power by suspending section 315, to do these other things, and they turn around and editorialize, then you are really in trouble, are you not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The only authority I had in mind is to give equal time to both candidates in a campaign in which there are two nominees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But how far do you go?

Let us take my own town of Seattle. The race for prosecuting attorney of King County may be more important to the people than the race for Congress. Where do you draw the line? How far down do you go?

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the Senator from Washington that in that area, you start where you can. If you can make progress in congressional and gubernatorial races, maybe you can work something out in other areas.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what we are trying to do. As the Senator will recall, we are trying to get educational TV up to a point where we can evaluate these things, and maybe they can perform a service politically.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I know it is a fine bill. However, I was discussing another aspect.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that.

Mr. PASTORE. On educational television, you may run into a little bit different situation, although section 315 applies, because it is all under Communications Act of 1934.

I realize what the Senator means, and I am hopeful that something can be worked out; but up to now, it has been a hard nut to crack.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, to pursue a bit further the subject raised by the Senator from Wisconsin, it seems to me that this is going to be a very difficult matter to work out. I have sympathy for what the Senator seeks to accomplish, but, even limiting it to the presidential elections, if this had been in effect, say, in 1924, it would have eliminated the great Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin. Only the candidates running on major party tickets would have had that opportunity, and he would not have had it.

To bring it down to the congressional level, in my own State of Virginia, in 1962 or 1964—I do not recall at the moment which—in the Third Congressional District, we had a Democratic nominee, a Republican nominee, and an Independent Democrat for Congress. I supported strongly the Democratic nominee, but I think that Independent Democrat—who came within a few votes of winning—had just as much right to the use of the facilities of radio and TV as did the nominees of the two major parties.

To turn to my own situation last fall, I had three candidates against me. I was the regular Democratic nominee. There was a Republican nominee, and the Conservative Party said I was too liberal, and they put up a candidate against me.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator repeat that, please?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Conservative Party said I was too liberal, so they put up a candidate against me. It cost me 60,000 votes. Then the Republicans—JOHN COOPER'S party—said I was too conservative.

Mr. COOPER. I deny the charge. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Then I had another opponent, a Socialist; I guess he thought I was too conservative also. But as my friend, the Senator from Ken-

tucky [Mr. COOPER] points out, the election came out nicely and my plurality was 117,000 votes.

But it seems to me that all those people who ran against me should have had the same opportunity for the use of public facilities or public airways as I had, or as did the nominee of the Republican Party.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Where you have cases like those to which the Senator has referred—the Coolidge-Davis-La Follette race in 1924, or the Byrd race for the Senate in 1966—it seems to me that this cannot apply. You have to start off with the situation which is most common—that maintains in more than half of the cases—that is, you have a Democratic nominee and a Republican nominee, or a Democratic nominee and one from some other party, and you provide that the station must provide a significant but limited amount of free time for both candidates, and sell no time to either of the candidates.

I agree with the Senator from Virginia that there are many difficulties, situations where it would be completely unfair to eliminate third parties, if you provide that the Democratic and Republican Parties are the only ones affected; but I think we have to think hard and continuously about this question, or we will be overwhelmed by the power of money.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I think the Senator is correct, but if I may get back to——

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield to let us hear from the Senator from Texas? I think he represents the other side of the coin.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Yes. I think we should hear from the other side of the coin.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, we should.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, while I believe there is a real need for something in the area about which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] speaks, I would like to point out that at the same time we must protect the right of the minority to be heard.

At the time I was elected to the Senate, in April 10 years ago, there were 21 candidates against me—22 of us in all. Sixteen put their names on the ballot and had difficulty in financing campaigns, but six of them were on the radio, television, in the newspapers, and everywhere. From the efforts put forth, I would think you might have called those six major candidates.

I do not think any of us had any rights over the 16 who could not raise the money to get on television. I think all had equal rights.

I think every candidate has an equal right to the airways—rather a spectrum than individual airways—which belongs to all the people. I think no one has a right to pass a law and say, "We got the most votes, therefore we are entitled to those facilities."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I think under section 315, we should not overlook one very important fact. That is that there is a fairness doctrine, which would still be in effect even though we repealed section 315.

I strongly believe that section 315 is doing much more damage to public campaigning generally than it is doing good. What it is tending to do at the present time, and will continue to do in the future, is provide stations with the right to deny even the major candidates the opportunity to express themselves.

In other words, the station is going to say, "We have to deal with section 315; if we permit you to appear, we have to permit 15 other candidates to appear also." The easiest way is for them to go ahead with their regular paid programs, denying the opportunity for people to hear what the candidates have to say, denying them the opportunity to make an intelligent judgment after observing the candidates on television. I believe that is the attitude which will follow if section 315 stays on the books.

I think it is much more fair and much more in the public interest to eliminate section 315, and simply have the stations required to obey the fairness doctrine. They still could have their licenses suspended or revoked if they did not follow the doctrine of fairness. That, in my opinion, is much more fair than trying to divide up the time on a minute-by-minute basis, of the candidates, and the order in which they appear. I hope that someday we will repeal section 315, and rely upon the fairness doctrine. I do not believe, however, that such action belongs in this bill.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield now to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I wish to return for a moment to the pending legislation. The Senator from Rhode Island has made a very effective and able presentation on Senate bill 1160. I wanted to ask the Senator a question or two in regard to it. Before I phrase my question, I should like to preface it by saying that I have a great fear of government propaganda. I might say that I subscribe to the views of the third President of the United States, who happend to be a Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, who said that if it were left to him whether to have a free press or a free government, he would take a free press, because without that, we could never have a free government.

I am concerned about Government propaganda. I have great confidence in the Senator from Rhode Island, and I have great confidence in the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the committee chairman.

I ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether he feels that adequate safeguards are contained in the legislation to prevent Government control of the program content and the facilities.

Mr. PASTORE. The answer to that question is very simple. I think that the one factor that took up most of our time in the discussion of this legislation was the concern on the part of the committee and most of the witnesses that this corporation should be completely out from under the control of politics, and that it should not indulge in politics.

As a matter of fact, the point was raised:

> Well, you are providing for 15 incorporators or members of the corporation to be appointed by the President, and that is too much authority for the President.

In order to compromise that matter, we came halfway between the recommendation that was made on the draft bill, and the recommendation made in the Carnegie report. The Carnegie report provided for a corporation to consist of 12 members, six to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and the other six to be elected by those that had been appointed by the President, thus giving us a board consisting of 12 people.

The reason they did this is that they thought that at least six members should be outside of the control of the President or not be beholden to him.

Frankly, I did not go along too much with that viewpoint. I think this is an important piece of legislation.

My argument was that if the President of the United States can appoint a member of the Supreme Court, who is confirmed by the Senate of the United States, and who, in fact, makes the decisions that guide the destiny of this Republic, why can he not appoint members of such a corporation subject to the confirmation of the Senate?

In order to resolve the matter and bring about such a guarantee, the pending bill provides that nine of the members shall be appointed by the President, subject to the confirmation of the Senate, and that the other six member shall be appointed by the nine members who have been appointed by the President.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Not yet. That is only part of my statement.

There was a condition contained in the measure that the corporation shall have the responsibility of developing public awareness. The question came up: "What do they mean by public awareness? Is that another gimmick for public control?"

So we took those words out of the measure, and then provided in the bill that there shall be no interference whatsoever on the part of the Government with relation to programing.

I think that in drawing this legislation we did about as good a job as anyone can do in putting words together that would give us that guarantee.

We must realize that we cannot give a guarantee on human nature. We must look to God for that. But as far as words go, I think we did a good job.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, with reference to not being able to give such a guarantee, that recalls another Jefferson quotation which I like:

> In questions of power then let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

That is why I like to stick to the Constitution.

Mr. PASTORE. I like to do so, too. I

think the Constitution is the best document ever written by man, but we must have men carry out that Constitution.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the six members who are to be appointed by the nine members appointed by the President be subject to senatorial confirmation?

Mr. PASTORE. No. The nine members appointed by the President will be subject to senatorial confirmation, and the six will not.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Was there a reason behind that?

Mr. PASTORE. The reason behind it was the argument made by Dr. Killian in the Carnegie report to the effect that he and the Commission thought it would guarantee independence from the political interference.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it came to my attention the other day that the Office of Economic Opportunity had requested $179,000 with which to set up a radio station and a newspaper in North Carolina.

Why in the world should a Government agency put out its own newspaper, a general circulation newspaper, and have its own radio station?

The statement has nothing to do with the pending bill, I say to the Senator from Rhode Island, but it makes me more concerned that any legislation which we pass in regard to television and radio should provide that the interest of the public are safeguarded, and that there is the least possible opportunity presented for Government manipulation or propaganda.

Mr. PASTORE. I could not agree with the Senator more. I think that was ill-advised. I do not think they need a radio station. We have enough media so that the Government can put its cause over to the people without that.

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator knows that I have already made some statements in the RECORD.

I favor the bill. I think its purpose is good. I think its intent is high-minded. I think that we have done our level best to regulate public television and keep it from heavyhanded Government control.

I think public television is certainly needed in this country because commercial television programing meanders so often from the mediocre to the moronic, and its god is glamour. It is probably the most misused or to so large a degree unused medium of communication since man decided he could make an intelligible sound so as to be understood by another man.

Television is often a horror to contemplate or, at the other extreme, a bore to observe. It has its great, high moments. It has its great programs and fine documentaries. But always the test is, Does it pay? I think there ought to be another test in the American cultural concept, and that test ought to be, Will it improve the intellectual standards of the American people?

Bearing in mind what has been said about the Constitution, will television aid, in that most sympathetic phrase in the Constitution, the pursuit of happiness? There is very little happiness to be pursued in the average television program. There is violence to be abhorred or absorbed. There is cheap drama to be observed, were one to advert to the beer can or the kitchen stove. There is monotony in the presentation and more violence in the very sell of the commercials, which scare us to death.

I am one of the great number of people in this country who have television sets and who join in the general apology, when someone comes in for a visit, which is to the effect, "We never look at it"—which is wrong—or "We hide it behind the door. We don't keep it in the living room."

There is a vast national apology going on in this country for the television. This I do not say in derogation of the great networks or of the other people who present programs. I certainly praise educational and instructional television. I praise what television has done in the public interest. But I should like to see public television begin to satirize. I should like to see the days of Addison, Swift, and Pope revived in this country, if that be possible.

I should like to see the satire of Buchwald. I should like to see people made fun of. I should like to see Senators, Representatives, the President, and everyone else made fun of within the limits of decency and good taste, without any fear that the Senator from Rhode Island or the Senator from Pennsylvania could do anything to the person who satirized, because there is no satire left in this country. There is no opportunity for satire. If any does appear, everybody jumps to condemn it.

I would hope that public television could bring to this country the gift of satire.

> O wad some Pow'r the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as others see us!

I believe it can be done. I believe that public television can arouse, inspire, and cause people to react strongly. Then the more strongly they react, the more apt they will be to react in the last process which the mind summons up: that is, the act of thought.

I should like to see people start thinking in this country—and thinking seriously. I should like to see television achieve its potential.

If the Senator from Rhode Island will excuse me for having indulged in a certain amount of oratory, what I am really saying is that I am for the bill, and I hope it passes.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. I should like to add my support to the bill so ably managed by the Senator from Rhode Island. As I have seen him agonize over the decision on the atomic energy development in Illinois, I have enjoyed observing him relish the subject of educational television and have been pleased by his being in the forefront of one of the most important steps this country and the Congress can take.

My own interest in educational television goes back 15 years ago, when a group of us organized the fund for adult education, of the Ford Foundation, a board that I served on for 10 years, and of which, I was chairman of the board for 3 or 4 years.

We felt that there should be in this country a situation with respect to public television comparable to the relationship that Carnegie developed with public libraries.

So we took $24 million of Ford Foundation money and invested it in the concept of educational television over a period of years.

We started the educational television network. We organized committees to interest communities across the country in developing local support for educational television stations. We pledged the initial purchase of equipment for all of those stations. In the period of the lifetime of our fund, we started 45 educational television stations, including channel 11 in Chicago. We did so by convincing each community that educational television was a community need and interest that had to be served; that the great educational institutions, labor, and business, civic leaders, and religious leaders should get together to provide community spirit and support. We found that the communities were able, in these stations, to effectively regulate and control the use of educational television in such a way that it has been remarkably free from criticism.

In looking at television, I have always felt as did Erwin Cannon, who once said that it would be better to have one good thought sent by tom-tom than to have some of the trash and trivia that goes across television networks on the commercial bands through this modern electronic miracle of communication.

Second. As a private citizen, a company with which I had been long associated sponsored, for the first time, prime nighttime television broadcasts in the public service, and worked with all three networks in sponsoring public service television programs on controversial subjects.

It is with this minor background in this field that I now indicate my desire to support, with great enthusiasm, the Educational Television Act of 1967. I am gratified to have this opportunity to support a national commitment for the further development and growth of this very exciting medium.

The bill before us, Mr. President, represents a decided advance in two aspects of our national life which will distinguish it, in my judgment, as milestone legislation.

First, it represents a strong national commitment to the development of a vital national resource. The opportunities for enrichment of the lives of our citizens afforded by educational television are of truly enormous proportions. It is significant that our recent advances in space-age satellite technology contribute heavily to the feasibility of bringing instruction and enrichment into the lives of all our citizens. Every citizen in the country who has access to a television set—and there are few in our society who cannot make such a claim—can

claim the benefits of this bill which, in the language of the committee report:

> Will aid and encourage the bold and imaginative plans for educational broadcasting which have been put before (the Committee) in the course of . . . hearings on the bill.

The second significant aspect of this proposal lies in its endorsement of and reliance on private sector initiative, leadership, and capability. The creation of a private, nonprofit corporation to undertake the development of educational television reflects what I regard as a growing trend toward a new definition of the role of the Federal Government in pursuing national goals and solving national problems.

Earlier in this session, I introduced the National Home Ownership Foundation Act. My bill proposes a private, nonprofit corporation and envisions creation of a new private sector-Federal partnership to achieve the national goals of decent housing and suitable living environment for all our citizens. I stated then that—

> The responsibility for conducting a national program of home ownership for initially lower income families should lie with the non-governmental sector, including both private enterprise and non-profit organizations and groups. *The role of government should only be one of reinforcement and guarantee, rather than execution and control.*

I regard the bill before us as a similar undertaking by a similar partnership. I am confident that the private sector is mindful of the responsibility and the challenge of this partnership. I commend the many interested foundations and organizations—the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, the Comsat Corp., and our great national networks, CBS, NBC, and ABC—whose interest in and contributions to this concept more than amply justify the confidence of Congress, as it will be expressed by enactment of this bill.

Mr. President, at the same time that I commend the committee and its chairman for their excellent report, I express the hope that we will not forget that the work to be done in this effort to develop a national educational television and radio resource is only barely begun. I am confident it will continue in the progressive spirit of this positive step forward, and I pledge my support to its progress in the years ahead.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

(At this point Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the principle underlying the creation of a publicly financed and governmentally controlled radio and television network raises very serious questions of basic constitutional policy. I have given long and careful consideration to the provisions of this bill and have concluded that I must oppose the adoption of title II of this bill.

Under title II, the Federal Government would be moving into an entirely new field of operations, for which there is no sanction whatsoever under the Constitution. I have read the Constitution carefully, and I can find nothing in it which authorizes Congress to legislate either in the field of education or of noncommercial broadcasting, and certainly not in the two of them together. While these fields have been touched upon in the past in authorizing grants for the construction of educational TV facilities, title II goes far beyond assistance to local effort, and sets up a quasi-governmental corporation for the production of programs of information and opinion. If we continue to use the general welfare clause as an open end to the Constitution, then the Constitution itself as a governing document will become meaningless.

Despite the safeguards pointed to by the proponents of the bill, there can be no doubt but that it violates both the spirit and the letter of the first amendment:

> Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

While this bill would not abridge the freedom of any existing news media, it would set up new media financed at least in part by the Government. No one in America today believes that any media in the world, financed by any government, is truly free. By setting up a federally funded Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Congress would be setting up media that are not completely free. I believe that contributing to the growth of even a segment of news media not completely free would be an abridgment of freedom of speech.

No one seems to have noticed that the method of funding this corporation is comparable to the method used by the CIA to finance Encounter magazine and other operations, that is to say, a partial grant with no apparent strings attached. All of the professional liberals and intellectuals in the Nation protested that Encounter and many of the other supposedly free operations had been compromised by U.S. Government support. Now I am not sure that Encounter was a wise choice as an anti-Communist weapon. Moreover, it was not a domestic magazine serving the American people. Yet the Corporation for Public Broadcasting will have a profound influence upon the American people, and I find it strange that our American liberals are not up in arms against the proposals in this bill. Anyone who truly loves liberty must oppose this bill.

Now I know that this bill has carefully excluded partisan politics from the programs of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Obviously, this is a wise move. American politics is not, however, composed only of partisan politics. We have ideological divisions as well. Nothing in this bill safeguards against the capture of the corporation by a small clique with definite ideological biases. The bill actually facilitates such a capture. On the 15-man board of directors a majority of just five of the President's nine appointees elects the other six. Thus a president could quickly have 11 of his men controlling the output of the corporation.

Moreover, the supposed independence of the corporation is called into question by the language of subsection (A), which appears on page 16, and authorizes the corporation "to obtain grants from and to make contracts with individuals and with private, State, and Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions." This clause could be used to develop and disseminate propaganda promoting the policies and programs of the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; Justice; Agriculture; Commerce; and so on. We would have propaganda designed to influence pending legislation, whether authorization or appropriation. I say to every one of my colleagues who values his independent judgment in assessing legislative proposals backed by Government agencies that those who vote for this bill are voting for something that has a vast potential to be used against them.

The meaning of the language from the text, "to afford maximum protection to such broadcasting from extraneous interference and control," is all too clear. The bill provides maximum protection from the interference of Congress, but it provides none at all from the manipulations of the executive branch, or worse yet, from capture by an ideological minority opposed to the programs of both. Congress must not abdicate its responsibilities to uphold the Constitution and the right of free speech.

The capture of this corporation by an anti-American minority is more remote, but quite possible. Normally, an aggressive President could be expected to use such a potent weapon for his own ends. Yet, at the same time, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting would be a vital target for radical and revolutionary ideologies. Once the directors are selected, they are completely free agents, answerable to no man or group of men. They are free to continue, or to break, allegiance to the President. I realize that no broadcasting station would be forced to accept the offerings of the corporation. But it is more realistic to foresee that most of their offerings will be accepted without close scrutiny by the local broadcasters.

Let me give one example of a case which has already taken place. Two or three years ago National Education Television, known as NET, the present private educational TV network, distributed a program entitled "Three Faces of Cuba." This program had been filmed mostly in Cuba, under the supervision of Castro's henchmen. Presumably, it was approved by his Communist propaganda experts. Its producer was a well-known American leftist, Robert Cohen, known for his attacks on the House Committee on Un-American Activities and sympathetic documentaries on Red China and East Germany. The final product was a notorious film extolling Castro. Yet it was shown to thousands of innocent schoolchildren all over the country as an objective evaluation before a storm of protests caused its withdrawal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the tape recording made from the film "Three Faces of Cuba," broadcast on March 22, 1965, by Miami, Fla., educational channel 2, WTHS, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an evaluation of this film entitled "Anatomy of a Film Analysis of "Three Faces of Cuba" by Edward Hunter, a professional propaganda analyst, also be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks following the transcript just referred to.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there are no built-in checks in this bill to insure that the Corporation will act responsibly. In fact, everything that guarantees so-called independence guarantees a potential for irresponsibility.

I see nothing in the bill, for example, which would guarantee that persons attacked by these public programs would have an opportunity to reply. I see nothing which would enable the opponents of certain ideas or philosophies advanced on a program produced by the corporation to present contrary views.

At present in broadcasting, we have the FCC's fairness doctrine, under which stations must make available free air time for opposing views. But this bill goes beyond mere broadcasting into Government-subsidized production. In fact, the point of the bill is to prepare productions equal in effectiveness to those of commercial TV. If the Government is going to underwrite such productions, it seems to me that the fairness doctrine should be expanded to include the expanded field of Government activity and that equal production facilities and budgets should be made available to opposing views upon application to the FCC.

I also see in this bill provision for the publication of a "journal." If this journal turns out to be anything more than a program log, then it seems to me that the freedom of the press would be directly impinged upon. I would want some assurance that we do not have some potential here for a weekly, even daily, newspaper sent free to schoolchildren across the land.

I would also like to see some specific provision which would bar the corporation from producing any programs which would influence legislation or promote the activities and visionary schemes of Government agencies or attempt to justify actions of the executive branch.

Mr. President, I can understand the desire of some to use television as a means of education. I think it is one of the finest means of education; but title II goes into the production of programs, as I stated, and this, it seems to me, is going entirely too far.

EXHIBIT 1

THREE FACES OF CUBA

(Transcript of the tape recording made from the film "Three Faces of Cuba," broadcast on March 22, 1965, from 9 to 10 p.m., by Miami, Fla., educational channel 2, WTHS)

ANNOUNCER. The following program is from NET, the National Educational Television Network. This is the story of three Cubans, three men from different levels of Cuban society whose lives have been changed by Fidel Castro. It is the story of Cuba today told by the three Cubans in their own way.

The first Cuban was a university professor in Havana, alienated and displaced by the revolution. He is now living in exile in the U. S. because his family remains in Cuba, his face will not be shown, nor his name revealed.

The second Cuban is Jose Garcia Nicolas. He is an ardent revolutionary. To him the new system represents an opportunity for unexpected power and status.

The third Cuban is named Francisco Salgado. He is an unskilled laborer. Today he accepts the revolution not for political reasons but because it has brought him his first steady job. The words you will hear are those of the three Cubans themselves. (The martial notes of the "26 of July Movement" hymn are played for 25 seconds, followed by thunderous applause that lasts another 25 seconds. Nearly one full minute of hymn playing and applause.)

(Voice of first Cuban.)

Raul Castro is the organizer who is well trained, cool operator, very unemotional, in a way mainly in his police like ideas.

Che Guevara is an Argentine physician, probably the more idealistic in the group, contrary in a way to Blas Roca who is the Stalinist, the old Soviet type (uproar 10 seconds).

I think Fidel Castro is an extraordinary man, one of the important men in our age. In his university years—I remember him at that time—he was a very leader-like figure. He would like to get into arguments and discuss them at length, sometimes for two days, without even moving from a bench in the plaza of the university. He is a volatile, exuberant type of leader, overtones of demagoguery are always present, of course, in the personality of the man. He believes himself to be a Christ-like figure . . . Messiah, a possessor of the Holy Ghost, saying . . . he is in my pocket every morning? (In Cuban vernacular, when one is very sure of having something—be it a friend—a case—an idea—it is commonly said figuratively: "lo tengo en el bolsillo"—which translated literally reads: "I have it (or him) in my pocket.")

Sometimes this figure [Castro] appeals to the low classes. He uses then a type of speech which is repetitive but full of impact ideas. There is no real philosophy but emotionalism in his type of speech. Then he appears as a middle of the road intellectual, able to manipulate faces which are very attractive. However, you find him speaking very intellectually about trends in modern painting and things of the sort. This means that he is a very important leader because he is a born demogogue in this respect, but a demogogue that appeals not only to the masses but to those of the intelligentsia.

Castro has taken this revolution quite personally, therefore, he would do anything to save the situation and therefore resort to any kind of alliance. (Now Fidel Castro's own voice is heard over the roar of the masses, shouting at the top of his voice: "que viva la revolución socialista"—'long live the socialist revolution'—"que viva el Marxismo-Leninismo"—'long live Marxism-Leninism'—finally he shouts "Patria o Muerte"—'Fatherland or Death'—followed by popular gay music. Time: 50 seconds.)

Announcer. The first Cuban, one of the approximately half million exiles who fled the island since Castro came into power. He now teaches in an American university.

(Voice of first Cuban:)

My family has been in Cuba for three generations . . . I was a university professor . . . I left the country . . . I teach now in the United States, I would rather not give my name for the reason that my family still lives in Havana.

The Biltmore Yacht Club used to be one of the most exclusive societies. These were private clubs in which the old families belonged from generations to generations; they represent a kind of elite. Fathers and grandfathers struggled so the grandson of their son get it because it meant something society-wise. In order to belong to such a club you had to be voted in by the members. This is why even Batista could never belong to it because no matter how many pressures he would have exercised otherwise, everytime his name came for vote it would be turned out. (Immediately 20 seconds of a romantic song.)

This is the Havana Hilton Hotel renamed Havana Libre Hotel. Was the leading place for the American colony and is also a kind of symbol for the socialist revolution take over.* Nowadays, instead of the American tourist having a beer or a cocktail in the bar you find the Rusian technician or the militiamen or the Negro worker. *(Background music is heard through this narrative.)

One of the main attractions offered to the tourist were the night clubs, among them, for example, the Tropicana in the outskirts of Havana. These cabarets also have gambling casinos attached to them run by American gamblers, professional gamblers from the Las Vegas set up. Today, of course, the American tourist is absent, the gambling is gone. We find these places run by the government. (All the time background music is heard, after the last word is heard a few bars of a song by a woman is heard (5 seconds). The people that go there are in the middle class, or sometimes in the lower middle class, of course the typical guajiros, the peasant, never goes there. For him the carnival in the streets is the real entertaining. (The background music of the woman singing stops and immediately the rhythm of a "conga" is heard for 12 seconds.)

The revolutionary themes are intermixed with the activities of the carnival, the costumes, the movements adhere along the lines of the propaganda (gay music is heard as background. Then the speaker stops and we hear 9 seconds of rhythmic music with drums.)

Mixed with the social elements we also find the voodoo elements . . . the old traditions taken from Africa. For the Russians this type of mixture of the tropical atmosphere and the socialist element is something very strange for them (18 seconds of drums and bells, typical Carnival music, is heard.)

Castro has taken the Negro question as one of the points in his program. The Negro in Cuba, he brought from Africa his idols. He was left to believe in them. He lived in the sugar plantations, he intermarried with the Spaniards . . . in fact, all through the previous years to Fidel's takeover, the only discrimination was in the social clubs, the high class clubs, in some type of university jobs, it is true, but nothing compared with what Castro has exploited later. Varadero Beach, one of the beautiful beaches in Cuba, had private clubs and private residential sections. Into these sections, of course, the poor elements of the population or the Negroes could not enter. He was not expelled violently but he was not given accommodation. What Fidel has exploited is that this wealth and all this tremendous things that the dictator built for the high classes is now going to be yours . . . you can use the yachts, you can enjoy the big mansion . . . he told the Negro: You must feel bad, you must have a headache, something must be wrong with you because you don't even fight to go into the Biltmore Yacht Club. He, of course, exploits continuously the fact that the Negro situation in the United States is in a bad shape not for the external policy (?) of the United States but for the state of the masses down there. (Here he is interrupted by a tremendous uproar of a great mass of people shouting and clapping during 9 seconds.)

The middle class in Cuba was a very hard working class, some of them, people that would have been working a whole life to build a house in Varadero because it was a

dream—because it was the end of the road, this was the kind of Utopia. The middle class at the beginning thought that it was a political revolution mainly to clean up corruption and destroy the brutality of the dictatorship, never realizing that it was a real social revolution. The last years of the Batista regime they would just go around playing the week-end, like if nothing was happening . . . Castro started by dispossessing these people of their property, the income was reduced to 600 dollars a month, at the most; the owners of houses would only be given the one they occupied; the savings accounts were reduced to 10,000 dollars per person; the real middle classes were the ones that suffered mostly.

The anti-American feeling that is prevalent in the Castro government was started quite early. One of the things that people do not understand in the United States is the fact that many of these big companies when they go out of the United States they act completely different. Here they pay taxes . . . Here they are regulated . . . The gentleman in the car stops with the red light . . . and so forth . . . Now this same person . . . exactly the same human being . . . goes to another land and suddenly becomes different . . . becomes a colonizer . . . and this thing got out of hand very early in the history of the Republic. Now, Castro took advantage of the negative sides of these things . . . he said: If we have gangsters in the Capri and we have gangsters in the Havana Hilton from the Batista regime, we are going to get rid of these people . . . He didn't stop one step further and he said: We are going to nationalize these big . . . the American industries and the refineries and I am going to run them with Russian oil. The Esso refinery is called now "Nico Lopez" refinery. Sabotage has been attempted several times by the underground but the security measures are quite effective. It has not been possible to do any damage to the inside installations, only minor damages once or twice to the fuel tanks outside.

One of the greatest of the economic blockade that the United States has imposed on Cuba is the oil from Russia being brought in English vessels. The English sublet these ships to the Russian government and they bring in the oil. If the flow of vessels from the Russian ports stops it would be a tremendous breakdown for the whole regime because everything is run mainly with oil. (Here is a long pause followed by 16 seconds of gay music featuring the high notes of a trumpet.)

The blockade has been more effective against the socialist regime of Castro in minor mechanical equipment (the trumpet and the band continues playing as background music) such as cars, refrigerators and airconditioned equipment and things of the sort. These were, of course, 90% American made, therefore you find in the streets of Havana cars that don't run because of lack of parts, that car has to be thrown out because of lack of maybe a bolt and this is where the thing hits the cars. (The background music never stopped but, suddenly, the "mysterious" exile stopped talking and we had another 15 seconds of solid music.) But in heavy equipment it is a different story. Lots of trucks and machinery and harvest devices are coming continuously from Czechoslovakia, from Poland, from Russia. (Another 14 seconds of music, gay, happy music followed.) Russians, Czechoslovakians and Eastern Germans . . . They have come over to help with military installations and sometimes to heavy equipment distribution . . . Sometimes to administer farms . . . (here the speaker stops talking and the whistle of a locomotive is heard, good and loud, for 5 seconds).

The Cuban Army today is the best trained and the best equipped one in all Latin America, approximately 100,000 regular men and about 300,000 to 400,000 militia . . . then you have the weapons coming from Russia and Czechoslovakia . . . the radar (?) guns and patrol boats and radar systems and missiles and airplanes . . . it will take a very massive major military operation to invade the island, to do something in the way of changing the situation by a military take over (the speaker stops and we hear the sound of guns and machine gun being fired and a distant plane taking off; this sound effect lasts 12 seconds). The sight of the Russian soldier disguised in civilian clothes in the streets of Havana became quite an experience with many of the Cubans. . . .

A phrase that you could hear very often in Cuba was: "Castro's revolution is very good but communism is not good. The revolution has been betrayed . . . now U.S. imperialism—quotations—has been replaced by Rusian imperialism . . . This is not the Cuban nationalistic revolution wanted but the bringing of a foreign nation to rule the political destiny of our own land (again he stopped to let the audience hear the roar of a jet plane taking off and fading away in the distance, for a total of 11 seconds).

The amount of people that have left Cuba since the beginning of the Castro regime is quite difficult to determine. They would place the figure in about half million human beings. The moment you decide to go you have to apply for the visa and the passport. The lines in front of the Mexican consulate, waiting in line sometimes a whole day, or two days, but this is only the beginning of the nightmare . . . Then is the long waiting period . . . the period also procuring some pesos in the proper hands, or the visa never appears. . . Finally the permit comes . . . then you have to surrender all your properties. . . . If you still own a house you have to give it to the government . . . then you have to wait for a place in a plane to Mexico or to Spain. If you don't have the pushing that it takes to get a place for you tomorrow then you may wait one year. . . .

In the beginning, of course, it was the Batista people, then came the very high aristocracy . . . the high classes . . . immediately it was followed by the professionals, mainly engineers and doctors . . . then some intellectuals . . . university professors . . . then the middle class, then the workers . . . and the peasant even (small pause and again a distant uproar like a plane passing by is perfectly audible—this lasted 7 seconds).

When the National Institute for Agrarian Reform—The INRA—became a very powerful institution one of the first things they did was to diversify the agriculture. The basic economy of Cuba, of course, was sugar. Not only now sugar was going to be raised but also some other crops. This brought about a great confusion. The corn and the rice that were introduced into this scheme failed for lack of preparation. This brought about rationing with the people waiting in line today for everything, the complete new measure that Cuba never witnessed. Castro blamed all this trouble to the United States blockade, but this blockade of the imports that the island had before is combined definitely with the lack of results of many of the plans that the INRA put into effect. The government now owns about 70% of the land. After this failure, sugar is being planted in great quantities once more but at the present time, of course, the sugar situation is about 40% down in relation to the pre-Castro days.

These houses were given mainly to the poor elements of the population. Of course this does not mean that everyone is completely and totally happy. The official figures mention the need of 400,000 units and only 25,000 have been built so far. The people that have received these new houses—a little better than 5%—act as one of the main sources of support for Castro and the revolution. (The speaker stops. A bird is clearly heard singing for 8 seconds and when the bird stops Castro's high pitch voice comes in strongly shouting: "Nuestro pueblo se enfrentará" (our people will face) followed by applause.)

The revolutionary defense committees are groups of citizens that Castro has established in Cuba. They are the watchdogs of the revolution, they are supposed to check on every neighbor, report any suspicious activities like meetings, like gatherings of people at late night. It works quite effectively. Castro in many cases has discovered many underground movements trying to form there (all this time Castro's voice is perfectly audible in the background giving a highly emotional speech, at times becoming somewhat stronger).

If you express an opinion in a cafe, if you complain about transportation, if you complain about rationing or you complain about food that's alright . . . but if you are a teacher or an educator and you express an opinion which is not (Castro's voice is heard louder in the background as the speaker makes a convenient pause) the official one, then you get into trouble, because this is indoctrination for the youth. The moral issue remains that, of course, it is a police state and that people go to jail just for the thinking basically against the revolution. (Again a pause and Castro's voice is clearly heard referring to "trabajo"—work.)

In many cases the political prisoner in Cuba is treated even worse than the common criminal. (Pause and shouts from the crowd are overheard.) There are no tribunals and no real court procedures nowadays. The exact number of prisoners is impossible to determine. Estimates vary from 70,000 to 15,000 like Fidel himself has expressed. (Pause and Castro's voice coming in again in the background strong and forceful, full of fire.) The families of the prisoners have tried to always help them one way or the other. Committees have been formed . . . Letters sent to international organizations . . . These have not worked very well, really. After all no totalitarian revolution is generous. if you don't have connections or know anyone you stay in jail until you die, disappear, get freedom in the next generation . . . No one knows what . . . (another pause and the voice of a singer is heard clearly singing: "el dia primero aquel" (that first day . . .)

The Becarios constitute one of the groups in Cuba today which are better off (pause and the singer is overheard again). They are the young offsprings of the peasants, or of the low class workers, or of the Negro who were born in the interior of the island and for the first time they come to Havana (the music grows in intensity "al cabo del primer año rapite . . . "—at the end of the first year repeats). They are treated very nicely by the government, they are given accommodation, clothing and transportation and they are put through college and universities (music strong again). The Becarios are housed in the old big mansions of the rich class in Miramar, in fact in my own house when I left there and they use all things that were left in the house, the furniture and the radio and so forth. These are the people that Fidel mainly counts on for the future. Fidel knows very well that if his revolution is still in power in ten years he will be safe for ever because they, the new generation . . . like what happens in Russia, for example, is perfectly indoctrinated in the new system. (The speaker stops and the singers—a very fine, well balanced group with good voices and rythm to spare sing for 30 seconds—one half a minute— ". . . para contra ley le deparan los de abajo, para el hombre sin trabajo muerto de hambre en el batey . . ." and the chorus sings: "y el pueblo después de un año repite 'gracias Fidel', y el pueblo después de un año repite 'gracias Fidel' "—. . . for against the law applied to the ones below, to the

unemployed starving to death at the batey—farm home site—. . . and the people after one year repeats "thank you Fidel"—and the melody dies off with the music of the guitars repeating the leitmotiv "y el pueblo después de un año repite 'gracias Fidel'." The Americans don't understand most of the lyrics but they surely understand "gracias Fidel" and that is all that is necessary.)

These people represent a dying class in Cuba. These are the people that have been given the alternative of either joining the revolution or being completely displaced. In a totalitarian state like such as Cuba if you do not belong to an organization . . . to the party . . . to the militia . . . you just . . . you are out. In some cases if you have some properties then you can live on with that to the rest of your days: The law says you are paid an allowance until you die. If they would come to the United States or go to any other country they would just find themselves with 5 dollars in their pocket. There is no claim . . . there is no moral commitment or force inside these people to make them move so they just vegetate . . . (pause and the singers play: "y el pueblo después de un año repite 'gracias Fidel' "—and after one year the people repeats "thank you Fidel").

Shortly after the revolution triumph, elements of the Catholic Church slowly but firmly started to oppose Castro. Castro reacted quite quickly by deporting all foreign born priests, a measure that affected mainly the Spanish orders. With the nationalization of the Catholic schools many of the chapels were transformed to warehouses or to schools of pure Marxist indoctrination. Just as the wave of anti-Catholicism approached a climax the Vatican started an official policy of separation of church and politics. The results were very immediate. A Castro envoy to the Vatican and a new papal nuncio with full powers in Havana. The churches remained open. Mainly the people within the churches are older people.

My family has a mausoleum in the "colon" cemetery (music heard far away very softly, guitars and singers) at least fifteen people are buried there. My parents and my grandparents and some of the relatives. (Same music goes on in background) in the 30's and 40's the cemetery became a status symbol. You had to own two Cadillacs and then a big tomb inside the cemetery. If a big angel was on top (?) it was better. Some of these tombs were like the ancient Egyptian ones, with corridors and two or three floors, elevators, air condition, private chapels. Now, this was one of the elements that Fidel took as part of the corruption of the past, this desire to express in death the difference of classes. Today the cemetery is nationalized, does not belong any more to the Catholic Church and although people continue to bury their dead there, it is not even so easy to buy marble nowadays and if you just leave with all your relatives the weed grows and the dome of the tomb may crack and just remain so.

If my father and mother remain still there an allowance is given to them monthly until they die one day eventually. If the situation would remain like that with no possibility of even visting them one day, it probably will be the end of a long line. (You hear the guitars and singers very near—3 seconds.)

ANNOUNCER. The second Cuban, a man completely dedicated to the success of Castro's new social order. Before the revolution he was a part time mechanic. Today he is a factory official and an officer in Castro's milita. (Music starts immediately after this, coming closer everytime, people uproaring and singing Cuba si, Cuba si, Cuba si, Yanquis no immediately after the music—20 seconds.)

(Voice of second Cuban:)

My name is Jose Garcia Nicolas, 38 years old, I work at the Empresa Consolidada Del Cigarro as a personal (he probably means "personnel") manager. When Fidel come to Cuba I was very, very happy because I was expecting something new. I knew the change . . . I knew something in my mind that is different that the other government we used to have in Cuba. First we have to form a militia in each factory. They showed me how to handle machinegun and M–1 and all American guns. I spent 17 months as part of my duty, second lieutenant, then the personnel manager quit Cuba so they said to me: "Do you want to take the place of the personnel manager of the Empresa?" I was surprised because I don't think that I can make good. Before the revolution I used to have two different jobs. I made $480 dollars a month. This income made me of the middle class, you know, so when I take this job I make $290 dollars. That means that my income comes down so I am here for about almost 30 months in this job. I am proud I got it; I expect to do good. I am not expect to disappoint the revolution. Every morning I have to use the phone to call the factory to ask him what happens if they got any trouble, so I can go there and see if I can fix the things with the union and the managers. Somos Socialistas . . . it means we are Socialist in mind and body (a few notes are heard on a guitar, small pause and a singer starts singing: "Yo del Ingles conozco poca cosa pues solamente hablo en Español, pero entiendo a los pueblos cuando dicen: Yanqui go home"—I know very little English; I only talk Spanish, but I understand the peoples when they sing: Yankee go home—then you hear the singer and guitar fading and the voice clearly starts talking again—music and song 17 seconds.)

Before 1959 I bought my . . . my car, a Plymouth 1950, the moment the car stops I have to change for a bicycle or a bus. So I have to take the bus because my brake wasn't good this morning (the singer approaches again, now singing clearly: "Lo dicen en Manila y en Corea, en Panama, en Turquia y en Japón, el clamor es el mismo en todas partes: Yanqui go home"—They say it in Manila and in Korea, in Panama, in Turkey and in Japan, the demand is the same everywhere: "Yankee go home."—17 seconds—while the music is fading again the man starts talking).

They call me that they have got trouble over there so I get there and asked the manager; he is a Negro, a good fellow, one of the best men that we have in the whole Empresa. Imagine a Negro managing in a factory before the revolution! The real position of the Negro in Cuba before the revolution came is the same as the United States Now! And now, you see that by myself we . . . We go dancing together, we have dinner together, we have lunch together. (Small pause.)

Before the revolution came it was very difficult to get in a cigarette factory. Sometimes the worker has to pay for getting a job over there. It was a big corruption in the union. Now . . . it is not anymore.

This is Yolanda my wife, 32 years old, we got married in 1952. She is going shopping with her ration books. We got one chicken per person a month, we get 16 pounds of rice a month, ¾ of a pound of meat, if we don't have meat, if we don't have the rice that we used to have before the revolution we accept the problem. We got to fix our troubles in our own way so we don't have to complain about that.

I have been using the same barbershop since I moved this place. Armando was with the police before the revolution he was a copper, and 90% of the coppers hit the people in the street . . . they kill the people in the streets! Before the revolution they take everything they want, clothes, cigarettes. They go to the movies . . . they don't have to pay anything. I think he doesn't like the revolution on account he doesn't have any political pictures in the barber shop, even in the house. And he doesn't express in any good way about the revolution and I don't know why he stays here, I surprised, I think he is making about $15 or $20 dollars a day . . . he is making good money . . . is the only one we have around.

Before the revolution I had to quit the school because I had to go to work (brief pause) so I quit the school in the sixth grade in 1939. I decided to go to school at night because you have to improve your intellectual, otherwise you won't help much the revolution. So I'm taking class from Sunday to Friday from eight o'clock to ten thirty. I think is good thing to go to school, I like mathematics and Spanish my teacher is one of the youngest teachers that we have in school, is . . . a nice pretty gal (entonation with gaity of the last phrase) Delay, Delay (?) is her name. We are always talking how pretty you come tonight teacher, what happen, you going some place, the movie? Oh no, I am going to my boyfriend. And I don't think my wife is jealous about the teacher, is one of those things, you know. Is a teacher, we respect her as a teacher. They show us the way we can go to a socialist country and next, become a Communist country . . . I believe that they say because it is the scientific thing. It's very interesting when you left a school 20 years ago and then you have to go to school again, the teachers go more easy for you.

My wife Yolanda works in the Cuban Telephone Company (before saying this last phrase you clearly hear a telephone operator saying: "Miami I have a messenger call going to Tampa, Florida) She makes the International calls from Miami, Europe, China, the whole part of the world. It was a private company an American Company, they was nationalized in 1959. So the revolution came, the revolution need qualified people so she told me she want to work. Say I, I don't want you to work all the money I am making is enough to support the family. Says "Listen, I want to work because the Revolution ask for people who speak English", my wife makes $135 dollars a month. She doesn't come back at home until eight o'clock in the morning but I think she is making pretty good. She says that she likes the job (small pause while you are listening to the operators in the telephone company and one of them says clearly "go ahead, hable," then, you hear voices).

This is a CDR meeting. The main duties of the CDR defense is watching the counter-revolutionaries, watching the "gusanos", gusanos means those people who doesn't are with us. The gusanos says that they are afraid of talk that we put them in jail if they talk. That's a big lie! We are Marxist, we are Leninist, we don't accept such a big liar! You can talk everything you like, except against the revolution. You have to talk right. You can talk rumors or bolas. Gusanos tell that Fidel is a traitor, we don't accept that because Fidel is . . . is honest. We know that. If I can slap a face I'll do it! If I have to smash their head, we smash it; ! (you immediately hear a great uproar of voices singing, "Cuba Si, Yanquis No")—53 seconds.

When the meeting was out I was to get home at two o'clock in the morning. So I get up at six o'clock to make some voluntary work at the sugar cane field at Pinar Del Rio, Habana Libre Central. I was talking with my assistant and other three other members that suppose to come, come to the sugar cane field for voluntary work.

So Monday morning I will tell them what happened that only three came. I wish the employees of the Empresa, the one hundred and twenty five come to make voluntary work but I can't make those people come to sugar cane because all those people, even my brother doesn't think about it. My brother is a doctor! He stays at home, he doesn't want to come make voluntary work. I don't think he likes the revolution because he used to have good money and now he

has to work eight hours. But I got an idea he become a good revoluntary, I hope so because he doesn't think bad things. I don't go to sleep, I go to voluntary work, I like to do that kind of job! Because you feel happy. They don't care about the revolution they prefer to stay at bed. Someone's make the job for him. (The noise of an approaching car sounding the siren is heard) The guy is my asistant, Luis San Martin, is one of the best man I have as assistant. The girl is Gisella. Before the revolution she was a domestic and become a good secretary now and one of the best girls that we have there. She is a member of UJC. That means Union de Jovenes Comunistas—Union of Communist Youth—she is a quiet girl and dynamic and nice girl (brief pause, then you hear children singing, children songs—11 seconds).

Today is Pepin's birthday. He is 8 years old. I felt a little tired because of the voluntary work last day but I happy when I see my boy is coming at 8 and all those kids coming to the house (all the time the children singing are heard in the distance in the background) and we buy a cake with 8 candles and we invite all neighbors (now the voices of the children are heard loud and clear for 22 seconds) Yolandita is a little mad because everybody was so interested in Pepin and the cake was for Pepin, so next time will be Yolandita.

This is my father in law profirio. He works at the cigarette factory. He was a cab driver in Chicago, he too lived in the States about 20 years and he got married in Cuba and went to Spain also during the Spanish Revolution, the Civil War. I was there three times in the States. Before the revolution came I was eighteen years old. You know . . . when you are young you are looking for something new. I was trying to stay there but they asked me for money, two thousand dollars . . . if I have two thousand dollars I don't have to go there looking for nothing, so I stayed here.

There is another children come to the party and some of the fathers doesn't are with the Revolution. We accept because the kid don't have the fault of the fathers. The children can come to my party anytime they want to play with my children, anytime they want. We don't care about that. (Brief pause and children singing again and laughing and applauding, then the children start rhythmically: "Denme La F. F. Demme La I. I. Demme La D, D, Denme La E, E." at this point the man starts.) Give the F, La Otra, I can't hear it, more louder, say give me the F, give me the I, louder, I can't hear you, give me the D, give me E and give me the L, Fidel, Fidel (then children voices clearly singing rhythmically "Fidel, Fidel, campeon, te comiste el tiburón en las playas de Girón" "Fidel, Fidel, campeón, te comiste el tiburon en las playas de Girón"—Fidel, Fidel, champ, you ate the shark at the beaches of Giron . . . Fidel, Fidel, champ, you ate the shark at the beaches of Giron . . .

I wish I could talk with Fidel personally. He leads the revolution and he show the Marxismo-Leninismo. I think he is the greatest man I ever saw in my life (at this point the children that have been singing all the time in the distance got closer and said clearly: "Fidel, seguro a los yanquis dales duro"—Fidel be sure to hit the Yankees hard—while fading away again.) I hope that my kid grow up in a socialist country and a Communist country (the children that were singing all the time are heard clearly singing "Fidel, seguro, Fidel, seguro, a los yanquis dales duro. Izquierda, Izquierda, izquierda, siempre izquierda"—Left, left, left, always left. (While the children finish their singing a march is heard approaching while the children voices are fading completely, many voices as in a meeting—49 seconds).

ANNOUNCER. The third Cuban, he is a semi-illiterate and knows little of politics. He is typical of the farmers and laborers who make up the bulk of the island's population. (Brief pause, and a voice saying in Spanish: Mi Nombre, Francisco Consuegra Salgado. Su edad, mi edad es 46 ño (here a new voice starts serving as interpreter repeating what he says . . .) My name is Francisco Consuegra Salgado, I am 46 years old, "Trabajo en Salud Publica, champeando los solares yermos, parte del rio y zanjas, para que la plaga no ataque al pueblo"—I work at a public health department. I use my machete to clear the bushes so as to wipe out the mosquitos near the river. (Brief pause, then a noise as an instrument cutting, a machete.) I make $88 pesos and 10 cents and I work 6 hours every day (in the background the noise is audible all the time, then a "conga" is heard and the voice starts again). Before the revolution I used to make more on occasion but I didn't have a steady job (the "conga" still is the background music). So, before, I could have made . . . $100 dollars in 15 days, for instance, but then I was off work, now I make less but my job is steady. The boots and the working clothes are given to me by the ministry, that is why when I finish work I take them off, put them away and I change into new clothes. (More music—10 seconds—a voice saying clearly: "a gozar, a gozar, a gozar.")

After I get off work I like to go to a nearby cafe where I like to have a glass cold water and some coffee and I invite my friends to have coffee with me. There's my friend Mesa, and Rafael Adalberto.

The papers are handed here. We have to sign them daily and give them to the foreman who will take them out afterwards to the ministry. This is done for payroll purposes so that our name appear on them and they know which day we worked. I know many cafe that due to the shortage of cups are using marmelade jars.

I can walk home, all the way home, but on this day, because is raining, I decided to take a bus take me home (pause).

Some of the people who work with me we like to stop at this pastry place and buy some pastries and some bread, some of us we like to eat our bread here so we stayed (?) out back before taking it to our house. But there seem to be some people that do not favor revolution, they go around saying "I am hungry and there is no another this no another that" whatever the people get I do get also so there I don't feel there is a shortage of food. (Unintelligible word.) Bread is no rationed you can buy as much bread as you wish. This picture that we see here about Fidel, Camilo, are hung in these bread houses which have been nationalized by the government are hung up on the walls by the government . . . after I finish eating my pastries and bread I get on board bus number ten and I get a transfer for bus number twentythree. Afterwards I must still get another bus to get home. The fare cost me eighteen cents, it takes me about 30 minutes to get home by bus. (you hear the bus sound as it is leaving a trumpet plays rythmically 35 seconds)

My wife name is Juanita Lafita, she is twenty five years old. My youngest son, his name Nelson, he is six years old, then comes Vlima, she is 7. Finally there is Della who is 8 years old. I am a member of the CDR, I do guard duty at night to try to prevent any sabotage. During the Bay of Pigs invasion I am not used to my guard and block. If I see any unusual happening I would have reported immediately. (Brief music sound in distance)

Now I have a couple of pigs and a few chickens on the back yard. (Sounds of chickens—a second) my son Nelson is the one who feeds the chickens (chicken heard) and some times my daughters like to do that too, but he chases them away (unintelligible) a place for minor. (Chickens heard again)

The school presently existing in the neighborhood was built by the former government. My children go to this school, my wife was at the school up to fifth grade and myself up to fourth grade. My son wishes to become a technician when he grows up, one of my daughters wishes to become a nurse and the other is fond of domestic work. These toys they are playing with now were brought them by the three Wise Men on the night of January 5th. I buy toys for them; I paid three dollars for each doll so that they would find them early when they woke up in the morning of January 6th. Before the breaking of Cuban/United States trade we used to get American toys here in Cuba, they were good dolls and I say this without detriment to the quality of the Socialist dolls which happen to be good dolls too. Back in 1962 we received a shipment of toys from the People's Republic of China and that made us very happy because we felt that on account of blockade we won't have as many toys available.

Some relatives of mine from Oriente Province came to see me. How long was it that we have not seen each other, and it was because of the hurricane that has hit us in Oriente province, it was an awful hurricane which did us a lot of damage; 4 families were lost including some members of my own family. (Dancing music heard.) We of the family seldom go out at night to the movie or dancing, but my children like to dance great deal. We have radio and always have had a radio (music in background) and they like to dance inside of the house. My wife go to a clinic where services are offered here absolutely at no cost by the government. If is a baby girl we'll name her Dania, if it is a boy we'll call him Panchito, that's the same name as the father. I keep a picture of Fidel because I am an admirer of the revolution. I also have a portrait of Santa Barbara . . . we are not Catholics . . . we never go out to church . . . I don't know the history of Jesus Christ. And not do I know the history of Santa Barbara, but I feel devotion for Santa Barbara and . . . I like to have her picture in my house.

Some of the members of the defense committee might be familiar with the work of Carlos Marx and Engels, but as to myself I am not familiar with it. (Pause, you hear the radio on) but I understand that socialism and communism is that now we workers and honest people have somebody to defend us because in the old times they really gave us a rough time. Marx, Engels, Kruschov, the social workers doing a kind of job similar to what Fidel Castro is doing with our people now (pause finish music).

This is the area where I used to live late in 1958. This was a slum in Luyano, I managed to buy the shack I used to live in for seventy pesos. Living conditions in this slum were extremely bad, when it rained there was more water inside the house than outside, there were ten thousand people also living here. Narcotics and prostitution were all over the place in connivance with the police.

With the advent of revolution things started changing. These new houses were given to us by the revolutionary government we put in so many thousand hours each of us building these houses. In my own case I put in 3,370 extra hours and my lease stipulates that I will not begin paying rent until sometime in 1970.

There are some advantages that I didn't have before, for instance, now I work six hours a day, but after I get off work then I have plenty of extra time in my spare time during the afternoon time to grow some corn right in front my place and that means an extra income that I get for my household.

I have a Chinese fan, I needed one and I had the money, there were no other fan available; I pay forty pesos for this Chinese fan. I had to make no sacrifice to purchase it. Everytime I had a chance I save away five dollars, ten dollars, whatever I had in hand to use (a few words are unintelligible).

When I first came to Havana I had to pay out seventy pesos for the shack I used to live in, in the slum section where my house was. In addition I had to pay two pesos every week to a police copper named Horacio: Now I don't have to pay those two pesos anymore. So I could perfectly have saved up forty pesos and then buy the electric fan which I now have.

I have some relatives in Oriente, they live in huts, in country huts. Now the conditions of these huts are quite different from those that the house I live in which was given to me by the revolutionary government. The floorings are made of boards . . . sometimes made of tiles . . . somtimes plain earth . . . I feel very happy and very lucky to have a house as the one I have today and not like the one I used to have right next to a stream of sewerage water.

Some people say that the Cuban revolution is OK but communism isn't. Now, my own feeling about this: If this government has given me new housing and other facilities which I now enjoy as a human being, then, I for one say, that I like communism . . . I am a Communist.

(Unidentified voice) (the following sounds like that of the first Cuban:) This is the story of Cuba today, Cuba Socialista. Cuba today is definitely very strong military dictatorship. The freedom of speech of press, even of expressing our own opinion in the streets, is of course gone. Castro is alive. Tomorrow he may die, he may be shot but the following remains with Castro or without Castro. (In distance music is heard.) The revolution in Cuba is like a signal, is the beginning of something very big, it is not an isolated problem, it is a challenge, not only for the United States but for the nations of Western Europe as well.

As I look back upon the last five years of my life I wonder what answers could we give, what could we find as a real tool against poverty and misery which are the ideal elements of communism. How can we shape the Alliance for Progress so it becomes a real effective instrument. How can we answer the third Argentinian, the third Chilean, the third Uruguayan so the story of these three Cubans does not repeat in a carbon copy in other countries. (The noise comes clear now and the background music is approaching closer and closer—popular music 30 seconds, then about fifteen seconds a hymn which we could not identify is heard.)

ANNOUNCER. We have seen and heard what the revolution means to three Cubans, each from a different level of Cuban society. There are others who would have given different impressions yet, the experiences, the feelings, the attitudes of these three are representative of large groups of their countrymen and of life on the island today (music heard briefly).

This is NET, the National Educational Television Network.

Remember share the good life. One of the keys to the good life in South Florida is the diversified cultural and informational programs scheduled of your community television station. Support Channel 2. Send your tax deductible contributions to the Community Television Foundation, 1701 DuPont Building, Miami, Florida.

NOTES

1. Punctuation has been added according to pauses and emphasis in tape recording.

2. Sound effects are described by us parenthetically. The time-length of the sound effects has been carefully timed and noted. The background sound effects are a most important subliminal tool used by the Director of the film.

3. When in doubt about the interpretation of a word or sentence, because of poor recording or bad pronunciation, we have indicated so by a question mark in parenthesis.

EXHIBIT 2

ANATOMY OF A FILM ANALYSIS OF "THREE FACES OF CUBA"

(By Edward Hunter)

The hour-long documentary film, "Three Faces of Cuba," was brought to my attention first in script form. An advertisement in TV Guide of March 22, 1965, contains this description of it: "Producer-director Robert Cohen, who filmed TV-documentaries in Cuba, China and East Germany, returns to Cuba for this look at developments since the 1959 revolution. Three Cubans—an upper middle-class exile, a revolutionary and a worker—tell the story."

I suspected that the "China" referred to in the advertisement did not mean Free China, which the U.S.A. recognizes, and, sure enough, it did not. It referred to Red China, which we do not recognize, a subtle piece of pro-communist propaganda in itself.

"Three Faces of Cuba" was produced for the National Educational Television Network (N.E.T.), for showing through its nationwide outlets. These number 91, according to its Washington office. The film, until May 5, 1965, was available for purchase in 16 mm. width from Audio-Visual Center, N.E.T., Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, although shipments came from a Michigan university. This was no small project. Students and academic circles were prime targets.

Later I had the opportunity of seeing "Three Faces of Cuba."

FILM FITS PROPAGANDA PATTERN

"Three Faces of Cuba" brought back memories of the propaganda analysis in which I engaged for the U.S. Military and various government agencies during World War II and in the post-war years. This included many enemy films. "Three Faces of Cuba" was fully in the spirit of these films.

My first reading of the script gave me the impression that I had seen this text before, or the film. As I went over it more carefully, recollections dawned on me. No, I had not seen this particular movie, but I had come across many like it. The format was old hat. I had met this pattern in productions by Red China and other communist countries, Nazi Germany, ultranationalist Japan during its period of continental aggression, and Fascist Italy.

The intent was always the same—to whitewash totalitarian excesses and to support a regime of terror, while concealing this in a false context of impartiality and objectivity.

The script was sent me by The Truth About Cuba Committee, Inc., of 646 S.W. 12th Ave., Miami, Florida. A couple of weeks later I flew there at the invitation of Luis V. Manrara, its executive director, to attend a special, private showing of the film, requested of the Community Television Foundation of South Florida, Inc., of which James I. Keller Jr. is president.

It took place in the auditorium of the Lindsey Hopkins Education Center, operated by the Dade County Board of Public Instruction.

The Committee retained me to evaluate the film at this presentation, arranged at the insistence of Mr. Manrara, as the result of numerous protests against it by informed Americans and anti-communist Cuban exiles who had seen its television production in Miami. Protests against the film had come also from other cities where it had been shown throughout the nation.

FILM IS "BLACK" PROPAGANDA

What I saw amply bore out the various accusations. The film obviously was not intended for Cubans or others acquainted at first hand with conditions in today's Cuba. The target is the American people generally, who lack the means to check up on what is in the film, and are without sufficient knowledge of propaganda tactics to detect the professional use of it against them.

Just as plainly, the target of the film includes the youth in the educational institutions of the United States.

Anything to which the respectable term, educational, can be ascribed possesses an advantage. The fact that it was a project of a so-called educational network gave it a presumed validity. As such, it was attitude-changing as regards Castro and Red Cuba, painting both in quite favorable colors, and seemingly as an aside ascribing only low motives and a base character to the United States and Americans generally. This is its primary impact in the United States, reinforcing the hackneyed smears found in red anti-American propaganda. Its approach is communist. The film is practically without a scene that can be divorced from this pro-red format. Yet it is presented as a factual account of present-day life on our Cuban island neighbor, supposedly arranged and produced independently, for the enlightenment of the people of the United States, including their student communities.

This puts the "Three Faces of Cuba" into a propaganda category called "black" or clandestine. The professional terms, "black," "white" and "gray," should become known to all the American people, and their usage explained, to help them protect their minds from being immobilized or captured during this cold war period of intensified assault.

"White" or overt propaganda is simple, and in perhaps a majority of cases is legitimate and even ethical. Its source is open or unconcealed. The origin of whatever message is being disseminated, or action being taken, is made clear, so the recipient or audience is able to gauge its motivation. This is as it always should be.

"Gray" propaganda brings in a dissembling device. It is midway between "white" and "black." Its true source is concealed. But the channel used, that is made to appear as the source that initiated the message or action, is on the same side. The ransom of Cuban prisoners after the Bay of Pigs betrayal was a "gray" operation. The U.S. government initiated it, but the American people were told that it originated within their own ranks, which was untrue. Jack Paar, as a private television performer, lent himself to this "gray operation" initiated by Robert F. Kennedy, who was then the attorney general.

OUR ENEMIES FAVOR "BLACK" PROPAGANDA

Then there is "black" propaganda, favored by America's enemies in their "cold war" against the United States. By this device, they release their message or initiate an action through an American vehicle as the ostensible source. This is the most dangerous propaganda tactic in the psychological warfare being waged against us. When the source of a foreign propaganda maneuver appears as American, the latter's role may be conspiratorial, collaborative, or wholly innocent, itself deceived regarding where its attitude-changing operation originated. We must guard against falling into such booby traps in psychological warfare. Those who produce mind-influencing material, as well as those who are the recipients of it, have an equal responsibility in this. Communism could make no inroads among us without resort to "black propaganda," spread through seemingly innocent or educational fronts. These constitute a transmission belt for the "black" material initiated by the communists, with the people of the United States as the target.

"Black" thus simply means the use of an opponent to express one's own views. What could be more subversive or perilous? Yet the United States is constantly falling for this nefarious tactic. Reds employ it by using Americans to convey an anti-American message, for example. In order to shield their minds from attack, people must understand how propaganda operates. We come

up against it daily in the misnamed "cold war," that is only deceitfully cold. This phase of warfare can paralyze a nation, setting it up for a fall, which is the objective of the red "psywar" (psychological warfare) planners, and the goal toward which each of their projects is pointed. The communists, to whom dialectical materialism is a bible, and who plan every action from a materialistic, collectivist viewpoint, conduct their propaganda entirely within this framework. Their propaganda is not intended just to alter a mind, but to bring about an action favorable to the red cause.

They are utterly pragmatic about this. They teach that every piece of propaganda must be designed to achieve an action of some sort. Their art work must be appraised from this point of view if we are not to be a pushover for pro-red machinations.

However arranged and whoever its participants, "Three Faces of Cuba" fits neatly into this setting. The American people, especially the inexperienced minds of our young people, with their utopian aspirations, are the main target of this film. Its message is that we have wrongly and unjustly judged Castro and communism, and that the evil is to be found among ourselves and in our free society, and not in the red ranks. The inevitable implication, too, is that we must not be lured into opposing Castro or Red Cuba—and inferentially, communism anywhere—but be friendly, and support these rather than our own country and its goals.

A college boy who sees this film and then is urged by reds on the campus, among the professors or the student body, to go out and demonstrate, carrying banners proclaiming refusal to bear arms for his country, or to fight against the red enemy in Viet Nam or elsewhere, would have been prepared by it for this. His resistance would have been corroded, unless he previously had been alerted to its propaganda content, and was able to recognize it for what it is, a deadly weapon in the red military arsenal aimed at the United States.

FILM EXPOSED BY ALERT CUBAN EXILES

"Three Faces of Cuba" was spotted through the alertness of stalwart Cuban expatriates, particularly The Truth About Cuba Committee, Inc., which took up the cudgels. Thanks to it, this insidious film has been exposed. If as a result, the American people become better acquainted with the softening-up tactics used against them, and gain a greater insight into how they have been submitted to skillful, pro-red propaganda, these Cubans will have repaid to this extent for the haven given them in the United States. They well recognize the interdependence of freedom. Americans owe a debt of gratitude to these exiled Cubans for their unrelenting efforts.

The Truth About Cuba Committee, Inc., pioneered among Cuban organizations in the ideological field. It is not fighting against Castro alone—nor alone for the freedom of stricken Cuba—but against international communism, on behalf of God, country and the dignity of man, knowing that these are interrelated. The Committee is doing this with a staff of underpaid and unpaid men and women, on the most meager resources, united by the realization that the fight is a common one, in which all free peoples have an equal stake.

REDS CONTROL NEWS RIGIDLY

Although this film is attributed to Americans, and its sponsorship is American, and it is distributed through American channels, it is the communist voice of Castro that we hear throughout, in virtually every phase of it. Practically all, if not all of the film, was photographed in Red Cuba. The inescapable conclusion from these circumstances is that the film might as well have received the imprint of the Red Cuban propaganda ministry. Its arrangement and supervision could have been only Red Cuba's, whether the control was exercised directly, indirectly, or even tacitly. Otherwise the filming could not have been made in Red Cuba, and the sound effects could not have been added.

These sound effects are the film's most revealing clues. The sound track added to the film in Cuba, and the speech that apparently was dubbed in, constitute the most effective part of the propagandist impact. These background effects are inserted time and time again, and always with obvious intent. A typical scene is that of the smiling faces of children in the so-called new Cuba, with the voice of Castro dubbed in as if a revolutionary chorus. The subliminal intent, of course, is to attribute the happiness of the children to Castro. Otherwise why juxtapose the two? Such calculated coincidence takes place throughout the production, and had to be planned this way. It could not have happened accidentally.

No communist government permits independent film production of any sort on its soil. It demands control of what is produced, by one means or another. The form this takes is tactical alone, and may appear to be the normal cooperation given by authorities to a visiting photographer. He does as he is ordered, which is one approach, or his will coincides with what the reds want, which is another approach.

If the producer is a sympathizer, or when secret ties exist, these instructions are followed automatically. All of this makes a product "black," and it is the process much preferred by the communist cold war planners for such targets as the United States.

This is not the occasion to go deeply into a description of Robert Cohen, the photographer, but a few points should be mentioned because of their direct relationship to the film. One concerns references to him by Lyle Stuart, who is known—notorious would be the proper word—for his publishing and writing in the fields of obscenity and extreme leftism; he puts out a sort of tabloid called "The Independent."

He gave his whole, 16-page issue of September, 1964 to a several months' stay he made in Red Cuba, during which he: "met Bob Cohen and his wife Helen. . . . He also has a producer with him. He [Cohen] filmed a seven or eight-hour tv interview with Fidel a year ago [1963]. He also did a tv record of two families in Havana and now wants to make a sound tape to go with the film. Doing this for the National Educational Television network.

"Bob Cohen tells me he gave some 60 or 70 lectures on Cuba after his last visit here. . . . He had his own problem (I think he had gone to China) on passport renewal. He refused to answer questions on the passport renewal form, saying that all they were entitled to know is that he is an American citizen."

The Supreme Court in a recent decision has rejected this position, so we can expect prosecution of some of those, at least, who have been defying this country's laws and interests.

The film, as made evident by Lyle Stuart's report, as well as by the testimony of its contents, is a patchwork, processed job, placing together bits as fit the the context and the objective, then inserting the sound track in order to round out the propaganda task.

The "three faces" of the film are those of an "ardent revolutionary," an "unskilled laborer" and "a university professor . . . now living in exile in the U.S." These conform to the image that the reds create, as a party of workers and peasants, in which intellectuals find their most satisfying outlet.

Two of these are described as Cubans residing in present-day Cuba, and they echo the communist line intact and faithfully. The film follows the format of a production in a free society, whose inhabitants may speak freely, without apprehension over being held strickly to account for every word they utter.

Only the exceptionally well-informed can tell by looking at the film that this was not the case with those interviewed in it. But without such clarification, a deceit is perpetrated on possibly the bulk of its viewers, especially among the youth.

Of course, they say only what they are instructed to say by the propaganda specialists of the Cuban red regime. Otherwise they would be dead ducks! Much the same is patently obvious for the man described as a professor, if not entirely so, for his family was said by the announcer to be still residing in Cuba. His identity is not given, but what should be obvious is that enough sympathizers of persons susceptible to its pressures were connected with the film in one way or another to make quite sure that Castro's henchmen know who he is. Any intelligent man in his position certainly would go under this assumption, that is, if he had any feelings for his family. Such persons left behind, anywhere from Red China to Red Cuba, are hostages for the words and deeds of their relatives residing abroad. They are constantly under an implied or enforced threat or blackmail as countless tragic cases attest.

Blackmail and ransom are well-known, profitable pressures exercised by Cuba's red regime, as elsewhere in the communist orbit.

Whoever knows anything at all about communism knows that anywhere, in any red country, anyone tapped for an interview is known to the authorities, and is going to praise the reds to the skies, no matter how he hates them. In no communist land is there any direct relationship between what one says and the facts. These have to be read between the lines, in the environment, and at best can only be deduced by an educated guess. The idea that a television program can be produced in Red Cuba, with interviews of Cuban residents, and have it give in any way the slightest clue to their actual thinking, is sheer ignorance of how communism operates. One might say that such an interview would give a view of what the red authorities want others to believe about red policy and how people think. No more than this, though.

Looked at this way by alert, informed viewers, some useful information can be gleaned from such films.

Naturally, under such circumstances, even if this had been an ethical attempt to obtain the views of an anti-communist, Cuban refugee, he would not have dared to say anything really detrimental to Castro and Red Cuba, and as can be attested in this case, he certainly does not do so in this film. Quite the contrary. He eulogizes Castro, justifies the communist revolution, and in effect condemns the past society. At the most, he does not go beyond the strictures of an anti-anticommunist. A viewer who is unacquainted with propaganda techniques, certainly a customary student who sees the film, would presume that it is what it presents itself as being, an educational and therefore an objective picture. He would likely accept its pro-communist message as a genuine expression of opinion. He would have no way of knowing whether there was any propaganda manipulation in the film. Yet there is evidence of such calculated planning from start to finish, for in practically every detail, it conforms to the traditional format of a pro-red propaganda movie.

FILM'S OMISSIONS MORE DANGEROUS THAN ITS ASSERTIONS

The major propaganda device used in the film is fabrication by omission. The salient facts about nearly every issue discussed are omitted, and practically the only details included are those that put Castro and communism in a favorable light, irrespective of how much processing and posing they require. The most important omissions, of course, are references to the control mechanism employed by the Cuban Reds, with the guidance and assistance of Chinese, Czech

and Russian specialists in brainwashing and terror. All details of atrocities and terror, perpetrated by Castro and his red compatriots, are left unmentioned. Not even a hint suggests that any such excesses take place. Yet incontrovertible evidence has accumulated of such bestiality. This alone would make the film a hoax. What has been omitted from the film, and this must have taken highly skilled and brazenly callous doing at times, is immensely more significant than what was put into it.

Some of the efforts at concealment are ludicrous once seen through, but if undetected, are a highly effective propaganda ruse, of a particularly disarming type.

In the film, the worker who has become an executive says there was "big corruption in the union" in the old days, but "not any more." At the very least, he might have added that trade unions as we know them do not exist in Red Cuba or in any other communist country. They have been converted into what are known in the United States as "company unions." Under communism they are arms of the state, enforcing its demands for increased work and decreased pay. One of the earliest actions of the Castro regime was to crush the strong labor union movement that was in existence. This is typical of the glaring omissions in the film.

The religious symbolism is raw. The announcer tells the viewers at the start of the film that it is the story of three men "whose lives have been changed," the change being achieved by Castro. The setting makes this approach evangelical. A preacher would have been more specific, saying three lives were saved by Christ.

The implication is subliminally left that there is such a similarity. This religious note is strongly reinforced later on. The presumed professor tells us that Castro regards himself as "Christ-like," as a "Messiah," and as "a possessor of the Holy Spirit." No hint is given that this might be sheer blasphemy and a lie, making black into white in the Orwellian manner of the Newspeak and doubletalk of the prophetic novel, "1984."

So far as this film is concerned, too, there is no trace of atheism in Castro or the communist regime, only a sympathetic attitude towards religion.

SAME AS ATTENDING A RED RALLY

Almost at the start of the film, at the conclusion of the announcer's capsule descriptions of the "three faces" presented as representative of today's Cuba, the dynamic and enthusiastic voice of Castro is heard neatly and propagandistically fitting into the setting. Indeed, this could be a Castro rally that the audience is attending. The film creates a mood for it. This is the very effective participation gambit, by which onlookers are caught up by the acting, and subconsciously participate in the scenes. The emotional type—and we all are, in varied degrees—especially youth, and any who come upon the film unconcerned, easily can be moved by this technique into becoming sympathizers of Red Cuba and communism, and their patriotism be commensurately decreased.

STIRRING MUSIC, THEN APPLAUSE

The announcer practically begins the film with reference to the "university professor in Havana," who "is now living in exile in the U.S." Ordinarily, one would have said that he had been forced to flee—an admission that there was something to flee from. But not in this presentation. He was "alienated" and "displaced." The implication is that he does not fit into the new society. The second man, described as "an ardent revolutionary," and the third as an "unskilled Cuban," are both said to have been benefited by the revolt. As the announcer completes these descriptions, the hym is played of the July 26 Movement, Castro's original rebel group, and "thunderous applause" is heard.

After such an inspirational start, one would feel mean to possess negative thoughts about the Castro regime. If the audience were young, such a psychological opening would be influential in creating a favorable image that would be difficult to change later on.

The first voice that follows the announcer's sounds as if it is the professor's, although it comes on without any introduction.

It offers a rhetorical description of Castro, whom he says he remembers from university years. He provides a superficial analysis of him as an exuberant talker, a "born demagogue" who thought of himself as a messiah. Nothing bad about this, of course. Not a word about his record as a killer from his early years, a criminal type who brought his vicious traits into politics, making it gangsterism and a government racket of the worst sort. A curious statement is made to the effect that Castro has taken the revolt "quite personally," and would "resort to any kind of alliance" to maintain it. At this point Castro's voice is dubbed in, shouting "Long live the socialist revolution," "Long live Marxism-Leninism," and finally, "Fatherland or death," ending up with popular music.

EXILES PROFESSOR CARRIES RED PROPAGANDA

The alleged professor is supposed to present the opinions of an exile, but actually he repeats the hackneyed, red propaganda line as regards both Cuba and the United States. He says the middle class first thought that the revolt was intended only to clean up corruption, "never realizing that it was a real social revolution."

His seeming criticisms of the Castro regime are rendered respectfully, as a Castro propagandist might present them, as a fulcrum for what actually is favorable and helpful to the red dictator.

An objective film that sought to give opposing viewpoints would have balanced the pro-communist point of view with the opinion of at least one person who was truly anti-communist, and in a position to state freedom's case. This film made no attempt to do so. The few hints of its are a disarming cover for the pro-communist line. The implication is that, as a refugee, the exile in the film would be anti-Castro, and talk at least as frankly as the two who show by their words that they are enthusiastically pro-Castro. This is not done in this film, which alone would make it red propaganda. Special note should be taken, too, of the role occupied by this presumed intellectual. Instead of speaking out against Castro and communism, the role into which he is fit, he is the channel for some of the major red themes. He reinforces the pro-Castro statements of the other two. In actuality, we have virtually no anti-communist or anti-Castro viewpoint expressed in the film.

In propaganda tactics, this is the loaded panel device, in which pro-reds and fake "liberals" monopolize a discussion, often over television, sometimes placed in opposition to a supposed anti-communist who is, at most, a cautious middle-of-the-roader, and is employed as a foil to strengthen the arguments used in support of the pro-red line. The public should learn to recognize this customary tactic.

WEDGE-DRIVING TACTIC EMPLOYED

An inseparable part of red psychological warfare is its wedge-driving or splitting tactic. Red gains are frequently the result of success in this alone. Indeed, if the communists were less adept at planting suspicion and sowing enmity between its foes, it would have expired many years ago. As might be anticipated from the format, the "three faces" contribute their bit to this, too.

The so-called professor tells us that the oil embargo we imposed on Cuba is being broken by Russian oil "brought in English vessels." He points out that if this flow of oil stopped, "it would be a tremendous breakdown for the whole regime because everything is run mainly with oil." In other words, he reminds us that England, our ally, is keeping Red Cuba in operation. Significantly, this is followed by a long pause, and then sixteen seconds of gay music that features the high notes of trumpet. As much as if to say:: "It won't stop coming; the American embargo is a farce! America's closest ally has broken it."

The implication is given that the other countries of the free world will bring about the failure of United States efforts to blockade Red Cuba.

The same professorial voice is employed to say that sabotage by anti-Castro elements did little damage to the American oil installations seized by Castro. No detail is given of any single, successful action by anti-Castro Cubans, in spite of the known fact that Cuba's red regime constantly complains and denounces the successful sabotage carried out against it. This, of course, would not have been permitted in this film. The opposite point is brought up on a number of occasions, for obvious psychological effect. The boycott, we are informed, did not even prevent toys from coming into the country from Czechoslovakia for the enjoyment of the children, and even electric fans from Red China were imported to make life pleasant for Cuban workers, who are shown as well-fed, in the act of munching bread, of which we are told there is a limitless supply. A closeup is significantly shown of a Cuban munching away at his bread. We even see a woman carrying home two chickens for dinner. Meager food rationing in Cuba belies the false impression of abundance which the film portrays.

"VOLUNTARY" WORK NOT EXPOSED

If this film were not intentionally subversive, or if there were any desire for objectivity, there would have been some clarification of the statement by the factory executive that he gets home at 2 a.m. from a political indoctrination meeting, then awakens at 6 a.m. for so-called "volunteer" work in a sugar cane field, besides doing his regular, full-time work. This is the way brainwashing operates, keeping minds so fatigued that they have no time to think over what they are being told, and too weary to resist. The red hierarchy exults over such excess exertion as proof of the people's enthusiasm.

"Voluntary labor" should be exposed as forced labor, for it is obligatory. A task is set forth, perhaps the harvesting of a sugar crop, and people technically are asked to "volunteer." But enough of them are obliged to volunteer to do whatever work the government wants done. The numerous pressures available to communism ensure this. The proof that "voluntary" means "obligatory," in the language of George Orwell's Newspeak, is that one never hears of a case when volunteers are asked for, and an insufficient number are obtained because of refusals. There is no alternative. Volunteering is obligatory.

An objective film certainly would have further clarified this statement by adding that the Cuban reds have instituted "military conscription," and put those drafted onto labor tasks at the minimal wage that soldiers receive, patently an example of the callous exploitation of labor. A television program that leaves the impression that one volunteers to work under communism in the manner that we use the word in the United States is lying to its viewers. Young minds—or any minds—should not be submitted to such falsification in the United States. Free speech does not mean that our children must undergo disloyal and even treasonable teachings. Yet when films of this nature can be shown as "educational," without their being explained for what they are, this is exactly what is happening.

The unannounced voice, presumedly the

alleged professor's, arises again at the concluding portion of the film, in a continuation of its role as transmission belt for the Cuban red propaganda machine. Castro may die, or even be assassinated, the "professor" says, but his work will remain. Music arises in the distance. He goes on to say that the Cuban revolution is a signal for "something very big," and that this is a challenge to both the United States and Western Europe.

FILM FOLLOWS A RACIST LINE

The film parallels the communist propaganda lines in practically all respects. One giveaway is the disproportionate stress put upon the Negro as a black man, and his supposed good life in present-day Cuba, as contrasted with the bad life he is supposed to be leading in the United States now, actually likened to his position in Cuba before Castro came on the scene and purportedly rescued him!

This is, indeed, an insurrectionary film, for it maligns the United States and its way of life, and whitewashes that of Cuba under the communists, encouraging an attitude of support for the latter country against the former. The American Negro cannot fail to get the point quite early in the film. The poor and the Negroes could not enter Cuba's "private clubs and private residential sections" and swim at the pleasant beaches before the communists came, but now Castro has opened these to all the people, the film declares, combining a whole set of propaganda twists and half-truths. This guileful message is conveyed through the voice of the anonymous figure described in the film as the exiled professor, who declares that Castro told the Negro that "something must be wrong" with him because he "don't even fight" for these rights.

At a time when the socialist-communist political complex in the United States is inciting racial disorders, unwilling to accept any orderly, legal reforms, seeking only to use the Negro issue as a medium for insurrection and the overthrow of the free American form of society, susceptible minds are sure to catch the insurrectionary implication. "You Negroes in America, and you who feel deprived," Castro seems to be saying, "get out on the streets and fight!" What other purpose could there be in making these gratuitous and falsified comparisons with life in the United States in a film that supposedly deals only with conditions on the red-dominated island of Cuba?

The racist issue is rubbed in again and again, sometimes subtly, as in the scene supposedly representing the American role in Cuba before Castro. Now in the Cuban hotels, "instead of American tourists having beers and cocktails in the bar," we are told, there are Russian technicians and Negro workers. The Americans who went to Cuba apparently were all colonizers, gamblers and exploiters, according to the so-called professor. Not a whisper is uttered concerning the really fine contributions and the unstinted assistance that the United States provided to raise living standards generally and enhance the dignity of man. The night clubs were the froth of it, yet they are made to appear in this propaganda film as the drink itself.

The strip-tease girl wriggling in a bikini in an Americanized nightclub scene is apparently a Negress. The film is full of such indirect allusions and slurs. They are subliminal in nature, irrelevant to the proclaimed purpose of the film, usually consisting of asides or reactions circuitously aroused. Sometimes they are blatant, as in the factory executives' reference to his Negro associate—"we go dancing together."

According to the film, the role that American influence played in Cuba existed only in the form of practically nude dancing girls, raucous nightclubs and gambling joints. These are presented as having now been cleansed and made wholesome by Castro, and opened to middle class and lower middle class revolutionaries for innocent recreation.

We are told that the Negro in Cuba's past was left "to believe in his idols," and we are shown how he supposedly has been brought by Castro into an equal and proud rank alongside his white co-revolutionaries.

FILM ATTACKS AMERICAN BUSINESSMEN

In the film, the so-called professor indulges in the usual smears against Americans and United States business generally, as are found in all pro-red propaganda. He repeats, as something taken for granted, that American companies abroad are dishonest and guilty of crimes against the countries where they are established, and that the United States citizen abroad "suddenly becomes different . . . becomes a colonizer."

This is all he has to say of the country where he apparently has found exile, although why he speaks this way is a question left unanswered by the film. The points he brings out practically always parallel the red propaganda line.

COMMUNIST IRON-FIST CONTROL

Everyone knows that Castro has set up a watching system to force everyone to spy upon everyone else. One of the purposes of this network of informers is to terrify the people, to make suspicions mutual, so that nobody will trust his neighbor or even relatives and kinfolk. A communist regime regards it as advantageous to have the public exchanging gossip about the ubiquitous ears and eyes of the red rulers, and the fearful controls exercised by the secret police. The film contributes to this state of terror. We are told the system "works quite effectively." "Many underground movements," we are informed, have been uprooted even before they got started. The warning could not be expressed any plainer, especially from the mouth of a supposedly anti-red Cuban. Everyone knows Cuba is a police state, so we are told it is one, and that "people go to jail just for thinking basically against the revolution."

Castro himself has said it is communist, and every communist regime is admittedly a dictatorship. Why the subtlety, then, except to befuddle the reader or viewer? Both the film and a "fact sheet" that was secretly distributed at the private showing, were alike in this use of sophistry, as a cover for what intrinsically is misinformation and falsehood.

Red purposes are advanced when propaganda about ubiquitous controls is spread among exiled Cubans and Americans. The Cubans can be discouraged by it from engaging in freedom movements that could be successful. The Americans might be led by it to withhold help that could be decisive in freeing Cuba.

RED TACTIC FEIGNS OBJECTIVITY

The film did not need to be censored by the Cuban reds, for its whole theme and continuity could have been arranged only in collaboration with them, excluding anything that conflicted with the red propaganda intent. A special note should be made, for an insight into the propaganda tactics used, that nothing critical of Castro or of communism in Cuba was included that was not already public knowledge throughout the world, but some allusions were permitted only to what everyone already knows. Anything superficially detrimental to the regime was presented in such a way as to produce a reaction in its favor. This was the extent of the supposed objectivity of the film, which actually is subjective, slanted in favor of Castro's seizure of power for the communists, and must have required professional guidance throughout.

The red tactic for controlled criticism can be recognized easily. Before something detrimental to communism has been exposed, every effort is made to prevent its disclosure, and to smear and terrorize those who seek to bring it out. But, as can be observed in the United States in anti-anticommunist circles, once the public has learned of it and it no longer can be hushed up, the fellow-travelers and the fake "liberals" shout louder about it than those who did the exposing. Simultaneously, they concentrate on squelching efforts to reveal whatever has not yet been brought to the surface regarding the crimes of communism.

The admission is made in this film that the exodus from Cuba now includes intellectuals, workers, "and the peasant even." Admission is made, too, of the well-known fact that the sugar crop suffered a setback, and that the diversification program in agriculture has not worked out well. Everybody knows these things, so there can be little or no harm to communism in relating them, rather benefit, by giving the impression that the film is fairly balanced, honest and objective, and that communists are free to openly discuss their errors and setbacks.

The test is not in disclosures of what is already known, but whether any derogatory data that is still being concealed has been brought to the surface. The pro-red propagandist keeps this from happening by this transfer tactic, diverting attention to what is already known. The public, the target nowadays of intensified propaganda that is devised with scientific precision, must learn to identify this tactic, too, and to detect the deceit in it.

As regards the present backward housing situation, the so-called professor lets himself go so far as to declare that while homes were confiscated and given to the poor, "this does not mean that everyone is completely and totally happy." What a lame criticism! Is anyone on earth "completely and totally happy"? Of course not. This is the gentle, whitewash approach used whenever criticism is made of the reds.

AMERICANS FOOLING OURSELVES

Much of the communist propaganda that has been channeled into the United States has slipped through undetected because those responsible for its presentation lacked the necessary background and knowledge, or were sympathetic to the issues presented. There is a widespread pat assumption that the American people could not be fooled by it. This is a most dangerous situation. The characteristic of young minds is that they accept words and facial expressions at face value, which is in the American tradition, and is one of our most prized traits, that we are struggling to preserve and safeguard. We should not allow advantage to be taken of this natural goodness in youth, so as to exploit and mislead it. That this can be done behind the sugar, bamboo and iron curtains is sad enough, but we betray our youth when we stand back and let it happen here.

The bulk of a normal audience—young and adult—viewing the "Three Faces of Cuba" over an outlet of an educational channel in a normal American city, would accept it under this sponsorship as objective. The failure to label it for what it is, the presentation of Red Cuba as Castro and world communism want the United States to picture it, is as heinous as the provision of obscenity and drugs for young minds. All this is happening under pro-communist encouragement and incitation. This analyst, well knowing the dictionary meaning of the word "treasonable," unhesitatingly applies it to such a situation. A pretense at objectivity, or a college degree, is no excuse for it; it only compounds the criminality inherent in it.

The showing of "Three Faces of Cuba" anywhere in the free world without propaganda clarification submits the minds of viewers to a diabolical softening-up process in the interests of communism against their own country, and certainly should not be permitted. In the U.S., it spreads defeatism and subversion. Elsewhere, it appears to confirm what the reds say about us and about themselves.

The film can serve a useful purpose in our

society, nonetheless, if it could be presented along with a thorough propaganda analysis of its contents at the same time. Indeed, it would be a valuable film for study in classes in communications, in our colleges and universities, where propaganda is being studied.

The immediate objective would be the restricted one of detecting the communist propaganda infiltrated into this specific film. The longrange objective would be to teach how to detect propaganda inserted into films generally. Nowadays, such knowledge is most essential, yet lacking. Although this film is presented as the story of Cuba today, its theme is a twofold one, neither facet of which truthfully portrays the Cuba of today. The film is part of a worldwide, anti-United States propaganda campaign now being vigorously waged by the communist international network. Its anti-American, longrange objective is demonstrated by slanderous scenes concerning our past influence in Cuba, the alleged hatred of America in countries allied to us, and the racial problem generally. This is its primary theme.

Its secondary theme is the happiness that communism is supposed to have brought to Cuba, contrasted with the island's alleged unhappiness in the past. Happiness under communism is a well-worn red theme, obligatory in propaganda inside red areas, propagandized outside as well. Happiness must be claimed in all descriptions of life under communism. "Three Faces of Cuba" has glowing faces in obviously posed scenes, of adults and especially children, but where the crowds are panned, they could not avoid photographing the grim faces which were not posed for the film.

The factory executive says he engages in so-called "voluntary" labor—we would call it labor conscription—"because you feel happy." The happiness line is part of a charged propaganda atmosphere that makes it unlikely for the average viewer to see through the falsehood of it. A class in propaganda techniques would have this explained in useful detail. I am told that in the United States, groups of high school students have been brought together to view the film, and to hear talks praising it. These programs are held after school hours, so school authorities technically can avoid responsibility. Young people would be inclined to take the posed scenes for the actuality. The film is made up practically entirely of such acts.

FALSE OBJECTIVITY HIDES BRAINWASHING

The film ends up with a plug for the Alliance for Progress, to make it "a real, effective instrument," which considering the pro-socialist character attributed to it by many reliable, well informed sources, may be a more apparent than a real anti-Castro statement.

In an equally weak ending, as if the program just had to inject something into it to counterbalance its consistent one-sidedness, if only for the record, the announcer cautiously admits "there are others who would have given different impressions."

Why were they not allowed to do so? There was ample opportunity, if there had been the slightest desire.

If these briefly stated, isolated points hastily brought in at the conclusion, of a seemingly anti-Castro nature, were not for cover purposes, maybe the explanation can be found in the requirement that groups enjoying tax exemption must be objectively educational. There could hardly have been any less objectivity than in "Three Faces of Cuba."

If any objectivity were the intent of the producers and sponsors, the least they could have done would have been to present the film as a defense of the Castro regime, and a portrayal of it as Castro would like to have it seen. Presented this way, as a representation of how the red bosses like to think of themselves, the film might be informative, even if primarily for psychiatrists.

FILM'S GOAL IS BRAINWASHING AMERICANS

The film is clearly aimed at the brainwashing of the American people, using Red Cuba as a medium. It can hardly be aimed at Cuban exiles, whose views certainly run counter to those interviewed in the picture. That Cubans abroad are not the target is shown, too, by the fact that the film is produced only in English, with no known Spanish version. Its producers surely realized they could not fool the well-informed Cuban exile community, and so sought to ignore it.

In all totalitarian states, the focus is on praising the head of state. He symbolizes the power complex. Castro certainly is the hero of this film.

Of course, among all peoples since the beginning of time, the man who gains respect and inspires others, especially youth, is someone ready to stand up for what he believes, and is willing to fight for it. The Castro enthusiast in the film provides this image. In his defense of "Fidel"—he is Fidel to him, too, as well as to the so-called refugee professor—he proudly declares: "If I can slap a face I'll do it. If I have to smash their head, we smash it." We hear at this point voices singing in Spanish, "Cuba, yes! Yankees, no!"

The tune, to the words, "Fidel, be sure to hit the Yankees hard," heard in the United States by a youthful audience particularly, without explanation or refutation, can have only a confusing effect. In the United States, such presentation constitutes training for treason.

Red propagandists have infiltrated into American schools, and we can be sure they would amplify such expressions later on, perhaps in group meetings or during sit-ins and so-called teach-ins. For us to permit this is more than naivety. In the colloquial expression, it is "asking for it!"

The music inserted into the film includes "Yankee go home," and to stress this point, the statement is made that this is the attitude of peoples everywhere, "in Manila, Panama, Turkey, Japan," listing some countries friendly to the U.S., without explaining that this is the work entirely of the communist conspirators in those places, and not the reaction of the people. If the announcer would have explained only once that some such passage as this obviously had to be red propaganda, for the Cubans interviewed had no firsthand knowledge of what was transpiring in those lands, some slight indication would have been given of a desire to give the film a fair balance. No such effort is made at any time.

A piece of unfounded, basic communist propaganda is inserted casually with the remark that, with the passage of ten years, the new generation of Cubans would be "perfectly indoctrinated" into the communist system, "like what happens in Russia." Well, the truth is that in the U.S.S.R. the new generation, as the old, has not been brainwashed into ideological acceptance of communism.

Indeed, this is the nightmare of the red idealogists. Only their continuation of terror, and what is equally effective, the belief calculatingly spread that there is little or no hope of getting help from the West—particularly from the generally anti-anticommunist United States—prevent the lid from blowing off.

The fact is that constant reports come from the red bloc about difficulties with the new generation, as with the old. Acceptance of communism, divorced from the various pressures exercised by it, is as far away as ever, if not more so. The future actually is hopeless for communism. What is inevitable is its ultimate defeat. The red hopelessness-inevitability line, that seeks to convince us that it is hopeless to oppose communism because its victory is inevitable, is sheer propaganda, astutely aimed at creating defeatism on our side, while distracting attention from the futilities of communism.

This red line is based upon another trick we should guard against. An unproven and even unfounded thesis is taken for granted, as if indisputable, and on this illogical basis a whole supposition is built up. In the film, the false thesis of communists acceptance by the Russian people is presented subtly, with the implication that it would be only a matter of time for the same to happen in Red Cuba. This is sheer buncombe.

The so-called professor fits his words neatly into this red hopelessness-inevitability line by virtually taking it for granted that Castro communism is here to stay.

Music is played during this mesmeric scene, as if the audience were present at a rally of Castro supporters who feel real affection for him. There is little subtlety in this, but young and uninformed people alike certainly can be expected to be carried away by the excitement of it, unless forewarned.

Some Cubans are quoted in an offhand manner in the film as saying that communism is not good, but that "Cuba's revolution is very good." As Cuba is admittedly communist, the hairline logic is difficult to fathom, except that it provides an opportunity to express approval of the red regime.

The extent to which various participating Americans knowingly collaborated in its production is irrelevant in this analysis. What is relevant is that no film of this character can obtain the cooperation of a communist country without being favorable to it, and following the inflexible instructions and the iron-clad regulations of the red regime in all forms of art, as weaponry in the war for the mind.

"Three Faces of Cuba" is not an infiltrated film; it is a "psywar" operation. Practically every scene in the film fits into the overall pattern of a pro-communist operation. If this were merely a case of pro-red infiltration in an objective film, there would not be this continuity. What the film essentially lacks is objectivity, and what it possesses is a pro-red bias.

The reaction of the viewer of this program, if he accepted its presentation as accurate and the whole story—and few people think about what has been left out when they are sufficiently moved or entertained—would be that he was wrong in believing the bad things that are said about Castro and Red Cuba—about communism and socialism in general, and their proclaimed war against us, that is aimed at our destruction as a nation and as a free people. The viewer would be inclined to suspect that it might be the other way around. Maybe we are the bad ones, as Castro says! This is the implication—one might say the subliminal impression—that the film seeks to convey. There is treason in such an approach. In 1965, naivety is no longer an excuse for it.

CONCLUSION

No longer in 1965 does any excuse exist for program sponsors or producers to claim ignorance of the life and death struggle between the international communist conspiracy and the free world. Naivety might have been understandable years back, but no longer. A careful reading of the script, and then a viewing of the film, convince this analyst that those who are responsible for it knew what they were doing, and had a Marxist objective in view, unless they are utter opportunists, or political psychotics, hating their country. Otherwise their political innocence must be boundless. The only way this film can be presented objectively and not harmfully would be as an example of how communists put their propaganda across in a disarming, sophisticated way, with a scene-by-scene analysis of the propaganda. This would make the film a useful lesson in propaganda techniques, and

show how the reds infiltrate their subversive ideas through a fake objective approach.

Only this way can the film cease being procommunist in impact. Indeed, this should be the objective, providing an example of how free people are able to convert an enemy maneuver into an advantage for our nation and liberty's cause, contributing truly to our educational needs in the cold war.

If the film had been presented merely as a defense of the Cuban red regime, the harm that the film can do would be greatly reduced. But it is presented with an American countenance, and as such is gross deception. The fact that such a film is shown to ordinary students without any of this clarifying information is shocking, and constitutes a prostitution of the educational process.

[From "Who's Who in America," Vol. 33 (1964–65)]

BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF MR. EDWARD HUNTER

Hunter, Edward, foreign correspondent, author; born in New York City, July 2, 1902; son of Edward and Rose (Weiss) Hunter; self educated; married to Tatiana Pestrikoff, June 30, 1932 (divorced May 1961); children—Robert and Tate Ann. Reporter and news editor of various newspapers, including Newark Ledger, New Orleans Item, New York Post, New York American; reporter Paris edition of the Chicago Tribune, 1924–25; news editor Japan Advertiser, Tokyo, 1927, editor Hankow (China) Herald, 1928–29; Peking Leader, 1929–30; covered Japanese conquest of Manchuria, Spanish Civil War, Italian conquest of Ethiopia, International News Service, 1931–36; pioneered in revealing brainwashing, introducing it to written word. Chairman Anti-Communist Liaison, 1962—. Consultant in psychological warfare to the United States Air Force, 1953–54. Served as propaganda warfare specialist, Army of the United States, with morale operation section, Office of Strategic Services, Asia, World War II. Author: Brain-Washing in Red China, 1951; Brainwashing: The Story of Men Who Defied It, 1956; The Story of Mary Liu, 1957; The Black Book on Red China, 1958; The Past Present: A Year in Afghanistan, 1959; In Many Voices: Our Fabulous Foreign-Language Press, 1960; Attack by Mail, 1963. Contributed articles on psychological warfare, politics and extremism to numerous magazines. Clubs: Overseas Press, Silurians. Address: 320 N. George Mason Dr., Arlington 3, Va.

OTHER DATA

(1) Publisher and editor of TACTICS, a monthly described by the then Congressman John R. Pillion (R-N.Y.) as "an unusually well-researched publication, worthy of the attention of anyone who is interested in sharp, concise analyses of the strategies, tactics, operations, and objectives of the world Communist movement." (Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Sept. 24, 1964, page A4866.)

(2) Served as specialist on propaganda pressures and psychological warfare, for: Office of Strategic Services (OSS) Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, The Pentagon and other Government agencies.

(3) Mr. Hunter put the word "brainwashing" in the language and, what is more important, alerted the world to its meaning. He was the pioneer on mind warfare.

(4) History-making testimonies of Edward Hunter for Congressional committees, made available by U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., include: "The New Drive Against the Anti-Communist Program," and Communist Psychological Warfare (Brainwashing)."

Now, Mr. President, I should like to ask the manager of the bill, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], a few questions concerning the operation of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting which is proposed to be established by title II of S. 1160, if the distinguished Senator would agree to respond.

Mr. PASTORE. I would be very happy to answer.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the main functions of the corporation, and probably its most important function, is either actively to produce or assist in the production, financially or otherwise, of programs for airing on noncommercial stations or networks. Is that not true?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the Senator's view, would the fairness doctrine promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission provide for the airing of philosophies or ideas contrary to those which may be expressed in programs prepared by the corporation?

Mr. PASTORE. Well, the licensee who accepts the program is subject to the Communications Act, and the fairness doctrine thus applies. In other words, in order to give assurance that there will be no monopoly here to indoctrinate the American people, the final decision of whether a program will be shown depends entirely and exclusively upon the local station. Thus, if a local station does not want to accept it, that is the end of it. Under the law, the corporation cannot engage in political activities. We have written these safeguards into the law. Much of the apprehension which has been expressed by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has been eliminated by provisions which have been put into this legislation. But, to answer his question categorically, a local station does not have to accept a program if it feels the program does not fit within the environment it serves.

Mr. THURMOND. Would the time be offered free of charge, as is now required under the fairness doctrine to give the opposing view?

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator mean if they have candidates?

Mr. THURMOND. No, I do not mean candidates—I mean, for instance——

Mr. PASTORE. Absolutely. If anyone feels he is offended under the fairness doctrine, he can appeal to the FCC and he will receive the same privileges and the same courtesies which he receives under commercial television.

Mr. THURMOND. He would be allowed to reply to the airing of philosophies or ideas——

Mr. PASTORE. Under the same conditions as of today. That is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Under the program.

My next question is: Since one of the most important functions of the corporation is to produce programs, it would not be likely that opposing views would receive the same treatment unless the production facilities were made equally available to those who held to contrary views. Also, since the public would be largely supporting the program through their tax money, it would seem to me entirely appropriate that the production facilities thus provided be made equally available for the preparation of programs expressing a contrary philosophy. Does the Senator agree with these observations and feel that fairness dictates not only that free air time be given, but that production facilities be made available as well?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, well now, we are getting ourselves a little confused by what we mean by "production facilities." We must understand that the corporation does not produce programs itself. This corporation will not be a fixed schedule network. It is not intended to be such a network. It is not supposed to be an operational production entity. It is not to produce programs itself. But it can contract for productions, and once it has either contracted for them or bought them, then it distributes the programs to the local stations. They will distribute their time to the local educational station.

Mr. THURMOND. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Would a program produced by a private group, expressing opposing views to that presented by a program prepared by this corporation, be given equal time?

Mr. PASTORE. If it comes within the purview of the fairness doctrine, yes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want to draw the Senator's attention to subsection (D) which begins on the bottom of page 16 and ends on the fourth line of page 17.

Mr. PASTORE. Go ahead.

Mr. THURMOND. In that section, the corporation is authorized to establish and maintain libraries and, in addition, to publish a journal. Is it intended that the journal authorized to be published be limited solely to an explanation of programs offered, or will it be open for publication or articles on a wide range of different subjects?

Mr. PASTORE. I would hope that it would be immediately informative as to what is going on, so far as a program is concerned. In other words, the journal would not be the Washington Evening Star or the Washington Post.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THURMOND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I want first to commend my friend, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for his very searching questions and for his very legitimate apprehensions as to what effect this measure might have in the matter of slanted television programs.

I assure the Senator, and I sit on the same side of the aisle as he does, that I am as interested in the rights of the minority as he is. I admire him because he defends them so sturdily. Let me assure him that his apprehensions were shared by many members of the Commerce Committee on both sides, and were expressed much as he has expressed them.

But, as the hearings continued and consideration of the bill went on, we were satisfied—and the unanimous report indicates that we were satisfied—that there is no grave danger of Government slanted public educational television because of this bill.

Let me say to the Senator from South

Carolina, in all frankness, that I listen to television programs night after night, because I do not go out very much. I like to get the news and I like to see some of the programs.

I find myself somewhat irked and a little irritated, as a minority Member—frankly, as a Republican—when night after night, not once, not twice, not three times, but many times all through the evening, I see the face of the President coming on the screen. Then, after I have seen his face—which is quite familiar to us—I hear an announcement about one of the fine, and presumably beneficial, programs of our Government—educating young people, training and retraining workers, and so on and so forth—and telling the people to whom to write to enjoy these benefits.

I am not complaining. He is the President. He is my President.

I merely want to say this to the Senator from South Carolina. Those announcements are given by the private networks—NBC, ABC, and CBS—as a public service. There is not anything I really can do about it if I do not enjoy them. There is nothing the Senator from South Carolina can do about it. There is nothing the Congress of the United States can do about it, because we are not supporting them. They are being supported by the sponsors or the networks themselves. They are paying for this time. Unless the networks do something that is way out, or obviously unfair, unjust or revolting to one of the parties—and I am sure they would not do that—there is not one thing the Congress can do except to quiz the FCC Commissioners when they come before us.

The point I want to make to the Senator from South Carolina is that when we engage in launching a program of educational television which is at least in part supported by Government funds, and in which the majority of directors of the corporation are named by the President, and confirmed by the Senate, it is in my honest opinion that a system that is partially Government supported and publicly controlled is compelled to lean over backward to avoid any apparent bias, which to me sometimes seems to be quite apparent in commercially supported networks.

If this bill becomes law, as I hope it will, and if, as time goes on, we have occasion to feel that there is a slanting, a bias, or an injustice, we instantly and immediately can do something about it. First, we can make very uncomfortable, and give a very unhappy experience to, the directors of the corporation. Second, we can shut down some of their activities in the Appropriations Committee and in the appropriating process of Congress with respect to this particular network, if we wish to call it a network in the sense that it is general programing. The corporation is much more readily accessible to the Senator from South Carolina, any other Senator, or to the Congress, if it is desired to correct any injustice or bias which might appear.

That is the reason why, sharing as I do the very natural apprehensions of the Senator from South Carolina—and I have respect for him; he is a careful legislator at all times—I became convinced that there is no danger of a Government-controlled propaganda machine under this bill.

In fact, we will be setting up a system over which we will have some control, and those in it will not be able to ignore us, even the minority.

I wanted to make my position plain and state my reasons to the Senator from South Carolina. I again compliment him for his very careful scrutiny of this matter.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his assurances in this matter. I appreciate his remarks concerning the statement I have just made. I also wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for answering the questions. Nevertheless, from the study I have given to the bill, I feel it is an entering wedge which we will later regret. I am strongly opposed to title II.

Therefore, I shall ask that I be recorded against passage of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am concerned about certain provisions of this bill In the State of Nebraska we have made great progress in educational TV. It is serving our State in an excellent manner. There is participation in it by every college and university in the State. Nebraska is doing more than any other State to reach the elementary and high school pupils. It is an excellent program operating under the present law.

Our educational program has been under a system of 50–50 matching funds. I believe it is a sound system. While Nebraska has not had all the money it could use, it has developed an educational television system that has attracted much favorable comment over the country. Many of the other States have sent individuals and delegations to our State to observe it.

I also want to express my concern over title II. I believe it is an unwise departure. I do not favor it.

I express the hope that before this proposal is finally enacted into law, we will go ahead and improve existing law without title II.

It is also my position that we are making a mistake in having the Federal Government provide 75 percent of the matching funds. I think it should be retained at 50 percent.

I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION FOR DEAN E. SHARP TO APPEAR AS A WITNESS IN THE CASE OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST KITZER AND OTHERS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, earlier today I reported a resolution. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 121) to authorize Dean E. Sharp, an assistant counsel, Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Committee on the Judiciary, to appear as a witness in the case of United States against Kitzer and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported with an amendment on page 5, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "shall" and insert "may"; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES. 121

Resolved, That by the privileges of the Senate of the United States no evidence under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession, but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That by the privilege of the Senate and by rule XXX thereof, no Member or Senate employee is authorized to produce Senate documents but by order of the Senate, and information secured by Senate staff employees pursuant to their official duties as employees of the Senate may not be revealed without the consent of the Senate; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that testimony of an employee of the Senate of the United States is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice and, further, such testimony may involve documents, communications, conversations, and matters related thereto under the control of or in the possession of the Senate of the United States, the Senate of the United States will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; be it further

Resolved, That Dean E. Sharp, assistant counsel of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpenas duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as assistant counsel of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines that any of the documents, papers, communications, and memorandums called for in the subpena duces tecum have become part of the official transcripts of public proceedings of the Senate by virtue of their inclusion in the official minutes and official transcripts of such proceedings for dissemination to the public upon order of the Senate or pursuant to the rules of the Senate, and, further, that such documents, papers, communications, and memorandums are material and relevant to the issues pending before said court, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding, and then always at any place under the orders and control of the Senate, and take copies of such documents, papers, communications, and memorandums in possession or control of the aforementioned Dean E. Sharp which the court has found to be part of the official transcripts of public proceedings of the Senate by virtue of their inclusion in the official minutes and official transcripts of such proceedings for dissemination to the public upon order of the Senate or pursuant to the rules of the Senate, and which the court has found are material and relevant to the issues pending before said court, excepting any other documents, papers, communications, and memorandums (including, but not limited to, minutes and transcripts of executive sessions and any evi-

dence of witnesses in respect thereto) which the court or other proper official thereof shall desire as such matters are within the privileges of the Senate; be it further

Resolved, That Dean E. Sharp, assistant counsel to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, in response to the aforementioned subpenas may testify to any matter determined by the court to be material and relevant (1) for the purposes of identification of any document or documents, provided said document or documents have previously been made available to the general public, and (2) to the offer of proof made by James Shellow, Esquire, attorney for defendant George Hruban, and Frank Oliver, Esquire, attorney for defendant Phillip Kitzer, Junior, in the above entitled cause said offer of proof having been made on the 12th day of May, 1967, and appearing at pages 9633 to 9641 of the transcript of the above entitled cause, but said Dean E. Sharp shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any and all other matters that may be based on his knowledge acquired by him in his official capacity either by reason of documents and papers appearing in the files of said subcommittee or by virtue of conversations or communications with any person or persons and he shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any matter or matters within the privilege of the attorney-client relationship existing between said Dean E. Sharp and the said subcommittee or any of its members; be it further.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the aforementioned subpenas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 14, change the period to a comma and add the following: *"Provided*, That three of the 15 members of the Board shall be associated with the operation of noncommercial educational radio and television stations."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the amendment which is at the desk will accomplish what I think is a very important change in a very important piece of legislation. We are taking a giant step forward by providing for a method of operation for noncommercial educational television and radio—in other words, noncommercial educational broadcasting—a real forward step to which this Congress can point with extreme pride.

I think no single Member of this body can point with greater pride than the chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], for the great work that he has done in this regard.

A number of changes were made from the original bill as it was submitted, and I think those changes have been made for the better. I think none of us who participated in the hearings would contend there are no mistakes and no imperfections in the bill. It probably will be found to be wanting in items which we have not even discussed, and to have shortcomings as to some of the items which we did discuss.

Two primary objects are sought in regard to safeguards. One of them is that the subject of this legislation will not be under governmental control, and the other is that the responsibility for the programing in the local community will be solely at the discretion of the individual local stations. I think to a great extent we have accomplished those purposes.

I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that to some extent we are going to have to depend upon the good will of men, and we are going to have to depend upon the appointment of capable, qualified people as the board of directors of this organization. The number of people to be appointed certainly could vary from some of the original proposals of both greater and lesser numbers than the number finally adopted, of 15; but I think 15 is a large enough number to accomplish diversity of opinion and yet small enough that it will not create an obstacle to effective operation.

I think we should provide for some members through whom the local station itself can participate in having some voice, not alone in the distribution of funds or in the arrangements for interconnections, but, what is more important to me, in the type of programs and the general tone and tenor that these educational functions will take. It is for that reason that I have submitted this amendment, which would provide that three of the 15 directors to be appointed, whether they be among the nine appointed by the President or the six which are appointed by the nine, shall be associated with the noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting industry.

I think these changes are worthwhile, and I think they would make a needed improvement in the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. First of all, I compliment the Senator from Indiana for the yeoman work he did in putting this bill together.

The reason why we did not particularize or state the categories or the affiliation of the board of directors was because we did not want to open up the matter too wide, and subject ourselves, possibly, to criticism from other groups, or demands or pressures from other groups.

Fundamentally, this bill requires that the ultimate decision on its acceptance of the program shall be upon the local station. The fact that this amendment provides that three of those members shall be associated with the local radio or television noncommercial stations, I think, is a desirable feature. I believe it is a good amendment, and I am perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank my friend from Rhode Island. I want him to know that I completely endorse this bill, and I think it is a giant step forward toward better television for the American public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senator from Indiana on this amendment. It is exactly what I had hoped to do myself. Coming from the majority, I think it is so much surer of acceptance. I would be greatly honored if the Senator would permit me to join my name with his upon the amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the distinguished Senator from New York as a cosponsor.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator, I would appreciate that privilege.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added to my amendment as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and all the members of his Communications Subcommittee for the speed and thoroughness with which they handled this legislation, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. It is my hope that the House committees will act with similar diligence and speed so that the Nation may begin to reap the benefits of financially sound, and independent noncommercial radio and television stations.

I also commend the members of the Communications Subcommittee for facing up to one of the most delicate but important problems inherent in any historymaking legislation such as this—the problem of the possibility of governmental control or influence over broadcasting. I am talking about those features of the bill designed to keep separate the concepts of Federal assistance and governmental control; specifically the section of the bill dealing with the appointment of directors of the proposed corporation to be set up as a buffer between the Federal Government and the noncommercial broadcasting industry and as a conduit for Federal assistance to these broadcasters.

The original bill provided for the appointment of all 15 directors directly by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The subcommittee suggests that this be changed to allow the appointment of nine directors di-

rectly by the President, with these directors authorized to elect the other six. In my testimony before the subcommittee I suggested that we, in Congress, should do everything possible to avoid even the implication of Government or political influence over this corporation, and suggested a method to provide such insulation.

In all respects, I still feel that we should have gone further in attempting to assure the country that not even the shadow of Federal control would be able to fall on the new corporation. I am gratified, however, that the subcommittee and committee saw fit to accept one portion of my suggestion, to wit: that the President appoint one portion of the directors, and that these directors would elect the remainder. I would feel a little more secure, however, if the members had agreed on a second part of my suggestion to them; that half of the directors appointed by the President must be nominated by the working members of the noncommercial broadcasting industry itself.

I would also feel more secure if the measure before us today contained specific provisions for an independent study leading to recommendations on the best and most equitable method of financing the Public Broadcasting Corporation in the long term. We all know that the bill before us contains only $9 million to set up the corporation, and that in the next session we will have to face the controversial task of providing noncommercial broadcasting with a steady source of income, divorced from the yearly appropriations process.

It had been my hope, as I said in testimony before the subcommittee, that such a study would backstop and bolster the President's announced intentions of sending to Congress next year proposals for long-range financing. Long-term financing is the core of any successful effort to make the best possible use of our noncommercial stations. All of us who believe that noncommercial broadcasting is a great, but little-used national resource, will be watching and waiting for the President's proposals next year, and must reserve the right to propose long-term financing legislation if such proposals are not forthcoming from the White House.

Mr. President, I make these observations because along with many others in this Chamber, I want this venture to succeed; and success will not automatically accrue by the passage of this legislation. This bill is a beginning—a good beginning—to be sure, but only a beginning.

In the final analysis, Mr. President, my position on this legislation today was summed up best by the president of one of the largest noncommercial television stations in the country. This gentleman visited my office last week to support both of my suggestions but to voice concern that nothing should be done now to hinder the enactment of this legislation. He said:

I agree that this bill could be better, but we need it now. I can see no future for noncommercial broadcasting at all without Federal aid, and we must begin now or we may lose the momentum we have.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from New York has been very active in this matter over the years, as have many other Senators. I wonder if he agrees with me that although right now this matter may not seem to be of overwhelming importance in the scheme of things—so many things are going on in the world at the moment—it will probably be the beginning of one of the most important steps Congress has even taken for the future of the United States?

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question about it. Indeed, I might say to my dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, that, strangely enough, the United States is one of the few countries which has not heretofore made full use of the public airways for this kind of tremendous educational effort. I think the country will be deeply indebted to him, to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and to all of us who have had a hand in the measure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Again I should like to state—I do not know whether it has been brought out today or not—that one of the reasons we can make this step forward—and it is only a step—is that the Committee on Commerce, including Senator PASTORE, myself, and some other Senators, 2 or 3 years ago finally got through a bill which required the manufacturers to produce only what we call all-channel sets.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Which opened up a new spectrum of use, and is probably mainly responsible for this growth of educational TV, together with a bill we passed to give one-shot grants-in-aid to help such stations.

Now we are taking a third step. I understand from the manufacturers that it takes 4½ to 5 years for all the television sets to be replaced, but most of the people now are in the all-channel set field, and such sets are becoming more and more common.

This is a really important step. Although it is not all-perfect, and there are many problems involved, I think that when we look back on it, it will be agreed that this will have been one of the most important bills the Senate passed this session.

Mr. JAVITS. I could not agree with the Senator more. I only express the hope that other efforts of the same character may be tied in, to do benefit to our whole hemisphere. For example, I have had the privilege of playing a rather important part in the great effort to have a communications satellite for North and South America. This would be a tremendously uniting force for the world.

I believe, Mr. President, that I have a family of rather typical children. I find now, for the first time, that the educational television channel is an established aspect of their listening time. Now this is quite an improvement when I remember that they were listening to and watching sensational westerns and so forth for almost their total television time as recently as 2 years ago.

This is a personal family experience, of course, I know the situation, from personal experience. However, if we need an argument in favor of this bill this is a clincher as far as I am concerned; this is it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. THE question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senate is today preparing to take a historic step in rededicating the public airways to the public service. S. 1160, the Public Television Act of 1967, marks the beginning of Federal support for educational and instructional television programing. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill.

Though the expenditures authorized under this bill are relatively small, this authorization is not the most important aspect of the support Congress is giving public television through this bill. The true significance of the bill is twofold. First, S. 1160 recognizes what the Carnegie Commission, and other responsible observers have noted about the present state of television and radio broadcasting. Private, commercial interests have relegated television and radio in this country to the role of huckster, to the exclusion of their educational and public service potential. S. 1160 enacts the principle that public funds must be appropriated to relieve television and radio from their exclusive reliance on commercial revenue, so that these media can begin to realize their full potential.

Second, S. 1160 establishes administrative machinery—in the form of the Corporation for Public Television—which will effectively demonstrate that Federal support can be given to television programing without the dangers of Government censorship or improper political influences. In itself, this will create an important and beneficial precedent for broadening public financial support of public television and radio.

For these reasons, I believe the Public Television Act of 1967 deserves the wholehearted support of the Congress. I am confident that it will receive that support.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the bill before us today, S.1160, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, represents one of those noble uses of our Nation's technology which makes every Member and every American extremely proud.

In 1950, a short 17 years ago, television was in its infancy. There were only 108 television stations in the United States, only one of which, WOI–TV, at Iowa State College, was licensed to an educational institution.

The Federal Communications Commission in 1952 set aside 242 station channels for the exclusive use of noncommercial educational television. By 1961, the number of channels reserved for noncommercial television had reached 268, and by February 1966, the number of channels reserved for noncommercial television had reached 329. In February 1966, the Federal Communications Commission revised its overall allotment so that today 633 reservations

are specifically available for educational television in the United States.

But, Mr. President, the mere reservation of channel allotments alone was insufficient incentive to provide full utilization of noncommercial television throughout the country. As of March 1967, only a fifth of the available channels for noncommercial television were in operation, even though public and private contributions were made to the 130 existing noncommercial stations. To this extent, Mr. President, we have today but a partially fulfilled dream, and yet we all know that a greater, more fruitful utilization of noncommercial television is almost within our grasp.

In my own State of Vermont, noncommercial television will begin operation in September. For the first time in the history of the State, a communications network will be available to 97 percent of the State's population. We have both pride and great expectations for our new Vermont educational television network.

Mr. President, we take pride because of the tremendous cooperation and dedication which have gone into the formation of educational television in Vermont. Dedicated citizens from the State, local, and Federal governments worked long and hard to prepare a system which would serve all of Vermont.

In Vermont, we are justly proud of our beautiful Green Mountains. But those mountains, while providing natural beauty, also provide an obstruction to television signals. Therefore, one noncommercial television station would have been inadequate to serve the needs of all Vermonters. When the Vermont educational television network commences operation in September, four UHF channels will be beaming pictures and sounds to every corner of the State. For the first time, many Vermonters will be able to see productions and activities of their State university. For the first time, many Vermonters will be able to visit from their living rooms historic battlesights of the Revolutionary War. For the first time, many Vermonters will be able to watch as tons of granite and marble are quarried from beneath our beautiful mountains.

I see, Mr. President, in my State and in thousands of communities around the country an increased sense of community and understanding as noncommercial television grows and blossoms into full life. Already that pride and sense of community is apparent in Vermont. Without a picture or a preview, the State legislature's contribution to the project is nearly $2.3 million. For a Vermonter, this is not merely a commitment of money—but more importantly, a commitment of faith in the promise and hope embodied in noncommercial television.

The provisions contained in the bill before us today will reaffirm that commitment of faith in the promise and hope embodied in noncommercial television, for not only Vermonters but all Americans throughout our great country.

Title I of the bill expands and extends the Educational Television Facilities Act. Under the present act, my State was given incentive and encouragement from the $800,000 received from the Federal Government. Enactment of this bill will insure that in the future States and communities will also be able to receive incentives as they construct noncommercial radio and television facilities.

Title II of this bill presents an exciting innovation in the development of noncommercial television. It embodies the heart of the proposal offered by the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television. It establishes a nonprofit corporation to help develop the promises and dreams of educational television. The corporation would provide an isolation from direct Government control.

In addition, it would encourage the full development of the expansive potential offered by this great media. E. B. White, the editor of New Yorker magazine, explained this great potential much more articulately than I could in a letter to the Carnegie Commission. Let me read a part of that letter now:

> I think television should be the visual counterpart of the literary essay, should arouse our dreams, satisfy our hunger for beauty, take us on journeys, enable us to participate in events, present great drama and music, explore the sea and the sky and the woods and the hills. It should be our Lyceum, our Chautauqua, our Minsky's, and our Camelot. It should restate and clarify the social dilemma and the political pickle. Once in a while it does, and you get a quick glimpse of its potential.

Most of us have seen that quick glimpse—often in different ways. To some of us, the programs produced by Fred Friendly and the late Ed Morrow showed us the vast horizons of television. To some of us, Theodore White's "Making of a President," or in-depth discussion of "China, the Sleeping Giant," exemplified television's potential. I have no doubt that I, too, could become a French chef if I watched Julia Childs more frequently.

But, Mr. President, whatever one's personal tastes, they often are unfulfilled because of limited choices in many areas of the country. The nonprofit corporation for public television can multiply the choices given to individuals who from time to time want to be "individuals" rather than mass audience.

Finally, Mr. President, title III of this bill provides $500,000 for a study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare into an area which is even less discovered than educational television—instructional television and radio. In this modern society of ours, where scientists, doctors, and philosophers are simultaneously making breakthroughs from the University of Vermont to the University of Hawaii, instructional TV may prove to be as important to education as assembly line production was to the automobile.

I, for one, shall support this legislation and look forward with great expectation to the results it will produce.

I might add, Mr. President, that within a year or so this body must face up to the need for adequate financing for noncommercial television. I believe that Senator MAGNUSON and Senator PASTORE wisely decided to take the overall improvement of noncommercial television step by step, and I am certain that they will return to this body next year with ways and means for stimulating educational television economically as well as through creative encouragement.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to voice my agreement with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] when he termed the bill we are now considering landmark legislation. When we consider that nearly one-fourth of the waking hours of the average American are spent viewing television, and that the airwaves over which television and radio programs are broadcast are public property, then we realize the responsibility we as Senators have for insuring that television and radio programing makes the fullest possible contribution to the betterment of individual and community life.

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 will, in my opinion, make a distinct, positive step in this direction. The reasons for this have been ably set forth by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, whom I think deserves our highest praise for his work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications. He and the members of his subcommittee have written a superb report, and the amendments they added to the original legislation have greatly strengthened it.

I am particularly pleased that educational radio has received the recognition and support it does in this bill. It was my privilege on April 12, 1967, to introduce a number of the members of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television of the members of the Subcommittee on Communications.

At that time I voiced my strong support for the proposals of the Carnegie Commission, and said that I hoped the intensity of concern over public television would not obscure the needs for public suport of educational radio. I am, consequently, gratified to see the support accorded educational radio in this bill.

Mr. President, I think the Senate—and indeed the whole Congress and the Nation—owes a debt of gratitude to the private citizens who gave their time and energy to both the Carnegie Commission and to the study of educational radio entitled "The Hidden Medium." A number of citizens of Massachusetts were instrumental in these studies, and I would like to call attention to Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and to Dr. Edwin H. Land, president of the Polaroid Corp. Dr. Killian served as chairman of the Carnegie Commission study, and Dr. Land served with him as a member. Also, Mr. Russell Jalbert, vice president of Boston University for university affairs, who both worked on the educational radio study and testified in favor of it. Does not the Senator from Rhode Island agree with me that these private citizens, and their colleagues, deserve our gratitude?

Mr. PASTORE. I would certainly agree with the Senator from Massachusetts on that point. They do indeed deserve our praise and appreciation for their bold thinking and hard work. And I very much appreciate the remarks of the Senator about the bill we have before us and the committee's work on it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ques-

tion is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

S. 1160

An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes

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 "Public Broadcasting Act of 1967".

TITLE I—CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

Extension of duration of construction grants for educational broadcasting

SEC. 101. (a) Section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 391) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "There are also authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of such section, $10,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the next four fiscal years.".

(b) The last sentence of such section is amended by striking out "July 1, 1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1973".

Maximum on grants in any State

SEC. 102. Effective with respect to grants made from appropriations for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1967, subsection (b) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(b)) is amended to read:

"(b) The total of the grants for any fiscal year made under this part for the construction of noncommercial educational television broadcasting facilities or noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities in any State may not exceed 12½ per centum of the portion of the appropriation for such year available for such grants."

Noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities

SEC. 103. (a) Section 390 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 390) is amended by inserting "noncommercial" before "educational" and by inserting "or radio" after "television".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(a)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "noncommercial" before "educational" and by inserting "or radio" after "television" in so much thereof as precedes paragraph (1);

(2) striking out clause (B) of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "(B) in the case of a project for television facilities, the State educational television agency or, in the case of a project for radio facilities, the State educational radio agency,";

(3) inserting "(i) in the case of a project for television facilities," after "(D)" and "noncommercial" before "educational" in paragraph (1)(D) and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such paragraph ", or (ii) in the case of a project for radio facilities, a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage noncommercial educational radio broadcasting and is eligible to receive a license from the Federal Communications Commission; or meets the requirements of clause (i) and is also organized to engage in or encourage such radio broadcasting and is eligible for such a license for such a radio station";

(4) striking out "television" in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of such subsection;

(5) striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3), striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) that, in the case of an application with respect to radio broadcasting facilities, there has been comprehensive planning for educational broadcasting facilities and services in the area the applicant proposes to serve and the applicant has participated in such planning, and the applicant will make most efficient use of the frequency assignment."

(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(c)" and "noncommercial" before "educational television broadcasting facilities", and by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) In order to assure proper coordination of construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities within each State which has established a State educational radio agency, each applicant for a grant under this section for a project for construction of such facilities in such State, other than such agency, shall notify such agency of each application for such a grant which is submitted by it to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall advise such agency with respect to the disposition of each such application."

(d) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by inserting noncommercial" before "educational television" and inserting "or noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, as the case may be," after "educational television broadcasting facilities" in clauses (2) and (3).

(e) Subsection (f) of such section is amended by inserting "or radio" after "television" in the part thereof which precedes paragraph (1), by inserting "noncommercial" before "educational television purposes" in paragraph (2) thereof, and by inserting "or noncommercial educational radio purposes, as the case may be" after "educational television purposes" in such paragraph (2).

(f)(1) Paragraph (1) of section 394 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 394) is amended by inserting "or educational radio broadcasting facilities" after "educational television broadcasting facilities," and by inserting "or radio broadcasting, as the case may be" after "necessary for television broadcasting".

(2) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by striking out "The term 'State educational television agency' means" and inserting in lieu thereof "The terms 'State educational television agency' and 'State educational radio agency' means, with respect to television broadcasting and radio broadcasting, respectively,", and by striking out "educational television" in clauses (A) and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "such broadcasting".

(g) Section 397 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 397) is amended by inserting "or radio" after "television" in clause (2).

Federal share of cost of construction

SEC. 104. Subsection (e) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Secretary shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Secretary to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Secretary shall pay such amount from the sum available therefor, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine."

Inclusion of territories

SEC. 105. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 394 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by striking out "and" and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(b) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by inserting "and, in the case of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, means the High Commissioner thereof" before the period at the end thereof.

Inclusion of costs of planning

SEC. 106. Paragraph (2) of section 394 of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "In the case of apparatus the acquisition and installation of which is so included, such term also includes planning therefor."

TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SEC. 201. Part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by—

(1) inserting

"SUBPART A—GRANTS FOR FACILITIES"

immediately above the heading of section 390;

(2) striking out "part" and inserting in lieu thereof "subpart" in sections 390, 393, 395, and 396;

(3) redesignating section 397 as section 398, *and redesignating section 394 as section 397 and* inserting it before such section 398 and inserting immediately above *its* heading

"SUBPART C—GENERAL";

(4) redesignating section 396 as section 394 and inserting it immediately after section 393;

(5) inserting after "broadcasting" the first time it appears in clause (2) of the section of such part IV redesignated herein as section 398 ", or over the Corporation or any of its grantees or contractors, or over the charter or bylaws of the Corporation,".

(6) inserting in the section of such part IV herein redesignated as section 397 the following new paragraphs:

"(6) The term 'Corporation' means the Corporation authorized to be established by subpart B of this part.

"(7) The term 'noncommercial educational broadcast station' means a television or radio broadcast station, which, under the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission, is eligible to be licensed or is licensed by the Commission as a noncommercial educational radio or television broadcast station and which is owned and operated by a public agency or nonprofit private foundation, corporation, or association.

"(8) The term 'interconnection' means the use of microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, communication space satellites, or other apparatus or equipment for the transmission and distribution of television or radio programs to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations."

(7) inserting after section 395 the following new subpart:

"SUBPART B—CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

"Congressional declaration of policy

"SEC. 396. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

"(1) that it is in the public interest to encourage the growth and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, including the use of such media for instructional purposes;

"(2) that expansion and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting and of diversity of its programing depend on freedom, imagination,

and initiative on both the local and national levels.

"(3) that the encouragement and support of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, while matters of importance for private and local development, are also of appropriate and important concern to the Federal Government;

"(4) that it furthers the general welfare to encourage noncommercial educational radio and television broadcast programing which will be responsive to the interests of people both in particular localities and throughout the United States, and which will constitute an expression of diversity and excellence;

"(5) that it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to complement, assist, and support a national policy that will most effectively make noncommercial educational radio and television service available to all citizens of the United States;

"(6) that a private corporation should be created to facilitate the development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting and to afford maximum protection to such broadcasting from extraneous interference and control.

"Corporation established

"(b) There is authorized to be established a nonprofit corporation, to be known as the 'Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this section, and, to the extent consistent with this section, to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"Board of Directors

"(c)(1) The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board'), consisting of fifteen members of which nine shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and six shall be elected by the members so appointed: *Provided*, That three of the fifteen members of the Board shall be associated with the operation of noncommercial educational radio and television stations.

"(2) The members of the Board (A) shall be selected from among citizens of the United States (not regular full-time employees of the United States) who are eminent in such fields as education, cultural and civic affairs, or the arts, including radio or television; (B) shall be selected so as to provide as nearly as practicable a broad representation of various regions of the country, various professions and occupations, and various kinds of talent and experience appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the Corporation.

"(3) The members of the initial Board of Directors shall serve as incorporators and shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish the Corporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"(4) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be six years; except that (A) any member appointed or elected to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed or elected for the remainder of such term; and (B) the terms of office of members first taking office shall begin on the date of incorporation and shall expire, as designated at the time of their appointment or election, as follows: the terms of three of the appointed members and two of the elected members shall expire at the end of two years, the terms of three of the appointed members and two of the elected members shall expire at the end of four years, and the terms of three of the appointed members and two of the elected members shall expire at the end of six years. No member shall be eligible to serve in excess of two consecutive terms of six years each. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, a member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has qualified.

"(5) Any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its power, but shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment or election was made.

"Election of Chairman; Compensation

"(d)(1) The President shall designate one of the members first appointed or elected to the Board as Chairman; thereafter the members of the Board shall annually elect one of their number as Chairman. The members of the Board shall also elect one or more of them as a Vice Chairman or Vice Chairmen.

"(2) The members of the Board shall not, by reason of such membership, be deemed to be employees of the United States. They shall, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties related to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this subpart be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $100 per day (or such other rate as may be determined by a vote of more than two-thirds of the full membership of the Board), including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, equal to that authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Officers and employees

"(e)(1) The Corporation shall have a President, and such other officers as may be named and appointed by the Board for terms and at rates of compensation fixed by the Board. No individual other than a citizen of the United States may be an officer of the Corporation. No officer of the Corporation, other than the Chairman and any Vice Chairman of the Board, may receive any salary or other compensation from any source other than the Corporation during the period of his employment by the Corporation. All officers shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

"(2) No political test or qualification shall be used in selecting, appointing, promoting, or taking other personnel actions with respect to officers, agents, and employees of the Corporation.

"Nonprofit and nonpolitical nature of the Corporation

"(f)(1) The Corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

"(2) No part of the income or assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any director, officer, employee, or any other individual except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

"(3) The Corporation may not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

"Purposes and activities of the Corporation

"(g)(1) In order to achieve the objectives and to carry out the purposes of this subpart, as set out in subsection (a), the Corporation is authorized to—

"(A) facilitate the full development of educational broadcasting in which programs of high quality, obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations;

"(B) assist in the establishment and development of one or more systems of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting and one or more systems of interconnection to be used for the distribution of educational television or radio programs so that all noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations that wish to may broadcast the programs at times chosen by the stations;

"(C) carry out its purposes and functions and engage in its activities in ways that will most effectively assure the maximum freedom of the noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast systems and local stations from interference with or control of program content or other activities.

"(2) Included in the activities of the Corporation authorized for accomplishment of the purposes set forth in subsection (a) of this section, are, among others not specifically named—

"(A) to obtain grants from and to make contracts with individuals and with private, State, and Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions;

"(B) to contract with or make grants to program production entities, individuals, and selected noncommercial educational broadcast stations for the production of, and otherwise to procure, educational television or radio programs for national or regional distribution to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"(C) to make payments to existing and new noncommercial educational broadcast stations to aid in financing local educational television or radio programing costs of such stations, particularly innovative approaches thereto, and other costs of operation of such stations;

"(D) to establish and maintain libraries and archives of noncommercial educational television or radio programs and related materials and disseminate information about noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting by publication of a journal;

"(E) to arrange, by grant or contract with appropriate public or private agencies, organizations, or institutions, for interconnection facilities suitable for distribution and transmission of educational television or radio programs to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"(F) to hire or accept the voluntary services of consultants, experts, advisory boards, and panels to aid the Corporation in carrying out the purposes of this section;

"(G) to encourage the creation of new noncommercial educational broadcast stations in order to enhance such service on a local, State, regional, and national basis;

"(H) to conduct (directly or through grants or contracts) research, demonstrations, and training in matters related to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting.

"(3) To carry out the foregoing purposes and engage in the foregoing activities, the Corporation shall have the usual powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, except that the Corporation may not own or operate any television or radio broadcast stations, system, or network, or community antenna television system, or interconnection or program production facility.

"Authorization for free or reduced rate interconnection service

"(h) Nothing in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, or in any other provision of law shall be construed to prevent United States communications common carriers from rendering free or reduced rate communications interconnection services for noncommercial educational television or radio services, subject to such rules and regulations as the Federal Communications Commission may prescribe.

"Report to Congress

"(i) The Corporation shall submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year ending June 30 to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before the 31st day of December of each year. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Corporation's operations, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this section and may include such recommendations as the Corporation deems appropriate.

"Right to repeal, alter, or amend

"(j) The right to repeal, alter, or amend this section at any time is expressly reserved.

"Financing

"(k)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $9,000,000, and for the next fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended.

"(2) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, no grant or contract pursuant to this section may provide for payment from the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for any one project or to any one station of more than $250,000."

TITLE III—STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION BROADCASTING

Study authorized

SEC. 301. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to conduct, directly or by contract, and in consultation with other interested Federal agencies, a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio (including broadcast, closed circuit, community antenna television, and instructional television fixed services and two-way communication of data links and computers) and their relationship to each other and to instructional materials such as videotapes, films, discs, computers, and other educational materials or devices, and such other aspects thereof as may be of assistance in determining what Federal aid should be provided for instructional radio and television and the form that aid should take, and which may aid communities, institutions, or agencies in determining whether and to what extent such activities should be used.

Duration of study

SEC. 302. The study authorized by this title shall be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before June 30, 1969.

Appropriation

SEC. 303. There are authorized to be appropriated for the study authorized by this title such sums, not exceeding $500,000, as may be necessary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this measure is designed to improve and develop the facilities and programing of educational broadcasting throughout the Nation. I can think of few legislative proposals exceeding its importance.

With its passage, the Senate witnessed the abundant skill of the one Member of this body who, over the years, has responded consistently to meet the needs of the public when the public's interest is vital. I refer, of course, to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], whose response in this instance was no less effective than it has been to all matters requiring the most careful public concern.

In this case he has achieved a singularly constructive program in an effortless manner—a manner that belied the long and arduous work which accompanied its ultimate success. He led the way by bringing to the Senate a proposal that best fits its far-reaching objectives.

As we pass the two-thirds mark of the 20th century all of us have become aware of the immense effects broadcasting media have upon society—and particularly the effects of television upon our youth. This bill, so carefully designed and drawn under the direction of Senator PASTORE, represents a large step toward the improvement and expansion of broadcasting media in the best possible way. Senator PASTORE deserves the thanks of the Senate for this accomplishment, not to mention the deep appreciation of a grateful nation.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] deserves equally high praise for this achievement. As the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Commerce, legislative proposals vital to the public interest have consistently gained his deep and abiding devotion. This proposal was no exception. We are deeply indebted for his outstanding leadership, his tireless efforts and his keen knowledge and understanding.

Others joined to assure the Senate's overwhelming acceptance of an effective Public Broadcasting Act. Notably we are grateful for the support of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the highly able chairman of the Commerce Committee, whose long interest in this matter is known by all of us; the senior Senators from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are similarly to be thanked for their strong support, as is the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY].

We are grateful, too, for the efforts of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] who, while expressing his own strong and sincere views, cooperated to assure the disposition of the measure swiftly and efficiently.

Once again, our sincerest thanks go to Senator PASTORE; a Senator whose achievements have always reached beyond the call, whose many examples of legislative ability are those to which we all may aspire.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am heartened by the passage of S. 1160, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. As a member of the Commerce Committee in 1962, I strongly supported the passage of Public Law 87-447, an amendment to the Communication Act of 1934 which hastened the construction of ETV stations. Now, after the tremendous strides that have been made in the creation of facilities for educational broadcasting, we have further legislation that will allow even greater progress in this area.

This bill recognizes the important fact that the construction of facilities is only a beginning in the field of educational broadcasting. Provisions must be made to allow such broadcasting facilities to present creative and outstanding programs of a varied cultural or educational nature. Title II of the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act addresses itself to the improvement and guarantee of quality broadcasting that is responsive to the needs and demands of the local community. Title II will also create the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which will assist in the development of an interconnection system among educational stations and help make high quality programs available to them.

What is of historic significance about this bill is that it includes the long-neglected group of educational radio stations in the programs for aid to broadcast facilities of this nature. Although not included in the provisions of the 1962 amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, educational radio stations will be permitted, under S. 1160, to be eligible to receive Federal matching grants for construction and expansion of facilities. This legislation clears the path for these radio facilities to join in the national effort to provide topflight cultural programs on noncommercial stations for the edification of us all.

The provisions of this bill are many, all of them vitally needed in the field of educational broadcasting. The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 is a welcome and significant piece of legislation in an important area of our lives; its potential contribution to the cultural enrichment and advancement of our communities and Nation is immeasurable. The call in this legislation for additional, thorough studies of the uses and roles of instructional television in our educational system, as well as a variety of other broadcasting techniques and programing concepts to enrich this Nation's educational objectives, is a welcome one indeed.

I wholeheartedly and enthusiastically congratulate the Commerce Committee for reporting this outstanding legislation and making unmistakable its firm commitment to the furtherance of educational broadcasting. I am proud to have been a part of the initial progress the Senate made in this respect in 1962 when I served on the committee. It is truly pleasing to behold the prospect of continued, immensely successful strides in this field.

The distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has done an outstanding job in steering this bill to passage, and is due the thanks of the Senate and the educational interests of the country for his leadership in this area of great national need.

MERGER OF INTERNATIONAL EDITION OF NEW YORK TIMES, NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE, AND WASHINGTON POST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate to what I consider to be an important international development—the merger of the international edition of the New York Times with that of the New York Herald Tribune and the Washington Post.

This development should produce a magnificent example of the very best of American journalism.

I think the whole country should be grateful to John Hay Whitney and Walter Thayer, of the Herald Tribune organization; and Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, of the New York Times, and should be grateful for the brilliant assistance rendered by Sydney Gruson, the editor in charge of the European edition; and Fritz Beebe, of the Washington Post, and Mrs. Katherine Graham, who is so well known to all of us, for carrying out

the achievement that will result in strengthening a great American publication in Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles which were published in the New York Times and the Washington Post on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1967]

INTERNATIONAL EDITION OF TIMES MERGES WITH PARIS COMPETITOR

(By Allen Whitman)

The International Edition of The New York Times will join Monday with The New York Herald Tribune-The Washington Post in Paris to publish a single daily newspaper, it was announced last night by the publishers of the two papers.

A statement on the merger was made simultaneously here and in Paris by John Hay Whitney, chairman, and Mrs. Katherine Graham, co-chairman, of The New York Herald Tribune-Washington Post International, and by Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, president and publisher of The New York Times.

The merger is subject to approval of the French Government, the announcement said.

The paper's name plate will read Herald Tribune, with the word "International" appearing between "Herald" and "Tribune." A line underneath will say, "Published With The New York Times-The Washington Post."

TIMES OFFICE TO CLOSE

The new paper will be published at the present offices of The Herald Tribune-The Washington Post, 21 Rue de Berri, off the Champs Elysee. The Times International Edition offices at 25 Rue D'Aboukir, near the Bourse, will be closed, according to Mr. Sulzberger.

Robert T. MacDonald, publisher of The Herald Tribune-The Washington Post, will serve as publisher of the merged paper, the announcement said. Murray M. Weiss, the present editor, will be editor of the new enterprise. Sydney Gruson, editor and chief executive officer of The Times International Edition, will work with the paper during the transition.

The combined paper will utilize all the worldwide news resources of The New York Times and The Washington Post, according to the announcement, and it will be distributed in 72 countries "with the largest circulation of any American newspaper ever printed abroad."

The current circulation of The Times International Edition is 47,000 copies a day, and that of The Herald Tribune-The Washington Post is 60,000.

THREE-WAY OWNERSHIP

"The new joint-venture company," the announcement said, "provides for a one-third interest for The Times and continues the relative interests of Mr. Whitney and The Washington Post as they had been in the remaining two-thirds."

Last August The Herald Tribune sold a 45 per cent share in its Paris edition to The Post for an undisclosed sum. The financial aspects of yesterday's merger were not revealed, and the principals declined to comment on them.

In making the announcement, Mr. Sulzberger said:

"We are interested in maintaining and strengthening the importance of the American voice abroad. Our new newspaper will be able to accomplish this admirably."

Mr. Whitney commented:

"Our intention is to continue to go forward, increasing our news coverage commensurate with this great increase in our resources. We hope to become of even greater service to the internationally minded communities abroad."

EXPANDED PAPER PLANNED

In also welcoming the new venture, Mrs. Graham said that the paper would expand both in content and circulation and that it would contain the fullest possible news contribution from The Post.

There was no definite word last night on the disposition of the International Edition staff of 140 persons, which includes 20 persons in the editorial department. Mr. Sulzberger said, however, that it was expected that some of the staff would be employed by the new paper. The present staff of The Herald Tribune-The Washington Post totals more than 100, according to a Post spokesman.

The new paper will publish six days a week, excluding a Sunday edition, according to Ivan Veit, vice president of The New York Times. The basic size of the paper will be 12 pages, Mr. Veit said. He also announced that advertising rates would be soon increased by an amount yet to be determined to reflect the expected rise in circulation.

The merger combines The Times, a relative newcomer to European journalism, with a paper that traces its lineage to 1887.

ONCE AN AIR EDITION

The Times began daily publication in Europe in June, 1949. For 11 years all the editorial work was done at The Times office at 229 West 43d Street, New York, and stereotype mats, ready to be cast and printed, were flown to Paris every night.

The printing operation was moved to Amsterdam in 1952. The paper, called The New York Times International Air Edition, circulated throughout Europe and the Near East.

On Oct. 20, 1960, The Times began publication in Paris of its present International Edition at a plant at 61 Rue Lafayette. This was a simultaneous edition of the New York paper, considerably condensed.

Teletypesetter tapes were punched in New York and transmitted by cable and wireless to Paris, where they were fed into type-composing machines. This process permitted The Times to circulate a virtual duplicate of its New York edition throughout Europe on the day of New York publication.

The concept of a simultaneous edition evolved over four years, until a major share in judgment of the paper's news content was shifted to Paris, and at the same time more of the type was set there. Last spring the paper moved to a new office on Rue D'Aboukir, and last September Mr. Sulzberger appointed Mr. Gruson as editor and chief excutive officer.

Previously, Mr. Gruson has been foreign news editor of The Times. As a foreign correspondent, he had filed dispatches from Poland, Britain, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Israel and Mexico in the course of his work for The Times, which began in 1944.

HERALD EDITION BEGUN IN 1887

The Herald Tribune-The Washington Post traces its ancestry to Oct. 4, 1887, when James Gordon Bennett, the younger, in self-imposed exile from the United States, started a Paris edition of The New York Herald. Mr. Bennett, who was often addressed as Commodore, was the son and heir of James Gordon Bennett, the elder, who had founded The Herald in 1835.

Commodore Bennett, a mercurial man who once in the nude drove a tallyho through the streets of Paris, was given to whims, and one of them was to start a Paris paper. It appeared because he wanted it to; it was as simple as that.

Although he called his creation The New York Herald, Parisians soon referred to it as "Le New York" and later as "The Paris Herald." It introduced the linotype machine, photoengraving and the rotogravure process to Europe. It also lost about $100,000 a year, which the Commodore cheerfully made up from his ample earnings in New York.

The Commodore ran his paper with an iron hand. At one time or another, he banned from mention in its news columns the names of Theodore Roosevelt, William Randolph Hearst and Kaiser Wilhelm II.

A FAMILIAR LETTER

He also insisted that the paper print every day on the editorial page a letter signed "Old Philadephia Lady" that asked readers how she could convert centigrade temperatures into the Fahrenheit scale. The letter ran for 18 years and five months, and it was dropped only on Mr. Bennett's death in 1918.

The Herald published in Paris throughout World War I, when it began to make money. After Mr. Bennett's death, it was operated by his executors until it was bought by Frank Munsey in 1920. The paper was thrown rather casually into the package when Mr. Munsey purchased The Herald in New York and The Evening Telegram from the Bennett estate for $4-million.

Mr. Munsey planned to kill the paper, according to newspaper historians, until he found $1-million in The Paris Herald's bank account. In any event, the paper survived, although not as a very great money earner, and it was sold to The New York Tribune in 1924, when that paper purchased The Herald.

It maintained its formal name as The New York Herald until 1935, when it became The European Edition of The New York Herald Tribune.

MERGER IN 1934

Meantime the Paris edition of The Chicago Tribune, founded in 1918, was bought and absorbed by The Paris Herald in 1934. The Chicago Tribune's paper was one of four English-language dailies in Paris in the twenties. The two others were The Paris Times, which was founded in 1924 by a group of American newspapermen and had a brief existence, and the Paris edition of The London Daily Mail, also started in 1924 and also short-lived.

A number of American reporters and writers went on to fame from the staff of The Paris Herald. Among them were Ralph Barnes, Elliot Paul, Arthur Moss, Eugene Jolas, Harold Stearns, Bert Andrews, Tommy Thompson, William Carney, Al Laney, Wilbur Forrest, Leland Stowe, Whit Burnett, Martha Foley, Charles Wertenbaker, Kenneth Steward, William Shirer and Eric Hawkins.

But perhaps the most famous member of The Herald's staff was Sparrow Robertson, its sports columnist. Mr. Robertson was known to generations of Americans in Paris, and he was on a first-name basis with many of European royalty. He was not especially keen on names, however, and he addressed his friends, low and high, as "Old Pal."

SUSPENSION DURING WAR

The European Edition of The Herald Tribune was suspended from 1940 to 1944 during the German occupation of Paris in World War II. It reappeared Dec. 22, 1944, from the office it had occupied in the Rue de Berri since 1930.

The paper came under Mr. Whitney's active direction in 1961. He had previously purchased a controlling interest in The New York Herald Tribune from Mrs. Ogden M. Reid and her two sons, Whitelaw and Ogden Reid. Mrs. Reid and her sons had operated the paper after the death of Mrs. Reid's husband in 1947.

Last summer The Herald Tribune ceased publication in New York as a morning newspaper during a strike and joined the now defunct World Journal Tribune in a new afternoon paper. Mr. Whitney then sold an interest in the European Edition to The Washington Post.

The Paris paper began to print articles from The Washington Post-Los Angeles Times News Service. It continued to publish

columns by Walter Lippmann and Art Buchwald.

The new paper is expected to continue to publish these columns. In addition, Mr. Sulzberger said last night, the paper would have available to it The New York Times News Service, plus such Times columnists as James Reston, Russell Baker and Tom Wicker.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 17, 1967]

NEW YORK TIMES AND HERALD TRIBUNE-POST FORM INTERNATIONAL PAPER IN PARIS

The International Edition of The New York Times will combine Monday, May 22, with the New York Herald Tribune-The Washington Post in Paris to publish a single newspaper to be known as The International Herald Tribune.

Utilizing all the news resources of The Washington Post and The New York Times, it will be distributed in 72 countries throughout the world with the largest circulation of any American newspaper ever printed abroad.

Robert T. MacDonald, publisher, and Murray M. Weiss, editor of the Herald-Tribune, will continue to direct the newspaper in those capacities, Sydney Gruson, editor and chief executive officer of the Times's International Edition, will remain with the new newspaper during the transition. The paper will be published in the Herald Tribune building at 21 Rue de Berri in Paris.

Announcement of the new newspaper combination and of a new partnership to publish it was made in New York yesterday by John Hay Whitney, chairman, and Katharine Graham, cochairman, of the New York Herald Tribune-The Washington Post, together with Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, president and publisher of The New York Times.

Its appearance on Monday will be the second major recent change in the 80-year history of the Herald Tribune in Paris. The New York Times plans to publish its final International Edition Friday night.

Last September, when the circulation of the Herald Tribune in Paris was at a record high of 62,000 copies daily, The Washington Post Co., of which Mrs. Graham is president, acquired a share in the paper. The new joint venture company that will begin operation Monday, subject to French government approval, provides for a one-third interest for the Times and continues the relative interests of Mr. Whitney and The Washington Post as they had been in the remaining two-thirds.

The Times, with a current circulation of 47,000 copies, began daily publication in Europe in June, 1949. At that time, all of the editorial work on the paper was done in New York and mats ready to be cast and printed were flown across the Atlantic to Paris every night. In 1952, the printing operation was moved to Amsterdam. In 1960, however, the paper moved over again to Paris, there to publish a simultaneous edition of the New York paper, considerably condensed. Gradually, this evolved into a more autonomous edition. It has been under the direction of Gruson for the last seven months.

The Herald Tribune-The Washington Post in Paris traces its history directly to the foundation in 1887 of the Paris Herald by James Gordon Bennett. It has been published daily in Paris since then as an independent newspaper whose contributors have ranged from relatively obscure newspapermen to great names of literature and politics including Ernest Hemingway and Karl Marx.

In making the announcement, Whitney commented, "our intention is to continue to go forward, increasing our news coverage commensurate with this great increase in our resources. We hope to become of even greater service to the internationally minded communities abroad."

Mrs. Graham also welcomed the new venture, noting that the paper would expand in content as well as in circulation and said that it would continue to have the fullest possible contribution of the worldwide resources of The Washington Post.

Sulzberger said "We are interested in maintaining and strengthening the importance of the American voice abroad. Our new newspaper will be able to accomplish this admirably."

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 225, H.R. 9029.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9029) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, despite the rule on germaneness, the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

A PLEA FOR REALISM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, some have argued that the Government of North Vietnam may be misinterpreting the meaning of the debate in the United States over our conduct of the war in Vietnam.

The catastrophe of a limitless war in Asia must be fully assessed, while there is still time. It could only bring unprecedented suffering and sorrow—a bloodbath without equal in human history. With the stakes mortally high, we must not permit the stifling of dissent in the United States. We must not fall silent out of timidity or despair, whatever the political retribution. The debate must go on.

It is equally vital, however, that the purpose of the debate, in the Senate of the United States, be understood by all, particularly by the Hanoi government. Our objective is the settlement of the war at the conference table, not the repudiation of American commitments already made to South Vietnam, or the unilateral withdrawal of American forces from that embattled country.

To this end, 15 Senators, all of whom have participated, to some degree, in the dissent, have joined with me in issuing the following statement.

We hope the statement will come to the attention of the Government of North Vietnam, and that it will be thoughtfully considered by all other foreign governments having influence in Hanoi.

The statement is entitled "A Plea for Realism." It reads as follows:

We, the undersigned Members of the United States Senate, have expressed, from time to time, our individual reservations concerning the American involvement in Vietnam. We have advocated and supported initiatives which we felt might lead to negotiations for an honorable settlement of the war. We continue to hope that the Hanoi Government will yet choose to open one of the diplomatic doors available to it, which will lead both sides to the conference table.

The conflict now appears to have reached an acute phase. At this critical juncture, it would be tragic indeed if there were any misconception in Hanoi about the realities of the political situation in the United States. We believe it essential to a realistic quest for peace that the nature of the dissent in this country, prevailing among those who have criticized our Government's policy in Vietnam, be accurately understood and assessed by the Government of North Vietnam.

The signers of this declaration, both Democrats and Republicans, share the conviction that the tragic war in Vietnam should be ended by negotiation of a mutually acceptable settlement. However, in the absence of such a settlement, we remain steadfastly opposed to any unilateral withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. We hold to this position, regardless of our partisan differences, because we believe it to be right. Moreover, we are certain that the American people, in overwhelming numbers, uphold the same position.

There are no doubt many citizens of the United States who share our expressed misgivings about the growing American involvement in Vietnam. But there are many more who either give their full endorsement to our Government's policy in Vietnam, or who press for even greater military action there.

We hope this assessment will be received in the spirit in which it is written—as a good faith effort to provide factual information about the dominant views in our country concerning the war in Vietnam. Perhaps in some way this information may help contribute to a negotiated peace, which is the last and only remaining alternative to a prolonged and intensified war.

FRANK CHURCH, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, GEORGE MCGOVERN, J. W. FULBRIGHT, FRANK E. MOSS, E. L. BARTLETT, LEE METCALF, VANCE HARTKE, GAYLORD NELSON, QUENTIN BURDICK, JOSEPH S. CLARK, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, ROBERT F. KENNEDY, MARK O. HATFIELD, WAYNE MORSE, CLAIBORNE PELL.

Mr. President, inasmuch as this statement appeared prematurely in the press, and certain interpretations were given to it, I feel it incumbent to stress at least three points.

First, this statement is not an effort in which the administration collaborated. It was drawn up initially by me. Before I circulated it to other Senators for their signatures, I presented it to the Secretary of State. I did so because I wanted to make certain that nothing in the statement would jeopardize any diplomatic efforts that might now be underway between the Government of the United States and the Government of North Vietnam, about which I had no knowledge.

The Secretary advised me that it would not. This was the sole purpose of presenting the statement to him.

Second, I stress that the statement in no way represents a change of position on the part of any signer, but rather it underlines the importance we attach to the continuation of the debate against a wider war.

I think that the past week in the Senate demonstrates that there is still much vitality in the dissent. And I have no doubt that we will continue to exercise our right, on the floor of the Senate,

to oppose any new moves in connection with the war in Vietnam that we regard as inimical to the best interests of the country.

Finally, Mr. President, there has been a story on the wire to the effect that Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State, had said to me that this statement, coming from Senators who have criticized the war policy, would have greater credibility in Hanoi than any statement he or any other spokesman for the administration might issue. I wish to say that the Secretary made no such statement to me, and there is no basis for that news story.

It may have resulted from an earlier attempt of mine, in June of last year, in which a number of other Senators joined, when we were fearful that the government in Hanoi might execute captured American airmen, as common criminals. At that time, the Under Secretary of State, who was then Mr. George Ball, said to me that he felt a statement signed by Senators who had opposed the bombing of North Vietnam, or who had advocated a suspension of the bombing, would have particular impact in Hanoi, for reasons that are self-evident.

I wish to clear up these points, because they have appeared in stories that somehow leaked out in advance of the news conference I held about an hour ago, at which time the statement was released and all the facts concerning it were fully and accurately reported.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I take the floor only momentarily to commend the Senator from Idaho for the initiative that he has demonstrated, not only in connection with the statement that he has just made but also because of the leadership he has provided as one of the thoughtful critics of our policy in Southeast Asia for a number of years.

I am glad that he has stressed what is certainly a fact—that nothing in the statement we released today signals in any way a change in the position of any of us who signed the statement.

I spoke in the Senate at considerable length a little over 2 weeks ago to outline a nine-point critique of our policy in Vietnam, and I stand today on every word I said on April 25 and before that in statements on the Senate floor.

I also appreciate the fact that the Senator from Idaho has made it perfectly clear that this does not signal the end of dissent on the floor of the Senate or elsewhere in the country. As a matter of fact, I believe it removes the chief inhibition to dissent, which is the charge that our dissent might be misinterpreted in Hanoi. I believe that Hanoi understands very well that no Member of the Senate has ever advocated unilateral withdrawal from this commitment.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I believe that the government in Hanoi understands very well that no Member of the Senate has ever advocated unilateral withdrawal in the absence of an acceptable settlement, no matter how regretful we might be about our original involvement in South Vietnam. But to erase any shadow of a doubt that such might be the interpretation in Hanoi, we have issued this statement.

On that basis, it seems to me that we have removed a haunting anxiety about dissent that should enable us to discuss this issue more freely, that should enable us to speak out with less inhibition against what we believe to be certain mistakes in the policy we are now following in southeast Asia.

I believe that one of the major mistakes is the constant escalation of the war, the sending of more and more troops, more and more bombers, more and more military pressure. The way to negotiation is in the opposite direction—toward deescalation and easing off of the military pressure on both sides.

I commend the Senator from Idaho, and I hope this statement, which he has drafted so well, will clear the way for us to continue with an honest and frank discussion of this very important issue.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

I would emphasize once again that the single purpose of this statement is to make clear that the alternative to continued war in Southeast Asia is the conference table.

Those of us who signed the statement have been advocates of negotiation. Indeed, the Senator from South Dakota and I publicly urged a negotiated settlement of the war, when negotiation was a dirty word in Washington, months prior to the time that the President of the United States made this the settled policy of the country.

It also has been the position of the signers that, given the commitments already made, and the depth of our existing involvement, it would be a serious mistake for this country to engage in a unilateral withdrawal from South Vietnam.

So the message should be clear: The alternative to the war is a negotiated settlement; and if there is any possible misconception of this in Hanoi, I hope this statement will help remove it, and thus contribute to a goal we all seek—the restoration of peace in Southeast Asia.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. I commend the Senator from Idaho for his laudable effort to reaffirm the position that the Senators have taken in opposition to unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam.

I have been disturbed about a recent opinion poll which indicated that many Americans would support unilateral withdrawal of our forces, and I have been disturbed particularly to learn recently that there is a body of support on college campuses for such a policy.

I believe we have a responsibility to indicate now the tragic consequences that would result for the people of Southeast Asia and the entire free world if we were to unilaterally withdraw from Vietnam. I am certain that the people of this country would not favor such a policy.

I believe it is in the best interests of the country that the Senators who have signed this statement reaffirm their right to dissent from certain policies of this administration, at the same time they now have clearly indicated their opposition, once again, to a unilateral withdrawal of our forces in South Vietnam.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Illinois very much. I admire his independence regarding the vexatious problem of the war.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes, in order that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I heartily commend the senior Senator from Idaho for his leadership in putting before the Senate and before the country—and, indeed, before the world—the position that has been enunciated in the Senate today.

I am proud to have taken part as a signer of this declaration, because I believe that it must be made completely clear, without any equivocation, that my colleagues and I—and also the vast majority of the people of this country—do not accept or advocate or in any way suggest that there could be unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam.

It seems to me perfectly clear that the only way to terminate this conflict is to come to the negotiating table or to continue the course that is now being followed. Since this course is so terrible and costly to us, as well as to North Vietnam, we should get to the bargaining table, but we should make it perfectly clear to Ho Chi Minh that continued delay in the negotiations can bring only further disaster to him, as well as cost to us; and that that course we can and must follow because of our commitment in South Vietnam.

I hope the message will be entirely clear not only in Hanoi, but also in the United Nations, to our European friends, and all over the world that that is the opinion of the United States.

The draftsmanship of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, his leadership in bringing this matter into focus, and the concurrence of so many Senators should indicate this clearly. I am proud to lend what small support I can to this endeavor.

Mr. CHURCH. I appreciate the statement of the Senator very much, and the fact that he joined as a signer.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I want to compliment the Senator on the fine statement he made today. I have listened with pride as one who is associated with him. I do express my views akin to those expressed by him that we should all hope fervently for a cease-fire, an armistice, and a negotiation in Asia to bring about peace between the forces of the Saigon regime and the

Hanoi government, and the forces of the Vietcong or the National Liberation Front, and the United States.

The Senator from Idaho has rendered a real, needed, and outstanding service, and I compliment him.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator. I hope this action may contribute to the securement of a negotiated settlement of this tragic war.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9029) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to H.R. 9029 be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as so amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that no points of order against legislation in an appropriation bill be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 10, to strike out "$49,013,000" and insert "$49,451,000".

On page 2, line 14, after the word "roads", to strike out "$3,900,000" and insert "$4,108,000".

One page 2, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "$2,600,000" and insert "$3,000,000".

On page 6, line 4, after the word "law", to strike out "$47,200,000" and insert "$47,179,000".

On page 6, line 11, after the word "contract", to strike out "$40,525,000" and insert "$41,530,000".

On page 7, line 8, after the numerals "203", to strike out "$18,000,000" and insert "$19,000,000".

On page 8, line 21, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "*Provided further*, That funds derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims shall not be available for advances, except for such amounts as may be necessary to pay attorney fees, expenses of litigation, and expenses of program planning, until after legislation has been enacted that sets forth the purposes for which said funds will be used" and insert "*Provided further*, That nothing contained in this paragraph or in any other provision of law shall be construed to authorize the expenditure of funds derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims, except for such amounts as may be necessary to pay attorney fees, expenses of litigation, and expenses of program planning, until after legislation has been enacted that sets forth the purposes for which said funds will be used".

On page 9, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "seventy" and insert "fifty-five"; and, in line 23, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "(including fifteen for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year)".

On page 10, line 13, after the word "for", to strike out "$4,140,000" and insert "$4,200,000".

On page 10, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$119,500,000" and insert "$122,028,000"; on page 11, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$34,458,000" and insert "$33,356,000"; in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,367,000" and insert "$15,247,000"; in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,900,000" and insert "$2,650,000"; and, in line 7, after the word "Wildlife", to insert "and (5) not to exceed $3,000,000 shall be available to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for supplemental allocations to the above agencies".

On page 11, line 16, after "(78 Stat. 900)", to strike out "$9,500,000" and insert "$12,028,000".

On page 13, line 8, after the word "functions", to strike out "$17,500,000" and insert "$25,000,000".

On page 14, line 17, after the word "activities", to strike out "$85,499,000" and insert "$86,299,000"; and, in line 18, after the word "which", to strike out "$13,960,000" and insert "$15,260,000".

On page 16, line 2, after the word "substitutes", to strike out "$38,180,000" and insert "$36,121,000, and in addition $400,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Appalachian region mining area restoration,' Bureau of Mines"; and, at the beginning of line 5, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which not to exceed $2,224,000 shall remain available until expended for the conduct of a tunneling technology program".

On page 16, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "$3,232,000" and insert "$3,367,000".

On page 17, line 23, after "(74 Stat. 337)", strike out "$9,180,000" and insert "$11,180,000".

On page 18, line 7, after the word "gas", to strike out "$740,000" and insert "$814,000".

On page 18, line 18, after the word "law", to strike out "$23,194,650" and insert "$24,219,650".

On page 20, line 8, after "(79 Stat. 1125)", to strike out "$1,678,000" and insert "$2,428,000".

On page 22, line 5, after the word "Refuge", to strike out "$43,010,000" and insert "$44,810,800".

On page 22, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out $2,568,000" and insert "$5,090,600, and in addition $400,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Appalachian region fish and wildlife restoration projects', Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife,".

On page 22, line 23, after "(79 Stat. 1125)", to strike out "$1,675,000" and insert "$2,425,000".

On page 24, line 19, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$40,422,000" and insert "$40,730,400".

On page 25, line 2, after the word "Service", to strike out "$29,581,000" and insert "$29,946,800".

On page 25, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$11,197,000" and insert "$12,671,500".

On page 26, line 6, after "(80 Stat. 915)", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$470,000".

On page 27, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "$11,130,000" and insert "$12,130,000".

On page 28, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$6,776,500" and insert "$7,064,500".

On page 29, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$400,000".

On page 30, line 23, after the word "lands", to strike out "$185,063,000" and insert "$186,218,000".

On page 31, line 12, after the word "$40,180,000" to insert "$42,029,000, and in addition $400,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Timber development organization loans and technical assistance', Forest Service."

On page 31, at line 23, to strike out "$18,251,000" and insert "$20,251,000".

On page 36, line 7, after the word "Act", to strike out "$82,000,000" and insert "$82,645,000".

On page 36, line 19, after "(42, U.S.C. 2004a), to strike out "$14,733,000" and insert "$17,606,000".

On page 38, line 16, after the word "expended", to strike out "$10,700,000" and insert "$11,170,000", and at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000".

On page 39, line 12, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$860,000" and insert "$1,360,000".

On page 40, line 4, after the word "publications", to strike out "$23,790,000" and insert "$24,323,000."

On page 40, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$2,316,000".

On page 41, line 6, after "5 U.S.C. 3109", to strike out $1,100,000" and insert "$1,168,000".

On page 42, line 12, after the word "proper", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,054,000".

On page 43, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "$190,000" and insert "$325,000".

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee, as indicated on page 1 of the report, considered budget estimates in the amount of $1,458,218,000, including indefinite appropriations of receipts, for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior and for the related agencies listed on page 2 of the report. Excluded from this bill are the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, and underground electric power transmission, all of which will be considered in the public works appropriations bill.

The committee recommends definite appropriations of $1,331,735,000. This is $33,931,900 more than the House allowance; and is $58,975,950 less than the budget estimates. Included in the amount over the House allowance is $8,925,000 in budget estimates sent directly to the Senate and not considered by the House. These requests pertain to additional funds for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and to a hospital for the Division of Indian Health.

The committee's recommendations increase the allowances in the House bill in the following respects:

Bureau of Land Management, $1,046,000.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, $1,984,000.

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, $2,588,000.

Office of Territories, $7,500,000.

Geological Survey, $800,000.

Office of Coal Research, $2,000,000.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, $1,775,000.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, $5,073,400.

National Park Service, $1,598,700.

Office of Water Resources Research, $1,000,000.

Forest Service, $5,004,000.

Division of Indian Health, $3,518,000.

National Endowment for the Humanities, $1,000,000.

The committee recommends a decrease in the amount allowed by the

House of Representatives for the Bureau of Mines, which results from disapproval of the estimate for tunneling technology, a new project. The committee's actions, except for this item, actually increase the House allowance.

The committee believes that even though it does not recommend all that the departmental agencies and members of the Senate desire, the bill is sound and well balanced. Every effort was made to provide as much as possible within the bounds of reason and with due cognizance of the general budgetary situation. Hundreds of amendments to the House bill were considered, and I believe that the bill as reported continues necessary development of the resources of the United States in a reasonable manner. I hope the bill will be approved as it was reported by the committee.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I take this opportunity, first, to compliment the chairman of the full committee for the many, many devoted hours he has spent bringing this particular bill to the floor of the Senate. As the Senator from Arizona indicated in his statement, this bill does contain the requests that have been screened from many hundreds of persons who have come before the committee for additions to the overall bill. I do not have the dollar amount, but the amount was substantial, and was in addition to appeals made by the various agencies involved.

The Senator from Arizona, of course, has handled this matter for many years. He is our leader in this great field of building America stronger in the field of resource management. I know that over the years he has watched with great pride the headway that has been made in all of these various departments.

Mr. President, the committee had some difficulty, I am frank to say, on the items in connection with the land and water conservation fund. There was a restriction placed upon us, rather urgently, by the limitation of amounts that came in from the fund itself. This was $110 million and we held reasonably close to that figure.

There was a suggestion of a direct appropriation from the Treasury of the United States of $32 million; the House allowed $9.5 million of that; whereas the committee allowed $12 million or an increase of $2.5 million.

Mr. President, there were adjustments made in the various park and recreation areas and seashores that were presented to the committee. In some instances we had to take some from the budget estimates. We cut them down to accommodate the requests made in other areas.

On balance, particularly in this troubled area of national parks, seashores, and lake shores, in holdings in the various park areas, we came out with an overall good bill.

I might comment specifically in that connection because attention should be focused on that matter. First, in connection with the Indiana Dunes, National Lake shore there was an estimate of $6.5 million for land acquisition, which was completely disallowed by the House of Representatives. I feel that was unfortunate because it occurred to me that it had the effect of absolutely eliminating the Indiana Dunes National Lake shore. The bill had a long and stormy course of action before it finally passed Congress and was signed into law last year. I believe we should move on in this area and acquire some of this land as quickly as we can. With that thought in mind, we allowed $2 million.

There are other items that could be commented on but I shall not take the time of the Senate in pointing them out item by item.

Mr. President, the end result was a good bill and I wish to compliment the chairman of the full committee for the many, many hours of faithful, patient, and hard work that he devotes in listening to not only appeals from the agencies involved, but also from the various congressional representatives and outside witnesses who are heard year after year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and, of course, to our distinguished chairman, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for allowing the budgeted item of $1,048,000 for land acquisitions in the Everglades National Park which was cut out by the House of Representatives. It is extremely important, in my judgment, at this time, that the Federal Government move to fulfill its obligations.

As the Senator knows, the State of Florida has contributed 850,000 acres of land and water. It has contributed $2 million of State funds. The Women's Federation of Florida has contributed one of the most valuable sites, the Royal Palm Hammock and surrounding areas, which it had maintained for years as a beautiful area to be preserved for a national park. The Collier interests contributed some 20,000 or 30,000 acres.

All these contributions should be considered and measured against the skimpy Federal contributions which have hardly made a beginning on the Federal commitment, should be measured against the troubles we have had in connection with water supply, in which State and Federal Government both have been put to unexpected and additional expense, and will go to more—and I want to recognize an added fact for the record—that many of our people in Florida, including public officials, feel that we in the Federal Government have not done our share in this matter.

I think that this is a peculiarly appropriate time to move ahead. I want to thank my distinguished friend very warmly. I might say that as a result of this long delay, the ultimate cost of acquiring these inholdings has gone up immeasurably through the years. I negotiated an interest on the part of a private donor in the acquisition of a key tract on the west coast which contained six or eight Indian mounds, only to find that the price formerly discussed with the owners had gone up so much that the problem could not be solved in the method we had hoped, by private purchase and donation.

For my State, and for the many thousands of people in my State who are concerned about the park, and the thousands of people outside the State who are also concerned, I particularly express my deep appreciation for this recommendation. This is a critical problem and here is a move in the direction of recognizing the Federal obligations assumed so long ago.

I did not want to leave the record silent on this matter because we greatly and deeply appreciate the attitude of our distinguished friends on that subcommittee, of which I do not have the honor to be a member.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Florida. I assure him that we will do our best in conference. There are problems involved. This should be acquired not only here but also for the entire Park Service, and we are going to work toward that end.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I join in behalf of the minority in congratulating the distinguished chairman, the majority members of the subcommittee, and the full Committee on Appropriations on the fact that we have again worked together harmoniously and without controversy, and have reported what I think is a logical and thoroughly defensible bill under the budgetary procedures dealing with the Department of the Interior.

I emphasize the debt of gratitude we owe both to the majority and minority staff members of the committee, who have labored long and hard on this subject. I might say that they worked together as a team. We could scarcely tell one from the other. When something needed to be done, it was done by whatever staff member we were able to contact at the time.

The bill represents a long period of hard work. We had 2,695 pages of hearings on the Senate side alone. The appeals which came over, after the House had acted, represented 911 pages, which is the longest, largest, and most extensive presentation of appeals that I have ever seen since I became a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Obviously, if we were to do our duty, we could not yield to all of the very persuasive requests which were made, not only by the departments, but also by other Senators and the general public. In addition, the budget estimate had the benefit of more than 40 amendments proposed by the Department alone. Some of those changes amounted to $83,343,150, including $14,425,000 in amendments to the budget not considered by the House.

The subcommittee recommended restorations totaling $17,166,700.

Our senatorial colleagues, indicating the diligence with which they pursue their work, proposed 208 changes to the bill, all in the direction of moving the appropriations upward. They included a dozen language changes either for the report or for language in the bill. The total monetary changes proposed by Senators totaled $68,258,500, of which the subcommittee recommended the approval of $18,246,000.

In addition to all the foregoing, there were innumerable requests from individuals and organizations outside the Government. These totaled $32 million, none

of which we were able to approve directly, although some of them were the same as those proposed by Federal agencies and Senators.

Of the additional approximately $100 million which was requested from non-Federal agencies, we were able to comply with requests in an amount totaling a little over $18 million.

It seems to me that the people of the country are gaining steadily in the realization that the importance of developing our natural resources and developing the great interior of the country is something of great significance not only to present generations but also to the future.

While in a period of war, a period of what I consider to be generally excessive spending—and it is impossible to move forward with projects as rapidly as I would like—I think the bill marks substantial progress. I can certainly, with great enthusiasm and complete conviction, recommend its approval to the Senate as a whole.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I was in fairly faithful attendance at the hearings on this bill which lasted, as I recall, for 23 days of the actual hearings. I was not there every day. However, the man who was there every day, to the best of my knowledge—and I made inquiry on this subject—was none other than the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Not only was he faithful beyond all comprehension in attendance at the hearings, but he also presided with diligence, with understanding, and with his usual great ability.

I congratulate him once more upon the bill which he has brought forth. Likewise I pay tribute to the great contribution made to the bill by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

As a memer of the subcommittee, in my opinion, the pending bill is a very good bill. It does not contain everything all of us would have desired, but in light of the circumstances, in light of other needs, in light of the testimony which was presented to the committee, and in exercising our best judgment as to what should be done following the presentation of the detailed testimony, I consider this to be a very, very good bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I do not believe there are any further amendments to be offered.

I have one amendment that I would like to suggest. I have talked this matter over with both Chairman HAYDEN and Senator MUNDT. I think it was through my own inadvertence that we failed to include it in the subcommittee. It adds $107,500 for land acquisition for the Wolf Trap Farm.

I send the amendments to the desk, which would add an amount for that land acquisition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendments, as follows:

On page 10, line 24, strike "$122,028,000" and insert "$122,135,500".

On page 11, line 3, strike "$33,356,000" and insert "$33,463,500".

On page 11, line 17, strike "$12,028,000" and insert "$12,135,500".

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I shall explain the amendment briefly. The proposal is to add $107,500 for land acquisition for the Wolf Trap Farm, which was donated by Mrs. Shouse. There are three or four inholdings within the boundaries of the area. It sems to me it would be prudent to acquire this land before the developers and subdividers move in. Mrs. Shouse has set up a fund of $1.7 million in escrow for the development of this area. With that type of benefactor and with that donation, we would be short-sighted indeed not to adopt the amendment.

I move its adoption.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I say that the Senator from Nevada had discussed this matter with the minority. It was discussed at one time in the subcommittee. I do not know why we did not provide for it at that time. It became waylaid because there were bigger items to handle. But the points made by the Senator from Nevada are completely accurate. This area is located in a place where there is a population growth, and there is a steady and constant growth. We are living in a period of inflation, which is not going to diminish until we practice economy in the Government. There is no question of the need to acquire this property to buttress the park. I think we can defend this amendment in terms of economy and the public interest. I enthusiastically support it.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, if there are no further amendments to be offered, I suggest the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc, of the Senator from Nevada.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on final passage.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I had a possible amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I would not want to preclude any Senator from offering an amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I did want to talk to the Senator from Nevada about it.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may offer an amendment notwithstanding that the third reading has been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have discussed this with the Senator from Nevada, and I believe the amendment will be acceptable.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to accept this amendment. It would add $10,000 to the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission appropriation. No strong case was made to add the $10,000, but I am perfectly willing to take it to conference.

I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the third reading of the bill, the amendment adding $10,000 to the item of $25,000 may be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the amendment has not been sent to the desk yet. I do so now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 43, line 14, to strike out "$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$35,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee has increased the funding of the Endowment for the Humanities program by $1 million, thereby raising the funding approved by the House from $3 to $4 million. The President's budget has requested $5 million and I regret that the full funding for this worthy program could not be obtained. However, the increase approved by my colleagues in the Senate Appropriations Committee will be helpful and this addition is desirable. I support it fully.

Today we know there are serious defects in our teaching of humanities which arise, principally, because of overworked teachers, inadequate staffing of existing facilities, outdated textbooks, and often a lack of coordination.

Through the teaching of the humanities man is able to learn more about himself and his heritage today and his hope for tomorrow.

The Humanities Endowment during its first full year has done a highly creditable job, thereby affirming the hopes of all of us that, with proper governmental assistance, the teaching of the humanities in our Nation could be revitalized and strengthened at a time in our history when such teaching is needed. The $1 million added to the Humanities budget is a tiny sum, indeed, compared to our enormous outlays in other areas. I hope the Senate will approve this vital addition.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I turn to page 19 of the committee report. I am very happy to note that funds in the amount of $233,000 for the commencement of construction of a trout hatchery at the Wolf Creek Dam site in south-central Kentucky have been recom-

mended by the Senate Appropriations Committee and that the Senate committee has accepted the amount contained in the House bill.

These funds represent another step in the efforts of the Kentucky congressional delegation to fulfill the hopes of some 360,000 Kentucky fishermen, in addition to bringing many economic benefits to our State.

In March 1966, I appeared before the committee and requested planning funds to determine the feasibility of establishing a suitable site for a trout hatchery in Kentucky. Upon the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Congress added $20,000 to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife budget for fiscal 1967 for the making of this feasibility study. Operating on the planning funds made available last year, the Bureau completed its study and recommended the suitability of a trout hatchery at the Wolf Creek Dam site. Now, construction of the hatchery can begin.

I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before the subcommittee on the Department of Interior's appropriation this year in support of construction funds and the recent correspondence I have had with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife on this subject be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I further note from the committee report that the committee has recommended funds in the amount of $11,180,000 for the budget of the Office of Coal Research, which amount represents an additional $2 million over the amount appropriated by the House and represents a substantial increase over the 1967 appropriation of $8,220,000.

I hope that in conference the House conferees will accept the Senate committee's recommendation.

I have urged for a long period of time that the facilities and research programs of the Bureau of Mines be expanded to deal with the problems of sulfur emissions from coal.

I note with interest for example, from the testimony of Mr. George Fumich, Jr., Director of the Office of Coal Research, which appears at page 1020 of the hearings, that one of the research contracts entered into by the Office of Coal Research for fiscal 1968 authorizes this type of program:

> This project would be directed toward reducing both air and water pollution from high sulfur coals. Success will permit the electric utilities to continue burning lower cost coals, thus keeping electric power costs to the consumer at a minimum. It will help to insure that a choice of competitive fuels will be available for decades to come.

In attending yesterday the hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Public Works Committee, we heard testimony from representatives of the Bureau of Mines describing various research projects undertaken by the Bureau to develop a technology, which does not exist today, for the reduction of sulfur emissions produced by the burning of coal. Earlier, the subcommittee heard representatives of the coal industry who testified to the great need for an intensified research program to deal with the problems of air pollution and the willingness of the coal industry to cooperate and assist in these research efforts to develop a technology to combat this form of pollution.

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks I wish to extend my appreciation and thanks to the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. HAYDEN], the distinguished ranking minority member [Mr. YOUNG], and the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee [Mr. MUNDT], for the consideration and thoughtful attention they have given to these Kentucky projects.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT OF SENATOR COOPER: TROUT HATCHERY, KENTUCKY

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Interior's Budget. I am here today to request funds for the commencement of construction of a trout hatchery on the Cumberland River at the Wolf Creek Dam site in south central Kentucky.

I think it would be helpful to the Committee's consideration of this request if I reviewed briefly the history of this project and its current status in light of the actions taken by this Committee and the recommendations made by the Interior Department's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

Since 1948 Kentucky has been stocking trout in its streams from hatcheries in other States, primarily from a hatchery in Virginia and one in Tennessee. The first stockings were experimental in nature. But in 1952, a trout fishery was established below Wolf Creek Dam on the Cumberland River at a point near where it is proposed that a hatchery now be constructed. It has been very successful. For the past six or seven years the Governor of Kentucky, the Commissioner of the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the membership of the League of Kentucky Sportsmen and the Kentucky congressional delegation have requested the Department of the Interior to proceed with planning for this hatchery.

In later years I have requested funds from this Committee. In 1965, while the Committee did not provide funds for site planning at that time, the Chairman, Senator Hayden, in a colloquy on the floor, told me that he would give consideration to this request the following year and that he felt the Committee would do so.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE INVESTIGATION AND REPORT

In March of last year I again appeared before this Committee and requested planning funds to determine the feasibility of establishing a trout hatchery at the Wolf Creek Dam site. Upon the recommendation of this Committee Congress added $20,000 to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife's appropriation for fiscal 1967 for the determination of a suitable site for a trout hatchery in Kentucky.

The Bureau completed its investigation and filed its completion report in December of last year. The Bureau's study, I might add, was aided by the data collected over the past two years by the Bureau in cooperation with the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources.

I am happy to note that in its report the Bureau made the following recommendation:

"Present facilities at the Dale Hollow National Fish Hatchery are not adequate for producing trout required for the Kentucky-Tennessee area. In order to permit production of the trout needed for the area, early action should be taken to construct the needed facilities at either the Wolf Creek Dam site or at the Dale Hollow Dam site."

The Bureau, in consultation with the Corps of Engineers, then reached a decision in January that the new hatchery should be constructed at the Wolf Creek Dam site.

CONSTRUCTION COST

On January 10, I wrote the Bureau's Director, Mr. John Gottschalk, and requested that he furnish me with the construction schedule and cost estimates for the hatchery as soon as these estimates were completed. In his reply Mr. Gottschalk places the total construction cost of the hatchery at $1,452,500. The amount required for Phase I of the construction is estimated to be $233,000 and it is this amount that I am requesting the Committee to add to the Interior Department's appropriation for fiscal 1968.

I would like to note at this point that the Report was not received until late in December and the cost estimates were not available until February of this year—too late for consideration in the Interior Department's Budget for fiscal 1968 as submitted to Congress by the President.

LOCAL INTEREST

In concluding I cannot emphasize too strongly the keen interest that is felt in Kentucky over the prospect of this trout hatchery. Yesterday I received a telegram from Mr. Minor Clark, Commissioner of Kentucky's Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, which expresses the sentiment in my State for the commencement of this project. The telegram reads as follows:

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

At least 360,000 Kentucky fishermen are still requesting funds for trout hatchery established to provide fishing in 628 miles of water. Besides creating such activities, great economic benefits result other than fishing, such as gains for many businesses, including motels, gas stations, etc. Kentucky has patiently waited such appropriations and all people here are looking forward for appropriations to start phase I as outlined by Bureau of Sport Fisheries after July 1.

MINOR CLARK,
Commissioner, Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources.

ASSOCIATION OF SENATOR MORTON WITH REQUEST

Finally, I would like to say that Senator Morton, who has been an ardent proponent of the trout hatchery over the past years, is familiar with my statement and wishes to be associated with it. We both appreciate the help this Committee has given in the past and we respectfully urge that the Committee provide the sufficient funds for commencement of Phase I of the construction of the trout hatchery as outlined in the program of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

I would also appreciate it, Mr. Chairman, if the recent correspondence I have had on this subject with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries could be included in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: This is in reply to your letter of January 10 regarding a hatchery below Wolf Creek Dam in south-central Kentucky. As requested, we have included a statement specifying the need for the hatch-

ery, along with itemized development requirements and cost estimates.

For the past several years, fishery biologists from the State of Kentucky and our Bureau have been assembling data on the numbers and sizes of trout needed for stocking Kentucky waters. These investigations show that there are 515 miles of streams which need to be stocked with legal-sized trout. An additional 113 miles of tailwaters are also suitable as year-round trout habitat.

Most of the large reservoirs in Kentucky have excellent trout fishing potential, and should be stocked periodically with trout. The use of reservoirs and tailwaters below dams to provide trout fishing is gaining in importance each year, and contributes substantially to the national sport fishery.

Based on management procedures used throughout the Southeast, the current requirements for trout in Kentucky are estimated to be about 150,000 pounds annually. A site for construction of a trout hatchery of this capacity is located below Wolf Creek Dam. An adequate water supply is available from pipes already installed within the Dam.

Outlined below is a program for development of the hatchery, broken down into phases with the latest engineering cost estimates:

Phase I:	
Acquisition of water and land rights, engineering and development	$15,000
Site preparation and rough grading	83,250
Station roads, parking areas, curbing, and gutters	50,000
Storm sewers	19,750
Water supply lines to aerator	65,000
Subtotal	233,000
Phase II:	
Hatchery building	218,750
Equipment storage building	50,000
Aerator building	84,250
Domestic water supply system	37,500
Domestic sewage system	37,500
Underground telephone	4,750
Underground electric system	20,000
Subtotal	452,750
Phase III:	
3 residences	60,000
Oil, paint, and chemical storage building	7,875
Vehicle storage building	42,250
Gasoline and fuel oil storage	10,125
Raceways	153,000
Water supply lines	32,500
Underground electric system	25,000
Outfall drain lines	34,250
Fish cultural equipment	30,000
Subtotal	395,000
Phase IV:	
Raceways	153,000
Water supply lines	32,500
Underground electric system	30,000
Floodlights, aeration, and electrical systems	31,750
Landscaping	50,000
Paving station roads, parking, and service areas	32,125
Fencing	12,375
Fish cultural equipment	30,000
Subtotal	371,750
Total	1,452,500

We are pleased to supply the above information, and appreciate your interest in the Bureau's programs to help manage the sport fishery resources of the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. GOTTSCHALK,
Director.

JANUARY 10, 1967.

Mr. JOHN S. GOTTSCHALK,
Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOTTSCHALK: Thank you for your letter of December 23 enclosing the report of the Fish and Wildlife Service approving the Wolf Creek dam site for a trout hatchery. I am naturally very happy to have this report and I know that sportsmen all over Kentucky are pleased with the final determination made by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

I am informed that it is the usual practice of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to prepare cost figures for the construction of the trout hatchery broken down into phases and their justification. I would like very much to have the opportunity to study and review these estimates and I would appreciate it if you would send me a copy as soon as your estimates on construction cost have been completed.

With best wishes for the New Year, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE,
Washington, D.C., December 23, 1966.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: Enclosed for your information is a copy of the Completion Report, Hatchery Site Investigations, Wolf Creek Dam, Russell County, Kentucky.

As you know, this investigation has been carried on for the past two years by this Bureau in cooperation with the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, and other interested persons.

We trust you will find the report interesting and useful.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. GOTTSCHALK,
Director.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee which funds the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, I was able to offer an amendment to the bill now before the Senate, which the subcommittee and full committee accepted, adding $450,000 for increased research by the Bureau of Mines on removing sulfur from coal. It is vital for the health of our Nation that a greatly accelerated attack be mounted on problems of air pollution. The answer to air pollution abatement, in my opinion, lies in research rather than in overly restrictive Federal regulation. The search to remove sulfur from coal and oil before combustion must be pushed.

The $450,000 is solely aimed at new process developments on a laboratory scale. Two Bureau of Mines developments have not yet reached the stage where they are ready for pilot plants, so the $450,000 is badly needed by the Bureau for the purpose of developing this basic research as promptly as possible.

I was also glad to join with Senator MCGEE, another member of the Appropriations Subcommittee, in offering an amendment to add $1.2 million for the Office of Coal Research on Project COED, by the FMC Corp.

As to the U.S. Park Service appropriation, I supported a restoration of $618,000 to permit construction of the Harpers Ferry Interpretive Facilities Center, which had previously been disallowed by the House. The new Center will be used by the Park Service for Nation-wide museum planning, audiovisual preparation of exhibits for use throughout the entire National Parks System, and graphics work on information material. It will provide a training center for personnel for National, State, and local parks and for some foreign countries. A master plan for the Center and campus area has been completed and a final building design is expected by June 5.

These funds will allow construction to start this fall, with a completion date in fall 1968. If the fiscal year 1968 funds had not been programed, operational savings of approximately 10 positions and $75,000 per year would be lost. Presently, the Interpretive Division of the National Park Service is scattered in four different locations throughout the country.

Other amendments offered by me and accepted by the committee were as follows: $56,000 for staffing and equipping a diagnostic service unit at the Leetown Fish Hatchery; $150,000 for advancing forest utilization research at Princeton; and $80,000 for designs and specifications on Eagle Lake Dam to be located near Cranberry Glades.

THE VIEW FROM MOUNT VERNON

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let the RECORD show that one of America's most hallowed shrines has been saved from destruction by the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

This Interior and related agencies appropriations bill will provide a substantial portion of the funds necessary for the Interior Department to purchase property rights on the Maryland shore of the Potomac, in order to save the breathtaking panorama which unfolds from Mount Vernon and rolls across the Potomac and along the Piscataway Bay area of Maryland shore.

Congress long ago recognized the need to save the Mount Vernon view. In 1961, when construction of a sewage treatment plant was proposed for the Piscataway Bay area directly across from Mount Vernon, Congress authorized a 1,152-acre park in place of the sewage plant.

That act authorized the Department of the Interior to acquire one-half the acreage of the park, on the understanding that the other half would be donated by private interests.

The public response to the threat of destruction of the Mount Vernon view was swift and uncommonly generous. Private owners and foundations committed themselves to contribute more than 450 acres as soon as the Government completed its authorized 586-acre acquisition of approximately 600 acres. In addition, private owners of property in the Piscataway area have pledged 168 scenic easements covering nearly 1,200 acres surrounding the proposed park.

The only condition that these private persons and foundations have attached to their notable civic spirit and generosity is that the Federal Government should fulfill its part of the bargain.

Congress simply must act now if the Mount Vernon view is to be saved.

The Piscataway Park project faces two direct and immediate threats in the very near future. First, if the Federal Gov-

ernment does not act to complete its acquisition of the park before the private offers of scenic easements expire this fall, the principal private contributions of property for the park and most of the scenic easements will revert to the present landholders. The second danger, equally real, is that the rising value of real estate in the Piscataway area in response to Washington's explosive growth will almost certainly compel the same kind of high density development in that area which has already been attempted on both sides of the Potomac Palisades and all along the Potomac shores from Georgetown through Alexandria.

The magnificent vista from Mount Vernon will be stamped out by high density housing and commercial building unless the Federal Government acts now to complete the Piscataway Park project Congress authorized in 1961. Are the millions who visit Mount Vernon to be deprived forever of the inspiring Potomac panorama at Mount Vernon?

The overview from George Washington's Mount Vernon Estate is an integral part of that historic shrine. In the past 6 years, more than 7.4 million Americans and foreign visitors have visited Mount Vernon to pay respect to our first President's home and surroundings.

Piscataway Park is one of the few national parks where the Government will get, in effect, a dollar back for a dollar spent because of the large donations of land and scenic easements. Its success could determine in large measure the future of cooperative park and open space programs, which, on the face of rapidly escalating land prices, could be the most economical method of preserving open spaces through donated land and scenic easements and a minimal Federal investment.

The Senate Appropriations Committee is to be highly commended for providing a substantial part of the Federal funds essential to save the Mount Vernon view. I urge the committee to hold fast behind this provision in the conference on the bill, so that future generations may share this priceless part of our heritage.

Mr. President, I ask that an editorial entitled "The View From Mount Vernon," which appeared in yesterday's New York Times, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE VIEW FROM MOUNT VERNON

If George Washington's home were in danger of being turned into a pizza parlor or torn down for a high-rise apartment, every patriotic organization in the country and every member of Congress would be thundering in protest. Yet as everyone knows who has visited Mount Vernon, much of its charm and one of the principal reasons that Washington loved it is its serene view across the Potomac River toward the green, rolling fields of Maryland.

What most tourists do not know and what the House of Representatives knew but chose to ignore is that most of the land on the Maryland side is in private hands. Only the farsightedness of the two private foundations and the unselfishness of private owners have prevented the desecration of the view from Mount Vernon. But every year those flashing neon lights and those hamburger "palaces" creep a little closer.

In 1961 Congress authorized the purchase of private land which together with lands and scenic easements donated by private individuals would protect the area forever. However, Piscataway Park, as the area is called in memory of an Indian tribe that lived there in colonial times, is not yet a reality. The House Appropriations Committee sliced away the $2.7 million necessary to complete the Federal purchase. If the Government does not acquire the land by August, the matching gifts of land and scenic easements will revert to the donors. With development pressures steadily intensifying, the present agreement among all parties may break down.

Since the members of the House apparently do not have the backbone to overrule the petty tyrants on their Appropriations Committee even when George Washington is involved, it is up to the Senate Appropriations Committee to put a stop to this purblind, penny-pinching foolishness.

While the Senate Committee is at it, it should restore the funds for the acquisition of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. Congress authorized the park in 1966 after years of bitter controversy, but the enemies of this project never give up. With land prices escalating, delay in purchasing the land would be a costly mistake.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 120 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Aiken	Harris	Moss
Allott	Hart	Mundt
Anderson	Hartke	Murphy
Baker	Hatfield	Muskie
Bartlett	Hayden	Nelson
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bennett	Hill	Pearson
Bible	Holland	Pell
Boggs	Hruska	Percy
Brewster	Jackson	Prouty
Brooke	Javits	Proxmire
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Russell
Cannon	Long, Mo.	Scott
Church	Long, La.	Smathers
Cooper	Magnuson	Smith
Cotton	Mansfield	Sparkman
Curtis	McCarthy	Spong
Dirksen	McClellan	Symington
Eastland	McGee	Talmadge
Ervin	McGovern	Thurmond
Fannin	McIntyre	Tydings
Fong	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Miller	Yarborough
Gore	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Montoya	
Hansen	Morse	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—15

Carlson	Ellender	Lausche
Case	Hollings	Morton
Clark	Inouye	Stennis
Dodd	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Dominick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Williams, N.J.

So the bill (H.R. 9029) was passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Presiding Officer appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is always a great experience to be on the floor of the Senate when the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is handling a measure. In this instance it was the appropriation measure for the Department of the Interior for fiscal 1968. True to form, Senator HAYDEN managed the bill with the same outstanding ability that has characterized his many years of public service in this body. Its unanimous adoption by the Senate is perhaps the best testament to the high caliber of its presentation, to the unmatched effectiveness of Senator HAYDEN's efforts. The Senate is once again deeply indebted to its patriarch.

The senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, is to be thanked for joining to assure the approval of the entire Senate. His strong efforts and articulate support contributed immensely to this success. Other Senators similarly are to be thanked. The senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and Iowa [Mr.

MILLER] are just a few who offered clear and convincing views to assist this outstanding achievement. It is an achievement of which we may all be proud.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 9481, the second supplemental appropriations bill for 1967. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader about the schedule for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no action taken on the second supplemental appropriations bill for 1967 tonight.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the commitment made by the leadership yesterday relative to the status of the supplemental appropriations bill today—and I thank all Members for allowing us to make the bill the pending business—I ask unanimous consent that if there are any amendments to the second supplemental appropriation bill, there be a time limitation of one-half hour on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill, the time to begin after the approval of the Journal on Friday next.

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, effective on Friday, May 19, 1967 after the approval of the Journal, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 9481) Second Supplemental 1967, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table shall be limited to one-half hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the meantime it is anticipated that a number of bills which have been reported by the Judiciary Committee and other committees will be brought up for consideration.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY TO FRIDAY AT 10 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. Friday next.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE 136TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF ALABAMA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently the 136th annual convention of the Episcopal Diocese of Alabama, meeting in Birmingham, Ala., adopted a resolution which was sent to General Westmoreland.

It is a very interesting resolution to read.

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

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE 136TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF ALABAMA, JANUARY 19–21, 1967

Whereas, we recognize the right of free men everywhere to protest their disagreement with the policies of their government; and

Whereas, certain church leaders and groups related to the Church exercising that right have voiced their disapproval of the involvement of the United States of America in armed conflict with aggressor forces in Vietnam and have called for withdrawal of our Armed Forces from this conflict; and

Whereas, the apparent effect of these protests and pronouncements is to give the impression that Christians in the United States generally do not support the mission of our Armed Forces in Vietnam; and

Whereas, such an impression not only tends to discourage the men and women of our Armed Forces in Vietnam who oppose the aggressors of the people of Vietnam, but also tends to encourage these aggressors in their hope that the American people will withdraw their support of our government purpose in Vietnam, thereby making the task of the men and women of our Armed Forces more difficult;

Be it therefore resolved that the 136th Convention of the Diocese of Alabama extend to the men and women of our Armed Forces in Vietnam and their leaders our encouragement to them in carrying out their mission of opposing Communist aggressors and assure them of our continual prayers for their safety to the end that they know that the sacrifices of life and time which they make in our name and behalf are not in vain;

And be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Commander of our Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Bishop of the Armed Forces of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America; and to such other interested parties as the Convention may indicate.

FIFTY YEARS IN PUBLIC ARENA—ATTORNEY ARTHUR J. FREUND HAS LED FIGHT FOR NUMEROUS REFORMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 7, there appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat an article commenting upon a long career in the legal profession by one of the most brilliant labor lawyers in the State of Missouri, Arthur J. Freund.

The title is: "Fifty Years in Public Arena—Attorney Arthur J. Freund Has Led Fight for Numerous Reforms." The article is written by Mel Luna.

I have known Arthur Freund for a great many years. I have worked closely with him in years gone by in connection with various American Bar Association projects.

I have considered him one of the truly great legal minds of our time.

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to ask unanimous consent to have this article about Mr. Freund printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FIFTY YEARS IN PUBLIC ARENA—ATTORNEY ARTHUR J. FREUND HAS LED FIGHT FOR NUMEROUS REFORMS

(By Mel Luna)

Forty years ago St. Louis attorney Arthur J. Freund clamored for reforms which led to a drastic reorganization of the police department.

In the 1930s he played a leading role in the purging of fraudulent registrations from the city's voter lists.

He drafted a civil rights voting law proposal in the 1940s which was considered radical by many of his colleagues, and in the 1950s he gained national attention for his fight against romanticizing crime on television and radio.

Time has failed to mellow Mr. Freund or dampen his enthusiasm for sounding the clarion on vital issues.

Now 76, the outspoken Mr. Freund has made national headlines for his warnings on efforts to overrule the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision by amending the Constitution.

A move to convene the first Constitutional Convention since 1787, when this nation was federated, had advanced unheralded in recent years, Mr. Freund contends. And these efforts may prove successful if two states join 32 others in petitioning Congress for a convention, he said.

He contends the public has not been sufficiently informed on the inherent dangers of the proposed amendment.

Most attention has centered on Section One of the proposal, which would impair the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision, he said.

DANGER OF SECTION TWO

But Section Two goes much further, he continued. It reads, "Nothing in the Constitution shall restrict or limit a state in its determination of how membership of gov-

erning bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned."

This provision, if adopted, would give states a blank check on apportionment which would reach all the way down to the local units of government, and would have enormous and profound legal ramifications, he asserted.

For instance, this could mean the Board of Aldermen could have 90 per cent of its members from South St. Louis, if it decided to apportion itself that way, he explained. And this would take place without judicial review because the U.S. Supreme Court, the third balance of power in the United States government, would have no say in the matter.

In May of 1964 Mr. Freund was cited by the St. Louis Civil Liberties Committee for his "almost single-handed" struggle to alert the public about three Constitutional amendments proposed in 1962 by an ad hoc committee of the Council of State Governments.

Two of these proposals (to permit the states to amend the Constitution without regard to Congress, and to create a Court of the Union to review U.S. Supreme Court decisions) apparently have not fared well.

But the proposal to rescind the decision of Baker vs. Carr (one-man, one-vote) has made considerable progress. The Council of State Governments reported two states have adopted the original resolution and 30 others a modified version sponsored by the organization two years later.

Mr. Freund said there is little public knowledge as to what is happening to the other two proposals.

He said this had been the situation with the one-man, one-vote resolution. Most everybody had stopped paying attention to it until it was determined almost overnight nearly 30 states had petitioned for it.

A Globe-Democrat check with the Council of State Governments shows the last time the organization checked on the other two proposals was in 1963.

COURT OF THE UNION

Brevard Crihfield, executive director, said the last count showed the proposal to simplify the amendment process has been adopted in 12 states, and the Court of the Union measure has been passed in four.

Every amendment to the Constitution has been submitted by Congress on approval of resolutions passed by two-thirds of each house. The Constitution also allows states to initiate the amending process if two-thirds of the states petition Congress for a Constitutional Convention.

(In either case, the amending process calls for ratifications of proposals by three-fourths of the legislatures of the states or by conventions of three-fourths of the states.)

Curiously, Mr. Freund has specialized in civil law, but criminal and Constitutional law has been his avocation.

This sideline has led to a number of awards in his 50 years of public service.

For instance, in 1936–37, he shared in the St. Louis Public Service Award for his role in purging city voter lists of fraudulent registrations. He also is the recipient of the Washington University Distinguished Alumni Award, and the USO of St. Louis, which he helped found, cited him for extraordinary public service.

Mr. Freund is a Fellow of the American Bar Association and past chairman of the organization's Criminal Law Section. His appeals to the radio and television industries to portray the majesty of the law, rather than the romanticizing of law offenders, have been inserted into the Congressional Record.

FATHER OF KIDNAP LAW

Always an innovator, Mr. Freund was talking about the need for federal legislation against kidnaping and for a national voting law years ago. His contemporaries, he recalls, told him this was folly. But he persisted and drafted proposals on both measures.

His proposed kidnaping law was introduced in Congress by the late Rep. John J. Cochran of St. Louis and was adopted following the Lindbergh kidnaping case.

But he was less fortunate with the civil rights voting proposal, which never took hold. He points out that a major article of the 1964 Civil Rights Law, conceived by the late President Kennedy, was the provision pertaining to voting rights.

Mr. Freund also drafted the legislation for the Missouri Highway Patrol Act.

A Republican, Mr. Freund acknowledges his views frequently have been termed unorthodox and unrealistic.

And he continues to have critics today. This especially is the case of his criticism on the lack of national debate on the proposed Constitutional Convention, which he regards as one of the most serious threats to our Constitutional form of government. Some of his critics claim he has been crying wolf.

But Mr. Freund, after nearly half a century in the public arena, enjoys a lively clash of opinions.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT VAUGHN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have just finished reading today a brilliant speech made by Mr. Robert Vaughn, who is not only a world-known television personality but also a brilliant student who is completing his academic work for a doctorate degree at the University of Southern California. He addressed a student meeting at Harvard University on May 5.

Not only is this a scholarly discussion of the Vietnam war, supporting the premise that Mr. Vaughn has stood for ever since he first spoke out several years ago in opposition to our escalating the war, but also, it is a speech that leaves no room for doubt as to my evaluation of the scholarship of Mr. Vaughn. It is also a stirring appeal to our Government for a cessation in our escalating the war.

I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A SPEECH DELIVERED BY ROBERT VAUGHN AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MASS., FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1967

First let me express my gratitude to the Dunster House Forum and Messrs. Gar Alperovitz, Cort Casady and Sandy Levinson for their gracious invitation to address the Student Body of this most distinguished of American Universities.

When I was invited to speak at Harvard I was informed of the renewed anti-war activity which has grown up in this community in recent months. Let me say that the form in which the dissent is being expressed . . . the concept of a "Vietnam Summer 1967" involving groups of volunteers, professional people, housewives and students in opposition to the Vietnam War is one I wholeheartedly endorse.

It is traditional protocol in speaking engagements such as this to take a few minutes to warm up your audience with a humorous anecdote or two. It serves as a lead-in and is not an unnatural procedure, but the subject matter that brings me here today is of such a stark nature that it seems to render that whimsical approach meaningless.

I'm here today to talk about the war. A war which is directly involving almost a half-million of our men. As these inadequate words are being spoken, people are dying. Dying for something that they believe in, or think that they believe in, or wished that they were able to believe in.

Anyone who has the ability objectively to study this war will find staggering volumes of evidence against it. In this war, more than any one that we have ever been engaged in, we are faced with that perplexing dilemma—what is the truth? We are concerned here, like nations have been so many times in past history, with what are the legitimate and illegitimate exercises of power. And we are confronted with the unavoidable question as to whether or not the compromise and destruction that are necessary to win this contest are proportionate to the good which may be achieved.

It is strange to be thousands of miles away from the scene of this struggle trying to understand it. It is difficult, being so far removed, to go beyond academic argument and experience empathy. We lucky civilians here in America know nothing of the reality of war. We know nothing of the sight and stench of carnage. Ask the sane men who have experienced modern war what it is like, and you'll see a disquieting look in their eyes.

Words are small substitute for experience. Perhaps Thomas Carlyle came close when he said, "Under the sky is no uglier spectacle than two men with clenched teeth, and hellfire eyes, hacking one another's flesh, converting precious living bodies, and priceless living souls, into meaningless masses of putrescence."

War is the failure of logic and the last desperate resource of passion. War has long been an unavoidable expression of the human condition. Yet, even more unfortunately, opposing groups of combatants have never been able to perform their respective hostilities without also involving and subsequently murdering a large group of innocent bystanders who, out of indifference or enlightenment, have not cared to engage themselves in that mass hysteria of barbarism. If war cannot be considered appalling for any other reason, this corruption and slaughter of the innocents has always been grounds enough.

If certain men choose to exercise their right to die violently in their youth, for whatever reason, valid or invalid, so be it. But should it be at the expense of others who choose to exercise their right to live? The problem for the non-aggressors, those who choose to live, arises when some aggressor government elects to threaten his inherent rights, including his ultimate right to live. It is then and only then that a man does well to fight. If there is ever any justification for war it stems from the intrinsic knowledge that there can be absolutely no other way to defend a righteous cause. Let us look now at the key issues in this Vietnamese war which our government claims to be a righteous cause, which therefore, makes it honorable for us to fight.

The United States government, basing its decisions on certain assumptions, has committed our political and military might to a steadily expanding struggle in Southeast Asia. William Winter, the distinguished journalist from San Francisco, has labeled those decisions, "fallacious assumptions". If, indeed, these assumptions that created our involvement are seriously challengeable, or even wrong, then U.S. policy is open to grave questioning. Using William Winter's general categories we will review briefly our Vietnam "assumptions." First, The Legal Argument: "The United States has a 'commitment' to South Vietnam."

Secretary Rusk said, "We have a very simple commitment to South Vietnam. It derives out of a Southeast Asia treaty, out of the bilateral arrangements that President

Eisenhower made with the government of South Vietnam, out of regular authorizations and appropriations of the Congress of last August (1964), out of the most formal declarations of three Presidents of both political parties."

Let us consider first the Southeast Asia treaty which Secretary Rusk speaks of—and which, by the way, Vietnam was never a party to. It was devised by John Foster Dulles in 1954 after the French defeat in Indochina. It was both a military alliance based on the fear of the "domino theory" and a strategic move that would enable us to retain a military foothold in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Dulles invited to Manila the Southeast Asian governments of India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines. However, India chose to pass up this opportunity to join the American military alliance, as did Ceylon, as did Burma, as did Indonesia. As a point of fact, only the three governments that already had military pacts with the United States and depended on the U.S. for support showed up: Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines.

Of the several non-Asian SEATO countries, Britain and France have refused involvement on the grounds that there is no Vietnam war commitment possible under the articles of the SEATO Treaty. And there was certainly no provision in that treaty for interfering in someone else's Civil War. And the Hawks' view to the contrary it was deemed a Civil War not only by President Kennedy but by the leading American authorities on international law, who collectively prepared a statement based on their investigations which was printed in the New York Times of January 15th, 1967, under the title, "U.S. Intervention in Vietnam Is Illegal."

Rusk's second point has to do with the appropriations of the Congress of August, 1964, which were passed in response to the Tonkin Gulf episode and, as it has been pointed out, was not a specific authorization for a large-scale land war. Besides which, it was an act of respect to the President—and in no way a "commitment" by the United States to anybody in Southeast Asia. We might do well to stress that our foreign aid policy has not hitherto included an automatic obligation to war on behalf of those recipient nations to whom we extend our financial aid.

The third point Mr. Rusk refers to is that our commitment to South Vietnam resulted from "The most formal declarations of three Presidents of both political parties." President Eisenhower, the first of the three in question, commenced the alleged "commitment" theory by writing a letter to President Diem on October 23rd of 1954, offering aid to the new government. But President Eisenhower himself definitely stated that the aid he had offered was only economic! And as late as September the 2nd 1963, less than three months before his death, President Kennedy said, "In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it, the people of Vietnam."

It is a curious fact that nowhere in the major speeches, documents, communiques and press conferences bearing on this subject since 1950 can one find the words "commitment", "obligation", or "pledge" used to describe our relation to South Vietnam . . . until the Johnson administration. Yet this administration's now-familiar refrain has been that our whole policy has continued unchanged since 1954.

So we see that the background of the term "commitment" is indeed hazy in the light of historical fact. Eisenhower and Kennedy attempted to avoid the problems we find ourselves in today. Eisenhower, in fact, said that we ought not to become involved in a big land war in Asia. As did General MacArthur, and General Gavin and General Ridgeway.

So the final point on this alleged "commitment" theory is: When we resort to invoking this term, to whom are we relating it? To the Saigon government? We must remind ourselves that the Saigon government, starting with President Diem, has been our own creation. And as Professor Hans Morgenthau points out, "In a sense we have contracted with ourselves, and I do not regard this as a valid foundation for our presence in South Vietnam." President Johnson, to anyone's knowledge, has not brought any further definition to the problem, usually saying simply, as he did in his Johns Hopkins speech of April 7, 1965, "Why are we in Vietnam? We are there because we have a promise to keep".

Furthermore, when Secretary Rusk appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's hearings on Vietnam, and was challenged to define the grounds of our "commitment", he made the following impatient reply. "Now there's no need to parse these commitments in great detail. The fact is we know we have a commitment. The South Vietnamese know we have a commitment. The Communist world knows we have a commitment. The rest of the world knows it. Now this means that the integrity of the American commitment is at the heart of this problem." He was so right about our integrity but contrary to the meaning he intended.

Next, The Political Argument: "We must stop aggression!"

The term "aggression", as usually defined in international agreements, refers to one nation's unprovoked attack upon another. Or, the imposition of one country's rule upon another by open force. In the case of the country of Vietnam there are not two nations at all, but one. As a result of the Geneva Conference of 1954, Vietnam was temporarily separated into two zones, North and South, thus allowing opposing factions to regroup, to prepare for the nationwide free elections that would take place in 1956. When we, the United States, together with the Saigon government under the dictatorship of Diem, prevented these internationally sanctioned elections, the Southern guerrillas, representing the will of 80 percent of the population, formed up again in order to resist this latest suppression of their freedom. When we violated the Geneva Accords by sending in military assistance to back Diem and then escalated that assistance, the guerrillas turned to their former leader Ho Chi Minh for help. When he sent that help to offset our illegal intrusion, we labeled that action "aggression."

The argument from the "Right" would probably be that Communist influence goes back farther than our noticeable appearance on the scene with Diem; back, in other words, to the Viet Minh. Quite so. But then our influence goes back also. It goes back to our two billion dollar financing of the French in their war against the Vietnamese. Back even to the now seemingly incongruous fact that we supported Ho Chi Minh in his resistance to the Japanese.

Too often, in trying to determine influences, we can follow a receding trail back to a disappearing point, and in so doing the truth becomes bogged down in such a conflicting set of intangibles that reasonable, progressive answers to the problem are made largely impossible. The issue, then, must ultimately refer itself to which country first broke international law and which broke it more often. The International Control Commission, which was set up by the Geneva Conference in order to determine those infractions, states that while both sides committed violations, the United States and South Vietnam committed the greater part of them. Viewed in this light, we are forced to again re-ask the question, "Who then, is the aggressor?"

Next, The Religious Argument: "We must stop communism!"

I use the word religious advisedly because a certain paranoia about communism has taken form in this country which has acquired the overtones of a holy crusade. Senator Fulbright described the irony in 1964, saying, "It has become one of the 'self-evident truths' of the postwar era that just as the President resides in Washington and the Pope in Rome, the devil resides immutably in Moscow."

It is not necessary to quote the radicals to prove the point. It is not necessary to repeat the illogicality of the Joseph McCarthy inquisition or the muddled thinking of Billy James Hargis, or the irrationality of the Birch Society's Robert Welch. No, there is ample evidence in the attitudes of more conventional national leaders. Lately we have heard General Westmoreland alluding in all seriousness to the war in Vietnam as a latter-day Christian crusade. We note Billy Graham flying his banner in the ranks of the Hawks. We see elected representatives of the people, certain U.S. Senators, Presidential candidates, former Vice Presidents, manifesting the same emotional substitutes to thought. We observe that Cardinal Spellman, deaf to the words of his own Pope, has somehow misplaced the arsenal of God and fervently rattles in its stead the sword of Mars.

Like all the "anti-isms", anti-communism is not a policy but an expedient to conceal the fact that we have no policy. Communism, whatever its spiritual limitations, is not the bastard-child of Satan. It is an ideology, and an ideology cannot be killed with a gun. If we seek to stop communism, war is proving to be the wrong way to go about it. As Professor Howard Zinn put it, ". . . We are protecting Vietnam by killing its people and destroying its land. Who else would want such protection?"

This is proving to be a century of revolution. We have yet to see, in scores of places in this tumultuous world, more and more of these revolutions. A new generation of leaders is emerging who are inspiring their people with the promise of social and economic achievement. They are not to be denied this need to modernize any more than it was denied to us. In our fervor to halt the potential spread of totalitarianism, what incredible precedent are we setting in Vietnam? Is this the way we intend to counter communism? Are we to oppose inevitably emerging popular revolutions when they don't meet with our fancy, and by our opposition totally ignore the will of the people involved? Are we to prevent the spread of communism by sacrificing the principles of Democracy? Oppose them by disseminating lies to our own people; oppose them by clandestine and illegal plotting in order to set up puppet militarist governments; by breaking treaties, by giving no heed to international law, by marching our legions through the countryside of foreign continents, burning homes, laying waste to the land, and indiscriminantly killing friend and foe alike in the zealous pursuit of our own ends? Can we possibly imagine that this bloody insanity will prove that the democratic way of life is more fulfilling than communism?

If we think our methods are righteous we are fooling no one but ourselves. Certainly not the rest of the world! And certainly not history!

Next The Strategic Argument: "We must stop China!"

The assumption here is that China threatens our nation's security by their avowed desire to wage war directly against us, or by indirectly inspiring wars of national liberation around us. The facts as they stand simply do not support the assumption that China is bent upon waging wars against her neighbors.

The Rand Corporation, under contract to the United States Air Force, did an exhaustive research assignment to determine the extent of China's aggressive tendencies. To the probable irritation of the Air Force, they

reported that China cannot, the records show, be so accused of aggressive tendencies.

What are the critical issues that have supposedly indicated her international aggressiveness? We usually cite the border disputes with India, Pakistan and Burma. However, these disputes were the direct results of British colonialism. The result of Britain readjusting the territorial demarcation lines of the Chinese borders. Even Chiang Kai-shek openly supported mainland China on these issues. China took back through negotiation or force what had been hers for centuries, and having done so, sought no further gains and stood fast at those points.

Then there is the oft-cited and totally misunderstood case of Tibet, a Chinese province within China that refused, among other things, to give up its practice of slavery. China, after 10 years of patience and prudence, forced Tibet to suspend that dissatisfactory practice and observe national law. Bloodshed was held at a minimum, contrary to popular propaganda.

Or we might cite the Chinese communist influence in Vietnam. However, we should do well to recall that Ho Chi Minh was waging his war of liberation long before China became a communist country. Then we fall back to citing Korea in which an invading army from the North attacked the South. But they were North Koreans, not Chinese. Sanctioned by the United Nations, our forces entered Korea to defend the South. And when we pushed beyond the 38th Parallel and up through North Korea, China warned that if we went as far as the Yalu River they would have to fight, the Yalu being China's electrical lifeline and also her national borderline. MacArthur unfortunately assumed that they were bluffing. When we pushed through the entirety of North Korea and displayed no intention of stopping at the Yalu, they fought as they said they would. When the war was over China withdrew her troops from Korean soil. Fourteen years later, the United States still has 60,000 soldiers there.

The United States and China are currently jockeying in a power play for the purpose of gaining territorial influence in Asia. And, looking at the situation objectively, the conflict has been staggeringly one-sided. For over 20 years we have been the strongest power in Asia. The United States has almost single-handedly prevented China from joining the world community of the United Nations. China has no combat troops stationed outside of her own borders. On the other hand, the United States has thousands upon thousands of soldiers in Korea, in Japan, in Formosa, in the Philippines, in Thailand, in Vietnam. And we give financial support to indigenous armies in all those areas. Our Navy churns at will through the Yellow Sea, through the North China Sea, through the South China Sea, and controls the entire Pacific Ocean. We have nuclear capabilities at dozens of striking points along China's threshold. All of which begs the question of who is threatening whom?

These very brief comments should not be misconstrued as a naive attempt to whitewash Communist China's power ambitions. Rather, simply a reminder that when China looks across her borders at this massive armament that confronts her, when she hears the voices of certain of our statesmen and military shouting, "war with China is inevitable!", we must recognize that she has excellent reasons for paranoia. The situation is narrowing down to which side is going to panic first and attack the other on the grounds of a "preventive war."

Too many of our military leaders and too many of our statesmen have too many times in the past been wrong in their judgments for us to predicate that their future decisions will suddenly be free of errors. If the impending catastrophe is to be evoided the U.S. has the responsibility of initiating the first steps toward a sane international policy regarding this gigantic Asian country that only one generation ago was our friend and ally.

Next: The Military Argument: "Bombing the North will bring negotiations."

Bombing, as witnessed in Britain, in Germany, in Korea, has proven its ineffectiveness as an inducement to bringing the enemy to his knees. And we are now dropping as much tonnage into Vietnam as we did into Europe at the peak of the Second World War. Despite our efforts to avoid it we are causing extensive casualties among the North Vietnamese civilians. And accidentally destroying churches, hospitals and schools. In the South, it has been estimated that we have wounded a million Vietnamese children and killed a quarter of a million more. And despite this carnage, or maybe because of it, we have driven the enemy further and further away from the possibility of any discussion at the negotiating table.

It is an inescapable fact that the bombing has not only failed its alleged purpose; it is indeed prolonging the war! We must recognize that the bombing has not reduced the enemy's will to fight, has not lowered the morale in the North, has not reduced the flow of supplies South, and most certainly has not advanced the cause of peace.

And lastly: The Idealist Argument: "We are fighting for Freedom."

The question here is whose freedom are we fighting for? Certainly not our own. The Vietcong constitute no threat to our territorial freedom. Neither do the North Vietnamese. Who then? Not the 80% of the South Vietnamese people who have made it amply clear by now that they are not interested in the brand of freedom we have so far offered them. We have consistently failed to give them the one thing that they so ardently desire, restitution of the rights to their own land. Our first puppet Diem saw to that by taking away from them 85 percent of the land they had fought for and won against the French. The absentee landlords to this day ride out to the villages under the protection of American guns to collect exorbitant rents that keep the peasants in a perpetual state of poverty and submission. Whose freedom, then, are we fighting for? The absentee landlords? Or maybe it's Air Marshall Ky and his Saigon staff who, with the exception of one man, are Northerners who fought with the French against their own people. Or could it be the South Vietnamese soldiers whose freedom we're fighting for? Could be. They don't seem to be very interested in fighting for it themselves. Every year they've been deserting at a staggering rate: 124,000 last year. And it is estimated that even more will make their exit this year. Or perhaps it's the very pro-American South Vietnamese black marketeers and grafters and procurers and prostitutes whose freedom we are concerned with? But that can't be, because we only recently created them ourselves by our presence there.

Then whose freedom are we fighting for? Perhaps we don't even know anymore. Let us not be naive about human nature, our attitude toward the Vietnamese contains as much opportunism as altruism. Yet there are those who would argue, with ready sophistry, that we are in Vietnam to give the people the right to vote for a freely elected government. However, the citizens who have come to the polls, and we should not forget that they are just some 20 per cent of the population, have found only representatives of the ruling military junta on the ballots. Opposition has not been allowed any voice. Is it our intention then to seduce these people with a brand of liberty we ourselves would most emphatically reject?

Senator Young of Ohio is of the opinion that, "The primary reason for our being in Vietnam today is our proud refusal to admit a mistake in our attempt to make Vietnam a pro-American and an anti-communist state. More than anything else, we are fighting to avoid admitting failure. As Walter Lippmann bluntly put it, 'We are fighting to save face!'"

If that be so, then we must in someway reflect, and by so doing temper our preoccupation with prestige and power and the feeling that a loss of either is intolerable. We talk so fervently of saving face, without realizing that face has already been lost. It has been lost irrevocably, step by step, as we have been talking peace while escalating war. Mankind has already observed our actions. Mankind has already recorded its reactions. What is done, is done, and there is no erasure possible. Face has been lost! But a nation, like a man, if inspired, can change. While there is violence in us, there is also creativity.

Change is the only worthy course of action left open to us. Only through change will we be able to initiate a compassionate and lawful conclusion to the hostilities in that small, tortured country we are ravaging. If we so treasure the opinions of mankind, its histories, having recorded our desolations, will also record our progressions.

If there is not a creative change in our attitude towards international relations it will not be due solely to the dangerously aggressive policies of President Johnson and his advisors. The mantle of guilt must also be worn by we the people who, by and large, have no empathy for what's happening in Vietnam or we wouldn't be allowing it to happen. Most of us have little interest in the matter. We're out of touch. Isolated in the most opulent country the world has ever known. We turn away with a shrug and say, "What can I do about it anyway?", or else we belong to that faction of rationalizers driven by an excess of questionable values and psychological infirmities who say, "Well, it's a dirty business but we're stuck with it! So I say let's bomb the hell out of them and get this mess over with!"

And thus we begin to see a brand of fascism parading under the guise of "Americanism." We see men compelled to Swagger rather than to think.

There are many roads to barbarism. And surely America, beginning to emulate decadent societies of the past, is in the process of discovering her own slick new state of barbarity.

Truth as usual, is one of the first casualties. It has been said that we prolong the war by opposing it—a strange logic indeed. These victims of irrationality must learn that one does not free oneself from a quagmire by foolishly plunging more deeply into it.

It has even been stated by the most militant defenders of our policies that dissention is un-American; furthermore, they are insisting, dissention is actually tantamount to treason. Are these zealots asking us to ignore the factors that have brought us to our current chaos? Are they asking us to compromise our morality and obediently contribute to a war we know to be unjust and illegal? Are they asking us to sit idly by while our young soldiers are brainwashed by their paranoid elders and packed off to kill for a mistaken cause? Are they asking us to resign ourselves passively to throwing more of America's young men into foreign graves? If respect for our Constitution, if compassion for our fellow man, if intelligent and informed opposition to the failures of our Southeast Asia policies can be deemed "treason", then the very meaning of the word has gone awry.

The majority of the American people, despite their differences of opinion, would like to see this war brought to an end. The problem is which course of action will best suit that desire. We have four approaches open to us. First: Escalation, which means an even greater increase of our troops, increased bombing North and South, our probable invasion of the North and the almost inevitable

likelihood of a major confrontation with China and Russia or both.

The second approach: Reclaiming; This would avoid the dangers of escalating the war in the North, but would still involve a greater increase of our troop strength in order to reclaim all of South Vietnam for the Saigon government. This plan would involve an expansion of our "search and destroy" methods, increased defoliation of the land, extensive relocation of civilians, forced pacification of the countryside, and after victory, the inevitable long-term occupation of what's left of that nation.

The third approach: Holding, or the "enclave theory", which would essentially be a territorial division of the South—a crazy-quilt solution in which *they* get that section, *we* get this, *they* get that city, *we* get this one. This would avoid the hazards of the two previously mentioned approaches, but would do little to solve the larger problem unless it also involved the following . . .

The fourth approach: Negotiations and Withdrawal; this would be a phased dewesternizing of the war, not a Dunkirk-like retreat. It would be a planned pull out under international control including whatever is necessary to protect the anti-communist Vietnamese after the cease-fire.

When one dispassionately examines the lengthy pros and cons accompanying each of these four approaches, one discovers that for the benefit of world peace and international order we must discard the first three approaches and begin to lay the groundwork necessary for accomplishing the fourth choice: negotiations and withdrawal.

If we really want negotiations the ways and means are still available. As Senator Robert F. Kennedy said in a speech on the Senate Floor on March 2nd of this year, "I propose that we test the sincerity of the statements of Premier Kosygin and others asserting that if the bombardment of the North is halted, negotiations would begin".

If we sincerely seek peaceful solutions for Vietnam I believe we will find inestimable support from not only Premier Kosygin, but Secretary General U Thant, Pope Pius VI, President de Gaulle and a vast host of world leaders and interested nations.

Without further delay we must take the following specific steps:

1. Unconditional termination of bombings in North Vietnam.

2. De-escalation of military operations in South Vietnam starting with the cessation of offensive operations.

3. Recognition of the National Liberation Front as possessing belligerent status, and hence negotiating status, equal to that of the Saigon regime.

4. We also must initiate the reconvening of the Geneva Conference, preferably in some Asiatic city, with our commitment to negotiate on the basis of the 1954 Geneva Accords, including the withdrawal of all foreign military forces and the elimination of all foreign bases in South and North Vietnam, within a specified period of time, and the re-unification of the entire country through free elections.

The war can be ended when we as a country will it to be ended. It is not beyond control.

If this nation still has a choice about its destiny, it hinges on the element of time and the point of no return. Have we not yet learned by experience? Have not the governments involved displayed enough prejudicial blindness, enough inane pride, enough intellectual rigidity? With the threat of the Third World War in the balance how much further can we escalate this war under the delusion that we are promoting peace? Have there not been enough lies to make us recognize the need for truth? Have not yet enough men died, enough women been slaughtered, enough babies burned?

When are we going to find the courage to rediscover our honor?

When, in the name of justice are we going to wake up!

THE NATIONAL FORESTS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a report on national forest operations be printed in the RECORD. This is an outstanding report of great conservation progress. I regret that the excellent photographs which so well tell the story of multiple-use success cannot also be reproduced.

This report covers the great national forests of Oregon and Washington, some 24 million acres protected and managed by only 3,700 full-time workers and 3,800 seasonal workers. There were 23,600,000 recreational visits made to these incomparable forests, which also supplied grazing for 119,000 cattle and 89,000 sheep, boundless hunting and fishing opportunities, a harvest of 4.7 billion board-feet of timber with almost $120,000,000 in revenue, half the water runoff in the Pacific Northwest, including the clean water needed for 150 cities, and water for power, industry, and irrigation. The 57 counties of the Pacific Northwest where these forests are located received record payments of $25,800,000, which was $4½ million more than 1965 payments. These figures give some appreciation and proof of the fact that this is a great investment and a wealth-producing investment belonging to all the taxpayers of the United States.

I think it appropriate to give public recognition to the continual fine work the Forest Service performs for all Americans as it strives to make these great public assets serve the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

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

NATIONAL FORESTS OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST IN 1966

A fisherman's boat drifts into calm water as the late afternoon sun casts shimmering highlights on leaves and water . . . a backpacking family pauses amidst the splendor of jagged cliffs, live glaciers and alpine flowers . . . a mountain goat—monarch of the high country—peers down from his skyline perch on a rocky pinnacle.

A smokejumper's adrenalin starts to flow as he gets set at the airplane's open door . . . a student worker searches out a file of correspondence . . . a watershed scientist stands in the middle of a clear, cold stream and counts the clicks heard in his headset.

These vignettes were just a few of the sights and sounds of the National Forests at work and play in the Pacific Northwest during 1966.

So too was a spectacle that would make the old time loggers gasp—the sight of a giant silver balloon lifting and carrying huge logs aloft.

And there were the stockmen taking their herds to the high grazing areas—retracing again the paths first blazed by their pioneer fathers even before the National Forests came into being.

All this and a lot more was part of 1966—a year of record or near-record demands upon the National Forests. It appeared that more people than ever before sought outdoor enjoyment on the Forests. And it was the second biggest year in history for timber harvest.

It's a big portion of a big country—that area embraced by the National Forests of the Pacific Northwest Region, Oregon and Washington. There are 19 National Forests in the Region, with 13 headquartered in Oregon and six in Washington. They total nearly 24 million acres, ranging from sea level (Siuslaw, Olympic Forests), to 12,326 feet (Mt. Adams on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest).

As directed by Congress, the Forests are administered under the principle of Multiple Use to guarantee sustained yields of wood, water, forage, wildlife, and recreation—a managed use of these renewable resources in combinations to best meet the needs of the American people.

One-fourth of the National Forest receipts from all resources and uses of the Forests—timber harvest, grazing, minerals, recreation, power, and other land use—are returned to the counties having National Forest lands. In fiscal year 1966, an all-time high of $25,824,836 was paid to 30 Oregon and 27 Washington counties. The total was $4½ million more than the earning distributed to the counties in 1965.

PEOPLE ARE THE KEY

Who are the people who carry out the complex task of National Forest management and protection?

The job in the Pacific Northwest Region is accomplished by a work force of approximately 3,700 permanent full-time employees and 3,800 temporary or seasonal workers. Skills and specialties are many and varied. There are career professionals in specialized fields such as forestry, range management, wildlife biology, soil science, recreation management, landscape architecture, and engineering. Technicians and aides assist in the accomplishment of much of the field work in these areas.

Other occupations include pilots, mechanics, cooks, smokejumpers, warehousemen, and equipment operators. Serving and supporting all of these activities are such administrative functions as auditing, accounting, contracting, personnel management, automatic data processing, and clerical.

Recruitment of sufficient numbers of employees possessing the high qualifications needed is becoming increasingly difficult, and is intensified by the remoteness of many Forest Service offices. Adequate housing also continues as a problem in remote areas.

Competing for college and technical school graduates, Forest Service recruiters visit campuses across the nation, interviewing candidates and explaining Forest Service work. High school "career days" visits, summer work programs, advertising, and other special efforts are also used to inform prospective employees in Forest Service careers.

RECREATION AND THE FORESTS

They came for camping, hiking, climbing, horsbacking, fishing, hunting, skiing, picture-taking, and just plain all-around enjoyment of the outdoors. "They" are the people who came by the millions to the National Forests of the Pacific Northwest in 1966.

The exact recreation visit totals were not known as this report went to press. Final information from the field was yet to be tabulated by electronic computers. It was expected that the totals for 1966 would show new records in recreational use of the National Forests.

In 1965, first year for computing National Forest recreation use by automatic data processing, 23.6 million recreational visitor days were recorded on the National Forests of Oregon and Washington. A visitor day is any combination equal to one person spending a 12-hour period in recreational activity within a National Forest.

If the 1966 figures continue an apparent trend, then most of the recreational visitor days during the year were devoted to camping and picnicking (7.6 million visitor days in

1965), and general enjoyment and sightseeing (6.7 million visitor days in '65).

Among the campgrounds having the heaviest use were the 211 sites, representing 6,155 family camping units, designated in the National Forests of Oregon and Washington for coverage under the Land and Water Conservation Act.

Use of the sites requires payment of a daily fee or the purchase of a $7 permit. In 1966, the permit was in the form of a gold-colored wallet-sized card, replacing the bumper sticker used in 1965, first year of the fee system's operation.

The annual permits are good at some 7,000 designated federal sites—including both National Parks and National Forests—throughout the Nation. In the Pacific Northwest during 1966, the Forest Service sold 25,814 seasonal permits ($160,698), and $1 daily permits accounted for $74,549, for a total of $255,247. Sale of the $7 permits was up 148 percent over 1965; daily permits were up 88 percent; and total income was 127 percent greater.

Snow fun booming

More than 2 million visits were recorded at 28 winter sports sites in the Pacific Northwest Region during the 1965–66 snow season. The total represented a 10 per cent increase over the previous season. Nearly three-fourths of the visits were for skiing, although all types of snow fun continued to grow in popularity.

On the Wenatchee National Forest, the brand new Mission Ridge ski area, 13 miles southwest of Wenatchee, opened for the 1966–67 season with a day lodge and two double chairlifts. Several existing ski areas began the season with newly added services and facilities. They included Crystal Mountain, Snoqualmie National Forest, new double chairlift; Bachelor Butte, Deschutes National Forest, new overnight lodge; Hoodoo Ski Bowl, Willamette National Forest, new double chairlift; Multorpor Ski Bowl, Mt. Hood National Forest, new double chairlift with lights for night skiing; and Timberline, Mt. Hood National Forest, new double chairlift.

Another highlight of the year for winter sports enthusiasts—the Forest Service granted a permit for development of the Hood River Meadows ski area on the east face of Mt. Hood. The new area was expected to be ready for the 1967–68 ski season.

Lot fees increased

Following extensive study, the Forest Service late in 1966 announced that fees for use of the 2,700 summer home lots on National Forest land in Oregon and Washington would be increased in 1967.

The new annual fees, beginning January 1, will vary from $30 for remote, less desirable lots, to $225 for high-value lots fronting on a lake or stream. The average increase per lot will be about $50 per year.

A use fee of 5 per cent of the market value of the lots is standard for National Forest lots. Lot values were established by comparison of more than 250 private lot transactions; and six National Forests with 75 per cent of the summer homes in the region used appraisals by professional, non-government appraisers. Appraisers found that summer home lot values as high as $5,000 were not uncommon.

Federal laws and regulations under which the Forest Service operates require charging fees in keeping with the current land values for this exclusive recreational use.

Wilderness proposal heard

Acting under the 1964 Wilderness Act, the Forest Service announced a proposal to establish a Mt. Jefferson Wilderness of 95,450 acres in the Willamette, Deschutes and Mt. Hood National Forests. A public hearing on the proposal was conducted on October 26 in Salem. Numerous statements made at the hearing, and by letter following the hearing, urged expansion of the boundaries to 125,000 acres. However, there was also considerable support for the wilderness boundaries as proposed, as well as requests for reduction in the size of the wilderness.

Under the proposal, the Mt. Jefferson Wilderness would include 81,549 acres of the existing Mt. Jefferson Primitive Area, established in 1930, plus additional adjoining National Forest lands totalling 13,901 acres.

HUNTING, FISHING ON THE FORESTS

Of all the recreational attractions on the National Forests, fishing and hunting are always near the top of the list. In 1965, when 23.6 million recreational visitor days were counted on the National Forests of the Pacific Northwest Region, 2.7 million visitor days were for fishing, and 1.9 million were for hunting.

By law, joint agreement, and long-lasting tradition, state game commissions are responsible for management and protection of the game, while the Forest Service is responsible for management of the wildlife habitat on National Forest lands.

In addition to continuing work in wildlife habitat improvement, fishery management on the National Forests received strong impetus in 1966 when two fishery specialists were added to the Regional staff. Primary duties of these men include coordination of work by other agencies which affects fishery habitat on the forests, as well as planning for future fishery-oriented water development projects. The fishery specialists also offer intensified training to Forest Service personnel on the environmental needs of the many fish species found in Forest waters.

A wide range of cooperative actions, including the Job Corps fish ladder project described on Page 19, use agreements on fish habitat projects; and management supervision of logging practices, were part of fishery improvement work in 1966. Feasibility investigations of sites for construction of small water impoundments for angling and other recreation benefits continued.

Along with the two fishery specialists, an animal damage control specialist was added to the Regional staff in 1966. His primary duties are to train management personnel in recognizing and identifying animal damage to the forests, devising methods of controlling the damage, and integrating the methods into field use.

THE NATIONAL FORESTS AND GRAZING

The clouds from the mid-summer storm begin to lift, revealing a peaceful pastoral scene of sheep grazing on the rolling green alpine meadow splashed with the color of wildflower patches.

A stream—cold, clear, sparkling—plays through the meadow. Sawtoothed and snow-crowned peaks soar in the distance.

You are visiting Horseshoe Basin in the high country of the Okanogan National Forest in north central Washington. The sheep seem as much a part of this landscape as the meadow, the wildflowers, the stream and the mountains.

And thus it has been for more than half a century.

You see a rider watching over his flock, just as he and his father before him have done for 50 years. The rider, Emmet Smith, is a big friendly man clad in worn leather chaps, army surplus field jacket and battered, sweat-stained Stetson. He tells you about his father, Ross Smith, now 88, first bringing sheep here in 1916 after the Basin had already been under grazing since 1901.

Emmet estimates that in 66 years of use—50 years under the Smith permit—the Basin has fattened at least 85,000 lambs with a value of $1 million, and produced 600,000 pounds of wool worth at least a quarter of a million dollars.

Emmet figures that's probably enough wool to make nearly 200,000 wool shirts like the warm Pendleton he's wearing.

Emmet and District Rancher Bob Snoich of the Okanogan National Forest talk about the range, and you can sense their pride in Horseshoe Basin and the way it has been managed to produce rich grass and bountiful, pure water over the years.

The Smith grazing permit is one of the 1,224 grazing permits administered by the Forest Service on 6.5 million acres of National Forest land in the Pacific Northwest.

In 1966, a total of 118,692 cattle and horses and 88,750 sheep grazed on the 19 National Forests and one National Grassland in the Region, accounting for a return of $255,151 in grazing fees.

While you're visiting in the high country of the Okanogan, you might meet some folks from another ranch operation very much representative of grazing history on the National Forests of the West.

As in the case with the Smith operation, the Victor Lesamiz ranch has a permit for grazing in the North Cascades. The permits were in existence prior to designation of the North Cascades Primitive Area.

Mr. Lesamiz is a success story in the best of the American tradition. He is a Basque who left his native Pyrenees Mountains at the age of 12, first working as a cabin boy. By the time he was 16, he was herding sheep in north central Washington, and he had his own herd at the age of 20. In 1907, he took his first herd into the Cathedral country, and he continues as the holder of one of the oldest grazing permits in the Region. In 1959, the Lesamiz Ranch converted its permit from sheep to cattle.

Every fall, a part of the old West lives again when they bring them down from the high country. Although still active at the age of 75, Mr. Lesamiz didn't make the 1966 drive which was headed up by his son, Victor Jr., and son-in-law, Ed Buchert Sr.

They call it the most rugged cattle drive in the State of Washington. This year it took them from the headwaters of the Similkameen River on the Canadian border to the home ranch near Tonasket—a distance of some 60 miles.

"After four or five days of this, it feels more like 160 miles," grins Vic Lesamiz Jr. over a steaming cup of trail camp coffee.

Range improvements, 1966

Range improvement work on the National Forests and National Grasslands, Pacific Northwest Region, in 1966 included the following:

Seeding of rangelands	acres	13,721
Spraying for control of bush, poisonous plants and noxious weeds	do	6,867
Water spreading projects	do	638
Fence construction	miles	228
Cattleguard construction		83
Spring developments		129
Ponds and reservoirs		129
Stocks driveways	miles	25

TIMBER HARVEST REFLECTS SLOWDOWN

More timber was sold but less was harvested from the National Forests of the Pacific Northwest in 1966, as compared with the record timber harvest of 1965.

The harvest decline was due in part to the substantial cutbacks in many plants using National Forest timber, reflecting the depressing effect on the wood products industry caused by a noticeable reduction in 1966 housing starts.

The amount of timber actually havested from the 19 National Forests in 1966 was 4.7 billion board feet, down from 1965's record 5.4 billion board feet. However, total value of the 1966 harvest was $119.6 million, up more than $10 million over the 1965 figure of $109.4 million.

While logging was on the decrease, timber sales in the Region last year amounted to 4.7 billion board feet with a value of $147.9 million. This was an increase of 263 million board feet over 1965 when sales totalled 4.4 billion board feet with a value of $122 million.

Volume of timber sold varies from the amount cut in any given year because the period in which a timber sale is harvested ranges from a few weeks to several years.

The Pacific Northwest Region's annual sustained-yield allowable cut is 4.325 billion board feet. Since harvest figures are averaged out over a period of years, a higher harvest figure for 1966 does not violate the sustained-yield principle.

National forest timber cut and sold, Pacific Northwest region, 1965–66

	Volume	Value
	Board feet	
Harvested:		
1966	4,728,456,000	$119,673,808
1965	5,419,569,000	109,475,722
Sold:		
1966	4,738,055,000	147,954,094
1965	4,475,085,000	122,011,511

Balloon logging begins

A huge balloon with a 10-ton carrying capacity was put to work in 1966 in the continual search for better ways to log timber from the steeper and more rugged areas of the National Forests in the Pacific Northwest.

With the great variation in terrain and timber size, logging is a challenging task in the Northwest. Timber on the more difficult areas cannot be harvested economically with conventional systems, nor without risking damage to soil and water.

The Forest Service encourages development of new logging equipment and systems by designing timber sales for the most promising of the new systems.

On the Williamette National Forest near Oakridge, the Deception Creek timber sale demonstrated that it is not only possible to successfully log by balloon, but under a certain combination of conditions, balloon logging may be the most desirable timber harvest method.

In principle, the balloon system is a comparatively simple cable method very similar to the conventional highlead. The major differences are that there is no spar tree, and a balloon is attached to the butt rigging to lift the log off the ground and "fly" the load to the landing.

By making it feasible to log the more difficult areas, balloon logging could add millions of board feet annually to the allowable cut on National Forest lands. Road construction could be reduced, and balloon "flying" of the logs could eliminate the damage to soil caused by logs being dragged to the landing by conventional methods.

Timber study launched

While the giant balloon was attracting the attention of Williamette Pass travelers, the Forest Service was launching a monumental study aimed at meeting the ever-increasing demand for timber from the National Forests of the Douglas-fir region.

The study will consider the effects of various intensities of management and timber harvesting rates by decades over the next 80 years. It will develop data on costs, returns, and evaluate impacts on other forest uses.

The study will analyze such technical forestry aspects as different rotation periods; intensive practices such as thinning, intermediate cutting, salvage and prelogging, and accelerated reforestation; protection from insects, disease and fire; accelerated road construction; and impacts of increased soil disturbance.

Also under study will be the effects of various timber management alternatives on other resources such as water, recreation, and fish and wildlife, as well as the impact of alternatives on local, regional and national economies.

Scheduled for completion by July of 1968, the study is described by the Regional Forester as "a pioneering job—a first attempt to provide a sound basis for making the key decisions necessary for modern, effective management of National Forest timber resources."

Other highlights in timber management during the year included development of a comprehensive system to produce most of the accounting records for timber sale business by automatic data process, and use of a new timber sale contract form developed by the Forest Service through negotiation with timber industry representatives.

Insect damage surveyed

Results of the 19th annual aerial survey of some 52 million acres of federal, state and private forest land in Washington and Oregon in 1966 indicated approximately 1.2 million acres were infested by timber killer insects.

Although no large-scale control projects were deemed necessary for 1967, several steps were being taken to reduce and keep losses at a minimum.

In northeast Washington, parasitic wasps were released for biological control of the larch casebearer, a defoliator of larch timber. Additional releases of the casebearer's natural enemies are planned for 1967.

Surveillance and eradication of the European pine shoot moth continued in Oregon and Washington. New infestations were detected in three Washington communities—Longview, Port Angeles, and Prosser—all located outside the established zone of containment. An infestation was found and eradicated in a Portland nursery which had shipped infested pines to Davis, California, where the trees were intercepted and destroyed.

LAND EXCHANGES

Additional progress was made during 1966 in the continuing program to block up National Forest lands into more manageable units. Six exchanges involving 1,598 acres of National Forest land and 1,936 acres of private land were completed under the General Exchange Act.

At year's end, three more exchanges were in the final approval stage. The cases involved 14,770 acres of National Forest land and 13,608 acres of private land. Two tracts of recreational land, totalling 154 acres, were purchased under the Land and Water Conservation Act, which provides authority to purchase land needed for public recreation.

During the year, negotiations were completed on 10 new share-cost road agreements, or major road purchases, between the Forest Service and private timber owners. The typical agreement covers an area of checkerboard land ownership. It provides for sharing construction and maintenance costs, and exchanging rights-of-way, for a joint road system within the area. Over the years, about 1,500 miles of road have been built under share-cost agreements, making 50 billion board feet of timber available for harvest.

In addition, the Region acquired some 500 road easements this year, mostly through negotiation. In 20 cases, or four per cent, condemnation action was required in order to provide essential multiple use access.

TRANSPORTATION STRIDES MADE

The year 1966 was another period of progress in the development of an adequate transportation system on the National Forests of the Pacific Northwest.

Representing a total investment value of $46.9 million, 1,736 miles of Forest Service road were constructed or reconstructed by purchasers of National Forest timber, and 489 miles were constructed by the Forest Service under contract from funds appropriated by Congress.

Also, 36 bridges were constructed at a value of $1.3 million, and 131 miles of trail were built or rebuilt at a cost of $690,000.

In October, the Region put into effect a regulation by the Secretary of Agriculture providing for cost recovery on special service roads. Under this concept of transportation system management, the Forest Service may require haulers of non-federal products, commodities and materials to pay their proportionate share of the government's investment in construction.

BAROMETER WATERSHEDS HAVE IMPORTANT ROLE

"Barometer watershed" became a new term that assumed increasing importance during 1966 under the Forest Service's vital responsibility for maintaining and improving the precious lifeline of clean and abundant water flowing from the National Forests.

Representing nearly half of the total water runoff in the Pacific Northwest, water from the National Forests serves the needs of more than 150 cities, generates electric power, irrigates crops and orchards, and provides endless recreation opportunities.

Four barometer watersheds have been established within the Region to serve as pilot projects for the Forest Service to evaluate watershed and multiple resource management practices. The barometer watersheds are the Green River, Snoqualmie National Forest, involving some 148,000 acres; the Entiat River, Wenatchee National Forest, 130,000 acres; upper Clackamas River, Mt. Hood National Forest, 87,000 acres, and north fork of the Umatilla River, Umatilla National Forest, 85,000 acres.

Installation of scientific instrumentation, allowing watershed management experts to figuratively record the pulse of the barometer watersheds, was nearly completed in 1966.

Watershed management principles developed from Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station reseach will be applied to actual on-the-ground use, and the instrumentation will enable Forest officers to monitor the effects of applied programs.

Among the most promising of the new practices is the work to increase water yields from National Forest lands in water-short areas. Through prescribed manipulation of vegetation cover, installation of snow fences, and other measures, it is hoped that a greater snowpack will be obtained to result in higher total water yields without increasing the risk of flood.

JOB CORPSMEN NOTE PROGRESS

For the Pacific Northwest Region's four Job Corps Conservation Centers, 1966 was the first full year of operation in helping to provide a better life for young men from poverty stricken homes.

Three Conservation Centers operated by the Forest Service and the Office of Economic Opportunity are in Oregon—Wolf Creek, Umpqua National Forest; Angell, Siuslaw National Forest; and Timber Lake, Mount Hood National Forest. The fourth center, Cispus, is in Washington on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. The centers have a total capacity of 800 Job Corpsmen, offering them work, basic education and vocational training, and social opportunities.

In fiscal year 1966, the four Centers graduated 229 Corpsmen to urban centers for advanced vocational training, and 220 were placed in jobs or entered the military service.

Conservation project accomplishments in 1966 by the four Centers included 354 acres of forest thinning and pruining; 300 acres of reforestation by planting or seeding; 39 campgrounds and picnic sites constructed or rehabilitated; 3.3 miles of road construction or improvement; 14.8 miles of trial construction and betterment; 13.9 miles of trail maintenance and seven miles of road maintenance; seven trail bridges constructed or improved; 361 bushels of cones gathered, and two heliports constructed.

Job Corps Center fire suppression crews distinguished themselves during the critical 1966 fire season, spending 2,500 man-days in fighting forest and range wildfires.

Corpsmen were also utilized on such projects as slash burning, telephone line main-

tenance, recreation and administrative site landscaping, construction and maintenance of Center facilities, and stream channel cleanup.

In a cooperative project designed to improve fishery habitat in the Collawash River drainage, Timber Lake Job Corpsmen began construction of a fishway over Pegleg Falls on Nohorn Creek. The job, to be completed in 1967, has the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries providing the funds, the Oregon State Fish Commission doing the engineering and design, and the Forest Service Job Corpsmen serving as the work force. Several miles of spawning and rearing area will be made available.

FOREST FIRE SEASON SEVERE

Prolonged drought conditions prevailed over Oregon and washington during 1966, and the fire season was one of the most severe on record.

On lands protected by the Forest Service in the Pacific Northwest Region, 1,460 fires blackened 12,890 acres of timber and range lands. The number of fires was 439 less than in 1965, but the acreage was four times as great.

The Winter Rim Fire, covering 6,222 acres on the Fremont National Forest, was the largest fire of the season on land protected by the Forest Service in the Pacific Northwest Region. Starting August 15 from a logging operation, the Winter Rim fire accounted for about half of the total acreage burned during the season in the Region.

Other large fires included the Hornet Creek Fire, Wenatchee National Forest, caused by lighting on August 26, 1,520 acres; Lostine Fire, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, started from refuse burning August 18 outside the Forest boundary, 1,245 acres of state and Forest protected land; and Devils Ridge Fire, Mt. Hood National Forest, believed started by an incendiarist on August 20, 1,230 acres.

The fires spread rapidly and were difficult to control, reflecting severe burning conditions. Hot and dry weather began in late March and continued through October over much of the Pacific Northwest. By mid-August, southeastern Oregon was described by the Weather Bureau as being in a condition of "extreme" drought. Pendleton had the driest April-June period since 1890. Lakeview, headquarters of the Fremont National Forest where the Winter Rim Fire occurred, suffered its driest season since 1931.

One favorable factor was a decrease in lightning-caused fires. The 694 blazes in this category were about 70 per cent of the 10-year average.

Aircraft continued to be a vital weapon in the battle against fires. Aerial detection was used to locate fires; smokejumpers were quickly dropped to launch an immediate attack; aerial tankers "bombed" fires with retardants to hold back the spread of the flames. If a situation worsened, fresh attack crews were flown in, some from great distances.

Fire occurrence

On lands protected by the Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, in Oregon and Washington.

	10-year average	1965	1966
Number of fires:			
Lightning	1,054	1,131	694
Man-caused	642	768	766
Total	1,696	1,899	1,460
Area burned (acres)	15,157	3,209	12,890

PROTECTING STATE, PRIVATE TIMBER

Management and protection of the 25,000,000 acres of private and state forest lands in Oregon and Washington are of major importance to this region and to the nation. They include much of the Pacific Northwest's most productive and accessible land. These lands are heavily used by recreationists, local residents, and others. They have provided most of the timber to supply the wood using industry in past years and the second-growth stands will provide much of the pulp and log requirements in future years.

The State Forestry Department in Oregon and the Department of Natural Resources in Washington administer many activities on these lands. On State-owned lands, this includes all multiple use activities. On private lands, fire control is the major responsibility, but State personnel promote good forest management practices. The federal government encourages protection and forest management on these lands by providing financial assistance. During the current fiscal year, federal allotments amount to some $675,000 for each state.

In addition to its regular budget, Oregon spent almost $1 million for extra costs to suppress fires during the 1966 season.

Federal-State cooperative fire control activity started in 1913 when a little more than $20,000 was divided between the two states to provide better protection. Today's protection program involves vastly increased expenditures, protection of all state and privately-owned forest lands, increased values of the timber and other resources protected, and an all-out effort to prevent fires or to control them with a minimum of acreage burned.

The 1966 fire season on state-protected lands was one of the driest in recent years. Fuels became excessively dry. This condition culminated on August 20 when a spark from equipment on a road started the Oxbow Ridge Fire. In two days the fire burned most of the ultimate 46,500 acres covered by this fire.

The State and Western Lane Fire Protection Association mobilized up to 1,000 protection personnel, logging industry employees, inmate crews, and other firefighters. Also, 165 pieces of mechanical equipment were assembled, including bulldozers, pumpers, tankers and power saws. A mobile weather unit was used to provide on-the-spot forecasts. Helicopters were used to dump some 153,000 pounds of fire retardant slurry on the fire as well as for mapping and scouting the fire. The fire was eventually controlled within 75 miles of firelines, but was the largest fire in Oregon in many years except for the three Tillamook Burn fires.

In 1966, Washington suppressed 1,331 fires with 1,616 acres burned. Oregon had 1,324 fires that burned a total of 57,044 acres. Both states are continually devising ways and means to prevent fires and also to control them more effectively after they start. Some of this year's activity included the following:

Debris burning started 385 fires on private lands during 1966 in Oregon and Washington. Oregon Department of Forestry personnel conducted a statewide interview survey to discover basic reasons for these fires. An analysis of this survey data will provide guidelines for future prevention measures to reduce fires from this cause.

Railroads accounted for 317 fires in the two states. Many of these fires resulted from ignition of an accumulation of chips on the right-of-way. Largely as a result of State protection personnel efforts, a netting is now spread over loaded chip cars to eliminate loss of chips. Continued use should eventually reduce the chip hazard on rights-of-way and result in fewer fires. Effort is also continuing to eliminate exhaust sparks and other causes of these fires.

Training of state protection personnel has been supplemented by use of the Forest Service fire simulator at Redmond, Oregon. About 120 men from the Oregon State Forestry Department and 45 men from the Washington Department of Natural Resources participated in the training. The simulator has proven very effective in teaching new suppression methods, policies, and individual responsibilities for taking effective action on fires.

A nationwide forest fire damage appraisal program was started this year by all state forestry departments. One of the training sessions was held in Eugene, Oregon, where representatives from California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska were instructed on procedures and developed criteria for use in this area. Data will be collected on fuels burned, weather, topography, time of day, and other factors influencing the intensity of the fire. This information combined with the data on timber damage will be correlated with forest surve statistics and processed nationally to obtain the fire damage to timber resources. When sufficient samples have been taken, damage can eventually be computed without the extensive field work now required.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Honorable E. D. "Debbs" Potts, president of the Senate of the Legislative Assembly of Oregon, brought to the attention of my colleague [Senator HATFIELD] and myself Enrolled Senate Joint Memorial 1, memorializing the Congress of the United States to "refrain from restricting, by legislative or other means, the availability of credit for agricultural loans."

This memorial was adopted by the Senate of the Oregon Legislature on February 14, 1967, and by the house of the legislature on February 22, 1967.

Agriculture is one of Oregon's major industries, and for that reason Senate Joint Memorial 1 is of special importance.

On behalf of Senator HATFIELD and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the memorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled, the Honorable Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and the Honorable Governor of the Farm Credit Administration:

We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, more respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the demands for credit for agricultural loans are necessarily increasing with the greater need for and increased costs of labor, materials, irrigation, and farm machinery; and

Whereas the growth in economic prosperity of agriculture has not kept pace with that of other industries; and

Whereas it is necessary to insure sufficient production of critical foodstuffs and fibers to support a growing population; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Congress of the United States, the Department of Agriculture, and the Farm Credit Administration are memorialized to refrain from restricting, by legislation or other means, the availability of credit for agricultural loans.

(2) The Chief Clerk shall send a copy of this memorial to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

Adopted by Senate February 14, 1967.
CECIL L. EDWARDS,
Secretary of Senate.
ED "DEBBS" POTTS,
President of Senate.
Adopted by House February 22, 1967.
F. F. MONTGOMERY,
Speaker of House.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON HOLDS THE LINE IN NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, President Johnson has recently been attacked for not having held Federal employment levels down to September 1966 levels when the President issued a job-freeze order. I think that such criticism is unwarranted.

The President's job-freeze order of September 1966, specifically exempted the Department of Defense because of its obvious manpower needs in the Vietnam conflict. It exempted the Post Office Department which, as we all know, has been working around the clock to keep up with the growing volume of mail. And it exempted the Selective Service System, whose employment needs have increased because of our Armed Forces requirements.

These are not Great Society programs. They are, for the most part, the direct result of America's commitments in Vietnam.

Moreover, a job freeze does not mean that there may be no changes in employment. It means that employment may not exceed—but may rise to—freeze levels. When the President issued his freeze order in September of last year, it held job levels down to the June–July 1966 level. If actual employment in certain departments was below that level, it could rise to it without violating the order.

But the crucial facts are these. From the freeze level—of June–July of last year—until March 1967, total Federal employment did rise more than 105,000. But that rise is represented by Defense, Post Office, and Selective Service. Actually, employment in all other departments of the Federal Government declined by more than 11,000 during that period. The President's job-freeze order has been very effective.

No one wants to undermine the Vietnam effort because the Defense Department could not recruit needed experts. No one wants to let the mail go undelivered because the Post Office simply did not have needed men. Nor does anyone want to stop the Selective Service System from operating because it could not increase its employment.

President Johnson has been the most cost-conscious President in the White House in recent years. Under his leadership, we had 3 successive years of relatively stable Federal force levels. And the basic reason for an increase during the past year has been increased Defense and national security and Post Office requirements.

I do not think there is even an argument here. I think we ought to get straight just where employment has increased and why. Unjustified criticism is misleading and reflects badly on an administration trying to do a good job at home and abroad under very exacting circumstances.

(At this point, Mr. BREWSTER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

LIMITATION OF AID TO GREECE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I notice in today's press references to the fact that major items of U.S. arms aid to Greece are being limited.

I commend the administration for this step and would hope that all military assistance would be held up until the Government of Greece announces the holding of free elections and a return to the normal constitutional process. Even then, I believe we should take a good, hard look at the actual prospects of Communist threat or Bulgarian invasion before reaching a decision on this matter. My own belief is that far too much American military equipment and assistance to date have been used as a counterpoise to Turkey and in the implementation of the recent coup.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, and in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 18, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord is the strength of my life.—Psalm 27: 1.

O God, our Father, whose still small voice calls us to turn aside for a moment from the weary ways of a worried world to wait upon Thee and to find our strength in Thee—make us aware of Thy Spirit, as we bow before the altar of Thy presence. Amid the haste of daily duties and the pressure of persistent problems may we find in Thee strength for the day, wisdom to make sound decisions, and the spirit of good will to motivate all our endeavors on behalf of our beloved country.

With a consciousness of Thy presence alive within us and tapping the unfailing resources of our faith may our souls be restored, our minds refreshed, our bodies renewed and together may we be made ready for the tasks and the responsibilities we face these hours.

"Lead us, O Father, in the paths of right:
Blindly we stumble when we walk alone,
Involved in shadows of a darksome night;
Only with Thee we journey safely on."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 666) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. THURMOND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 67–9.

ROGERS PRAISES U.S. BACKING OF OAS MEETING ON CUBAN SUBVERSION

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago a subversive team from Cuba tried to land on Venezuelan soil and were captured. To the Venezuelan Government this represented an open attempt on the part of Communist Cuba to export subversion and potential revolution.

At that time I spoke here asking that the United States back Venezuela if our neighbor called for a meeting of the members of the Organization of American States to discuss the pending danger of Cuban subversion in South America.

Yesterday Venezuela made such a request, and I am proud that the United States has not hesitated to support this request.

Events of the past year have made it evident that Castro does not intend to shy away from his promise to export subversion throughout South America. This