

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trinity Industries, Inc., 4001 Irving Boulevard, Dallas, Tex.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Luther L. Miller, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jack Mills, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. Charles B. Murray, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Automotive Service Industry Association, 168 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Campaign for Agricultural Democracy, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 202 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Retired Teachers Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Oliver, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Susanne Lois Orrin, in care of UAW, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee on Africa, 211 East 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David J. Pattison, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of Life Underwriters, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. George Pazianos, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Howard O. Robinson, Jr., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Royall, Koegel, Rogers & Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Realty & Petroleum Corp., 16 West 61st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Jonathan W. Sloat, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert Wm. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Mr. Stanley L. Sommer, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 404 Commerce Building, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles L. Stewart, Jr., 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corp., 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 404 Commerce Building, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Union Industriale Prato, Prato, Italy; American Textile Importers Association, 200 West 34th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Sutherland, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. World Airways, Inc., Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif.

A. Evert S. Thomas, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Clark W. Thompson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Independent Telephone Association.

A. Phillip Tocker, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Tucker, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United Business Schools Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rein J. Vander Zee, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Installment Land Sales & Development Association of Florida, Inc., 420 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Robert H. Voight, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. Walker, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hanna Mining Co., 100 Erlevue Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Charles A. Webb, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, Association of Intercity Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert P. Will, 487 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert N. Winter-Berger, 123 East 75th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lewis F. Wood, 1900 West 29th Street, Pine Bluff, Ark.

B. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Development Corp., 2828 Coral way, Miami, Fla., Holly Corp., 1111 West Pothill Boulevard, Azusa, Calif., Cherokee Village in care of John Mack Smith, Post Office Box 830, West Memphis, Ark.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

O merciful God, whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever, we beseech Thee to grant unto us, who in the morning seek Thy face, the benediction which a sense of Thy presence lends to each new day. Unite our hearts and minds to bear the burdens that are laid upon us.

To Thee we lift our hearts in prayer, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite hearts.

Help us in all things to be masters of ourselves that we may be servants of all.

Wilt Thou crown our deliberations with Thy wisdom and with spacious thinking to fit these epic days.

As heralds of Thy love, send us forth across all barriers of race and creed, bearing to yearning hearts, as a holy sacrament, the bread of human kindness and the red wine of willing sacrifice.

Make real to us that kingdom whose radiant verities are its faith, its ideals, its visions which shine on the far horizons and its aspirations that lay hold of God and goodness without alloy.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday,

May 25, and Monday, May 29, 1967, was dispensed with.

REPORT ON SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Fourth Annual Report on Special International Exhibitions conducted during fiscal year 1966 under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

The primary purpose of the program—in which the Nation's economic, social, and cultural achievements are exhibited in international fairs and expositions—is to build bridges of understanding between the United States and other countries of the world. Each exhibit is designed to show how our accomplishments relate to the capabilities and aspirations of the different countries. Because the exhibitions feature the products of American industries, they also contribute to mutually profitable trade relationships.

Since the program began in 1954, more than 100 million people—primarily in Eastern Europe and the developing countries—have witnessed 176 exhibits designed to help them understand, appreciate, and benefit from American progress and experience.

During fiscal year 1966, the United States participated in a broad range of international events:

Trade fair exhibitions in Algeria, Ethiopia, Hungary, Iran, Poland, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia: These exhibitions dramatized our progress in mechanical equipment for farm and industry, educational techniques, electronics, and space.

Expo 67: During the year, plans were laid for our participation in the World's Fair which opened in Montreal, Canada, in April 1967. "Creative America" was chosen as the theme of this country's exhibit, which pictures American achievements in the arts and space technology.

Labor exhibits at trade fairs in Ethiopia, Hungary, Iraq, Poland, and Yugoslavia: The purpose of these exhibits was to project the true image of the American worker and the role he plays in the affairs of this Nation.

Special-purpose East-West exhibits in the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia: More than 2 million persons attended these exhibits, which featured the machinery of American industry, American architecture, and the graphic arts.

As in past years, the program's effectiveness was the result not only of Government efforts, but also of the contribution of materials, time, and talent by hundreds of private firms.

All Americans are indebted to them for their efforts to help carry America's message to the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 31, 1967.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board for fiscal year 1966.

For three decades the insurance system administered by the Board has been protecting railroad workers and their families against the economic hazards which accompany unemployment, sickness, old age, and death.

During the period covered by this report, more than 1 million individuals received \$1.2 billion in retirement and survivor benefits—an increase of \$82 million over the preceding year. These payments brought to \$14.5 billion the total amount paid to retired employees, wives, and survivors of deceased employees since the program began in 1936.

In fiscal 1966 payments for unemployment and sickness dropped below the \$100 million mark—to \$88.1 million—for the first time in 13 years. This reduction reflects the unprecedented economic expansion which this country has enjoyed during the last 6 years. In each, unemployment among railroad workers showed a significant decline.

The increases in retirement and survivor benefits reported here represented increased comfort and security in the retirement years of many worthy citizens. But even greater comfort and protection would come with congressional enactment of the social security amendments which I have proposed this year. The proposed 20-percent increase would in the first year alone bring \$65 million in added benefits to some 385,000 railroad workers and their families.

I again urge the Congress to take this vital step toward our goal of providing every elderly citizen an adequate income and a meaningful retirement.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 31, 1967.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

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

On May 26, 1967:

S. 1161. An act to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On May 25, 1967:

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, and other laws relating to housing and urban development, to correct certain obsolete references.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid be-

fore the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 24, 1967,

The Secretary of the Senate, on May 26, 1967, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5357) to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89-487.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 399. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain real property to the city of Batavia, N.Y.;

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. 5357. An act to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89-487;

H.R. 7965. An act to transfer title to tribal land on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9481. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment; that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill and asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RIVERS, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. BATES, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. O'KONSKI were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution

(S.J. Res. 26) designating February of each year as "American History Month," with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) to declare the week of June 18 "National Coal Week."

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

H.R. 7819. An act to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) marking the 175th anniversary of the admission of Kentucky to the Union, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 7819. An act to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INSURANCE AND GUARANTEES ISSUED TO YUGOSLAVIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of April 1967, not previously reported, totaled \$942; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON RECEIPTS FOR MEDICAL STOCKPILE OF CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarterly period ended March 31, 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July 1966-March 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

H. RES. 230

Whereas, the following bills have been introduced in the 90th Congress:

1. Employee-management relations: H.R. 460, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ), and S. 341, introduced by Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md). These bills seek to improve employee-management relations in the federal governmental structure.

2. Higher salary levels: H.R. 5407, introduced by Representative Arnold Olsen (D-Mont), and S. 854, introduced by Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md). These bills seek to raise Levels 1-5 postal employees to Levels 2-6, with a "saved rate" factor for those persons in steps 11 and 12 of each level at the time of enactment.

3. Basic Monday-Friday workweeks: H.R. 5407, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ). This bill would establish a basic Monday through Friday workweek in the postal service with employees to be paid at the rate of time and one-half for work on Saturdays and double time on Sundays and Holidays.

4. Life insurance: S. 271, introduced by Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md), and H.R. 464, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ). These bills would improve life insurance benefits for all federal employees.

5. Sick leave credits: S. 759, introduced by Senator Ralph Yarborough (D-Tex), and H.R. 464, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ). These bills would give an employee at the time of his retirement the option of being paid one-half the cash value of accumulated sick leave, or have the total number of days credited for retirement purposes.

6. Health benefits: S. 1065, introduced by Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md) and H.R. 6351, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ). These bills would require the federal government to pay the entire cost of the employee Health Benefits Program.

7. 30-year optional retirement: S. 104, introduced by Senator Hiram L. Fong (R-Haw), and H.R. 1186, introduced by Representative Byron G. Rogers (D-Col). These bills would permit an employee to retire after 30 years of service, regardless of age and without reduction in annuity.

8. Prohibit work measurement: H.R. 766, introduced by Representative Edna F. Kelly (D-NY). This bill would prohibit the use of

measuring devices or methods for determining the efficiency of postal clerks.

9. Postal substitute overtime: H.R. 1023, introduced by Representative Richard L. Ottinger (D-NY). This bill would provide overtime pay for substitute postal employees for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a single day.

10. Invasion of privacy: S. 1035, introduced by Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (D-NC), and sixty other Senators; H.R. 6390, introduced by Representative Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis). These bills would prevent unwarranted government invasions of the privacy of federal employees.

11. 35-hour workweek: H.R. 7346, introduced by Representative Arnold Olsen (D-Mont). This bill would establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for federal employees.

Whereas, these bills would materially improve the working conditions of federal employees, increase their employment benefits and increase their efficiency; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1967, that it request the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the above mentioned bills introduced in the 90th Congress; and

Be it further resolved that duly authenticated copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF IOWA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk two concurrent resolutions from the Iowa State Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution 40 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 43 and ask that they be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

The concurrent resolutions were referred to the appropriate committees, as follows:

To the Committee on Appropriations:

[From the General Assembly of the State of Iowa]

S. CON. RES. 40

Whereas, Iowans wish to honor Herbert Hoover, the 31st President of the United States, and the only Iowan ever to be elected President of the United States, and

Whereas, the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site at West Branch, Iowa, is of national interest, attracting more than 750,000 visitors since 1962, and

Whereas, this site includes the Presidential library and museum, and the grounds are the location of the former President's birthplace cottage and the gravesites of President and Mrs. Hoover, and

Whereas, the present site is incomplete and inadequate and part of it is in an unfinished and unsightly condition, Now Therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Iowa, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the General Assembly of the State of Iowa urges the Congress of the United States to approve the President's \$470,000 appropriation request which was included in the Interior Department's appropriation bill for land and building acquisition and development at the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this

Resolution be forwarded to each of the members of the Iowa delegation in Congress.

ROBERT D. FULTON,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
AL MEACHAM,
Secretary of the Senate.
MAURICE E. BARINGER,
Speaker of the House.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

[From the General Assembly of the State of Iowa]

S. CON. RES. 43

Whereas, United States Department of Defense statistics for fiscal year 1966 reveal that 873 of the 4,873 servicemen killed in Vietnam fighting for freedom were interred in national cemeteries; and

Whereas, many more of the servicemen who have lost their lives would probably also have been buried in a national cemetery had there been space available near the home of the next of kin; and

Whereas, there are those in governmental authority who are against expanding the national cemetery system or providing additional space in those national cemeteries already existing; and

Whereas, the burial allowances of the Veterans Administration and those allowances provided under Federal Social Security are far too meager in many instances to provide for the last rites of many veterans and servicemen; and

Whereas, world unrest is again exposing and committing large numbers of persons to military service and battle; and

Whereas, this is not a proper time for limiting or closing the national cemetery system to those presently serving or expecting to serve in the uniform of our country; now therefore

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House concurring, that the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to take such action as is necessary to direct the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and other appropriate governmental agencies to establish and maintain an adequate and permanent national cemetery system to provide burial space for all United States military servicemen or women so entitled and who wish to be so interred; and

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Senate forward copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, United States Secretary of Defense, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Iowa delegation serving in the United States Congress.

ROBERT D. FULTON,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
AL MEACHAM,
Secretary of the Senate.
MAURICE E. BARINGER,
Speaker of the House.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. MORTON):

S. 1882. A bill to provide for deductions of political contributions, to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and to prohibit solicitation of Federal employees by political committees; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:
S. 1883. A bill to amend the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and myself, a bill designed to provide for deduction from taxable income of political contributions, to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and to prohibit solicitation of Federal employees by political committees.

Under this bill extra deductions of \$100 would be allowed to each individual who contributes to the party or the candidate of his choice. The Corrupt Practices Act would be amended to provide full disclosure by all political committees, whether operating in a single State or otherwise. Second, the bill would provide that the Corrupt Practices Act be amended to cover primaries as well as general elections. Third, the law as amended would place a complete prohibition against any solicitation of Government employees, either by other Government employees or by any political committee on their behalf, for campaign contributions.

I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 1882) to provide for deductions of political contributions, to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and to prohibit solicitation of Federal employees by political committees, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. MORTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SENATORS WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE AND RANDOLPH AGREE ELECTION CAMPAIGNS SHOULD BE SHORTENED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Surely.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I compliment the Senator from Delaware on his giving continuous close study to the problems connected with election of Members of the Congress and of the President and Vice President of the United States.

While I in no wise would wish to claim that I anticipated what the Senator was thinking and recently stated in reference to the compression of long political campaigns into a period of 5 or 6 weeks, the record will disclose—and it is not important for me to document it here today—that several years ago I advocated the shortening of presidential campaigns in this country, and also the campaigns for membership in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I was drawing, as the able Senator from Delaware perhaps has drawn, on the experience with shorter campaigns in Great Britain. The parallel between the situations in Great Britain and the United States is not perfect, of course,

because of the greater population density and the smaller size of that country. But, with present-day improved methods of transportation and communication in this country, it seems to me to be highly important that the proposal now made by the Senator from Delaware for the shortening of election campaigns for the offices of President and Vice President be given very careful consideration. He bases his argument, in part, for shorter campaigns on the financial drain on the parties which the present lengthy campaigns entail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for such additional time as completion of the colloquy may require.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. The drain on the treasuries of the parties is an important consideration. But certainly there is a drain also on the resources of the candidates themselves and, in many instances, those of their friends who wish to properly assist them in seeking public office.

I think it is important that we realize that the people of the United States will no longer suffer from a lack of information by reducing the length of campaigns to the shorter period contemplated by the proposal of the Senator from Delaware. With our present media of communication and methods and modes for exchange of opinions and information, the American people can and will be made aware of essential campaign facts and candidate positions and will be able to respond to them within the contemplated 5 or 6 weeks. It is no longer necessary that campaigns run 3 or 4 months.

I believe the proposal is very timely, and that we would do well to consider this matter of campaign limitations in connection with the other proposals presented by the Senator from Delaware and other Senators, having to do with expenditures, the filing of reports, and the general subject matter of election campaigns.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator, and I add that the shortening of campaign is an important part of the proposed program.

I understand that it would not require a change in the Federal law to shorten political campaigns but that it would require action by many of the State legislatures which have designated deadlines before which candidates must file. In my own State, for example, the deadline is early in September.

I have discussed this issue with various officials of the national committees of both major parties and have corresponded with the chairmen of the two committees. I shall ask them to present their views on the length of campaigns when this measure is before our committee on the question of financing.

I would say further that I have received much support from many people, not only those who have had experience in campaigns at the presidential level but also many Members of Congress who feel that the shortening of the campaigns would be a constructive step.

I have suggested that the national

committees get together and arrange for the national conventions to take place early in September after Labor Day to be followed automatically by the State conventions in September. By late September we could have all the conventions out of the way, and in the 5 or 6 weeks which follow there would be ample time for a concentrated campaign. There would be adequate time to place the issues before the American people and could be done in a far more intelligent manner than through the long-drawn-out campaign as at present, with so much repetition.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his support.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not feel that the prospective situations in any of the years just ahead, are in anywise similar to the situation in 1896 when William Jennings Bryan was running for the Presidency against William McKinley. There are those who say, whether correctly or not, that had Mr. Bryan had a few more weeks in which to campaign, he could have been elected.

I shall not discuss that point except to say that in those days the candidate in question had to carry on his campaign without the present comprehensive nationwide coverage in the daily press, entirely without the media of radio and television, and also without a mobile American population. People then were more or less confined to one area. But our modes and methods of transportation and communication today are another element which helps make unnecessary the long campaigns of the days of William Jennings Bryan and William McKinley.

I wish that Mr. Bryan might have been elected President of the United States, of course, but it is not the situation which prevailed in 1896. In that year there were campaigning handicaps which are not present in this era. It is the situation which prevails today that we are attempting to meet and campaigning ground rules might logically be modernized.

For that reason, I think the shortening of the presidential campaign is a timely and valid suggestion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. There is no question that extended campaigns were essential in the days prior to the television, radio, and the widespread distribution of our daily press. In recent years, however, general communication and travel have advanced. We are living in a new age, and certainly we should move our campaigns out of the horse and buggy stage.

I thank the Senator.

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL JURY SELECTION BILLS (S. 383, S. 384, S. 385, S. 386, S. 387, S. 989, S. 1319)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce a change

in the Federal jury selection hearings for June.

It was previously announced the hearings would be held at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 6, Wednesday, June 14, and Wednesday, June 28, 1967, in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, 6226, New Senate Office Building. I wish to announce one change: the hearing on June 14 will now be held on Tuesday, June 20, at the same time and in the same room as previously scheduled.

NOTICE OF NEW DATES FOR HEARINGS ON RETIREMENT AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last month I announced that the Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual of the Senate Special Committee on Aging would conduct its first hearings on May 22 and 23. However due to a conflict with other business of the Senate, these hearings had to be postponed. I am pleased today to announce that the hearings have now been rescheduled and will be held June 7 and 8. These will be general survey hearings and from all indications they will yield helpful testimony from many experts.

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Federal Aviation Administration wants Congress to dip once more into the public coffers—this time for \$198 million—so that it can carry on with the development of a gigantic, probably useless, and potentially menacing development: the supersonic transport.

Congress has already appropriated \$531 million for the SST. If we approve this new request, the total will be \$729 million. By the time the SST prototypes are built and tested, the Government will have poured nearly \$1.3 billion into a venture of questionable value. And that is not likely to be the end of Government financial participation, despite FAA protests to the contrary. If the manufacturers get their way, the total Government investment could go as high as \$4 billion.

What do we get for this huge investment of public money? We get a plane that cuts time in the air between New York and Paris from 6 hours to 2½. That is an important accomplishment. To perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the population—the high-powered international businessmen, the impatient jet set playboys and the like—it is pleasant and it is fun. But is it more important than finding a cure for air and water pollution? Is it more important than attacking the roots of poverty? Is it more important than eliminating unemployment by training the unskilled? Is it more important than building an educational system throughout the land that will provide every child, whatever his race or origin, with the opportunity to fully develop his potential?

These are the choices. We do not have the money to do everything. In a period of rapidly spiraling war costs and mounting budget deficits, deciding what stands at the top of our list of national

priorities is more difficult than usual. The House made a choice the other day. It decided to kill the rent supplements program which would cost us a relatively small amount in the coming fiscal year and would do immeasurable good. Is this how we are going to order our priorities?

I am sure it will be of great interest to the young tradesman in Kenosha with a family of five to support, or to the struggling middle-aged businessman in Dubuque trying to put two children through college, or to the family of 10 in Harlem living on a subsistence income, to know how their Federal Government arranges its priorities. They are likely to wonder a bit—to put it mildly—about a standard of values that puts a gigantic frill like the SST ahead of a countless number of vitally necessary projects.

Speed is not the ultimate value. Even strong advocates of the SST do not dwell very long on the speed of this plane when they are defending it. Surely, they, too, have been struck by the irony of a world increasingly knotted and twisted in endless traffic jams, where terrific speed in the air is canceled out by long periods in holding patterns, waiting for clearance to land, and by long frustrating trips on the ground to and from the airport. Surely, they see that speed, too, is subject to the law of diminishing returns. I have no doubt that we may soon have the technical capacity to build a passenger missile that could travel at 10 and 20 times the speed of sound and shoot a man from New York to Sydney in an hour. A man, of course, would arrive at his destination in a condition roughly comparable to that of a jellyfish.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The comments of the Senator make it possible to draw the conclusion that because of the difficulty of landing, the plane might turn around and return to London before it could land.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator raises an excellent point. I believe that all of us who have flown in this country—the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Wisconsin have flown—know how frequently this kind of situation occurs.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

I agree with Bo K. O. Lundberg, Director General of the Aeronautical Research Institute of Sweden, who observed that most prospective missile passengers not specifically trained as astronauts would probably find it pointless to save even a whole day of travel if they then needed perhaps a week to recover from the excitement of having been shot as part of a bullet or meteor. But, it might be an efficient substitute for narcotics.

So we do not hear much about the need for tripling the speed of commercial air travel from the SST advocates. What

we hear instead is this: We are told the SST will prevent our aircraft industry from losing its worldwide superiority to the Anglo-French consortium, which is 3 years ahead of us in the supersonic race. We are told it will provide work for thousands. We are assured the project will result in an immense technological fall-out. And, finally, we are assured by FAA and the manufacturers that it will have a highly favorable effect on the balance-of-payments position of the United States.

These are important considerations. But prudent people do not buy an expensive car just to decorate the driveway in front of their house. They buy it so they can drive from point A to point B. If they do buy it solely for decoration, then most of us, I think, would agree that they are being wasteful. But, if they can afford it, if it is not going to take food out of the mouths of their children, it is charged off to extravagance or eccentricity and forgotten. I think the analogy applies to the SST. This project is being sold to us not on the grounds that we have a vital need for a plane that would cut in half the length of the flight from New York to Paris. That is what we are paying for. But that is not the way it is being sold to us. Instead, we are told we need to build the SST to keep our aircraft industry in the peak of health. Does that mean the Government should take \$4 billion out of the taxpayers' pockets to build a nuisance machine that would criss-cross the country with 50-mile-wide carpets of sonic booms, a machine that would transform the world into a huge drop-forged foundry?

The Federal Government is gearing up to do just that in order to protect an industry which does not need the protection at all, if it has the superiority it claims. The trouble is the SST may turn out to be the scourge of the industry rather than a boon to it. Karl M. Ruppenthal, director of the transportation management program at Stanford University, writing in the May 22, 1967, issue of the Nation, said:

It is safe to predict that because of the sheer magnitude of the dollars involved, the advent of the supersonic transport will inevitably result in a much smaller number of airlines in the United States, and much greater consternation in the (aircraft) industry.

The SST gives Boeing and General Electric a supersonic monopoly and leaves other companies standing at the post.

The Government is preparing, in effect, to conduct a giant public works project to employ highly skilled workers who do not need the help.

And it is doing these things partly because of a claim—which has been disputed by the FAA's own economic consultants—that this venture will save us from a disastrous decline in our balance-of-payments position. The decline, we are told, would occur if the Anglo-French consortium produced a successful supersonic transport and our airlines bought a large number of them. But, the FAA consultants—the Institute for Defense Analyses—concluded that gains from foreign sales of an American SST

could be more than offset by a big increase in American tourist spending abroad and also by a reduction in the sales of American subsonic aircraft. The so-called alleged gains in the balance of payments are not there, and competent, objective, and expert advice indicates that this is the case.

I am convinced that if the sonic boom problem is not solved and if a solution to airport congestion is not found, the supersonic transport—whether produced by the United States or by the consortium—will have little chance of being commercially successful. Switzerland, Sweden, and West Germany have already declared that they would prohibit overflights of supersonic planes if they produce disturbing sonic booms. The Swedes have said they would consider a boom disturbing if it could awaken a light sleeper—a pretty stringent limit. The West Germans have said the booms would be unacceptable if it were proven they damaged human health. Other countries are very likely to follow the Swedish, West German, and Swiss lead when they have been subjected to the booms and discover how disturbing they can be when they occur with maddening regularity.

Mr. President, we had a little experience with this problem in Wisconsin when the Air Force picked Milwaukee as a city over which they would fly B-58's. The avalanche of mail which I received from Wisconsin constituents during that period of time indicated that they were all critical and deeply concerned, and that they only accepted it because it was a military effort and in the interest of national defense. This shows how adverse the reaction would be if these were commercial flights.

The occasional super-booms of two and three times normal intensity that would inevitably be produced by nearly every SST flight might be enough to ban the SST's from flying over heavily traveled sealanes as well. If this happened, the SST would be so restricted it probably would not carry enough payload to buy the chewing gum stewardesses hand out before takeoff. SST advocates who admit the sonic boom effect would prevent flights over populated land areas have been arguing that SST ocean flights would be enough to make the plane a commercial success. The FAA has said that even with boom restrictions on overland flights, 500 SST's would be sold by 1990. They seem to discount any possibility of sealane restrictions. But, if the sonic boom can cause severe damage on land, then it can cause damage at sea, too. The shipping and fishing industry is not likely to accept incessant destructive booming without protest. And they by no means lack political clout.

Thus, far from representing a big gain, the SST could as easily spell economic disaster for the aviation industry, even with heavy Government participation. The sonic boom is only one of the countless technological dilemmas the SST developers must overcome, although it is the one for which prospects of finding a solution are dimmest. The other problems are almost as difficult because supersonic flight is really a completely different quantity from subsonic flight. As one writer has put it, flying beyond the

speed of sound is like flying in a totally new medium. The difference between a subsonic plane and a supersonic plane is like the difference between a surface ship and a submarine. Building a successful SST demands a quantum jump in technology. The heat generated by air friction becomes a particularly critical problem at supersonic speeds. The high altitudes at which an SST must fly to reduce the sonic boom effect raises the problem of cosmic radiation and its effect on the crew after repeated exposures. Occasional solar flares would pose a threat to passengers as well because of the much higher intensity of radiation during such periods. The maneuverability and balance of a plane at supersonic speeds are less predictable. I have great respect for the capability of our scientists and engineers, however. They may find the answer to all of these problems in the laboratory tomorrow, or next week, or next month. But, until then we can not bury our heads in the sand. We have to recognize that the obstacles we are confronted with are enormous. We cannot base national policy on wishful thinking alone.

Mr. President, I might point out that the research is going to continue whether we invest this enormous amount of money or not. It is going to continue in the space program and in the defense effort. The Defense Department has said that it has no military value at all.

The SST, if we built it, would be the first commercial plane ever developed without substantial prior military experience. Of course, military planes have been flying at supersonic speeds for years. But almost all of them have been small planes compared to this flying football field we propose to build. There is almost no experience with planes the size of the SST at supersonic speeds. The SST would be a Mach 2.7 plane. And there is no experience whatever with flight beyond Mach 2 with any planes, small or large, for the sustained periods the SST would have to fly to turn a profit. In a report to President Johnson in December 1963, on the SST, Eugene R. Black and Stanley de J. Osborne observed that the experience of the Air Force in innovating new systems had been that if 25 percent of the vehicle was new, it would take up to 5 years of development. If as much as 50 percent was new, it would take 10 years. Almost all of the SST is new—radically new. Its airframe would be made of a new alloy—titanium. Perhaps the only component of the plane whose properties during supersonic flight we have some familiarity with is the pilot. And even he may act differently than we expect under the pressures of having to fly this golden goose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the SST advocates will answer that our lack of experience with this kind of plane is the most persuasive argument there is for building the prototypes so that we can gain that experience. But we all

know that once the prototypes are built, there will be no turning back. After more than a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money had been poured into this boondoggle, the pressure would be immense to go into the production stage whether the sonic boom had been muffled or not, and whether or not the safety of the plane had been proven beyond doubt.

What I find most serious is that the FAA is already hedging its bets on the success of the SST, diluting standards—in short, selling the public down the river.

The Government contract with Boeing, the airframe contractor, made public only a few days ago provides for only 100 hours of flight testing of the two prototypes over a 6-month period. The Black-Osborne report recommended a full year of flight testing as a minimum and the tenor of the report suggested that far more than that would be desirable.

But, what is even worse, the FAA has apparently decided to forget about the sonic boom problem. They seem to have adopted the philosophy that if they cannot beat the boom, they will ignore it.

The contracts for phase II—the design stage—of the SST program specified that the sonic boom effect produced by the plane while cruising at 60,000 to 90,000 feet should not exceed an average intensity of 1.5 pounds per square foot. The top limit during the SST's acceleration and climb was set at 2 pounds per square foot. Even those limits were considered too high by a number of experts on the sonic boom—chief among them Bo Lundberg, who has been studying sonic boom effects for 7 years. The contract limits referred to the average boom intensity produced in the wake of an SST. But atmospheric conditions and deviations from a straight and steady course, Lundberg pointed out, could produce grossly magnified booms three and four times the average intensity in the 50-mile-wide carpet of sonic booms trailing every supersonic flight. These super-booms—as Lundberg labeled them—are the ones that can do severe damage to property and can even affect personal health. The reflection from walls of the boom shock wave can result in even further magnification—often by as much as 100 percent.

During the extensive sonic boom tests over Oklahoma City 3 years ago, the average boom intensity reached during any of the 1,253 supersonic flight runs over the city never exceeded 1.6 pounds per square foot, and most of the time not more than 1.2 pounds per square foot. Yet the FAA, which conducted the tests, received nearly 5,000 formal damage claims and a total of more than 15,000 complaints of all kinds. The FAA said that in an opinion survey it did at the time, 27 percent of the residents polled said the booms were intolerable and that they could never learn to live with them. That 27 percent should be compared with the fact that only 22 percent of our people on the basis of our estimates will use the SST.

But, now, I find that the FAA has had the audacity to draw up a contract with no sonic boom limits whatsoever. All the

phase III contract requires is that Boeing "develop an airplane design to reduce the sonic boom effect." There is not a word about how far it should be reduced, or to what level. The contract requires Boeing to study boom characteristics but it does not require it to hit any target. It sets no meaningful goal. For all practical purposes, it leaves Boeing free to ignore the boom effect.

But that is not all. The FAA has admitted, I just learned, that the airframe design contracted for in phase II would produce an average sonic boom intensity above the limits set by the phase II contract. The sonic boom effect produced by the air frame design to which we are now committed would have an average intensity of 2.38 pounds per square foot during acceleration and climb, and 2 pounds per square foot during cruise—far more—in fact, almost double—the Oklahoma City experience where, as I said, more than one-quarter of the people there, at least, declared they could not live with the intolerable effects of the sonic boom.

So we have what amounts to a failure to meet specifications of the phase II contract. Yet the FAA insists on bulling ahead into phase III anyway.

The FAA has apparently concluded either, first, that the task of muffling the boom is impossible; or second, that it is content to build a plane that would be limited to ocean flights, which drastically reduces chances that the plane would be a commercial success—and I remind Senators that if it is not a commercial success, the Government could be out as much as \$4 billion—or, third, that the public is just going to have to learn to live with the boom no matter how destructive or disturbing it may be.

I have a feeling, judging from past FAA pronouncements, that it is probably the latter. The following statement from a recent FAA brochure gives that feeling added credence:

Individuals tend to accommodate themselves to an initially disturbing noise once it becomes a pattern of daily life. There are noises today in cities and in small towns that are taken for granted which, if they were introduced as new noises, would cause disturbances for an initial period of time.

The FAA refuses to recognize that there is just no parallel between the loud din of everyday life in the 20th century and the destructive menace of the sonic boom. Unsound buildings in every city would crumble to the ground like the "one-hoss shay" after repeated boomings. Ancient monuments and historic shrines like this honored building would be particularly susceptible. The west front of the Capitol, we have been told by the Architect, is so unstable that it could be demolished by the impact of a crash at National Airport. Imagine what the effort of 10 or 20 loud sonic booms every day, week in and week out, might be. This is not science fiction. Much damage has already been done by military supersonic flights, yet the planes involved were comparatively small and the areas subjected to the booms sparsely populated. The size and weight of the plane are the primary variables in determining the size of the boom. The prehistoric cliff

dwelling in Mesa Verde National Park, as one example, have been seriously damaged by sonic booms, the Interior Department disclosed not long ago. To prevent this mass destruction of property, boom restrictions will inevitably be imposed, as I stated earlier; and if they are, we will be able to kiss our investment in the SST goodbye.

The Institute for Defense Analyses, which conducted a demand analysis study for the FAA, predicted that only 279 SST's would be sold by 1990 in a boom-restricted market if the planes sold at \$40 million apiece. That may even be an overestimate because the price per plane could run as high as \$50 or \$60 million. The Government, according to the financial plan in the phase III contract, would not recoup its investment until 300 planes have been sold.

The FAA, in its execution of the SST contract, has abdicated its responsibility to the public. It has failed to protect the interests of the Government.

The absence of sonic boom specifications is only one example. In another serious oversight, the definition of what will constitute a "royalty-bearing airframe" for purposes of recouping the Government investment when and if the SST's go on the market is so worded that the Government might have to write off most of its investment even if the SST is successful.

The SST airframe is defined for purposes of recoupment as one "principally of titanium structure and that achieves or is designed to achieve a maximum safe cruising speed of not less than mach 2.2 nor more than mach 3.1."

Remember, this section of the contract—entitled "Financial Plan for Future Phases of the SST Development Program"—is directed 10 and 15 years into the future. Suppose another metal is developed with properties making it superior to titanium. In fact, a better alloy may already have been found. The Air Force has been conducting extensive experiments with boron filament. What is to prevent Boeing from abandoning titanium in favor of boro filament, if that proves superior, 1 or 2 years after the production stage of the SST program had been launched? Similarly, what is to prevent them from trimming here or adding there in order to push the top safe cruising speed a hair above the mach 3.1 specified in the contract? The airframe definition represents an outrageous blunder on the part of the FAA. It can have nothing but unfortunate consequences. It will result in one of two things: preventing the contractor from adopting desirable major changes to improve the plane's performance, or bringing about the complete nullification of the royalty plan for repaying the Government investment because the production model airframe is not covered by the narrow definition in the contract.

The FAA's handling of the SST program so far is eloquent testimony to the wisdom of the Black-Osborne recommendation that a new independent authority be created to manage this venture.

The FAA has been exerting far too much of its energy selling the SST and

too little protecting the public interest. As Fred L. Zimmerman of the Wall Street Journal wrote recently:

If propaganda could power a plane, America's supersonic airliner probably would be flying by now.

We have all been subjected to a supersonic snow job. It is time for us now to take a hard look at the other side of the issue. We may be on the verge of bulldozing the brontosaurus of the air age—a mechanical monster with an immense capacity for speed that may well be irrelevant to the real needs of our day. I do not think the American people should be asked to finance the development of this monstrosity.

In subsequent speeches during the weeks ahead, Mr. President, I intend to deal in greater detail with some of the questions I have only touched on lightly here today. I will have more to say on the menace of the sonic boom, on the economic arguments being used to defend this venture and on some of the many technological obstacles, aside from the sonic boom, which must be hurdled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles published in the two most recent editions of the Nation by Karl M. Ruppenthal be printed in the RECORD, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues; also a recent New York Times editorial on the SST.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

[From the Nation, May 22, 1967]

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT—BILLION DOLLAR DILEMMA

(NOTE.—This is the first of a series of three articles on the supersonic transport. Succeding articles will deal with several of the technical problems involved in the design, manufacture and operation of the aircraft, and with some broad social and economic problems. Mr. Ruppenthal has been a contributor to The Nation for several years. An active airline pilot for twenty-five years, and an attorney, he is director of the Transportation Management Program at Stanford University.)

(By Karl M. Ruppenthal)

With a stroke of the pen in 1963, Juan Trippe declared war on the Boeing 707, the Douglas DC-8, and all other subsonic transports that now fill the air. Placing an order for six Concorde's, the chairman of the board of Pan American World Airways relit the fuse on a bomb that had been quiescent since an Anglo-French combination, with the financial backing of their respective governments, announced that they would develop a plane to fly at Mach 2—or twice the speed of sound and appreciably more than twice the speed of presently operating commercial jets.

The first important reaction to Trippe's decision came from the President of the United States. Just one week after Pan American announced the placing of its order, John F. Kennedy authorized a major study of the supersonic transport (SST). And from this there followed a series of revolutionary events, the full effect of which will not be felt for years to come.

The SST will present all of the airlines with gigantic economic problems. In some cases the problems will be so severe that the airlines will forget their pride, together with their touted free-enterprise philosophy, and ask unabashedly for government subsidy. Other airlines will reluctantly merge or sell out; still others may simply go broke.

The revolution will force the Federal Aviation Agency to make new expenditures aggregating hundreds of millions of dollars, and the sheer volume of money required will increase the federal role in all phases of aviation. The government will be called upon to pay for most of the research and development required for the SST itself. It will also be required to develop and install new and complex navigation systems. It will be called upon to provide funds for new airports, new terminal facilities and for new safety devices. It may be asked to train pilots, to control traffic, to underwrite insurance, and to finance dozens of other ancillary projects. So great will be the demand for federal funds, and so great the government participation in all aspects of the supersonic project, that the aviation industry as a whole will need to develop some remarkable corporate agility if any aspect of private enterprise whatsoever is to be maintained.

The supersonic revolution will have an important impact on the United States in a host of other ways. It will add measurably to the balance of payments controversy; it will be a disquieting influence on living patterns; it will become the center of another controversy with Britain, France and many of the other nations of the world. It may be an important factor in determining whether there shall be continuing boom, widespread land speculation or large-scale unemployment in Los Angeles, Seattle and Hartford. Although the Federal Aviation Agency has indicated that Boeing will receive the prime contract for the air frame, and General Electric will build the engines, component parts will be made by subcontractors. Boeing's decision to subcontract certain systems and components will depend, in part, on its own ability to produce them. If the SST timetable indicates urgency, Boeing will be forced to subcontract large systems because of the shortage of labor and engineering talent in the Seattle area.

Should Johnson assign the program an urgent priority, he might well give Ronald Reagan the biggest boost he could possibly get. Boeing's subcontracting could add new jobs to an already swollen economy in Southern California. It could stimulate the real estate market, bringing higher prices, additional commissions and more sales. Reagan could claim credit for the increased level of business in the state, leaving post-boom problems for another administration to face.

The pending supersonic step in the evolution of aircraft is so large that physicists would term it a quantum jump. This leap through the sound barrier will shatter much of the aircraft industry, several of the airlines and the peace and quiet of much of the world.

Always before in the progress of aviation, measurable alternatives have been available to the airline industry. When the DC-3 was obsolescent, the manufacturers and the airline industry could make rational decisions concerning the planes that were proposed. A rather simple, basic issue was involved: would the airlines be justified in buying planes that were larger, faster and more productive? Was there a reasonable prospect that increased capital expenditures could be amortized through additional speed, additional lift and related economies? Could the greater capacity be absorbed? What new-plane problems could be anticipated, and what would be the probable cost of their solution? In short, the question was resolved by balancing the costs of designing, building and operating a projected new plane against the revenues that could reasonably be anticipated from improvements in comfort, economy and speed.

Thus the decision to graduate from the DC-3 to the DC-4 was relatively easy to make. While the later plane required a larger capital investment for each ship purchased, it offered considerably lower seat-mile costs. It was a more efficient plane. The same basic

factors operated in the decision to drop the DC-4 in favor of the faster, more efficient DC-6 (and its competing plane, the Lockheed Constellation).

In the pre-jet days, the relationship between speed and initial cost was almost linear. Thus an airline could decide whether to increase its investment in aircraft, say, 10 per cent, in order to achieve a 5 per cent increase in speed. But when we enter the supersonic age, the old cost-speed equation will no longer apply. It will become entangled in a variety of complex physical laws and the airline industry will have much more difficult choices to make.

Basic to the problem is the fact that present jets now cruise at speeds slightly less than the speed of sound—usually in the range between Mach .80 and Mach .86. Because of the nature of the turbulence (and other phenomena) associated with flying at and near the speed of Mach 1, it is not practical to think in terms of small increases in speed. And since it is similarly impractical to think in terms of Mach 1.2 or Mach 1.5, the only real question is whether the next generation of jets should cruise at speeds on the order of Mach 2 or Mach 3—that is, at twice or three times the speed of sound.

In 1963 when it was first seriously proposed that the United States taxpayers might underwrite the cost of developing a supersonic transport, it was often stated that the development cost of the aircraft would approximate \$1 billion. After some behind-the-scenes fencing, the SST project was taken from the Federal Aviation Agency and placed in the hands of the Defense Department. Subsequent meetings of the SST study committee were held in secret, and all that transpired is not a matter of public record. However, James P. Mitchell, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, who had served on an earlier study committee, indicated in 1964 that the \$1 billion research and development figure was about right. Another member of that committee was reported in *The New York Times* as saying that the development cost would be from \$600 million to \$1.2 billion.

In those days, spokesmen for the Kennedy administration suggested that the federal government might be willing to finance 75 per cent of the project, but that notion brought forth anguished cries from the aircraft manufacturers. They pointed out that if the industry were to invest all of its profits for a decade, it would still be unable to come up with that amount of cash. There was some public debate and a good bit of private maneuvering. Eventually the government proposed that the taxpayer finance 90 per cent of the preliminary costs (in practice, it would come to higher than this, since the aircraft industry, as long as it was making a profit in other areas, could deduct its 10 per cent share of the R&D costs from gross taxable income). The public was assured at the same time that the SST was certain to be a sound investment and that their tax money would be returned to them—with handsome interest to boot.

Evidently the financial community is not so sure. Although many investors eagerly seek situations in which a good bit of risk is coupled with quite high returns, no investment banker has yet suggested forming a consortium for the private financing of the supersonic plane. Indeed, one reputable investment banker has stated that without the underpinning of a government guarantee, such securities would have virtually no investment standing.

That judgment is supported by the fact that though development costs of earlier planes were minuscule compared with estimates for the SST, Lockheed was reported to have lost some \$90 million on its executive jet, the Jet Star, in 1966 alone. It lost some \$50 million on the Electra, although it is a very efficient craft and 188 of them were sold. And General Dynamics lost some \$400 mil-

lion on its 880s and 990s—the only commercial jets that company has yet produced.

Meanwhile the estimate for SST research and development costs has increased. The \$1 billion figure most commonly quoted in 1963 (when the aircraft manufacturers indicated that they could not possibly finance 25 per cent of the costs) was soon doubled. In January, 1967, both *The Wall Street Journal* and the Transportation Association of America were talking of \$4.5 billion. The magnitude of this figure can be appreciated when one considers that it is twice the New York Stock Exchange value of all the shares of Lockheed and Boeing combined. It is eighty times the highest net profit ever reported by any airline in a single year, and something like twenty times Boeing's total corporate debt.

While \$2 billion or \$3 billion or \$4 billion may cover the research and development costs of the project it will not provide the airlines with planes. And some financial analysts question whether even the \$4 billion R&D figure will really be enough. Government-financed projects are notorious for exceeding their estimates, and projects that venture into new and relatively unknown areas are subject to wider errors of estimate than are projects in more traveled fields.

But suppose, to be very optimistic, that the research and development costs of the supersonic transport can be held to about \$2 billion, as some of its proponents now believe. Under one system of accounting it might be presumed that such costs should be spread over the total time span in which this particular plane may be produced—say the next ten years. That would mean that each supersonic transport built in the United States over the next decade would be charged with a portion of the costs of research and development. If, for instance, only 100 such transports were built, each of them would be charged with \$20 million in research costs, in addition to the cost of manufacturing each plane. If 1,000 planes could be sold, the R&D costs assigned to each plane would be but \$2 million. This means that to set a realistic price on the planes, one must know not only the probable cost of manufacture and the total cost of research and development but also the number of planes likely to be sold.

There is considerable variation of opinion about the potential market. One aircraft executive estimated that some 900 SSTs could be sold by 1985, but other estimates are much more pessimistic. An important—and as yet undecided—factor is whether or not supersonic flights will be permitted over land. If they are restricted to over-water routes, the market for the plane will be sharply reduced. Another aircraft executive indicated on a C.B.S. broadcast that if the plane were restricted to over-water routes, the market would be reduced to some 585 craft. That would almost double the amount of research and development costs to be allocated to each plane and, of course, there is no guarantee that even this estimate of the market is correct.

It is worth noting that the aircraft industry has on occasion been too enthusiastic in its sales forecasts and too conservative in its cost estimates. Probably the most spectacular example of this wishful tendency was demonstrated by General Dynamics. According to an article in *Fortune*, the company produced its 880 jets in the face of its own studies indicating that the market was too small to return a profit. The result was a staggering loss, a change of management and near bankruptcy.

Even the majestic Douglas Aircraft Company, once undisputed world leader in the field of transport aircraft, has had its problems. Although Douglas had a respectable backlog of orders for its DC-8 and DC-9 jets, the company recently faced severe financial problems, and there were alarming indications that it might be unable to make good

on its delivery commitments to the armed forces without a substantial infusion of government money. For a time it appeared that it might be necessary for the government, in effect, to co-sign Douglas' note at the bank. Only the rescue operations performed by McDonnell Aircraft made that government guarantee unnecessary.

But that crisis made an effective point: once the government has invested billions of taxpayers' money in a given project, it is not likely to pull out merely because preliminary cost estimates were too low. Someone in Congress will always raise the cry that since so much money already has been invested, additional funds must be spent.

It is true that SST advocates forecast that the taxpayers will recover the funds invested on the research and development of the supersonic transport. Some propose that these costs be charged directly against the planes, the tag to be set accordingly. Others feel that since the cost of manufacture will in itself be exceedingly high, it might not be prudent to increase the selling price of each aircraft by such a substantial amount. Too high a price would surely shrink the total market for the planes and thus make them even more difficult to sell. These people would prefer that the government recover its research and development expenditures through a monthly royalty charged against the operations of the planes.

But slice it as you will, there is no doubt that the taxpayers would bear the financial risks of the project. They will be called upon to pick up the tab if the market estimates are overly optimistic, if an airline is unable to make its royalty payments, or if the aircraft manufacturer falls upon evil days. That is the history of government guarantees in almost every field of endeavor.

While a monthly royalty device for recouping the taxpayers' investment has certain appeal (after all, much of the U.S. economy is based on the idea of buy now, pay later), it raises the problem of the value of money itself. If the taxpayers invest a dollar in a project today, it cannot be fairly said that they have made a sound investment if but a single dollar is returned to them a decade hence. If that same dollar were deposited in a reputable savings and loan association, it would double in a decade. And if it were prudently invested in the electronics industry, the chemical industry—or, indeed, in airline stocks—there is a high probability that its value would be a good bit more.

Their economic studies challenged by a number of economists (allegedly including some from the Bureau of the Budget), most SST proponents will no longer say precisely how the taxpayers will be repaid. Recent statements indicate that the repayment may not be in dollars channeled directly from the project into the treasury, but that much of the repayment may come indirectly because the project will stimulate employment, and increased employment will increase the flow of income tax dollars.

Of course this economic argument is not new. It was made by Lord Keynes a good many years ago when he pointed out that government spending could stimulate economic activity. The real question to be decided is which vehicles for government spending are most efficient in this respect, and there is reason to believe that other government-financed projects could be used at least equally well to stimulate economic activity and thus the flow of tax dollars.

The magnitude of the cost of the SST program comes into better perspective when one considers costs from the viewpoint of the carriers. Just twenty-five years ago an airline could buy a DC-3 for \$125,000; today, a single spare engine for a subsonic jet costs at least twice that amount. With the advent of the jet age less than a decade ago, the airlines fell under severe financial pressure.

So great were the problems surrounding the introduction of the jets that it was not at all certain that several of the major airlines could afford the price. Virtually every one of the major European carriers incurred substantial losses. In more than one instance the prospect of recovering the losses was so slim that they were simply written off by the government that was the principal (or sole) stockholder in the line.

In the United States the financial picture was so bleak that four major airlines—American, Eastern, Pan American and TWA—publicly announced merger plans. Almost every other U.S. airline made serious merger studies, although many of these activities were never revealed to the press. It was not until the general level of business activity rose to new heights that the U.S. airlines moved out of real danger. Had the business boom been delayed for another year or two, several airlines would have ceased to exist—at least in their present form.

The stakes will be much higher, and the ante far greater, when the airlines begin to play the supersonic game. At the present time it is estimated that a single Supersonic plane may cost on the order of \$45 million. This is just a little less than the entire after-tax profits that any airline has ever reported in its most profitable year. Of course airline revenues have been increasing at a rapid rate and are still rising. But even if the present growth rate continues, gigantic problems must be surmounted before an airline can equip itself with a fleet of supersonic transports. Any major U.S. airline will have to dedicate its entire net profits for at least a decade to the purchase of supersonic transports, unless profit margins can be improved, the tax burden reduced, or substantial funds made available from other sources. If total airline earnings are dedicated to SST purchases, the stockholders may become starved of dividends in order to provide the public with an exceedingly fast ride.

While the financing problems for the major airlines will be severe when the supersonic transports begin to arrive, they will seem trivial by comparison with what the smaller U.S. carriers will face. Consider an aggressive, highly profitable trunk line like Continental. Its growth rate has been spectacular, its profits increasing at a prodigious rate. But in the most profitable year in all its history, its after-tax profits were on the order of \$10 million—about one-fourth the probable cost of a single supersonic transport.

Most of these smaller carriers compete with at least one of the Big Four over important route segments. If the big carriers do indeed operate supersonic transports over the highly competitive routes, the middle-sized subsonic carriers may well be left standing at the post. If the proponents of the SST are correct in their assumption that the public will flock to the faster planes, those lines that do not have an extensive route structure, or the requisite financial resources to purchase supersonic equipment, will have severe competitive problems the like of which they have not yet experienced.

For survival they may attempt to merge with other troubled carriers. Failing in that attempt, they may be swallowed up by the lines that have routes suitable for supersonic operations. If they do not merge and are not swallowed up, their financial situation may become so precarious they will begin to exist on government subsidy, or simply turn up their toes and go bankrupt.

The local service carriers, too, may well be caught up in the blast of the supersonic jet. Consider the affluent passenger who alights in Seattle from his two-hour cross-country flight from New York. Will he be content to spend a like amount of time getting from Seattle to his destination airport near Pocatello, Boise or Spokane? And how will the local service carriers respond?

While all of the effects upon the airlines

themselves cannot be forecast completely at this time, it is safe to predict that because of the sheer magnitude of the dollars involved, the advent of the supersonic transport will inevitably result in a much smaller number of airlines in the United States, and much greater concentration in the industry.

As for the aircraft manufacturers, the forecast is even more bleak. If the supersonic transport should be commercially successful, it may well drive from the skies the slower, subsonic jets—and their manufacturers. The result would be even greater attrition in the ranks of the commercial plane producers, whose death rate has already been substantial. Now gone from the ranks of commercial aircraft builders are such once familiar names as Martin and Convair (General Dynamics). Douglas has had its problems, and it is not at all certain that relatively affluent Lockheed will attempt to build another commercial plane.

This tendency toward concentration would certainly be increased with the advent of a supersonic transport that is successful in an economic sense. It could even be that but one or two large aircraft complexes would remain: the prime contractors who design and manufacture the aircraft together with their respective (client) subcontractors. If a completely successful supersonic transport is actually built, there may be little demand for competing, subsonic planes.

The utility of the supersonic transport is indeed a two-edged sword: If the plane is suitable for a relatively small number of airline routes and can operate only from a limited number of airports, it may be an economic disaster for the manufacturers and for the taxpayers who put up most of the money. On the other hand, if the manufacturers are able to come up with a versatile craft, capable of operating quietly and efficiently over a large number of airline routes, and able to satisfy the demands of a large portion of the traveling and shipping public, then its effect may be to destroy much of the value of presently operating subsonic aircraft and to create another set of problems for the airlines and for their financial backers who hold substantial mortgages on the aircraft that are presently flying.

[From the Nation, May 29, 1967]

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT—II—HEAT, COLD, RADIATION AND THE BOOM

(NOTE.—This is the second of Mr. Ruppenthal's three articles on the supersonic transport. The first (The Nation, May 22) dealt with some of the economic aspects of the SST. The third will consider some of the political and social ramifications of the project.)

(By Karl Ruppenthal)

Before the proposed U.S. supersonic transport can get off the ground, some impressive technical problems must be solved. One of these concerns heat. When a plane travels through the air at three times the speed of sound, the heat generated on the skin of the craft will be on the order of 500° Fahrenheit—about the temperature that a French chef uses to broil a steak. Because aluminum loses much of its strength after prolonged exposure to such temperatures, neither aluminum nor any of its presently developed alloys can be used for the exterior surface of the SST. At present, the designers of the Mach 3 (three times the speed of sound) transport are working with titanium alloys and stainless steel. The disadvantage of steel is that it is heavy; titanium is much lighter, but it is relatively new on the industrial scene. It is also difficult to form and expensive to work. While it is entirely possible that new technologies for working this metal will be discovered, they are not yet at hand. Titanium offers promise to the aircraft designer and to the scientist, but to the banker it promises heavy costs. A

great many research dollars will be spent in an effort to develop an air frame that will be sufficient to the task and still be light enough to carry a profitable payload.

The heat produced by flying through the air at high speeds produces other problems. How are the airlines to keep the passengers from being broiled alive as they speed about in their supersonic oven? While the task of air-conditioning the plane is not a momentous engineering feat, it requires the development of a system capable of dissipating large amounts of heat quickly and efficiently and without employing heavy or bulky machinery.

Paradoxically, flying at high altitudes where temperatures run as low as -100° centigrade, the plane's fuel (kerosene) may tend to freeze. The engineers are thus attracted to the idea of linking the two temperature problems together: heat created on the surface of the plane might be dissipated into the plane's fuel supply. To the man at the drafting table, this looks like a fairly straightforward solution to the problem, but to the pilot who is trained to think in terms of fire, the prospect is less inviting.

The spectrum of new engineering problems is challenging and wide. Windows and other openings on the SST must be able to withstand a wide range of temperatures and pressures. The problems associated with windows are so great that it is likely there will be no windows whatsoever in the cabin, and the pilot's windows may be functional only for take-off and landing. The plane may cruise entirely on instruments, depending upon radio, radar and other electronic devices to achieve separation from other planes.

Since the Mach 3 jet will cruise at 60,000 to 80,000 feet (10 to 15 miles)—its pressurization systems must not fail. The cabins of today's jets are pressurized to the equivalent of about 5,000 feet when they are at cruising altitude (normally between 24,000 feet and 41,000 feet mean sea level). The fail-safe features of the 707 and the DC-8 provide an oxygen mask that drops automatically in front of each passenger in the event the cabin loses pressure. But this will not be good enough for the Mach 3 craft. Should the cabin rupture at 60,000 feet, the passengers' blood would boil, and the oxygen mask would be of no avail. Only a space suit, or a system which cannot possibly fail, will suffice. This means fail-safe pressurization systems, doors that will not leak, windows that cannot be blown out. All of these features can be developed, but each development may add to the weight of the craft, and they will certainly add to the cost.

High-altitude flight creates another problem which aviation has not yet fully faced—the hazard of radiation. At the cruising altitudes of the SST, the primary cosmic radiation consists mainly of protons (the nuclei of hydrogen atoms). The energy of these particles can be extremely high. Nuclear scientists have stated that the shell of the aircraft will not protect the occupants from radiation; as a matter of fact, it will act to increase the dosage rate.

Flying at the new cruising altitudes, the occupant of an SST will be exposed to a radiation dose equivalent to about 2 millirem per flying hour. Since 500 millirem per year is the maximum specified for nonradiation workers by the International Commission on Radiological Protection, a passenger (or crew member) would receive the maximum permissible dosage in 250 hours—just one-fourth the amount of flying time plane crews are now allowed annually by the Civil Air Regulations.

Further, particular solar events greatly increase the radiation dosage. Anyone passing through such an event might receive the maximum permissible annual radiation dosage in a single flight. Because of the genetic implications of radiation, some biologists

have suggested that crew members for the SST be selected entirely from people beyond the normal childbearing age.

Thus, all hostesses on supersonic transports would be at least 45—a breed of flying grandmothers who would contrast sharply with the image of the chic young thing the airlines have cultivated so assiduously these many years. Far more serious from an economic standpoint would be the effect upon the working life of pilots. The cost of training well-qualified DC-6 captains to fly the Boeing 707 was on the order of \$30,000 per man. If training costs for the SST are but twice that amount, an airline will think twice before making such an investment in a pilot who has very few productive years ahead of him. The FAA requires all airline pilots to retire at 60.

Furthermore, one competent test pilot has stated that in today's jets a pilot can wait as long as fifteen seconds before reacting to a situation without risking irreparable harm. If he is correct in his estimate that only five seconds of reaction time will be available to the SST pilot, trouble may be in store. For it is well known that as a man becomes older, his judgment may improve but his reaction time becomes longer. In short, it looks now as though neither young men nor old men will be suitable as pilots for the SST.

Turbulence also will be a problem. As the airlines took to flying at altitudes used by subsonic jets, they began to experience clear air turbulence. Several of today's jets have encountered turbulence that has breached the aircraft structure or thrown it completely out of control. The supersonic transport must be designed to withstand the most severe conditions that can be encountered, and about these conditions relatively little is now known.

What is known is that the impact increases with speed, and the standard practice for subsonic jets is to reduce speed as soon as the condition is recognized. The worst problem of clear air turbulence arises principally from the fact that at present there is no accurate way to forecast its existence. Unless major advances are made in weather analysis, it may be impossible for the supersonic airliner to know of clear air turbulence far enough in advance to take precautionary measures.

But these problems of radiation, heat transfer and metal fatigue pale by comparison with the one great problem of supersonic flight, for which nothing approaching an answer has yet been found. That is the sonic boom, and indeed the problems of the boom are so important and so far from solution that they may wreck the nice economic calculations that have been made by proponents of the SST, and the SST timetable as well.

Many people are under the misapprehension that the sonic boom is a momentary phenomenon. In a movie made a decade or more ago, some Hollywood star flew through the theoretical "sound barrier." As his plane approached the speed of sound, he encountered many weird phenomena, but once the speed of sound was exceeded, all was smooth. There was no vibration, no problems—and no boom. How the aircraft industry wishes that the Hollywood version of the sonic boom were reality! The fact is that the sonic boom, a shock wave, is a continuing phenomenon, and it is created when a plane flies at any speed higher than Mach 1.

If a supersonic transport were to cruise at the speed of Mach 3 at altitudes used by present-day jets, it would leave in its wake a trail of destruction fifty miles wide. Although the Air Force has taken great pains to minimize the damage caused by its supersonic jets, the number of damage claims filed against the federal government has been steadily increasing. Some 3,000 were filed in 1962 alone. The Air Force no longer publishes the number of claims filed or the amount of reparations demanded, but it is known that

the dollars paid, together with the cost of processing claims, has already run into the millions.

Sonic boom damage caused by military planes has been responsible for a wide variety of claims. In 1962 a farmer in North Dakota was paid \$1,048 because his animal had to be shot after a boom caused it to bolt into a barbed-wire fence. Another farmer in Hallock, Minn., was paid \$50 because booms caused his chickens to panic and suffocate against a wall. In Cedar City, Utah, a store owner was paid \$1,900 to replace plate glass windows and stock damaged by a boom. A farmer in Northern California sued the Air Force for \$1.25 million for boom damage to livestock and irrigation pipes.

Even when the claims are farfetched, they must be investigated, at a cost of about \$100 per claim. The Air Force recently investigated (and denied) a claim from an elderly recluse who sought \$19 million in damages because he alleged that a boom had turned his house upside down. Also denied was a claim from a Cleveland motorist who said that sonic booms had ruined his automobile's power steering.

Because of the rising number of claims the Air Force has in recent years run a public relations campaign. Hundreds of civic leaders along B-58 test corridors near Strategic Air Command Headquarters in Omaha and the General Dynamics plant in Fort Worth have been assured that sonic booms aren't much louder than thunder. "The flights are the by-product of training maneuvers to save lives," said an Air Force spokesman. "Americans will have to learn to live with sonic booms. There's going to be more of them—a lot more."

This is a sobering background for the SST, particularly when one considers that most of the Air Force flights have been conducted with relatively small planes and over sparsely populated areas. The shock of the sonic boom varies with the size of the aircraft, and the damage created by the boom obviously varies with the value of the real estate that lies in its wake.

Uncertain about the effects of the sonic boom, the Federal Aviation Agency undertook experiments in Oklahoma City some time ago. After the residents had been carefully prepared, a series of runs was made. When there were claims of structural damage, the FAA made appropriate inspections. It also purchased structures in various parts of the city to record the vibrations and to note how much damage actually occurred.

At the outset, the residents of Oklahoma City were rather proud that their city had been selected for these important experiments. Many of them were eager to see them succeed. When the booms first began, most residents were mildly amused. But as they progressed, many of them became annoyed. At the conclusion of the test, many Oklahomans breathed a sigh of relief that the ordeal was at last finished.

In their official pronouncements the FAA has stated that the tests indicate that 73 per cent of the Oklahomans indicated that they could live with the boom (at least, with a sonic boom such as they experienced during these particular tests). This means that some 27 per cent of the residents indicated that they would be unwilling to tolerate even that much sonic boom. That fact is significant for several reasons.

In the first place, the people were well conditioned. They knew when to expect the sonic booms, knew that they would occur only in daylight hours. They understood that the experiments were carefully monitored and controlled, and that they might well serve a useful scientific purpose. Add to that the fact that there are no historic shrines in Oklahoma City; no ancient castles that might be shattered by a sonic boom; no Revolutionary War structures; no great galleries; no sensitive seismographic instruments.

Consider also that much of the industry of Oklahoma City is based on and around aviation. The very large Air Force base, Tinker Field, together with the various installations of the Federal Aviation Agency, supply by far the largest payroll in the city. Within its metropolitan district are aviation schools, aircraft plants and other small industries with an aviation orientation. Much of the rest of the economy is based on petroleum, for which aviation is by far its largest single customer.

Important also is the fact that the residents of Oklahoma City knew that the sonic boom program was temporary. But despite all the factors, more than a quarter of the people affected found the boom intolerable. During the twenty-six weeks of carefully controlled sonic boom tests in Oklahoma City, the Federal Aviation Agency received 15,452 complaints from residents and 4,901 formal damage claims. However, a spokesman for that agency concluded that the fault was not with the sonic booms but with the public relations efforts of the agency. Said Maj. Gen. J. C. Maxwell, the FAA's director of the SST program: "We [shall] need to do a much better job in telling the SST story in the years ahead."

Speaking of the tests, B. O. K. Lundberg, the Swedish aviation expert, states that the number of people protesting the boom would be far larger than the number of people ever expected to enter a supersonic plane. He states that every flight across the United States would produce a "boom carpet" covering some 10 million people and terrifying millions more.

Although thousands of damage claims have been filed and millions of dollars paid for their satisfaction, no claims have as yet been filed for the most tragic effect of the sonic boom. It was not until last January 11 that the Interior Department revealed serious damage to the prehistoric cliff dwellings in Mesa Verde National Park. Some of the most scenic areas known to man have been defaced. A Navajo Indian, Guy Quazzie Teller, watched as the shock wave from a single military plane demolished a large portion of a magnificent overhanging cliff.

On October 4, 1966, Park Ranger Charles B. Supplee, "a qualified archaeologist," observed continuing damage by sonic boom between 12:27 and 12:31 P.M., and at 2:33 P.M. park rangers counted eighty-three sonic booms from August 11 through December 22, 1966. On October 12, 1966, after three short booms were reported, "approximately 10 to 15 tons of dirt and rock was found to have fallen from one of the formations near the bottom of the Navajo Loop Trail, in the park." Interior Secretary Stewart Udall said that the situation was disturbing because of the "intrusion of the sonic boom on the fragile masterpieces of nature."

According to *The New York Times*, Udall discussed the matter with the Air Force "which promised cooperation but suggested that the Federal Aviation Agency should be consulted. Air space is considered to be the province of the aviation agency."

George B. Hartzog, Jr., director of the National Park Service, reported that the number of sonic booms over the Canyon de Chelly (in Mesa Verde National Park) had increased sharply in 1966. "With extensive back country and side canyons, the total damage is impossible to assess; however, it is reasonable to assume that it is extensive in view of the on-site observation in Canyon del Muerto." There park service engineers estimated that about 80 tons of rock fell on the cliff dwellings.

Additional damage has been found in Bryce Canyon and Zion National Parks in southern Utah. There, amazing sandstone formations, the result of nature's forces conspiring together for millions of years, have been reduced to rubble in an instant by a single sonic boom. While the Interior Department presumably could ask monetary

redress from the Defense Department, such a payment would be nothing more than an internal transfer of funds. Nothing can restore the damaged areas.

The severe wreckage already done in the U.S. by a handful of supersonic military planes increases the probability that such historic cities as Antwerp, Nuremberg and Vienna will never permit supersonic planes to approach within 100 miles. It goes without saying that the prohibition against overflight will be automatic for such jewels as Paris, Florence, Rome and Athens. The West German and Swiss Governments have already announced that they will forbid SST flights over their jurisdictions if their people find them annoying.

Even in the United States, where the historic shrines are much younger and less priceless, it seems improbable that even the flying public will be willing to risk boom damage to Mt. Vernon, Independence Hall or the White House. It seems more likely that the public will restrict the planes. That would mean that their utility would be severely reduced and the total cost per plane increased accordingly.

Some of the proponents of the SST seek to minimize the problem by saying that some inconvenience is the inevitable price of progress. They liken the process to the necessity for a prairie horse to become accustomed to the passing of an occasional railroad train. But obviously this is no realistic parallel. Given all that is presently known about the sonic boom, if regularly scheduled supersonic flights are permitted across the country, thousands of structures must be redesigned and rebuilt and their occupants fitted with sound suppressors, or a sonic boom right of way something like 100 miles wide must be cut from coast to coast.

Some people have suggested that since the force of the boom is a function of the size of the plane, a smaller version might be built for flights over land. Thus, they contend, the larger model (built by Boeing) could make the overwater hops while the smaller model (built by some other company) could fly over land. While this suggestion has the virtue of spreading the pie among several aircraft companies, it has the disadvantage of additional cost—perhaps \$1 billion more. And much of the time that potentially would be saved flying a supersonic transport from Los Angeles to Vienna would be consumed in transferring from the little jets to the big jet at New York, again to the little jet in London or Paris. Furthermore, the size of the market for each type of aircraft would be so reduced that there would be virtually no chance that either could ever pay its way.

Speaking of the problems of the sonic boom, C.B.S. reporter Bill Stout suggests that if the SST is restricted to overwater hops, the SST could easily become a multi-billion-dollar bust. And while over-ocean sonic boom problems have been dismissed as insignificant by the SST promoters, it is not at all clear that this view is shared by the ocean shipping industry, by pleasure boatmen or by the fishing interests. If the sonic boom swamps a few yachts, damages the masts in merchant vessels, and rudely awakens sleeping passengers on ocean-going liners, an entirely new set of legal problems may be created. Who is to say that the aviation industry has the right to interfere with ocean-going commerce? Might the sonic boom be construed by the shipping nations as interference with the traditional freedom of the seas?

As small segments of the public have become aware of the destructive potential of the sonic boom, public apprehension has increased. Unless they have a clear economic interest in the project themselves, many people will seriously question whether the increased speed can possibly be worth the cost. They are not impressed by the statements of SST promoters that the public simply will

have to get used to the boom. Nor are they convinced that overland operations should be permitted even if the earth-bound humans in sparsely populated areas are somehow compensated for the noise.

All of this raises serious questions concerning the feasibility of the supersonic transport itself and important questions also in a somewhat different realm. Should decisions critically affecting the living qualities of the earth be made only by the promoters, the bureaucrats and the technologists? Or should such decisions be shared by the people who must inevitably bear the brunt of them and who inevitably underwrite the cost?

[From the New York Times, May 21, 1967]
SUPERSONIC ECONOMICS

Supporters of Government subsidies for the supersonic passenger plane have continually stressed that it is needed to strengthen the nation's balance of payments. But a special report made for the Federal Aviation Agency and kept secret until now punctures this sales pitch. Far from helping to reduce the deficit in the balance of payments, the report by the Institute for Defense Analysis suggests that the SST may actually add to it.

The report states that the gains from foreign sales of an American SST will be more than offset by a big increase in American tourist spending abroad as well as by a reduction in sales of subsonic American planes. The F.A.A. disputes this analysis, insisting that if 500 SST's are sold, the balance of payments would benefit to the tune of \$17 billion, while if 1,200 are sold, the gain would be \$32 billion.

But given the high—and still unknown—cost of the SST and the problem of the sonic boom that threatens to limit its use, there is doubt that the manufacturers can sell 500 planes, to say nothing of more than twice that number. Some studies made for the Government estimate that only 200 to 300 will be sold by 1990.

The very fact that there can be no certainty about the sales prospects for the SST or its impact on the balance of payments argues for a deliberate and conservative approach in financing it. Statements based on hope and supersalesmanship are considerably less convincing than the hard facts of supersonic economics. The SST is supposed to be a commercial venture. It should meet commercial standards of investment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRIFFIN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE, NOT STATE DEPARTMENT, MUST RATIFY HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—LXXX

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise today to once again express my disappointment over the inactivity of this body with regard to the human rights conventions. There are those among us who say that the Department of State and the President have not done their share in convincing us to fulfill our constitutional responsibility of ratifying these treaties. I would hereby let it be known to each Member of the Senate that the time for "passing the buck" has termi-

nated. We must step up to the challenge that the Founding Fathers of our great Nation created for this body. We must act upon the conventions.

The State Department is the oldest executive department of the U.S. Government. It originated with a resolution of the Continental Congress of January 10, 1781, as the Department of Foreign Affairs, and was reconstituted as the Department of State on September 15, 1789. Thomas Jefferson was our first Secretary of State from 1790 to 1793.

With the rise of the United States to a position of power and responsibility in world affairs, the American people have increasingly recognized the influence of foreign affairs on their daily lives and have taken a more active interest in foreign policy.

This relatively new position of the United State of America has greatly increased the responsibilities of the Department. Today State has 7,500 American employees in the United States and an equal number stationed abroad. In addition, it now employs approximately 10,000 foreign nationals at our overseas posts.

The Secretary of State is the President's agent and principal adviser on matters of foreign policy and is responsible for the operation of the Department of State and the U.S. Foreign Service. He, in turn, has four chief advisers. The daily work of the Department is carried on by specialized units, most of which are headed by Assistant Secretaries.

One of these, the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, is subdivided into five offices, including the Office of International Economic and Social Affairs. That office, as described in the Government Organization Manual, "coordinates and develops for the Department, U.S. positions on the international aspects of human rights."

The State Department has, throughout this decade, maintained a very realistic stance on the Human Rights Conventions. The Department has informed Members of the Senate that State favors ratification and intends to see that the President ratifies each convention at such time as we in the Senate have given our advice and consent.

Mr. President, we cannot ask for the State Department to do more. It is we, and not they, who have been granted the responsibility of consenting to the ratification of any treaties. Our Constitution states unequivocally that two-thirds of the Senate must consent before the Department of State or any other Department in the executive branch can play any further part in the treaty-making process. We have shirked this responsibility long enough. We, the Members of the Senate, during the 90th Congress, should accept the opportunity history has thrust upon us. We should ratify the Conventions on Slavery, the Political Rights of Women, Forced Labor, Genocide, and Freedom of Association.

PRESIDENT OF CHICAGO BANK SPEAKS OUT ON TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently Mr. Alvin F. Friedman sent me an

excellent letter and statement endorsing the truth-in-lending bill. As the president of a Chicago bank with extensive experience in the installment lending field, Mr. Friedman is in a particular good position to judge the various arguments which have been raised against the truth-in-lending bill. Mr. Friedman concludes that all of these arguments are without merit and that it will be a simple matter for lenders or extenders of credit to provide full disclosure of credit costs to the consumer. Mr. Friedman points out the somewhat absurd position of banks who advertise that they pay 5 percent interest on savings but charge "4 percent" on loans. Obviously, few banks can stay in business on these terms. The truth-in-lending bill would require the banks to admit that their so-called 4-percent loans are really approximately 8 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD Mr. Friedman's excellent letter and statement.

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

AMALGAMATED TRUST & SAVINGS BANK,
Chicago, April 27, 1967.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Congratulations on the good work you are doing in the Senate, re: your credit disclosure bill.

I certainly support the principle that retail merchants and lenders should be required by law to disclose to the consumer all credit charges, both as dollars and cents and as the approximate yearly percentage rate, before the transaction is completed. Some of my reasons for this position are per the enclosed.

Keep up the good work!

Cordially,

ALVIN F. FRIEDMAN,
Vice President.

RETAIL MERCHANTS* AND LENDERS SHOULD BE REQUIRED BY LAW TO DISCLOSE TO THE CONSUMER ALL CREDIT CHARGES EXPRESSED BOTH AS DOLLARS AND CENTS AND AS THE APPROXIMATE MAXIMUM YEARLY PERCENTAGE RATE BEFORE THE TRANSACTION IS COMPLETED

A free society demands that the consumer be given the facts by which to make an intelligent choice, whether he takes advantage of that knowledge or not.

The American competitive system of free enterprise cannot operate as it is supposed to operate unless the participants have available to them, before the time for decision, the maximum possible information on which to make a decision—that is, to compare the price and quality of one service supplied by one supplier with that offered by another. The long list of consumer credit abuses makes it clear that such is not the case in the area of consumer credit transactions.

The 3 per cent per month plan of small loan companies is really 36 per cent per year! The small service charge of 1½ per cent per month on department store charge accounts could be as high as 18 per cent per year, i.e., if monthly payments are made after the grace periods.

The 4½ per cent of new car financing of some commercial banks is actually a charge of \$4.50 per year per \$100 loaned and amounts to an annual interest rate of approximately 9 per cent.

The so-called 7 per cent rate for financing used cars offered by some dealers is at least

* Revolving charge accounts could be exempted.

13 per cent per year and sometimes very much higher—18 to 25 per cent per year or more.

The advertised 5 per cent rate on home improvement loans is not less than a 6 per cent first mortgage, as it would seem, but is nearly twice as much, or about 10 per cent per year.

The cost of teenage credit now being promoted by some retailers as only "pennies per week" is sometimes as high as 80 per cent per year.

The Federal Trade Commission states that the installment add-on or discount rates is untrue and misleading, and that the real rate is approximately twice the stated rates in these cases.

When the consumer is informed as to the true credit rate, it is significant to note that he pays much less than the uninformed consumer. This conclusion was reached in a study conducted by Consumers Union in October of 1964.

The question obviously arises, therefore, why are not more consumers informed? The answer is that present credit practices are simply too complicated, complex, and confusing. For example, after four hours of instruction on credit rates with an excellent textbook and well-experienced teacher, only 38 per cent of a group of college students were able to figure out the annual rate of interest within six points. The average consumer remains uninformed, with results that are often socially destructive.

Now, if a disclosure bill became law, a consumer wishing to finance a used car for 18 months, with an unpaid balance of \$700 and monthly payments of over \$46, the car dealer would have to show the consumer, before he signed any papers, that his total finance charges were about \$129, and that this is a yearly rate of 22 per cent. After the consumer has this useful information, he could more intelligently decide if he wanted to pay these charges, or if he might wish to "shop around" for less costly financing.

In the long run, the best interests of the business community will always be served if there is honest and effective competition. It is obvious that a competitive and effective pricing system cannot be successful in the presence of misleading or deceptive pricing practices.

President John F. Kennedy recognized the plight of the confused and often bewildered consumer when he stated, "Excessive and untimely use of credit arising out of ignorance of its true cost is harmful both to the stability of the economy and to the welfare of the public. Legislation should therefore be enacted requiring lenders and vendors to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amounts and rates which they will be paying for credit."

Recently, a vice chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Chairman of the Installment Credit Division of the New York Bankers Association, publicly urged that lenders be required to state, both in dollars and annual interest rate, the maximum cost of consumer loans.

To simplify the computation, rate charts have been worked out and printed which make it easy to determine the consumer's annual rate. For example, disks, slide rules and charts devised and perfected by the Credit Union Supply Association, Bowery Savings Bank, U.S. Department of Defense, and the Michigan Agricultural Extension Service, respectively, give to little-skilled clerks the ability to compute the approximate annual rates in a few seconds which are accurate to a tenth of a percentage point.

The United States Department of Defense requires that sellers and lenders dealing with our three million servicemen and their families disclose in advance the dollar amount and the approximate annual rate. This Defense Department action is implemented by the use of a prepared table of

figures which shows the approximate annual percentage rates for level monthly payment plans, within $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent point at the lower rates and $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent at the higher rates.

In the states of Massachusetts and Washington, in 1966 and 1967, respectively, there are laws requiring retail merchants and lenders to disclose both dollar amount and approximate annual rate of credit costs. The Deputy Commissioner of Banks and General Council of Massachusetts has been quoted as saying:

"I am happy to report to you that the implementation of the legislative purpose expressed in the new Massachusetts statute on Truth in Lending has met with an unusual and unexpected measure of success. The allegations made by those who opposed the principle of truth in lending, on the ground that it was completely unworkable, have been proved beyond doubt to have been in error. We are encountering no difficulty from the lending agencies of this Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, the reverse is true. I think it a fair statement to say that the banking interests at every level are co-operating in every possible way, and that as a result thereof, the public interest is being substantially served."

Our Canadian neighbors in Nova Scotia and Ontario have passed legislation requiring complete disclosure of credit costs both in dollars and cents and as an annual rate. Nebraska's installment Sales Act of 1965 required that full disclosure of the yearly rate must appear on one of the documents or written instruments.

In addition, savings institutions are giving and advertising the effective rather than the nominal rates of interest. This further demonstrates the fact that financial institutions are capable of disclosing annual rates, figuring interest daily, and allowing deferred and irregular payments. Furthermore, it is a general practice for real estate loans to be stated in terms of actual yearly interest. The Boston Federal Savings and Loan Association shows the annual interest rate on its application form. The Federal Housing Administration's Guide for Home Buyers and Owners quotes monthly payments, total costs, and interest rates.

Also, experience with laws requiring some disclosure of credit rates shows them, too, to be successful. For instance, some state statutes, including the Illinois Installment Sales Act, already require that the total financing charges in dollars and cents be disclosed. Under Section 42, Chapter 74, of the Illinois Installment Loan Act, the lender is required to state the rate "as the dollar interest charge per \$100 per year of the original principal amount." Other state small loan acts require that the interest be stated as a simple annual percentage on the unpaid balance.

In addition to the consumer, the ethical and efficient lender or credit extender will also benefit if credit prices are made explicit in an accurate and uniform manner. Indeed, we cannot have a workable free enterprise system unless there is an adequate framework of rules which require sellers to accurately and honestly inform the buyers about their wares. Requiring full disclosure of credit costs will restore healthy competition to the consumer credit market. Although some business men complained about the Truth in Securities Act and various other labeling and full disclosure acts at the time of the enactment, they soon came to realize that such legislation was essential to the maintenance of a competitive free enterprise system.

Basically, the question is whether full and meaningful disclosure should prevail in transactions between dealers and lenders on the one hand and buyers and borrowers on the other. Full disclosure will reward the ethical businessman, deter the careless and less ethical, and generally benefit all but the determined and conscious wrongdoer.

A major benefit of requiring full disclosure could be a significant contribution to overall economic stability.

The need for the stabilizing effect on the economy which could result from disclosure of credit costs has been pointed out by Dr. James Tobin of the President's Council of Economic Advisors. "The cost of credit normally rises in periods of boom and inflation and falls in periods of recession. This natural cycle in credit charges, reinforced by monetary and credit policy, is a stabilizing force on the economy . . . However, the stabilizing effect of changes in credit costs depends on awareness by consumers that the changes have occurred. If buyers are ignorant of the true costs of credit, they are less subject to influence by cost changes. Increasing consumer awareness, . . . will help to make the cyclical fluctuations of credit costs a more stabilizing influence on the economy."

Moreover, Federal Reserve officials believe that economic growth is impaired when consumers are misled about the price of credit. The Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia in the April, 1960 issue of its *Business Review* pointed out that a real burden for the economy "occurs because consumers often buy on time in an uninformed way without knowing the cost of the money they are borrowing. When they do this, they not only hurt themselves, but they reduce the efficiency with which the economy provides goods and services in accordance with consumer taste."

ALVIN F. FRIEDMAN.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of 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.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY HENRY H. FOWLER

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, one of the most delightful, and one of the ablest Virginians is the present Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler.

On May 25 the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot did an editorial profile on Mr. Fowler, which, at the appropriate time, I shall ask consent be made a part of my remarks; but before doing that, I should like to point out that Secretary Fowler is the fourth Virginian to hold a Cabinet position during the 20th century.

Carter Glass served as Secretary of the Treasury under Woodrow Wilson, and then, in 1919, came to the Senate, where he served from that time until his death in 1946.

Claude Augustus Swanson was elected to the Senate in 1910 and served until his resignation in 1933, at which time he became Secretary of the Navy. Then, during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., served as Secretary of State.

I might say, Mr. President, that Mr. Fowler ranks, in ability and competence, equal with those three great Virginians who served with such distinction in the President's Cabinet.

I am proud of my friendship with Henry Fowler and with Mrs. Fowler; and Virginia is proud of this native of Roanoke who now resides in Alexandria—

and who is serving with such distinction, as Secretary of the Treasury.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD pertinent portions of an editorial profile of Henry H. Fowler, published in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot of May 25, 1967.

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

WITH AN INDEPENDENT STREAK

Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, who is known to hundreds in business, political, and government circles as "Joe," got the nickname while attending Jefferson High School in Roanoke.

"There was a restaurant, the Blue Ribbon, operated by two Greek brothers, Chris and Paul, where we'd go for hamburgers after dances. They had difficulty remembering our names and took to calling everybody Joe. We started addressing each other that way, and several of us who played basketball around the area called our team the Jefferson Joes. I carried the habit into college, and as I was one of the few Joes around, the name stuck."

He played, as well as read, furiously. He tried all sports, except football, which his father forbade. In college he was a boxer in the 129-pound—the featherweight—class.

"I didn't make any decision about a career until my senior year at Roanoke College. My father wanted me to be a lawyer. My mother, who was deeply religious—Momma sang in the choir in the Methodist Church—wanted me to be a minister.

"I liked to write, I liked to speak, I liked working with people, and had a pretty strong competitive instinct. Law, as a general discipline and as a profession, combined all those factors. The next choice, the thing I sweated out, was being a newspaperman."

(In high school he edited the "Junior World-News" in the Roanoke World-News, and in college the campus weekly. "I'm a frustrated newspaperman," he said.)

He was fond of the University of Virginia—and therefore went to Yale for his law degree. "I knew I mightn't do as much work if I went where I knew so many people; and when I landed on the campus at New Haven, I didn't know a single human being."

He won a doctorate at Yale on a Sterling Fellowship, took the Virginia Bar exam, and, on the way to New York City for a job interview, stopped in Washington for a social weekend. He liked the brisk intellectual environment and stayed as a law clerk with the firm of Covington and Burling.

After a year he joined the Office of General Counsel to work on a major Constitutional case in defending the Tennessee Valley Authority, not so much because he was drawn by the issue of private v. public power as by his concern as a Southerner in seeing an opportunity for the region's economic development. "It was the first evidence of a delayed Marshall Plan," he said.

While he was with the TVA he met and married a pretty administrative assistant in the architects' office, Trudye Pamela Hathcote. They have two daughters and three grandchildren and live in an early 19th Century house in the old section of Alexandria.

He worked in several Government agencies, including the War Production Board, during World War II, and directed the Defense Production Administration during the Korean War.

"I've always been a liberal among conservatives and a conservative among liberals. Anybody who knows me gets very confused by the situation. It's that independent North Carolina streak, that's all it is.

"That fellow up there—" he pointed to a portrait of Alexander Hamilton over his office mantel—"now I admire Jefferson as much as anybody, but the two of them—Jefferson and Hamilton—represent forces

that are not so much conflicting as complementary.

"I always have admired the contribution Hamilton made to the creation of the national government, but I have a strong feeling for state and local rights.

"Looked at in the terms of Alexander Hamilton's contribution, I don't see how otherwise we can play the role of international leadership we didn't seek but which history and destiny placed upon us."

AND A DECEPTIVE CALM

Henry H. Fowler's call to leadership came one day early in 1965 when he, a lawyer of 56, was sitting in a board of directors meeting of the First and Citizens National Bank in Alexandria and received a call to come to a side door of the White House.

"I knew the President well, and I thought he planned to ask my opinion of various persons he had under consideration for the vacancy. Riding into Washington I organized my thoughts about what to say of their qualities and characteristics. We met in the Cabinet room and he put me in the Secretary of Treasurer's chair to his left and said, 'Well, now if you were sitting in my chair, who would you want in that chair?'"

"I began my spiel, and after about three minutes, he cut me short, and after he finished speaking, that was that."

Had he any hesitancy about accepting?

"I'm just like a private given a gun and told to get in there. I had no hesitation at all.

"Let me say I'm all out for him. Lyndon Johnson has more background and experience for the Presidency and inspires in me more confidence than any man I have ever known.

"From a personal standpoint, I find him a very warm and stimulating individual. He fascinates me, the skill with which he operates. Sometimes I get almost bemused watching him handle a situation, but I never had a better boss.

"He's a man who always surveys very carefully the alternatives or options the situation presents, but having deliberated, he is capable of prompt and decisive action."

How does the occupant of the Treasury's hot seat maintain what seems to be an easy, self-contained calm?

"A lot of it is natural. Being a Southerner and a Virginian, I don't like to hurry when it isn't necessary.

"Secondly, when I was about 36, I had something called a spastic colon—which turned out to be an ulcer—and I was told I ought to try to do things deliberately. I certainly haven't lived up to it."

Does he turn to any special reminder in moments of stress?

He pulled from his wallet a mimeographed poem a friend had given him. Entitled *Slow Me Down, Lord*, it asks for help to know the magical, restorative power of sleep, the art of taking minute vacations, of chatting with a friend, petting a dog, reading a few lines from a good book.

Remind me each day of the fable of the hare and the tortoise that I may know there is more to life than increasing its speed; let me look upward into the branches of the towering trees and know that they grow tall because they grow slowly and well; slow me down, Lord.—

James F. King, his executive assistant, observed that the Secretary practiced some of it: "When it comes to the magical, restorative power of sleep, he proves he doesn't need as much as anybody else."

He seldom plays tennis, attends international conferences on government holidays, and devotes most of his reading to government documents.

About his only relaxation, noted Mr. King, is "just such an infrequent conversation as he has had with you."

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR SPONG AT EMORY AND HENRY COLLEGE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong] delivered the commencement address at Emory and Henry College, in Emory, Va., on Sunday, May 28, 1967. In his speech, Senator SPONG described the problems and turmoil of our time as "recurrent themes of an industrial and urban age." After telling the graduates that the purpose of their education had been to provide them with "the historical perspective necessary for an understanding of where we have been, and the intellectual skills necessary for making intelligent decisions about where we are going," Senator SPONG pointed out to them that—

It will be your responsibility and your challenge to take the more advanced problems and issues of the technological and urban age out from under what Thomas Jefferson called the "regimen" of your ancestors. To accomplish this, you must add experience to your historical perspective and academic preparation.

I found Senator Spong's speech provocative and thoughtful, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., AT EMORY AND HENRY COLLEGE, EMORY, VA., MAY 28, 1967

I want to talk for a few minutes today about your world—about the world you grew up in and about the world whose future you, now more than ever before, have a chance to determine.

You are among the first of a generation to live outside the immediate experience of two events which had significant materialistic and profound psychological implications for your elders. These events were the depression and a world war. At the same time you are among the first to have spent your entire life in a world alerted to the potentialities of atomic and nuclear power.

Your age has been characterized as one of skepticism, of unrest, of anxiety, of moral breakdown, of a disregard for law and order. Some supporting evidence can, of course, be found for all of this.

I believe, however, that the events and situations of our world can also be viewed as recurrent themes of an industrial and urban age.

In 1962 Michael Harrington published a book entitled *The Other America*. His subject was the poverty which exists in the ghettos of many of our large cities. Another author, Robert Hunter, wrote a book called *Poverty*, in which he defined the term as the condition in which persons "though using their best efforts, are failing to obtain sufficient necessities for maintaining physical efficiency." After studying all available statistics, Hunter concluded that "about 10 million Americans were living in poverty."

If the name of Robert Hunter is less familiar than that of Michael Harrington, it may be because Robert Hunter wrote in 1904.

People demonstrate—for civil rights, against the war in Vietnam, and for various other causes. But such activities are not without their antecedents. In the early years of our century, Susan Anthony waved picket signs for women's suffrage. The Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Anti-Saloon League carried their crusades into the bars and saloons themselves. The so-called

"bonus army" of veterans marched on Washington in 1932 demanding cash bonuses and was dispersed only after regular troops had been called out.

And student involvement in such activities is not original with our decade. If today's anti-war signs say "Draft Beer, not Students" rather than "Schools, not Battleships," it may be because this is 1967 and not in the 1930's.

Today, some adults, including members of the academic community, encourage students to refuse to fight in Vietnam. Yet Charles Elliot Norton, Harvard professor emeritus at the time, advised students not to enlist for service in the Spanish-American War, because it was an "unrighteous war."

Pointing to antiwar demonstrators and draft card burners, some persons have concluded that the United States is losing its patriotic tradition. But it was in 1933 that the magazine, *The Nation*, after describing antiwar demonstrations, predicted, "It will take more than flag waving and bugle calls to empty the colleges for another war." Of course, only a few years later the colleges were emptied as Americans went to fight a "war to end all wars" and to try where they had failed before "to make the world safe for democracy."

Unfortunately, the world is still not so safe for democracy—as evidenced by Cuba, Berlin, the Middle East, some areas of the developing nations and the Southeast Asia country of Vietnam. And it is not so certain that the "war to end all wars" completely accomplished the purpose of its slogan. While a nuclear war has become widely recognized as the prelude to destruction, we find ourselves involved in the so-called "limited war."

Furthermore, we are told that our people are confused and uncertain about our current involvement in a particular "limited" conflict.

But that is not so novel either. *U. S. News and World Report* wrote "Down at the grass roots, what people want is peace, if they can get it. Failing that, they want to fight a war, when they must, that they have a real chance to win. They don't see this chance in an all-out war with Communist China." The same article quotes one person as saying "It's foolish to fight little fires until Russia is ready to launch an all-out attack," while another person suggests "pull all our men out, cut the losses short."

The article is 17 years old and refers, of course, to the Korean conflict.

Observers speak of a breakdown in respect for law and order and the President of the United States calls for a massive program to control crime. Organized crime is said to present a particular threat. If we refer to the problem today as organized crime rather than gangsterism or racketeering, it is perhaps because crime has become more subtle, more sophisticated, if you like. But to say that it is a recent threat is to ignore the Al Capone era and such things as the 500 gang murders which took place in Chicago alone between 1920 and 1929.

Likewise, to point to a moral breakdown among youth is to disregard much of what took place in the 1920's and to point to a Billie Sol Estes or other corruption in government is to forget a Tammany Hall, the teapot dome and a Boss Tweed.

This does not mean that our problems are the same as they were in previous years. In fact, the complexity and magnitude of these problems, and even their focus has changed drastically.

What I am suggesting is that many of our problems are in general the old industrial-age problems in the new wrappings of a further developed technological and urbanized nation. We have, for example, had the problem of war before, but not the same threat of destruction. We have had poverty before, but not on the same scale; war demonstrations, but not with the same implications, a previous relaxation of moral standards, but not with the same results. We have had

urban problems but not the questions of air and water pollution, rapid transit, health and educational manpower on the same massive level.

Yet, despite this increase in the scope and intensity of our problems, advanced technology and expanding educational opportunities have offered a new insight into our problems and an increase in the capacity for solving them.

You have not been given all the answers to your problems here in the past four years. Hopefully, you have acquired the historical perspective necessary for an understanding of where we have been and the intellectual skills necessary for making intelligent decisions about where we are going.

It was Thomas Jefferson who noted that as the human mind "becomes more developed, more enlightened; as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered; and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times." "We might as well," he continued, "require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as (require) civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of our ancestors."

You can no longer wear a boy's coat. At the same time, the world into which you are going will not permit you to put on a man's coat all at once. In a way you will be required to start all over, at the beginning, as a freshman. You are likely to enter an office or company which has its procedures set and over whose control you will have little influence. It is probable that you will not begin earning quite as high a salary as you would like or doing the "interesting and creative" jobs that you want to do or holding the responsibility which you feel you are capable of handling. In some cases you may not be able to determine what time you go to lunch or how long you have to eat. You may be required to follow certain procedures, even on things as minor as answering the telephone, which you feel are ridiculous.

You may feel now that you know your particular field well. I trust that in many instances you do. But you will not always succeed and you will not always be right. You are likely to find that four years of studying does not match ten or fifteen years of direct experience and that there are aspects of your chosen profession which you never thought of. A doctor, for example, may be expert in his particular medical field, but if he cannot arrange the business part of his job, he is likely to find that bills do not go out, that the needed supplies are not maintained or that his record system is not complete. Or take the case of a teacher, a lawyer or a newspaperman. No matter how knowledgeable each might be in the area of his specialty, each will be truly forceful and influential only if he also has the understanding of human nature which comes with experience. These phases of a job may seem minor or peripheral to you, but they are essential for effectiveness and efficiency.

This is not intended to discourage you. Neither unbridled optimism nor undue pessimism is warranted. If you have the historical perspective and intellectual tools which I mentioned and the good fortune of finding a job with a capable and progressive company, this experience should be only a part of your continuing education, and additional preparation for the role you will later play. For, not only do those from whom you must now begin to learn have experience in their professions, but they also have experience in dealing with the problems and issues which are recurrent in our history. These persons have already wrestled—if on a lesser scale—with poverty, with disease, with finances, with war and peace. They have made progress, they have laid foundations on which to build. They may not have the answers to all the problems posed by the broadening scope and intensity of technological and urban development. They certainly cannot

hand to you on a silver platter all the solutions you need in the upcoming decades. But you would not want that, for that would deny you the opportunity to develop your own potentialities and to meet your own problems. It will be your responsibility and your challenge to take the more advanced problems and issues of the technological and urban age out from under what Thomas Jefferson called the "regimen" of your ancestors. To accomplish this, you must add experience to your historical perspective and academic preparation. "Nothing ever becomes real," said Keats, "till it is experienced—even a proverb is no proverb to you till your life has illustrated it."

I hope your lives will be richly illustrated and I wish you well in all your endeavors.

WHAT'S NEW AT PATUXENT WILDLIFE REFUGE?

Mr. MUNDT, Mr. President, as Senators know, I have for many years been urging appropriations for a research project at the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge near Laurel, Md., designed to preserve American rare and endangered wildlife. The program is now beginning to provide positive results. There is increasing public awareness of the problem and interest in helping solve the problem.

On May 26, Burt Schorr, writing in the Wall Street Journal, provided us with a most interesting and informative article on the attempt to take whooping crane eggs from the nesting grounds at Wood Buffalo National Park and return them to the Patuxent Center for hatching. This project is underway right now and is a significant step in the preservation of whooping cranes and an eventual increase in their numbers. Mr. Schorr also discusses several other aspects of the rare and endangered wildlife program.

I ask unanimous consent that his story entitled "United States, Canadian Agents Plan an Urgent Joint Operation Next Week," be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES, CANADIAN AGENTS PLAN AN URGENT JOINT OPERATION NEXT WEEK—HELICOPTERS WILL CARRY TRAINED TEAMS TO SEEK OUT ELUSIVE QUARRY IN THE NORTH COUNTRY

(By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—An urgent international operation starts next week. Here's the lowdown:

Two U.S. Government agents arrive by plane at Fort Smith in Canada's remote Northwest Territories to join their counterparts from Ottawa. A U.S.-Canadian team then speeds by helicopter over the almost-impassable lake-and-muskeg terrain to pre-selected destinations. Trained hands probe for the mission's precious quarry and place it in special insulated carriers warmed by hot-water bottles to 99 degrees. Back in Fort Smith, the U.S. operatives load their prize aboard a Canadian government aircraft and fly nonstop to their secluded Maryland countryside headquarters. There a tense wait begins.

Another CIA caper? Hardly. The operation is designed to aid survival of the nearly extinct whooping crane. What the U.S. Government men—actually two soft-spoken biologists from the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center outside Washington—aim to bring back from Canada is five or six giant beige and reddish-brown whooper eggs scooped from nests in the wild.

If the hopes of the Patuxent bird men are

realized, some 10 days of artificial incubation will produce a number of tawny, fluffy-feathered whooping crane chicks. These birds, together with others hatched later from additional eggs, could in turn beget more whooping cranes. The potential result: A major victory in the 30-year struggle of naturalists to preserve the graceful whooper, North America's tallest bird (over four feet), from eradication by trigger-happy hunters and the intrusion of civilization on its shrunken habitat. A count of the species' present survivors turned up a meager 43.

STEPPED-UP EFFORT

The Canadian quest is only one of the signs that Uncle Sam, after decades of half-hearted effort, is now committed to preventing endangered North American, Caribbean and Pacific wildlife species from following the passenger pigeon and the penguin-like great auk into extinction.

In the fiscal year ended last June 30, Congress began providing significant infusions of cash for preservation projects. One result of this spending, a \$145,000 wildlife propagation setup that will permanently house the whooping crane incubator and newly hatched birds, is nearing completion at the Patuxent center.

With more than a dozen wildlife specialists added to its staff, the Interior Department's Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife also has been able to begin essential studies of other endangered creatures. These range from the California condor, a giant vulture whose population is believed to total less than 100, to the black-footed ferret, a small and rarely seen Great Plains denizen that spends much of its time underground in prairie-dog burrows.

Naturalists, pleased by the Government's concern, say it reflects a surge of public support for preservation of the total natural environment.

THE ENVIRONMENT CRISIS

"There's a new awareness of pollution problems and the environment crisis that makes our job easier; people are beginning to recognize that diversity of species is the best index of an environment's worth," asserts Roland C. Clement, staff biologist and vice president of the National Audubon Society, which has pioneered in wildlife preservation efforts since its founding in 1905.

Businessmen, too, seem to sense a change in public attitudes. Some see wildlife protection as a way to earn good will.

Not long ago, Northern States Power Co. and Boise Cascade Corp., after conferring with Federal wildlife representatives, set aside a total of 330,000 woodland acres in northern Minnesota and Wisconsin as sanctuaries for the imperiled national symbol, the American bald eagle. Both companies adopted such safeguards as marking their land-management maps with eagle-nesting sites, establishing buffer zones 660 feet in radius around active nest trees and barring foot trails and other development that would make the nests more accessible to man.

"If corporate officials don't take such steps, they're going to face increasing Government encroachments," a Northern States spokesman predicts.

But Federal wildlife men still have much fact-finding to do before they can be sure what new protective moves to make. It was only last year that the Government got around to publishing its first comprehensive list of endangered species—some 300 birds, mammals, reptiles, amphibians and fish. Sample selection: Indiana bat, gray whale, Hawaiian monk seal, American alligator and shortnose sturgeon.

Collecting data on wildlife is a hard job. Some of its difficulties can be glimpsed in the work of the Craighead brothers, John and Frank Jr., two Montana ecologists. They have been studying the Yellowstone National Park grizzly bear since 1959, supported by Government and private funds.

The grizzly, or *Ursus horribilis*, sometimes comes in half-ton sizes. It can turn without warning into a savage juggernaut of claws and teeth—a trait that used to discourage close scientific surveillance. But using hypodermic darts loaded with a muscle-paralyzing anesthetic and then administering shots of tranquilizer, the Craigheads immobilized more than 400 bears for examination.

RADIO-EQUIPPED BEARS

To learn more about life among the grizzlies, they affixed colored tags to the ears of 225 of them and fitted more than 30 with two-ounce battery-powered collar radios. (The radios were donated by Philco-Ford Corp., a Ford Motor Co. subsidiary, which also developed special tracking equipment able to pick up the radio "beeps" from as far as 20 miles away.) Thus, the minute-to-minute whereabouts of individual bears could be known.

As a result of their efforts, the brothers were able to make the first accurate generalizations about the Yellowstone region's diminished grizzly population (estimated at 850 in Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, and Colorado). One Craighead finding is that the average wild female grizzly doesn't breed until her fifth year and only produces one litter every 3 years. Another is that the average grizzly life-span in the wilds is only 5 or 6 years, with hunters outside the Yellowstone Park limits accounting for about 40% of the mortality. Reflecting the Craigheads' belief that a female might easily be killed before reproducing once, their final report will recommend tighter state game regulations to allow shooting of only a few "trophy" grizzlies each year, rather than the more general "meat" hunting now permitted outside the park.

The far smaller size of the whooping crane population has made whooper detective work every bit as exacting as grizzly tracking. One dedicated American ornithologist, Robert Porter Allen, spent a decade before finding some of the few remaining whooper nests in the 17,300-square-mile wilderness of Canada's Wood Buffalo National Park, which will be the target of next week's joint U.S.-Canadian expedition. Though the Canadian Wildlife Service suspects a dozen pairs of the birds are now mating there, it probably won't be able to pinpoint the location of more than half of them when time comes for the egg-napping, says David Murno, director.

PREDATOR PROBLEM

Robbing these nests won't imperil whooper survival as it might seem, U.S. and Canadian wildlife men argue. "Studies suggest that nearly half of the whooping crane nesting effort is wasted due to predators eating eggs and other factors," says Ray C. Erickson, the Patuxent biologist who will lead the mission to Canada. "In addition, there's a heavy loss of young birds."

Six years' successful experience in artificially hatching eggs removed from Florida and Oregon nests of the less rare sandhill crane raises hope for much improved survival of baby whoopers through use of an incubator. But a question remains as to whether the artificially incubated cranes will in turn produce offspring in captivity. Patuxent-reared female sandhills have produced over 30 eggs during the last two years. Yet none of these eggs have proved fertile; the male birds haven't done their part.

The Patuxent bird men now theorize that because all young animals seem to "imprint" or become mentally fixed on the first living individual seen, early exposure of the young sandhills to human beings has prevented them from accepting each other as mates.

So if whooping crane eggs are successfully hatched, Mr. Erickson plans to insist that any person approaching the birds be garbed in a white shroud—thus vaguely resembling a parent crane—or be concealed behind a screen. In addition, the young birds will be exposed to *Canus*, an adult whooping crane now in residence at Patuxent, as well as life-

sized whooper silhouettes cut from plywood and painted white.

THE ALASKA CENTENNIAL OPENING IN FAIRBANKS: A GREAT SHOW

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, along with my colleague from Alaska, Senator BOB BARTLETT, I had the privilege of attending the opening of the Alaska Purchase Centennial in Fairbanks this past weekend. Representatives of our State and Federal Governments and of the Government of Canada participated in this event, which was an unqualified success and reflected great credit on those who brought it about.

A vast amount of highly intelligent planning, good taste, sound judgment, and dedicated effort produced a result which drew hearty and deserved praise from all who attended.

The days of 1898—the days of the gold rush—were brought to life vividly, entertainingly and charmingly. Past history and custom were entrancingly brought before a new generation of pioneering Alaskans. The tourists will love it. This achievement by the Centennial Commission was in itself an historic event and will remain for future generations to enjoy. There was much else—all of it very good.

An interesting article on the opening, written by its west coast correspondent, was published in the New York Times of Sunday, May 28. I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the news story by Lawrence E. Davies be printed in the RECORD.

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

ALASKANS OPEN AN EXPOSITION TO MARK THE CENTENNIAL OF "SEWARD'S FOLLY"

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, May 27.—Alaskans today commemorated the 100th anniversary of "Seward's Folly," one of the biggest real estate deals in American history.

DOGSLEDS TO SPACE

Ribbon cutting and speeches by American and Canadian officials opened the exposition, in which the transition of Alaska from the dogsled era to the space age is depicted.

Senators E. L. Bartlett and Ernest Gruening, Alaska Democrats, Representative Howard Pollock and Gov. Walter J. Hickel, Republicans who replaced Democrats in last November's election, and Arthur Laing, Canadian Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, had roles in the opening ceremonies.

President Johnson was represented by Ross D. Davis, Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Former Judge Vernon D. Forbes, chairman of the Alaska Purchase Centennial Commission, J. D. Vogwill, president of Alaska 67, and several others were on the program.

The centennial center was unveiled at the end of a week of mild temperatures, ranging during the day from 50 to 60 degrees, at a time of year when it is light here at midnight. A midnight baseball game is scheduled for June 21, between the Fairbanks Goldpanners and a team from Japan.

Humorous as well as serious references to the Russian-American land deal worked out by Seward with the Russian Minister, Baron Edouard Stoeckel in 1867, marked the celebration's start.

A celebration marking the sale of the land to the United States by Czarist Russia began at a 41-acre exposition center in this old Gold Rush town. State, Federal and local

governments and individual contributors are spending on it more than the \$7.2-million paid by a reluctant Congress in the original transaction.

"Seward's Folly," negotiated in 1867 by the then Secretary of State William H. Seward, gave the United States 586,400 acres of land at the price of a 5-cent postage stamp for every four acres.

The Alaska 67 Centennial Exposition is expected to draw about 400,000 visitors. But, like Canada's more ambitious Expo 67 in Montreal, it is accepted in advance by enthusiastic Alaskans as a money loser.

During the year, in 41 communities all over the state, the Purchase Centennial will be observed, but the officially designated focal point for the next 126 days, until Sept. 30, is the Fairbanks site on the Chena River here in the interior of the 49th state, 100 miles below the Arctic Circle.

A KOSYGIN "TELEGRAM"

The official program bore a series of fictitious telegrams, including one signed "A. Kosygin, Moscow," that had the Soviet leader giving this notice to Alaskans:

"Sirs: Have filed for injunction with International Court of Justice. Cease all activity at Alaska 67. Examination of grandfather rights indicates we still hold title to property you call Alaska."

The Fairbanks phase of the statewide observance packs in a mixture of education, the arts—ranging from handicraft of Eskimos, Aleuts, Athabascans and Tlingit Indians to musicals and drama on several stages, along with paintings by Alaskan artists—and a spectrum of amusements.

Visitors to the amusement park climbed aboard open cars drawn over a mile-long track by a little steam locomotive of the "Crooked Creek & Whiskey Island Railroad," a reproduction of an engine with a pot-bellied smokestack that operated over narrow-gauge tracks to the goldfields around 1885.

Others preferred to "mush" behind a dog team, with wheels substituting for sled runners in the absence of snow.

EMPHASIS ON CRAFTS

The exposition planners laid heavy emphasis on native arts and crafts. A village built on the site has brought Eskimos and Indians to Fairbanks for the summer to live in Eskimo sod houses and Indian log cabins. A house of stretched walrus skins illustrates the housing of King Islanders living off the state's western coast.

Dr. Erna Gunther, chairman of the anthropology department at the University of Alaska, set out to fill a small anthropological museum at the fair with art and artifacts to match the slogan, "Native arts of Alaska, come home."

"What I've tried to do is to find Alaskan art work all over the world and bring examples back for the exposition," she said. "Here is an ivory-decorated wooden sunshade from the museum of Rear Adm. Adolf Etolin of the Russian Navy in Finland. He spent 1820 to 1824 in southeast Alaska. I have a wooden figure six feet tall, not a totem pole but a figure memorializing a person, coming from Mexico City."

Her prizes include, she said, one of three known copper masks, inlaid with abalone shells, made by Tlingit Indians. She borrowed it from a museum in St. Joseph, Mo. A similar mask, she noted, is possessed by the Museum of Primitive Art in New York.

LOG CABINS SALVAGED

The exposition took advantage of Fairbanks' urban renewal projects to salvage 34 log cabins, which have been permanently installed to house exhibits at the fair site. In fact, all structures on the grounds, except the United States pavilion with its silver geodesic dome, are marked for retention as part of a lasting pioneer mark.

The old Palace Saloon at the corner of Gold Rush Street and Sourdough Way has

been rebuilt. It boasts of a picturesque 22-foot bar found by its owner, Bob Guthrie, in the ghost town of Iditerod.

"Wiley Post," Mr. Guthrie said, "had a drink at this bar in 1934 when he made a forced landing at Iditerod on one of his attempted trips around the world."

The saloon and adjoining cafe, along with cancan dancers on a tiny stage, offers a menu of sourdough pancakes, reindeer sausages, reindeer miner's stew and Alaska king crab.

A Gold Rush era exhibit of immense popular potential is "The Big Stampede," housed in Pioneer Hall. An audience seated on a slowly revolving platform views a series of 15 murals by C. (Rusty) Heurlin, long a leading Alaskan artist, showing gold prospectors in the Klondike and Fairbanks rushes at the turn of the century. A taped narration of 45 minutes by Ruben Gaines, a Pacific Northwest radio commentator and storyteller, explains the murals.

Nearby the largest sternwheeler of its cargo-carrying type ever to operate on Alaskan inland waters—the 242-foot-long Nenana—has been reconditioned from her rotting stage into a modern restaurant for permanent use at the fair site.

While Anchorage and other cities and towns participate in their own centennial expositions during the year, Sitka, the headquarters of Russian America, takes the center of the stage on Oct. 18.

A century ago on that date the Russian flag was hauled down and the Stars and Stripes hoisted. Congress had not yet begun action to appropriate the purchase price for Alaska worked out six months earlier.

THE CITIZEN, THE CRIMINAL, AND THE CRIME

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the May 28 issue of the Washington Evening Star contains a lengthy feature article written by Ronald Sarro and Walter Gold, in which the frustration of being a Washington policeman is graphically depicted.

Coinciding with the publication of this article was the news of the release by Kemper Insurance of a 30-minute motion picture entitled "The Thin Blue Line," dealing with crime and police problems.

In a city which saw a 60-percent increase in crime from last April to this April, the lament of a policeman, as reported by the Star, is:

We get absolutely no cooperation from people, and when you do, the courts defeat it. Sometimes you wonder if it's worth it, and maybe you look the other way.

In this context, Kemper publication asserts:

A wave of frustration has swept over the entire field of law enforcement, adversely affecting police recruitment and the rate of resignation.

The writers of the Star article also quote an unnamed policeman as saying:

I knew that if anyone challenged my arrest, I'd get no backing from the top—the officials, that is—they have no set policy. Sometimes if they think no one will raise a stink about it, they'll pat you on the back and tell you you're a good officer.

The increase in crime, together with the obstacles placed in the path of arrest by recent court rulings; congestion in our courts; and the attitude that somehow, collective society is to blame for the actions of criminals, hardly auger well for the permanence of the basic equation for the lessening of crime.

Few law enforcement officers would disagree that the prospects of prompt capture, speedy trial, and severe penalty are major deterrents to crime.

In all three respects, we as a nation, are failing.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Evening Star article and the publication by Kemper Insurance, which describes the crime problem in the Chicago area, be printed in the RECORD.

I ask also that two recent editorials from the Evening Star, entitled "Bad Day on the Crime Front" and "Crime: What's That?" be printed in the RECORD; also the text of a speech on Washington crime which I delivered on May 25 before the Political Study Club of the District of Columbia.

I further ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Wyoming State Tribune of May 17, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

In this latter item, Tribune Editor James Flinchum, after describing the prospects of a brutal summer of civil unrest in America, asserts that—

Before all of this occurs, the Johnson Administration, which is sitting back complacently and refusing to do anything against such lawless outbreaks, had better take action.

I thoroughly agree with that observation.

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

[From the Washington Star, May 28, 1967]

THE COPS TELL THEIR STORY: "YOU'RE DAMNED IF YOU DO, YOU'RE DAMNED IF YOU DON'T"

(By Ronald Sarro and Walter Gold)

As you pound the pavement, you wonder whether you will make the arrest that will cause a riot.

Wheeling around in the white cruiser, you know that in this city the smallest incident can turn into a life-and-death situation.

Deep in the pit of your stomach, you feel you're damned if you do, and damned if you don't—and nobody else really knows how it is.

You are a policeman, but white or Negro, you're mocked, ridiculed, spat upon, stoned, taunted, enticed or jumped at the slightest provocation by militant youths.

President Johnson calls it a national trend towards lawlessness. You call it a powder keg of hostility and hate.

Most demoralizing of all, you feel the people you're doing it all for—the community—are not with you. Your morale is the lowest.

What once would have been a routine arrest becomes a federal case, an incident, a disturbance with dangerous racial overtones.

That split-second decision you'll have to make on whether to use your nightstick and gun quietly gnaws at you. And you wonder whether the man above you will back you up.

That about sums up how Washington's on-the-beat policemen say they feel today.

To find out what it's like to police Washington streets The Star went to the men who do it, interviewing dozens of policemen in the city's 14 precincts.

This was in the wake of recent shooting incidents involving policemen and youths.

The officers were breaking a department rule by talking to reporters, and Police Chief John B. Layton was opposed to the story. One reporter was asked to leave a precinct building for attempting to conduct interviews. But they talked anyway.

The National Crime Commission, in its report on police, observed that "the capabil-

ity of a policeman, and particularly one who works in a high crime rate or slum neighborhood, to act in a restrained manner is constantly tested."

In doing his job, the commission said, "A policeman's authority is daily challenged by unruly juveniles anxious to detect any weakness or fear. In dangerous neighborhoods, he may be mocked, threatened or even spat upon."

"Even if an officer is of the highest quality, his work and the people with whom he must deal may cause him to become disillusioned or angry," it said.

So is it on Washington streets.

"It's the people's attitude about police work," said one veteran Negro officer. "It's a rotten job and you do it."

"You wonder if you'll make the arrest that will cause a riot. If you can see that far ahead, you don't make the arrest and avoid it."

"You put your job on the line every time you step out of this precinct," he said.

BAITING A POLICEMAN

The type of baiting a policeman is subjected to was seen last week just after two Negro youths were wounded by the Negro officer on the Northwest playground during a struggle which stemmed from a routine arrest.

The playground had been cleared for the investigation, and two white policemen guarded the entrance. A bearded Negro youth tried to push his way into the playground. He was told it was closed for the time being.

"What the hell do you mean I can't go out there, man, I pay my taxes," the youth said. As the policeman repeated his superior's instructions, the youth, taller and heavier, pressed toward the policeman's face, saying: "Look, whitey, you guys have just murdered (they were wounded) two more of my brothers and I'm going out there to find out why."

There was another exchange, and then the agitator said, "If you want me to move back, whitey, then you're going to have to shoot me . . . you're going to have to murder me like you just did my two brothers."

The officer was then flanked by a racially mixed group of newsmen, and some youngsters broke the tension by laughing at the agitator. Whereupon he said, "All right, whitey, you've got me outnumbered but you just wait. You'll have to shoot me before the day is over."

As he left, he shouted over his shoulder, "This is the last straw. We're going to get even with all of you before sundown."

FORCE UNDER STRENGTH

Eight out of 10 Washington policemen are white. The city is more than 65 percent Negro. Eight out of 10 arrested persons are Negro; as are eight out of 10 victims of crimes.

The Metropolitan Police Force is more than 300 men short of its authorized strength of 3,100 men. Many of its men regularly work six-day weeks.

Both Negro and white officers emphasized that the color of the policeman's skin doesn't make much difference on tense Washington streets.

"If they have a riot, they are not going to pick out whites or Negroes. Just policemen, and we're all in the same boat," said an 11th Precinct Negro private.

A veteran of nine years on the force, he said, "I'm apprehensive out there. Some of these youths provoke police to arrest them just so they can yell police brutality."

"I've taken some verbal abuse myself, although not too much without acting. The kids know that to claim brutality is the one way to get back at police for exercising his authority no matter how justified," the officer said.

"DON'T TURN YOUR BACK"

Talking of his "apprehension" on the street, the Negro officer said, "It's don't turn

your back or make a mistake, because it could be your last time.

"In 1959, I felt I had the community's support, the community with me. Now nobody's with us, not even the businessmen. All they say is they never see a cop."

He continued:

"They'll abuse you out there, the kids, calling names, struggle and put up a fight for no reason, same tactics as ever, just more of it. You very seldom get in trouble over major crime; it's always the petty things."

"An officer is afraid to use his gun, even if it's justified. Officials are constantly putting it in your head about the penalties. Some officers don't want to get involved under these conditions. The old time cops wouldn't have stood for it."

"Even in the most routine arrest, a crowd is going to gather . . . And you wonder, is the fellow going to complain; is the case going to be thrown out of court; are you going to be sued for false arrest?"

"You are afraid to move out there and you gotta be careful. Some officers are afraid to do anything. Others are a little jumpy, because of the tension and may be quicker to use the stick."

"But a policeman has a gun, a nightstick, and a blackjack, and when someone attacks you, you have to assume he's trying to do you in, and act accordingly," he said.

UNDERSCORES DISRESPECT

A white 14th Precinct officer underscored the disrespect for police by youth. "It's police in general they don't like and it doesn't matter about the color of your skin," he said.

"We're enticed every day, mostly by name calling and rock throwing. They have a favorite obscene name they use—and they use it on officers of both races."

"A man will call you that and the policeman gets mad. He might tighten up on his hold on the man's belt some, but I've never seen a policeman hit one for it."

"It's funny about force. A colored policeman often can use force and get away with it. They (youths) can't charge discrimination."

A policeman for four years patrolling a high tension area in Northeast, the officer said, "These kids hate cops. They just hate the white ones more."

"The book says its a felony assaulting an officer, and you can use your gun. But no one can tell you what to do out there. You do what seems best and right for the moment," the officer said.

"We get absolutely no cooperation from people and when you do, the courts defeat it. Some times you wonder if it's worth it and maybe you'll look the other way."

The officer said that when responding to calls for certain crimes, like "man with a gun" or "robbery in progress," he "will have the gun ready, but not out, or I should say I'm ready to pull out the gun."

"You wonder about getting killed every day. You go into the projects, and everything you do is wrong, even if you're trying to help them," he said.

A 29-year-old Negro officer assigned to a mid-town precinct offered a poignant appraisal of the situation. He told it this way:

"A lot of us, especially the Negro officers, thought that things would be different once the city started hiring more colored men to be policemen here."

"We thought that, with a more balanced police force, there wouldn't be as many complaints from the people that the 'white cops' were picking on them. The white officers were glad . . . the colored people would stop squawking."

"But somehow, none of this happened. Instead our own people turn against us in many cases, calling us Uncle Toms, and 'the white man's slave.'"

"To the nigger on the street—that's right,

we call some of our own niggers; there's a difference, you know, between a Negro and a nigger— . . . to the nigger on the street we were traitors.

SCOUT CAR INTEGRATION

"The integrationists were yelling, 'integrate the scout cars,' so we integrated the scout cars and that didn't do much good either . . . A black officer and a white officer would make a joint arrest and, if it was a white man we locked up, we were picking on him. . . . He'd say, 'Your black partner tell you what to do?' . . . and the Negroes said just the opposite, so we still couldn't win."

"It used to be that every time a white officer shot a Negro suspect, the civil rights groups raised all kinds of hell. Now they do it every time any policeman shoots a criminal."

The Negro officer concluded:

"But whenever one of our men, white or black, gets attacked or even killed by a hood, you never hear the good citizens raise hell. I'd like to know what goes through their minds. Do they think that we're something less than human, something like discarded trash that isn't missed?"

"As for me, man, when I police, I just play it cool. I'm no hero."

SEES "BACKPEDALING"

The young white lieutenant assigned to a downtown precinct said, "It's no secret that the police here are backpedaling. They let these bums get away with so darned much only because any type of crackdown brings screams of protest from the civil rights groups."

"I say the hell with these civil righters and the protesters. If a guy breaks the law, then lock him up and charge him with the offense. And if he gives you any lip, verbally or physically, use whatever force is necessary to maintain your arrest, or your name is mud."

"Because the word gets around that you backed down, and from then on you have to fight every punk in the precinct to keep law and order."

A 40-year-old white private from an uptown precinct observed, "We'll probably never get back to the old days when a policeman was a policeman and his word was law and, by God, you'd better not defy him or you'd go to the hospital before you went to jail."

"Perhaps we kicked around too many people too often and now the cycle has gone the other way. Neither way is really right. The only way to restore some sort of law and order is for more than half of the people who live here to rise up against the criminals who are less than 5 percent of the population."

ON A POWDER KEG

A policeman on the beat is "sitting on a powder keg," according to a 13th Precinct Negro private, a member of the force for four years.

"If you don't get a man off the street right away, there is a possible incident. A lot of times this is impossible. There are many times when the arrest is provoked."

"They know—the unruly ones—what our limitations are and take it upon themselves to cause a disturbance. You have to do something about it and if you don't, you're harassed by everyone," the officer said.

"You're caught between the devil and the deep blue sea. Juveniles know just how far they can go and they take you to the breaking point. It's the code of the street. To live in it, you have to be stronger than the next man," he said.

PERSONAL CONTACTS

"But the average policeman likes being a policeman," the private continued. "They train you to use your logic, but you don't know what you'll do in the heat of battle."

Many of the officers interviewed emphasized the need for personal contacts with members of the community in non-adversary settings. One suggested, "When they

have community relations meetings, the privates who patrol and live with the people should be invited, not just the officials who are hardly ever out on the street."

A Negro sergeant, who has served on the force nine years in the 10th and 2nd Precincts, said some officers have taken the street difficulties personally and say "what's the use, and do just enough to satisfy their captain."

"They see a crime in progress and they turn the other way . . . A lot of men have the feeling they are not going to be backed up. They are constantly hounded by superiors. There are inequities in enforcing department policies. Police don't have the guidelines to help them in these tense situations."

"HAS BETTER CHANCE"

"I have run into both Negroes and whites who are afraid of the people they have to police. I have seen one officer directing traffic while his partner was in a fight. That's ridiculous."

"A Negro officer has a better chance of getting to know the people in his precinct simply because of his race . . . We ought to get back to the ideal of all Negro precincts. . . . There are white officers in number 11 who won't go into Barry Farms (public housing project.) Negroes can."

The sergeant said one difficulty in developing better police-community relations is that "white officers have trouble telling one Negro kid from another. They can't be police in these areas."

"Police and city officials are catering too much to these so-called community leaders around here. These community leaders have got to stop talking about the long hot summer, and riots and these things. They are planting the idea with people. Trying to generate a riot. Trying to incite a riot. And I mean Stokely and Barry and the rest."

One Negro private, a 10-year veteran of Anacostia duty, said:

"I think Washington police take more abuse without retaliation than any other major police department. In other places, police would bash some heads in," he said.

"Here we are told to stay away from areas during disturbances, and in effect not protect the public, but leave it to community leaders and they end up with glory for preventing something they sometimes contributed to starting," the officer said.

He charged that "some poverty workers have a very hostile attitude toward police and transfer it to the people, and especially the youths."

A 25-year-old white former private, who has just quit the force out of disgust and disillusionment, said "I feel sorry for the guys I leave behind."

Bitterly, he said "I put in my time, did what I was told most of the time and managed to avoid a real blow up with one of those damn agitators."

"I knew that if anyone challenged my arrests, I'd get no backing from the top—the officials that is—they have no set policy. Sometimes, if they think no one will raise a stink about it . . . they'll pat you on the back and tell you you're a good officer."

One tough Negro private of 20 years on the force criticized the conduct of some of his fellow officers.

"Some white and Negro policemen feel you go out and shoot everybody down and that's the way you solve the problem," he said.

"In some of these crowd situations, some officers act like spectators. They don't know what to do or are afraid to do it."

"Putting on a uniform and swearing in does not make a cop. These rural men who come into the metropolitan area are not used to handling big city problems."

"In Anacostia, I went into a crowd of 200 people and pulled out a boy who threw a rock at a police car. They didn't bother me. They knew me and knew they couldn't beat me."

REFLECTS ON DIFFERENCES

A veteran white officer who served in both the 11th and 5th Precincts, reflected on the differences between policing in 1952, when he came on the force, and today.

"The men are jumpy," he said.

"Policing now is completely different than it was 10 years ago. I used to enjoy going to work," he said, adding:

"The biggest part of it is that these youths have no respect for any authority. In the past they normally would give police some backlip. But now they think nothing of jumping a policeman."

"They are looking to agitate a policeman into doing something to cause a scene. You are tense. It affects your working conditions, your home life, your marriage."

ALWAYS FEAR

This point was echoed by a Negro private from the 14th Precinct. A seven-year veteran, he said, "In the back of your head there's always fear."

"I do my job and don't think about it. If I didn't, I'd end up in the nut house like (a name). His wife kept on him, reminding him about the chances of getting killed."

This officer told his views on working the troubled far Northeast area. He said:

"No two officers are alike. We're people, too, you know. You take as much as you can and there must be flexibility. If you can see that far, don't make an arrest, and avoid a riot."

"The law says to make an arrest, but you have to use your own judgment. So you let the minor ones go. But in a major offense, I take my chances and make the arrest."

"The best thing to do with name calling is to ignore it. Some officers won't and get all excited about it."

"But I won't stand for it when they come right up to your face and cuss you out, or spit. I might even bash a head. But it takes years of knowing and experience, not what the department teaches you."

For example, he said, "In a crowd situation, when two policemen pull up, don't get out of the car. Back off and get all the men you can and then go back in there. Two men couldn't possibly handle it. They lose communications leaving the car, and could lose a life or get beat up."

A 14-year veteran Negro officer, assigned to the 14th Precinct, said: "When these crowds gather," he added, "put the loudest mouth there on the spot. If you're having trouble quieting down a drunk, challenge the loud-mouth to help."

A white 14th Precinct officer had much the same idea: "I've got a favorite saying when a man's mouthing off in a crowd. I tell them, 'You know so much about it you tell me what to do.' That usually shuts them up."

He said that in disorderly crowd situations, "there just aren't enough arrests. The precinct is just content to break them up. At least we should bring them all in and call their parents and make them come down here, pull them away from their television sets if you can find them, and make them control their kids so the parents won't have to come down here again."

TELLS OF SUCCESS

A seasoned lieutenant from a precinct east of the Anacostia River told of success in handling a crowd of youths in the manner the 14th Precinct private advocated.

"About the first of the year, there was this group of youths throwing rocks at a police car with white and Negro officers in it. We arrested all 15 of them."

"A fellow from the human relations council and I sat here in the precinct and we brought in all the parents. It was encouraging. The parents were very cooperative. One whipped his kid right here. They really chewed these kids out."

A contrasting example was observed by a reporter in a precinct last week. The moth-

er of a 9-year-old Negro boy blasted her child for telling police he saw two older youths stealing lawnmowers.

"You're nothing but a stool pigeon. Next time you don't know nothing, you didn't see nothing, and you walk the other way," the mother said, accenting her warning with a poke to the face.

IN NEW SOUTHWEST

And what of the policemen in the precincts where racial tensions are not so acute? Is their attitude about the job better?

Said a 25-year-old 4th Precinct white private:

"I'm glad that I'm in the new Southwest area, where most of our problems are house-breakings and noncontroversial crimes . . .

"I put in my eight hours a day and that's all. I have no desire to get out there and become a dead hero. . . . Sure, I'm looking for another job, isn't everyone?"

A 36-year-old white police private assigned to the 7th Precinct in Georgetown asserted, "If those officers who patrol the Negro sections of town think their hands are tied, they ought to come over to Georgetown for a while."

"We've got the kids and the beatniks to put up with along The Strip . . . and those little monsters, white or not, give us more headaches than a whole mob of colored kids."

"Sometimes we can't tell the boys from the girls the way they dress, until we get them to the precinct house . . . and then there is sometimes hell to pay for locking up some big shot's son or daughter who was dressed like a fag in the damndest assortment of old clothes you've ever seen."

"White or black, you can't win as a policeman here," said the Georgetown area officer.

CHANGE IN HABITS

There were other views on the change in policing habits.

"It's for certain that we aren't policing like we used to, mainly because there just aren't enough of us to go around," said a 38-year-old white police detective.

"When I left the 2nd Precinct in 1965, there were 228 men assigned to just that precinct. I checked there yesterday and there now are only 112 men, counting officials. Now I ask you, how the hell can you patrol a precinct properly with less than half the manpower you had in 1965 and crime up nearly 100 percent?"

A huge Negro sergeant, crippled by a brick that a Negro youth hurled at his back last year, tapped his cane on the floor as he talked of returning to the job, if he ever can.

"You don't think much about the situation out in these street incidents at the time. You do what you think is right and use as much force as you think is necessary. A police officer's first duty is to uphold the law. I have been called all sorts of names, mocked, harassed, enticed. But you cannot inject your personal feelings into it."

Two discs were shattered by the brick, thrown from a group of angry youths protesting his arrest of seven unruly Negroes in Anacostia. Asked if he had any second thoughts about the handling of the incident, the sergeant said, "I wouldn't have done it any other way."

THE THIN BLUE LINE: THE POLICE/THE PUBLIC

(By Fred E. Inbau, professor of criminal law, Northwestern University Law School)

(NOTE—Fred E. Inbau is a member of the Chicago Crime Commission. He is a former director of the Chicago Police Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory, a widely recognized authority on criminal law procedures, and author of several books, including a standard law text, Cases and Comments on Criminal Justice. He is also the Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science.)

In the early morning hours of a day in October 1963, three young hoodlums savagely assaulted Frank Perry, a uniformed police officer on duty with the Chicago Police Department. His assailants overpowered Officer Perry and seized his gun. He might have been killed except for the sudden appearance of two fellow officers in a cruising squad car.

The men who attacked Officer Perry were apprehended, tried and convicted. They had long police records; their offense was a serious threat to community law and order. Yet, the three convicted criminals, ages 23, 19 and 19, were granted probation. For reasons unknown, the trial judge expressed the opinion that Officer Perry was a "crybaby".

TRADITIONAL VIEW OF THE POLICE

During most of the 20th century, an American policeman seldom had to face a charge of "crybaby". Although a particular police force might sometimes serve as a target for rough humor or often as the excuse for public cynicism, most communities saw nothing wrong with their police that could not be corrected by a new chief or by the election of a local reform ticket.

For all their human imperfections, American policemen were regarded as courageous protectors of the innocent. In line of duty, they regularly faced the threat of physical harm or, if need be, the ultimate fact of death. It was no exaggeration to regard them as a thin line of men in blue striving to defend the peaceful members of society from its thugs, murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals.

HAVE WE CHANGED OUR MINDS?

Every casual reader of the newspapers knows that something has happened to this traditional view of the police. The scare-words "police brutality" regularly appear in the headlines. Too often holiday weekends produce stories of conflict between young pleasure-seekers and the police in resort areas. Motorists complain of improper enforcement of traffic laws. Newspaper reports of trials in court tell of repudiated confessions, alleged mistreatment of prisoners and charges of police bribery and incompetence.

From the slums to the suburbs, from the stories in daily papers to the decisions of the highest courts in the land, controversy rages over the conduct of policemen and the proper use of police powers. So widespread is the confusion and dissatisfaction that observers striving for impartiality must ask: Who has changed? The police? Or the public?

WHAT THE FACTS SHOW

If the widespread indictment of the modern policeman can be supported at all, surely it must be on the basis of some factual evidence. Is today's policeman less self-sacrificing in his traditional struggle with law-breakers? Available figures make a mockery of any such contention.

Instead, records prove it is becoming increasingly hazardous to serve the American public in the uniform of a police officer. During 1965 one in every ten policemen throughout the nation was the victim of an assault. In New York City during the same year, assaults on policemen increased 8% over 1964. From January through June, 1965, 264 Chicago police officers were injured on duty; during the same period of 1966 the number increased to 364. In July, 1966, excluding the detective division, 76 Chicago police officers were assaulted by persons resisting arrest; another 73 were injured as a result of mob action or fights between citizens. Over a recent five-year period, 406 Atlanta police officers incurred major injuries while making arrests. During the past six years, throughout the nation, 278 officers were killed.

In the area of professional skills, are the police of the '60's less accomplished than those of earlier days? It would, indeed, be difficult to show that they are, on the basis

of any objective evaluation. Evidence indicates many fewer cases of physical abuse of suspects than formerly and far less intrusion on the constitutional rights and privileges of citizens. The so-called 3rd degree during the interrogation of criminal suspects—a fairly common practice twenty, or even ten, years ago—is a rare occurrence today. As for police procedure in general, it is an established fact that today's policemen are much more highly trained than ever before.

It seems certain that we must look elsewhere for the cause of the current wave of dissatisfaction with our police forces.

THE POLICEMAN AS A SYMBOL OF SOCIAL ILLS

Undoubtedly much of today's criticism of the police results from the fact that the policeman has come to be the uniformed symbol of many social ills. Unlike other representatives of local government—aldermen or members of the school board, for example—the policeman is on public view day in and day out. He therefore feels the brunt of much of the community's pent-up resentment over social conditions.

It is unreasonable to regard the policeman as responsible for the plight of minority groups. He did not create the slums or the Negro and Puerto Rican ghettos; nor have the police caused segregation and discrimination. Nevertheless, there is a widespread identification of the police with all these failures of society.

The psychology of this identification—the source of much basic resentment against the men in blue uniforms—is easy to understand. Most motorists have had the experience of being stopped or ticketed by a traffic policeman. Even when the driver knows that the action is justified, he is still likely to feel some humiliation and embarrassment. If the officer seems brusque or rude, or if the motorist can convince himself that he did not violate the law (perhaps, "only a little bit"), his anger will burn hot. Psychologically, it is a short step from anger against a particular man in blue to transferred resentment of all police officers.

Perhaps most damaging of all to the image of the policeman has been the role he is forced to play when controversies over the civil rights of minority groups cause violence. With each passing summer it becomes more and more difficult to distinguish between legitimate social protest and flagrant violation of laws designed to protect persons and property. Puzzling and unpleasant though this choice may be for us all, for the police, who are professionally responsible for the maintenance of law and order, it is a cruel dilemma.

POLICE MORALE IN THE CRISIS

Men who accept hazardous public service as a way of life hope for the good will and good opinion of their fellow citizens. It is hard for the police to accept daily danger in the face of mounting public disrespect and outright hostility. A wave of frustration has swept over the entire field of law enforcement, adversely affecting police recruitment and the rate of resignation.

During the first six months of 1964, 1965 and 1966, Chicago's police resignations—without pension and for the purpose of accepting other employment—jumped from 20 in '64 to 37 in '65 and to 90 in '66. In July, 1966 alone there were 37 such resignations!

A breakdown in police tenure and recruitment would produce dire consequences for our society. As the false image of policemen as the defenders of inequities in our social system gains a greater and greater hold on the public's imagination, we tend to forget that we must depend on these same men to protect us from the criminal element in our society. Nothing less than a highly trained and soundly motivated body of men, replenished by effective recruitment and wholeheartedly devoting itself to career service, will protect the American people from violence and crime.

A CHANGE OF PUBLIC ATTITUDE IS CALLED FOR

If we are to arrest the obvious deterioration of police morale, a dramatic change in public attitude is called for. Our citizens must come to a more realistic appreciation of the awesomeness of a policeman's responsibility. Reasonable allowance must be made for inevitable errors of judgment in the performance of his duties.

When the public appraises the conduct of any other public employee or of any member of another profession, due allowance is made for the frailties of human nature. All too often, in the case of a policeman, we make no allowance for the normal human traits of impatience and anger. We forget or ignore the frustrations that confront him in his job every day.

We should never forget, in our dealings with a police officer, that he may have spent an eight-hour day confronting drunks, thieves and thugs. He may have suffered painful blows. He may have been attacked by knife or gun. A near psychotic may have spit in his face. At all times, nevertheless, he is expected to suppress any expressions of resentment or frustration. We expect him to show the composure of the surgeon, the patient understanding of the clergyman, and the learning of an appellate judge. And if he fails, he and his office may be condemned or scorned in a manner never inflicted on any other public servant.

All this is not to suggest that the public must condone whatever the police do, or that we should never hold the police accountable for mistakes. No responsible police officer asks for or expects any such special privilege. We must evaluate a police officer's conduct in any given situation within the context of all the facts and circumstances confronting him at the time of his decision-making.

THE COURTS AND THE POLICE OFFICER

Not only is the individual police officer frequently second-guessed in a particular case by the public or the press, but it has become highly fashionable lately for judges to formulate police policies and prescribe police procedures. A number of recent decisions severely limit the effectiveness of police officers in dealing with suspected criminals.

Even cases of physical assaults on officers—for example, the instance of the assault on Officer Perry, with which we began this discussion—seem in recent years to have been resolved in court with unusual leniency. Naturally this form of consideration for the proven guilty is the practice that the police find hardest to accept. Inevitably, it lessens their willingness to risk life and limb in scuffles with law-breakers.

It is the constitutional function of the courts to insure that no one is convicted except by "due process of law". In essence, this has always meant a "fair trial"—providing adequate safeguards to protect the innocent. For example, if the prosecutor seeks to use as evidence a confession that the police obtained by force, threats, or promises of leniency, the evidence should be rejected by the court. Under such circumstances an innocent person might make a false confession. But in the past few years, decisions of the Supreme Court have held that, regardless of the validity and reliability of the evidence against an accused person, it must be suppressed if the police deviated from the procedures prescribed by the courts.

This practice of turning the obviously guilty free—for considerations apart from the protection of the innocent—is a considerable factor in producing the present low morale of the police.

SOME KEY CASES AND DECISIONS

A few cases may help explain police resentment. Several years ago a housewife in Washington, D.C., was raped in a laundry room in the basement of her apartment building. Strong suspicion centered on one Andrew Mallory, a relative of the building's

janitor. In fact, the suspect was the only one who could have been in the basement at the time, but the victim could not positively identify him as the rapist because he had used cloth to conceal his features.

Several days later the police located the suspect and held him in custody a few hours. After a short period of questioning—without the use of force, threats, or promises of leniency or any other conduct that might make an innocent man confess—the suspect admitted he was the rapist. His confession, together with other evidence, satisfied a jury, beyond a reasonable doubt, that he was guilty.

Nevertheless, upon appeal to the Supreme Court, the conviction was reversed on the ground that the confession was inadmissible as evidence because the police had violated a rule requiring arrested persons to be brought before a judicial magistrate "without unnecessary delay". It was futile to try the confessed rapist again because the confession was indispensable to proof of his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. He was therefore released.

Soon afterwards he assaulted another woman, and later was caught burglarizing a Philadelphia home in which he had attempted another rape. This time, with no technical out, he was sent to the penitentiary.

In another Washington, D.C. case, the Supreme Court rule laid down in the above case required a trial judge to release a man who had not only confessed to the murder of his wife, but had also led the police to the place where he had buried her body. In ordering the defendant's release the trial judge said: "I will direct a verdict of acquittal, but I do so with a heavy heart . . ."

Policemen experience a feeling of bitterness and frustration when they see a dangerous criminal set free. But Supreme Court decisions rendered on June 13, 1966, by a vote of five justices to four, seem to indicate that we have not seen the end of the practice.

The Supreme Court held that before any criminal suspect can be questioned by the police he must first be advised:

- a. that he has the right to remain silent;
- b. that anything he says can be used against him;
- c. that he is entitled to consult with a lawyer; and to have him present during questioning; and
- d. that if he cannot afford a lawyer, he is entitled to have one provided for him.

All of this was entirely new law. Over the years, at least thirty state supreme courts, and at one time the Supreme Court itself, held that the Constitution did not require the police to warn a suspect of a right to remain silent (although, this did not permit the police to force him to talk). Just a few years ago the Supreme Court specifically held that the police were entitled to question a suspect even though he asked for a lawyer and even though a lawyer was at the police station, trying to see him.

These earlier decisions were based upon the theory that the Constitution provides only that "in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right . . . to have the assistance of counsel for his defense." Nowhere in the Constitution is there any guarantee of the right to counsel before the start of a prosecution.

The warnings now required will be a considerable handicap to the police in producing evidence against guilty persons—especially the warning regarding the right to counsel because the standard advice of every lawyer to his client is: "Don't talk." The burden of this decision on the police results from the fact that many serious crimes can be solved only by the interrogation of criminal suspects. Fingerprints and other circumstantial evidence are rarely found in cases involving muggings, murders, or rapes committed on the streets and alleys of our cities.

CONCLUSION

In our efforts to preserve individual rights and civil liberties, we cannot impose so many restrictions on law enforcement agencies that they will be powerless to prevent crime and apprehend criminals. Our only practical course is to strive to improve the quality of our law enforcement agencies and to create an atmosphere in which the civil rights and liberties of all will be respected.

This must be done by selecting and promoting our police on a strict merit basis and by making certain that they are properly trained and adequately compensated. They must also be internally supervised with respect to abusive and corrupt practices and protected against politically inspired interference.

Further progress will result as the general public once more develops a sound and realistic attitude toward law enforcement agencies. As a guide toward our thinking on this point, the plea of Commissioner G. B. McClellan of the Royal Mounted Police deserves the consideration of all law-abiding citizens: "When the policeman exceeds his authority, bring him up short, but when he is doing a tough, thankless and frequently dangerous job for you and for all you hold dear, for God's sake get off his back."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 22, 1967]

CRIME—WHAT'S THAT?

There is one thing to be said for our new Attorney General, Ramsey Clark. You never know what to expect when he takes off on the subject of crime.

In an interview the other day, the attorney general was reported as saying in effect that all the talk about a national crime wave is much ado about nothing. "The level of crime has risen a little bit," Clark said, "but there is no wave of crime in the country."

As an item in support of this thesis, the attorney general told of one city (unidentified) in which crime was up 1 percent from last year. But last year, he added cheerfully, crime in that city was down 1 percent from the year before. As for official statistics which indicate substantial yearly increases in crime throughout the country, Clark said: "We do ourselves a great disservice with statistics."

For our part, we do not quite know how to interpret this comment. It is true that crime statistics do a great disservice to the Clark suggestion that the crime wave talk is a case of making mountains out of molehills. But our attorney general, in all deference, is talking through his hat—at least as far as the crime statistics for Washington are concerned. Whatever the fact as to the statistics for his unidentified city—statistics, incidentally, which he seemed to think were quite useful—the figures for the Nation's Capital add up to a devastating rebuttal of the Clark crime thesis.

The most recent statistics for Washington show a dismaying crime rise here of 59.7 percent last month over the previous April. This included a 103.8 percent jump in robberies. The rise in serious crimes in March was 51 percent over March of 1966. The President's message on crime in Washington, promising safe streets and so on, went to Congress in January. The local crime statistics for that month revealed a jump of 42 percent over the same month a year ago. And to take a longer statistical journey into the past, the crime index in Washington 10 years ago was about one-fourth of its current level.

Yet our attorney general tells us that "we do ourselves a great disservice with statistics." It would be nice, we suppose, if the nasty figures could be thrown down the sewer. Then it might be possible for some people to believe that there really isn't any such thing as a crime wave. Possible for

some people that is, but not for those who are the victims day in and day out of robberies, rapes, burglaries, assaults, and you name it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 24, 1967]

BAD DAY ON THE CRIME FRONT

About half of the first page of the last edition of yesterday's Star was given over to the story of crime in Washington. And it couldn't have been otherwise—unless one believes that the way to deal with crime is to pretend it isn't there.

This latest chapter of our local crime story began Monday evening when a police officer was forced to shoot two hoodlums who attacked him on a school playground. Around noon yesterday a bank messenger was shot to death in a robbery at 10th and P Streets NW. At about the same time a young woman, Judith K. Robeson, who worked for Senator Carlson of Kansas, was found brutally murdered in her apartment at 800 Fourth St. SW. To top off the day, police had to battle a crowd of unruly youngsters trying to crash the city's annual Cadet Corps review at Eastern High School. After bottles and rocks began to fly, 19 arrests were made. All of this, of course, was over and above the daily run of "routine" crime in this city.

It seems to use that a day of this sort should be enough to shake up the most complacent, the most myopic, crime watcher. But maybe not.

Senator Carlson put his finger, perhaps unintentionally, on the root of the difficulty.

It fell to him to phone the bad news to Miss Robeson's parents in Kansas. "I tell you," he said, "it was rough. This kind of thing is just unbelievable until it happens (to someone) in your own office."

Well, "this kind of thing" is believable enough to thousands of people, generally "little" people, in Washington. All too often, they have seen members of their families murdered. They know what rape, robbery and assault mean. It is believable to the policeman whose daily stint is becoming more and more hazardous, while more and more fools or worse mouth the cry of "police brutality." And every indication is that the trend of crime is going up, not down. We hope that "this kind of thing" will not have to happen to someone in everyone's office before the threat of crime is taken seriously.

A new District crime bill—not a "tough" bill, but better than nothing—has started to move through the House. If it is passed, we hope the Attorney General, who seems to think that crime is something of a myth, will support it. And we also hope that the President, who makes fine speeches about safety in the city, but who unwisely vetoed last year's crime bill, will sign it into law.

Perhaps the message that is implicit in Senator Carlson's comment will get through to these protected gentlemen who have the power, if they will use it, to do something effective to curb crime in Washington.

TEXT OF REMARKS OF SENATOR CLIFFORD HANSEN AT NOON MEETING OF THE POLITICAL STUDY CLUB OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Each of us here today has at least two things in common. We are all interested in politics, and we live in a metropolitan area that has one of the highest crime rates in the nation.

And so I would like to speak with you for a few minutes about a war being fought right here at home—a war which we clearly are losing.

With all due respect to the Attorney General, statistics and our own newspapers tell the story of crime in the nation and in Washington.

Since 1960, the United States population has increased eight per cent. Crime of all types has increased 46 per cent. Much of

this increase has been among juveniles. Indeed, it has been reported that of all criminals arrested by the police, the most frequent age is 15.

The Washingtonian soon learns, as have my wife Martha and I, that the streets of Washington are not a good place to be found when the sun goes down. Crime in Washington during the month of April increased 60 per cent from the level of April a year ago.

Our city seems to be caught in a double play that favors criminal activity. On one hand, crime is increasing; and on the other, it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain a fully-staffed police department.

Recently, the Washington police force had 310 vacancies.

One wonders if factors more than high risk and low pay haven't contributed to the disinclination of our young men to don the blue uniform of our most valuable public servant.

There's a line by an anonymous poet which goes, "God and the soldier we adore in time of trouble, and not before." This is equally true of our police. A motorist will look with disdain upon an officer who tickets her for speeding; five minutes later, that same officer may nab a mugger or purse snatcher who had made that motorist his victim.

It is a fact that in the United States today, combined spending to prevent or punish crime, carries an annual price tag of 27 billion dollars. This is 7 billion dollars more per year than we spend on education. Crimes of violence increase at an incredible rate.

Evidence of nationwide crime syndicates which form an invisible government in our major cities is more apparent every day. But paradoxically, our courts and our social philosophers seem constrained to weep, not for the murdered, but for the murderer . . . not for society's law-abiding majority, but for society's law-breaking minority.

Recently, when a New York court was forced to throw out the conviction of a confessed six-time murderer because of the so-called Miranda decision on voluntary confessions, District Attorney Aaron A. Koota had this to say:

"The United States Supreme Court has weighted the scales of justice heavily in favor of the criminal suspect. I am not a prophet, but the handwriting on the wall indicates a trend on the part of the court to outlaw all confessions made to police. If and when that melancholy day comes, the death knell of effective criminal law enforcement will have been sounded."

I suggest to you that the criminal law exists to protect those who obey it from those who don't. When the courts distort this basis for the law to create from it a system of false equality that was never intended, the law ceases to become a shield for the society it is supposed to protect.

It becomes instead a pitiful instrument which feeds on trivia and technicality and serves neither to protect society nor punish society's offenders.

Sir Edward Coke wrote nearly four centuries ago that "reason is the life of law. The common law itself is nothing else but reason. The law," he said, "is the perfection of reason."

But how is reason served when by a one vote majority of the Supreme Court, the self-admitted guilty are turned upon society to wreak their havoc on the bodies and treasures of those who obey the law? When this occurs, the law and reason have parted company.

All of us are familiar with the Mallory decision. The U.S. Supreme Court turned loose a confessed rapist because a day had elapsed between his arrest and his arraignment. Mr. Mallory's response to the society which had gifted him again with his liberty was to again commit the crime of rape.

The history of man's efforts to create a framework of civilized law suggests that a

debilitation in the system's appendages spreads rapidly through the trunk and to the heart.

We have today increases in crimes of violence on the streets; a system of organized crime throughout our nation; we have Stokely Carmichael threatening to "tear" our "cities apart."

Mr. Carmichael has told us in painfully graphic terms that he intends to take over Washington lock, stock and barrel. Given this young man's propensity to violence and his thirst for power, Washington might well indeed have a long, hot summer.

Law enforcement officials from J. Edgar Hoover down, agree that most positive remedy to crime—whether it be violence in the streets, systems in the cities, or sedition in the slums—is prompt capture, speedy trial and severe penalty.

In all three respects, we as a nation are failing.

The obstacles before our police negate prospects for prompt arrest and arraignment.

The congestion in our courts makes the speedy trial unlikely.

And a peculiar philosophy pervading our society is lessening the severe penalty.

It is highly unlikely that the Congress will take any action to vitiate recent Supreme Court decisions which I feel have contributed not only to the increase in crime, but the decrease in apprehension and conviction.

But there must be some things that we, as citizens, can do to protect ourselves, rather than simply double-bolt the door at night, and keep a shotgun at hand.

It seems to me that one of the most basic protective measures is to decrease the criminal element in our society by the rehabilitation of first offenders.

Studies show that we have a better than 50-50 chance of saving the first offender and keeping him from a career of crime.

Also, to keep criminals from society, we can demand much tighter control over parole and release of multiple offenders, particularly those with a record of crimes of violence.

Studies show that a life sentence for most prisoners runs only 12 years before parole. U.S. News and World Report stated early this month that of all criminals freed in 1963, from Federal prisons, 82 percent were re-arrested for new crimes by June 30, 1966.

And so, I suggest that we not be so quick to turn loose the man with the long rap sheet. The parole and probation schools have pitted the classic school, with its emphasis on law, against the humanitarian school with its emphasis on man. The community protection role should take precedence over rehabilitation of the convicted multiple offender.

We have an obligation to offer freedom and aid only to those not likely to assault society again and that is the first offender—the one who goes to prison with the best chance of being rehabilitated.

I am thoroughly convinced—from watching the rehabilitation program at the Wyoming State Penitentiary, during my term as Governor, that we must not, in our penal system, throw the first offender into the environment of the hardened, habitual criminal.

The education of environment works to the detriment of those who might be saved from a life of crime. If it requires special prisons for first offenders only, then I think we ought to consider making that economic commitment. Or we could simply segregate our prisons now in existence.

But in any event, the importance of keeping first offenders from habitual criminal elements is a vital step in the diminution of the size and potency of society's criminal element.

Another measure that we could take—this applies to apprehension—is to enact a realistic wiretapping law which goes beyond the very limited national security authorization requested by the President.

I have helped author a bill that would create a search warrant-type procedure for the granting of electronic surveillance warrants by judges at the Federal, State and municipal levels.

To get authorization for a wiretap, an authority would have to show cause, establish need and deposit all of the information gleaned from wiretaps with the authorizing judicial authority.

The telephone wires which connect every town and city are an important factor in the organization of criminal networks. The ability to intercept these messages is of ever-increasing importance in law enforcement.

I am convinced also that we should reconsider our attitude toward juvenile offenders—and child raising.

This question goes to the very heart of the child-parent relationship; to the permissive school of child-raising that is invoked today. This philosophy, I might add, is largely of the same Doctor Speck who preaches Viet Cong supremacy in the company of civil rights leaders who ought to know better.

I think it is well to remember that children are young adults. What they will be in maturity, they are becoming as children.

As adults, they will reflect the moral judgments they see made in the home: both by example, and by loving but positive discipline.

They will be compassionate if their earlier lives reflect the therapy of compassion.

They will have a lively concern for others if their lives have been of concern to others.

A child needs to be involved in his family; not just fed and clothed by it. He needs to be guided by his family, not just shielded by it, and he needs at least as much Mom and Dad as Doc Spock and television.

When parents again take responsibility for the conduct of the lives they create, I think we will find fewer of our young people dragged into juvenile court.

But once they're in those courts, I firmly believe that they ought not to be clothed in a mantle of anonymity and freedom from exposure.

In the Rocky Mountain country which has been my home for more than 50 years, there is a splendid old judge in Helena, the capital of Montana.

He is Judge Lester Loble. His philosophy for controlling "juvenile crime" was outlined in a speech in Salt Lake City.

Said Judge Loble, "If they're tough enough and big enough to topple tombstones, steal cars and knock old men over, they're big enough to be tried in open court with their parents in the front row and with press coverage."

But more important than any of the foregoing, is the attitude of the common citizen toward the criminal, toward society of which he is a part, and toward the law enforcement officer whose job is his defense.

In commenting recently on the upcoming task force report on organized crime, former Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach blamed apathy for the flourishing of such crime. It could also be blamed for the flourishing of most of our crimes.

We need to involve ourselves in the problems which face our over-worked and under-paid law enforcement officers.

We need to take the demeaning term "cop" out of our prose.

We need to make the term "support your local Police" more than a bumper sticker.

We need to rise up in righteous indignation when a little band of hate mongers threatens to badger a police officer, who is doing his duty, offends one of their number.

We must signal the lawless minority that the law-abiding majority of us will stand behind the police whose excellence is our shield against rampaging crime.

If our cities have become jungles, we are partly to blame—not for any so-called "collective guilt of society," but for our apathy

and our misguided sentimentality for those who prey on the persons and property of our citizens.

We are falling because we have lost sight of the importance of punishing crime, praising police, pitying victims, and protecting society.

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, May 17, 1967]

TROUBLE AHEAD

The echoes of the shooting in Houston had scarcely died away early this morning before the disclaimer went up that the rioting at Texas Southern University was organized. Many people, however, will find this hard to believe.

How can hundreds of students engage in such an event, employing firearms, molotov cocktails, chain lengths and other weapons, if it is not organized? The making of a molotov cocktail in itself is not a spontaneous act; nor is the collecting of firearms under the dormitory roofs of a large educational institution.

People hereabout would be a little horrified, we think, if a large cache of arms were discovered in the dormitories at the University of Wyoming. Yet in defense of the rioting at Texas Southern University last night and early today, it is described as a spontaneous occurrence. Presumably the collection of deadly weapons by the students body is a part of their academic efforts.

It is clear now that with the rioting that occurred last week at the Negro college at Jackson, Miss., and this latest outbreak at another Negro college in Houston, the long hot summer predicted by racial rabble-rousers has begun.

It is time that Congress cast aside its chariness, as reported in a column on this page today by Washington observer Holmes Alexander, and commence an intensive investigation into the circumstances of these grave breaches of the peace.

An article that appeared in the Sunday, May 7 issue of the New York Times and later inserted in the Congressional Record by Sen. Jack Miller, Iowa Republican, contains some grave warnings of the events to come.

It quotes the national secretary of the Students for a Democratic Society, one Gregory Calvert, 29, a former history teacher, as saying that group is "actively organizing sedition" and that is it working to organize a guerrilla force in urban areas.

It describes the dominant hero of the New Left movement as Ernesto Che Guevara, the onetime ranking Castroite official who disappeared under mysterious circumstances from Cuba several years ago, was believed at first to have been murdered, and now is reported in South America organizing guerrilla-type revolutions to break out all over this hemisphere.

The Times article reported that some of the young student followers of the New Left movement have gone so far that they now regard Communists as "squares" and have no use whatsoever for "establishment liberals."

It quoted a 24-year-old graduate teaching fellow at Michigan State University at Ann Arbor, identified as Michael Zweig, that he thinks violence is necessary and adds that the idea frightens him. Mr. Zweig adds somewhat as an afterthought: "There isn't a great deal of personal liberation in burning down a Cleveland store."

A student who succeeded Zweig as president of the Students for a Democratic Society at Ann Arbor expressed the belief, according to the Times article, that "Nicaragua and a lot of other countries" ought to organize to resist the United States.

Against what? It is not said; apparently just to "resist the United States," whatever that means.

Four persons were wounded in that rioting at Houston last night. Before the cries of

"police brutality" go up, let it be noted that three of the wounded were policemen, one of them hurt so critically that he later died; and only one was a student.

Before this summer is over, a lot of policemen may be wounded and killed, battling to preserve the peace and to prevent a disintegration of our society through such anarchic acts as occurred last night in one of the country's largest cities. Yesterday afternoon the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. said the Negroes demanded their "freedom." Freedom for what? To riot, shoot at the police, throw molotov cocktails?

Before all of this occurs, the Johnson Administration, sitting back complacently and refusing to do anything against such lawless outbreaks, had better take action. Congress also holds a responsibility and the House Un-American Activities Committee should commence immediately an investigation into all of these acts and statements from New Left rabble-rousers.

There is trouble ahead in this country. Big trouble.

THE LIVING AND THE DEAD OF HILL 881—WHAT PRICE THEIR SACRIFICE?

Mr. SCOTT, Mr. President, Mr. John G. McCullough, of the editorial page staff of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, is a man of great patriotism and great eloquence. He wrote an article on the meaning of war in Vietnam that, in its simple beauty, comes close to the meaning of war anywhere, at any time.

I will not describe it to this Chamber but offer it to the Senate for its own contemplation. I would say, however, that a public school in northeast Philadelphia plans to do a "choral speaking" arrangement of it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

NO PLACE FOR FLAGS OR BUGLES—THE LIVING AND THE DEAD OF HILL 881—WHAT PRICE THEIR SACRIFICE?

(By John G. McCullough)

What do you tell them? What do you say to these quiet warriors in shrouded rest now on litters? How do you explain it all to this stilled file of the dead?

Hill 881 is a mark, a rough circle, on the military maps of South Vietnam. There are two 881s. They are 2,890 feet high and this makes them important to men who wear steel helmets and carry weapons. They are the high ground. So long as there have been wars men have fought and died for the high ground.

So men with the big whistles mark the map and speak into a field radio. Then the young warriors, many of them with boy faces under men's helmets, heed smaller whistles and move through the valley in this northwest corner of Vietnam.

WAR WITHOUT FANFARE

This is not a place of flags or bugles. The young men, as they lean forward against the now rising ground, wet their lips. Sometimes they breathe deeply. They put one foot in front of the other. They continue to move.

Morning sun slants through the windows of a fifth grade, parochial school classroom in Northeast Philadelphia. A girl is at the blackboard drawing lines to show the parts of a sentence. A woman, eyes wide in shock, suddenly is in the doorway. Her hair is in curlers. The nun at her desk is puzzled and starts to rise. "Some officers came in a car," the woman blurts out, "and said our Buddy was hurt bad in the war. I'll have to take

Betty home." The nun tries to remember. Was it seven or eight years ago that Buddy was in this room—drawing lines around sentences?

In the living room of a house on a narrow street in West Philadelphia two Marine Corps officers sit with a Negro woman. They have told her her son has been killed in Vietnam. Now they explain that his body will be returned home and they offer to help with the arrangements. The mother nods. But she only half listens. She looks at a photograph of her son and she thinks that it was just this time last year that he posed for this picture in a high school cap and gown.

OTHER HILLS 881

Hill 881 has no name. The 881 tells only the height of the hills in meters. The others usually had names, although some were just numbers. There was Pork Chop Hill in Korea. There was Sugar Loaf and "The Draw" on Okinawa. Bloody Nose was Pelelieu. Iwo Jima's was "The Mountain." There were hills and bigger all along the line in Europe of the 1940s and back in the earlier 1900s, too. It is not the names that make them special. It is the men who climbed and crested them, the many who died, that makes them important. Millions of men go into uniform. Hundreds of thousands get into combat. The number of men who have climbed and fought their awesomely private and intensely personal wars on the 881s, the Pork Chops and the Sugar Loafs of history is far more limited.

FALLEN OF WORLD WAR II

There are prayers on these places, but not the prayer of organs and stained glass. "God, don't let the weapons jam," or "God, get the ammo and the water up." These are the prayers. Sometimes the prayer will be "God, don't let the mortars hit here." For on the 881s and the Sugar Loafs fate spins a wheel. A man you've never seen twists a knob an extra click and it is your turn. A rise of rock but inches high becomes a sanctuary. And the men who have climbed the slopes and come down again will for the rest of their lives be able to close their eyes and see each fold of ground, the brush, the debris of battle. They will see, too, their friends and the "others" in the grotesque sprawl of the fallen.

In a past war, after another 881, those who remained sought out those who had fallen. Then, too, there was a row of covered dead on litters. Those who lived paid tribute for the most part simply by standing close to those who were covered. For there is a closeness, one that others cannot know, between those who live and those who die on Hills 881.

From Okinawa's Sugar Loaf one of those who walked back was a warrior given to profanity. For days and nights he had fought alongside two friends. He watched them die. So he sought them out among the others who had fallen. And when he found them he sat on his heels near their covered heads and took from his pocket a harmonica. After he had knocked the tobacco shreds and dust from it he played softly, and over and over, the strains of "Silent Night, Holy Night." That it was the heat of summer made no difference to him or to the others who silently gathered around to join in this battlefield tribute. When someone later asked him why the music, he explained, with an oath that meant nothing, that this was "the only holy song I know."

COMRADES IN ARMS

So what do you say to those who fall on a Hill 881? Do you speak of duty and country? Not to these men. They were "on the Hill." That talk is for those who were not. Do you talk of democracy or of a threat to the world? No. They know of this, too. Nor would it achieve much to talk of pickets, flag burnings and draft defiance at home.

The men who fight to the crest of the hills in this war have in this something

which sets them apart from those who climbed other hills in other wars. So they think, not of those at home who dissent, but of those who move beside them up the slopes and whose friendship and judgment is really all that matters on a Hill 881.

So all you can say with your thoughts to these men in shrouded sleep is: "I'm sorry for what happened to you." This is what the Marine said with his harmonica. His way was better.

MORE ACTION IS REQUIRED IN OUR MILITARY SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, every schoolboy knows the story of Robert Fulton and how he could not find anyone to invest in his submarine. Historians have said that had Napoleon put more money into this venture he would have won at Waterloo.

But we seem to have fallen prey to the same inaction syndrome that has previously condemned other great nations to downfall. Maginot Line mistakes are being committed by computers in the Pentagon in the name of "cost effectiveness." This is the excuse for not doing something new on the grounds that it will cost more than what it replaces. A century ago, I am sure, everyone was arguing that steamboats would be more expensive than sailboats, but in those days it did not matter. We could wait for the British to prove that that was wrong. But we cannot afford that luxury today, when the future of freedom rides on our ability to get there first with new discoveries. If the Russians beat us once in the race for weapon supremacy, that may be the end.

Two weeks ago, Gen. Bernard A. Schriever addressed himself to just this point in a speech before the Aviation/Space Writers Association at their meeting in Las Vegas, Nev. He is now retired, but his counsel deserves attention because of his great record in building a strategic missile system when we were faced with a possible missile gap in the late 1950's. In his speech he points out that we are incurring grave risks in deferring our investigation of space as a corridor of threat.

In the previous Congress, we appropriated \$50 million more than was requested by the Secretary of Defense for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory research program. Those funds still have not been applied in spite of our anxiety that we were not proceeding at sufficient speed. When the Secretary of Defense submitted his new program for fiscal year 1968 he cut the Air Force proposed budget for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory again—this time by \$80 million.

We have not fully completed a review of the new budget, but I, for one, intend to examine our military research program very closely. It may be that more support from Congress will be needed to override the inaction now prevailing in the Department of Defense.

Because this subject is of great consequence to the Nation, I ask unanimous consent that General Schriever's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

A LONG VIEW OF THE U.S. SPACE PROGRAM
(By Gen. B. A. Schriever, U.S. Air Force (retired), Aviation/Space Writers Association, Las Vegas, Nev., May 15, 1967)

First, I want to commend all of you in AWA on the occasion of your 29th annual meeting. You certainly know where to hold a convention. I believe it was the practice of writers and philosophers in the olden days to locate where they could meditate and concentrate without distractions. It is certainly being loyal to the traditions of your profession to meet here in the desert . . . in this atmosphere of austerity and privation.

Actually, I welcome this opportunity to come to Las Vegas, the gaming capital of the country. My game is golf, as some of you may know, and I generally shoot in the low 70s. If it gets any colder than that I quit.

Seriously, it's nice to be here and I am both honored and grateful to have a place on your program.

Mr. Haney and Mr. Johnston have talked about the Apollo program. This afternoon Dr. Adams and Dr. Pickering are going to outline the prospects for manned and unmanned space flight in the next ten years. I've agreed to speak at this time on "a long view of the U.S. space program" which I assume, by inference, extends beyond the moon and the next decade.

This isn't the easiest subject in the world. In fact, a lot of us have been trying to see beyond our noses in this space business for some time.

I'm convinced we can do all the forecasting, second-guessing and blueprinting we want, but we're really not going to come to grips with space until we change our thinking . . . or at least, expand it. Thus far, our explorations geographically have shown more imagination than our explorations intellectually.

We have to recognize, just as we gradually came to do with the airplane, that old standards, old criteria, and old ways of doing things may no longer pertain. I admit it's difficult not to be subjective about space when, as Emerson said, we find ourselves "sensitive to a thousand influences, instructed by the past, invited by the future . . ." Yet if we are to be constructive about its potentials we must come to know space not as a stranger but as an intimate friend. This means knowing its faults as well as its virtues—its possibilities both for us and against us.

Space may have no decisively unique military advantages, beyond those of observation, warning and communications identified in the Rand studies of 21 years ago. But we'd better be sure. And we can't be sure unless we keep an open mind and an open technology, with respect to military space applications. At present we still act as though we're not certain that space is here to stay or that defense in and from it is important.

I'm concerned because I believe that in the long run the value of the U.S. space program will be determined by our national attitude as much as by our aptitude.

By this I mean we must not only have the tools, the talents and the technologies to achieve difficult goals, but the desire and the determination as well.

Someone has said that the future cannot be predicted, but that futures can be invented. I would agree. The lunar landing program is nearing reality because we as a Nation invented the technologies necessary to it. All of the great developments of this century are the products of invention, not prediction. Wishful thinking has never produced an ounce of hardware or an iota of defense. Yet we spend a great deal of time and effort trying to predict the future of space and wish away the perils of its unknowns.

Amazingly enough, one of our problems today is the absence of incentive for inven-

tion and innovation in military aerospace systems. Considering the growth in research and development in recent years, both in funds and projects, it is remarkable that this should be so. Nevertheless, there is no space goal or space technology that I know of that is presently straining our capacity for inventiveness or ingenuity. But there are four factors that are working against any trend toward vigorous space progress.

In the first place, necessity is the mother of invention and few, if any, space goals are viewed as "necessary" today. The defense establishment has been hard pressed to justify military requirements in space according to the present ground rules of "see need, see solution."

Secondly, any significant invention is always preceded by an active curiosity. We are not very curious about space today. We would prefer to dismiss by logic any fears that an enemy may find a corridor to free world vulnerability through space. What, we ask, can an enemy do militarily by means of space that he cannot do as effectively by conventional means? The fact that we have no definitive answer doesn't mean there isn't one; it only means we ascribe to the enemy our own limitations of thought or technology. A nagging curiosity can be a useful national asset. Part of the research and development responsibility should be the task of keeping curiosity alive and healthy.

Third, there is the economic factor. War and welfare are making heavy demands on the treasury. And it's precisely when cash is short that cost-effectiveness becomes the way of life. Admittedly, decision-making is not nearly so difficult when there are no budget problems. But basing decisions on comparative costs can be risky. There's a circular dilemma here that leads nowhere. First, since inventions can't be predicted, neither can their costs, which makes them high risk projects. Second, without tangible cost figures, such "high-risk" proposals can't compete against proven systems, where costs and capabilities are known.

Fourth, there is the problem of national purpose. I suggest that this is an inhibiting factor rather than the positive influence it should be because our national objectives today seem clouded and uncertain.

Just about ten years ago, when I suggested that ballistic missiles might be springboards to space, I was admonished for making that "provocative" suggestion. Since then, many other proposals or alerts from military sources, some of them elementary to progress or productive to national security, have been rejected as provocative or destabilizing or escalating the arms race.

This is of great concern to me, for I am of the opinion that the competition between Communism and freedom still exists. I believe the threat to our security not only has not disappeared but actually has sprouted a few more hydra-like heads. I do not perceive where our cautions about innovative defense technologies or our strict subscription to the "peaceful" purposes of space have altered in any way the Communist campaign for, first, technical; second, economic; and, third, political superiority in the world. Space is one avenue toward the achievement of these goals.

Now please don't misunderstand me. I'm not trying to resurrect the space race or infer that the Soviets have better space capabilities than we have at present. I'm talking about the "long view" and from where I sit it seems to me that we're not as alert today as we should be to technological opportunities.

What can we do about this?

For one thing, we must try to give more encouragement to invention, innovation and creative thinking.

Some scientists, for example, have expressed concern over what effects certain space-applied forces might have on missile

warheads. Or about the feasibility of satellites systems for missile defense. Or the consequences that improved orbital surveillance capabilities might have on the survivability of our sea-based ballistic missiles.

In the second place, scientific and technical curiosity not only needs to be stimulated, but properly compensated as well. Curiosity is expensive today. Few companies, particularly those operating on fixed-price or incentive contracts, can afford to do much free lance experimenting. Incentives are awarded today principally on performance—not the performance of the product, but the performance of the contractor in meeting schedules, staying within costs, and improving efficiency.

There also is little pronounced curiosity about space on the part of the public. As you in the editorial professions know, your space copy must be sensational, spectacular or controversial to attract attention outside of the "trade." In our self-satisfied technological affluence, we may have become blasé about space. Or, as I would prefer to think, we simply have not educated the public sufficiently to the significance of space . . . at least its post-lunar significance.

We put a great deal of faith these days in surveys and public polls, which usually show that the majority favor the status quo, or have no opinion. As an example, I was amused by the 1776 political poll imagined by humor columnist Art Buchwald recently. His survey showed that "63 per cent of the colonists thought the British were doing a good job," "83 per cent thought the Minute Men at Lexington hurt our image," and only "12 per cent thought the Declaration of Independence was a good document." Mr. Buchwald reported that "on the basis of the results of this poll, the colonials decided they didn't have enough popular support for a revolution and gave up the idea of a United States of America."

Public opinion is vital, but progress depends on leading it, not following it.

Third; if we are going to overcome the present economic obstacles to space progress, we must prepare technologically to do several things. One: we must get on with the research and development necessary to reusable space boosters. I know this is no simple project. We looked into it many times while I was in the service. Here's another instance where justification becomes a brick wall. We can't actually justify the high costs of developing a reusable system until we have the necessary volume of space missions; at the same time we can't cost-effectively program any high utilization of space vehicles until the price comes down. Let me just add, incidentally, that the airplane was once in this very same predicament.

Still on the subject of economics, it is equally important to close the loop at the other end. The ballistic type of re-entry and return is at best primitive. The Soviets, as you know, recently had a sad lesson on the risks involved.

In addition to being an awkward and unsophisticated technique, the Gemini-type re-entry requires a very costly recovery force. We will gain a real operational as well as an economic advantage when we achieve a piloted re-entry and precision landing capability.

There is another aspect to the economic factor which inhibits our progress. Economic reasons are given frequently to explain why we can't pursue a certain proposal or develop a certain technology. With all our reputed scientific and technological resourcefulness and our reputation for technical breakthroughs, perhaps we should be actively exploiting technology in search of an economic breakthrough. Every step forward doesn't have to cost more than the last. First costs are not necessarily the minimum costs, and often prices can be reduced rather quickly as has been the case, for example, with boron fibre materials.

Fourth; if our long view of the U.S. space program is to be a positive and productive one, we must strive to see space included in the fabric of national policy, national posture, national progress and national purpose.

At present our attitude toward space, like our aptitude, is fragmented. Space is admissible to peaceful purposes but not to military, though the distinction is still indistinct, in my judgment. Space has broad support in its unmanned phases, but the value of manned space ventures is still being debated.

On the first of these points I have nothing to add. The arbitrary separation of space activities into peaceful and military is just that—arbitrary. It simply serves to emphasize, by comparison, the straightforwardness of the Soviet program. Their single-purpose program seeks only to attain a versatile technological superiority which, once attained, will serve the political purpose they choose regardless of what kind of a space program we have or how we categorize it.

Deliberation over the respective merits of manned and unmanned systems is, I believe, very serious to the long view of space. In the emphasis we have placed on technology, it is easy to relegate man to a subordinate position. Yet this goes against every experience of mankind over the ages.

We have made black boxes do a great deal for us, and the end of their potential is not yet in sight. But neither is man's potential exhausted.

Further, I am of the opinion that having man on board will eventually contribute to the economy of space missions. The "Six Rs" inherent in space operations—rendezvous, resupply, repair, replace, rescue and return—all demand human judgment, dexterity and ability. The life support systems necessary to safety and survival may well prove to be a cheap price to pay for such proven versatility. It may be cheap indeed once we have significantly improved present-day thrust to weight ratios.

As most of you know, I've talked a lot in praise of technology over the last dozen years or so. At the same time I've tried never to lose sight of the fact that people make technology possible; that the proper partnership of man and technology gives us the means to design our destiny.

We have elected to include space in that destiny. It's a wise choice. It would, perhaps, have shown greater wisdom if we had pioneered space voluntarily instead of waiting for a boost from sputnik.

The Soviets know our indecisiveness and consider it a weakness. As one Russian official observed: "The U.S. is a great and powerful country," he said, "but it has a hard time deciding what to do."

If we are not to be an after-the-fact nation forevermore, we must shift to an attitude of action rather than reaction, decision rather than deferral, in our space ventures and in other affairs of national and international significance.

Present technologies afford us the means and future technology the options to do whatever we want with our environment. Space is a part of that environment. We live on an orbiting planet which the disensions of man have pockmarked with the afflictions of war and other inhumanities. These have been carried to the far reaches of the land, on and under the seas, and into the skies.

If we are to keep space free of the means or the implements of threat, we must take the long realistic look at history—and recognize that peace prevails only when those who would victimize others are denied the means to do so.

Technology today is by far the principal enabling instrument of national power. If we're out in front in technology—in space and across the board—let's keep the pace.

If we're on a par with any other nation, then I suggest we're not doing enough.

We can't afford to fall behind the power curve at a time when technology is the overriding factor in the measurement, application and determination of power internationally.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION UNIT OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE CONCLUDES COMPREHENSIVE HEARINGS ON AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967—HAS TESTIMONY UNDER STUDY — ABATEMENT LEGISLATION WILL BE BOTH REALISTIC AND EFFECTIVE, SENATOR RANDOLPH FORECASTS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on May 18, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of our Committee on Public Works concluded hearings on S. 780, the Air Quality Act of 1967.

Under the informed and capable chairmanship of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the subcommittee conducted 6 days of hearings in the field, 2 of which were devoted to tours of industrial plants and research and testing facilities, and 12 days of hearing in Washington.

The subcommittee received testimony from approximately 124 witnesses representing a broad segment of public opinion and representing all levels of government. Industry, labor, conservation groups, and independent scientific, technical, medical, and other professional experts likewise were heard. In addition to statements by the witnesses, extensive supporting material was received. In all, the printed record of hearings will be in four volumes of approximately 2,600 pages.

This year's air pollution abatement legislation presents the Congress with one of the most involved and complicated subjects in the entire field of domestic affairs. And certainly it is the most complex pollution abatement legislation which has come before the Committee on Public Works during my more than 8 years of service on it, including the greater part of the past year as its chairman.

The task of abating air pollution on a national scale requires consideration of highly involved technological, meteorological, medical, physiochemical, and economic matters. It is, in short, a question that involves consideration of human ecology in its broadest sense, namely, the entire range of man in his urban environment. On this, as well as many other subjects before Congress, there is an oversupply of "instant experts" who are presuming to prejudge and even second-guess the subcommittee and the full committee before sessions are held by either to consider the basic legislation and amendments proposed or to be proposed. The "instant expert", in this frame of reference, is the individual who—without attending hearings and listening to testimony and questions and answers on many facets of the subject under consideration—alleges in advance prejudicial actions by members who will deliberate on the legislation and make recommendations to the Senate, and, indeed, to the whole Congress.

Mr. President, I have been a cospon-

sor and constant advocate of every pollution abatement measure which has been reported from the Committee on Public Works during my tenure in this body. My commitment to improving the quality of our environment has not been diminished by my proposal of amendments to S. 780. As I stated when introducing my first amendments on this subject, it is my conviction that they will enhance and make more effective the administration's efforts to solve the air pollution problem. These amendments were addressed to what I consider certain deficiencies in S. 780 as introduced. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has given me assurance that they will receive the same kind of consideration that is given to all responsible proposals in the field of pollution abatement, and I ask no more and no less.

Testimony presented to the subcommittee by administration's witnesses contained certain contradictions and inconsistencies on the subject of ambient air criteria, ambient air standards, and emission standards. Similar inconsistencies appeared in the testimony of other public and industry witnesses.

The subcommittee has an arduous task ahead of it in resolving these inconsistencies and in reporting a coherent, effective, and workable air pollution abatement bill. This task will not be lessened by the offer of simplistic solutions which present the problem in terms of "good guys" versus "bad guys." We must all work toward the same end of improving the quality of the human environment. There are honest differences of opinion in how best to achieve that end within the limits of present technological capabilities and without creating undue economic dislocations. I shall continue to work toward that end, and I am confident that the members of the Committee on Public Works will continue to maintain a record of achievement in this area.

It is my belief that we will report an improved version of S. 780 in the first session of the 90th Congress within time for Senate action and, I hope action also by the other body. This measure must be realistic and effective, and I predict it will fulfill these objectives.

CHRISTENING OF THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER U.S.S. "JOHN F. KENNEDY"

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, in Newport News, Va., on last Saturday, the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy* was christened. Present were members of the late President Kennedy's family including our distinguished colleagues, the Senators KENNEDY.

President Johnson, in a brief and moving tribute, spoke of John Kennedy, his ideals and the symbolism of the carrier *John F. Kennedy*.

Also in attendance were many thousands of Virginians, including those who had labored at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., to build the *John F. Kennedy*.

The simplicity and dignity of the launching touched all who were present,

and its meaning was eloquently described by the editor of the *Norfolk Virginian Pilot*. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Norfolk Virginian Pilot*, May 27, 1967]

CHRISTENING OF THE "KENNEDY"—LIEUTENANT'S NAMESAKE

John F. Kennedy once cited, as an example of the opportunities awaiting young people choosing careers in government, his rise from an obscure lieutenant to commander-in-chief of the armed forces. He might have applied the same subtle humor to today's launching in Newport News of the aircraft carrier bearing his name. For the lieutenant was in the PT flotilla, an element of the "dungaree navy," without much polish or much to polish: a collection of thin-hulled motorboats with a thin line of rank separating skipper from crew. A PT compares to a carrier as a mosquito compares to an eagle.

Yet there was style in the World War II PTs and in their dangerous work and, it follows, in the young men who manned their greasy parts and their torpedoes and their cockpits. The same sort of style distinguishes the carrier; it is in the pilot's eye and fingers, in the flightdeck sailor's graceful arms and nimble feet, in the controlled violence of the catapult and the arresting gear's functioning. Style and orderliness were innate in the lieutenant and the commander-in-chief. The USS *John F. Kennedy* is being well christened.

"The cost of freedom is always high," Mr. Kennedy said upon an occasion that invited no humor. The Cuban crisis was building up. "But Americans have always paid it," he added quickly. "And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission. Our goal is not the victory of might, but the vindication of right—not peace at the expense of freedom, but both peace and freedom, here in this hemisphere, and, we hope around the world. God willing, that goal will be achieved."

John F. Kennedy led America toward that goal then. The *John F. Kennedy* on joining the United States Fleet will inherit a role in the mission, in this hemisphere and around the world.

STRONGER GUN LAWS NEEDED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a band of armed men recently forced its way into the chamber of the California State Assembly. It was, as the *Los Angeles Times* asserted, a striking example of the need for effective gun control legislation.

As it turned out in the California case, no one was shot. But the elements for disaster certainly were there—for all of the rifles and pistols and shotguns were loaded.

The ironic factor is that the armed men who stormed the legislature were protesting a proposed gun control ordinance. Those armed men serve as a chilling reminder that legislation should be passed swiftly to keep firearms out of such irresponsible hands.

The editorial in the *Times* discussed the California incident at length and it certainly is worthy of serious attention. I respectfully ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

[From the *Los Angeles Times*, May 4, 1967]

STRONGER GUN LAWS NEEDED

The need for effective, comprehensive weapons control laws was never better illustrated than when a band of Negroes armed with loaded shotguns, pistols and rifles forced its way into the Assembly chamber at Sacramento.

The performance shocked not only those legislators and others in the Capitol who were supposed to be intimidated thereby but all law-abiding Californians who did not think such things possible in this enlightened day and age.

Ostensibly the so-called "Black Panther Party for Self Defense" was on the scene to protest a proposed law which would make it unlawful to carry a loaded weapon within a city.

The Black Panthers insisted the bill was "racist." But neither that view nor their actions found takers among Negro legislators. Assemblyman Leon Ralph (D-Los Angeles), felt the bill was aimed at other groups and that it should "be applied equally to all, black or white." Assemblyman Bill Greene, whose district includes the Watts area, branded the action "senseless" and added that "no person, black or white, can condone this."

As a result of the unseemly demonstration it is probable that the measure will be made even more restrictive or an even broader act passed.

That the Black Panthers should lay stress on the constitutional right to bear arms under the circumstances which obtained at Sacramento, makes their position completely farcical.

Certainly the authors of the Bill of Rights never had in mind such groups as the Black Panthers, the American Nazis, the Minute Men or the KKK when they wrote, in the Second Amendment:

"A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

On the other hand, perhaps they foresaw the need for a well-regulated militia to protect against the emergence of just such groups in the future.

Under existing California statutes it is a violation of the Fish and Game Code to carry a loaded weapon in an automobile. There is, however, absolutely no law which prohibits carrying loaded weapons in plain sight on the public streets or anywhere else including, obviously, the chambers of any state, county or city legislative body. There is, of course, a law against disrupting a legislative session. But that hardly meets the situation.

Several days before the Sacramento demonstration Atty. Gen. Thomas Lynch declared that there is no place in this day and age for "Wild West" exhibitions of firearms.

"The time has come," Lynch said, "when we have to legislate against carrying or exhibiting guns in public places."

The *Times* agrees. The present situation is ridiculous—and fraught with danger.

Even the National Rifle Assn., that most militant defender of the right to possess arms, should agree that incidents such as occurred in Sacramento and which may occur elsewhere, cannot be tolerated in modern society.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the war on poverty is one of the favorite whipping boys nowadays, perhaps second only to our efforts in Vietnam in the amount of vituperation and scorn that is heaped upon it, day in and day out, by certain vocal elements.

But fortunately the innate good sense of the American public has not been

swayed by this continuing criticism of the poverty program, any more than it has been by the almost constant carping on the Vietnam issue.

A good, solid majority of Americans favor a continued or expanded war on poverty, just as a good solid majority of Americans favor our efforts to prevent the loss to the free world of South Vietnam.

Roscoe Drummond, in a very perceptive article in today's Washington Post, puts the complaints about Sargent Shriver and his Office of Economic Opportunity in their proper perspective.

Admittedly, there have been mistakes, perhaps many more mistakes than should have been made. But they can and should be corrected without doing so at the expense of the millions of Americans who live below the poverty line.

Mr. Drummond concludes his article with the following paragraph, a brief statement with which I heartily agree:

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing departments which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

Let us hope that Congress will show the same good sense as the general public, by rejecting the idea that OEO should be dismembered and its programs distributed among the various Government departments.

I ask unanimous consent that Roscoe Drummond's excellent column be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1967]

THE WAR ON SHRIVER: PUBLIC BACKS
FIGHT ON POVERTY
(By Roscoe Drummond)

The American people are making no mistake in giving their strong support to the war on poverty.

Voters are 60 per cent behind the war on poverty and want it continued or expanded, the Harris Survey shows. Public support has been growing steadily for the last seven months.

The Nation as a whole has come to accept the war on poverty as one of the most compassionate, humane, and intelligent programs of the Johnson Administration.

And the Republican leadership in Congress, launching its own "opportunity crusade," avows that it favors all of the anti-poverty programs and backs all of the anti-poverty goals—but would do the whole thing differently.

Surely all this should be sweet music to the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Why, then, as he goes to Congress soon to defend his proposed budget, should Sargent Shriver, the coordinator-in-chief of the war on poverty, be the target of so much criticism for his administration of the program? Has he been a flop? Has he been incompetent? Has he been a dull-minded and routine administrator?

No one will argue, certainly not Shriver, that everything has come up roses in the Office of Economic Opportunity. But the volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered.

These facts ought to be borne in mind:

1. Much of the criticism comes from the extremists who pretty much cancel each other out—those who attack Shriver because they don't want the war on poverty to be doing anything and those who want Shriver to be asking for ten times as much as he is now doing.

2. The OEO has made mistakes. They should be recognized and corrected. The new antipoverty bill now before Congress greatly tightens the program. But the OEO had to do things quickly in its early period and obviously it has not done them well. But let's not forget that if there were no OEO there would be no war on poverty. There would be no Headstart. There would be no Job Corps. There would be no Community Action and, above all, there would be little recognition on the part of middle-class American that poverty in the United States acutely exists—32 million men, women, and children beneath the poverty line who must be relieved.

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing departments which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

THE GUN MEN'S POSSE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Chicago Sun Times recently discussed what it termed attempts by some interested and well organized groups to spur creation of civilian posses. Instead of curing civil disorders, the newspaper suggested, such posses might well lead to pitched gun battles in the streets.

It'd be just your bad luck if you happened to get in the line of fire, as many would. The posse just might get you. Think of that, when you consider whether you want one in your home town or not—

The newspaper said in an editorial. Law enforcement obviously must be left to professional law enforcement agencies, not a bunch of amateurs. The editorial is a stern and timely reminder of some of the consequences of some of the people taking the law into their own hands. I respectfully ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Chicago Sun Times, May 10, 1967]

THE GUN MEN'S POSSE

The National Rifle Assn., which thinks that everybody who is anybody at all should be able to own guns in any quantity, has now come up with another hair-raising notion: It has urged its 800,000 or more members to form armed civilian posses as a "potential community stabilizer" against rioting in the cities.

Well, now. So no urban home would be complete without a gun, or several guns. The impulse is understandable: It is a romantic thing, harking back to the posses of the old West. Even in those days, the vigilante was a dubious character, and in today's crowded city would be an even greater threat to both lives and rights. Police work is better left to the police, and if the police are inadequate, there's the National Guard, and if that's not available, there're still sheriff's deputies and state police in large numbers. If a tense situation does not develop into a riot, it no doubt would if hot-headed amateurs go about brandishing and firing guns.

In its blindness the National Rifle Assn. ignores another flaw in its terrifying plan: If its members can get, own and use guns, so can the citizens who are members of mobs. If one side starts shooting, the other side can too. What the gun totes advocate, then, are pitched gun battles in the streets, and it'd be just your bad luck if you happened to get in the line of fire, as many would. The posse just might get you. Think of that, when you consider whether you want one in your home town or not.

NO VIGILANTES, PLEASE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, what this country needs is a substantial infusion of support for its law enforcement agencies. Those agencies need money to hire more men, to train them better, to equip them better. The point of this would be to win the war on crime and protect our citizens. All of these aims would be furthered by President Johnson's proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Act.

What this country does not need is people taking the law into their own hands. That is just what the criminal tries to do and we have had enough of that. The Chicago Daily News suggested recently that certain well organized groups are urging a return to law by vigilante. The vigilante system was thoroughly discredited decades ago, and any attempt to revive it would surely be laughed out of town. The editorial in the Daily News is an enlightening one, and I respectfully ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Chicago Daily News, May 10, 1967]

NO VIGILANTES, PLEASE

The National Rifle Assn. has urged its 800,000 members to constitute themselves as civilian posses to help "stabilize" things in case of urban rioting.

We suggest that Gov. Kerner and Mayor Daley put their respective police chiefs on the alert to break up any such attempts at vigilantism.

The organization that has led the fight against gun control laws goes even further, in the May issue of its magazine, and recommends that homeowners arm themselves against "savagery and pillaging." It recommends 12-gauge shotguns, but adds that "there is a good deal to be said for a sledge or ax handle."

What is obviously intended as propaganda to whip up support for the rifle association's position comes near to being incitement to terror.

While the association piously presents itself as abetting the regular authorities, it also suggests that these authorities may prove wholly inadequate to cope with large-scale rioting. In those circumstances, "the armed citizen represents a potential community stabilizer" whose "support of law and order" could prove essential. "What if the National Guard were overseas in a major war?" the magazine asks. "Who then supports the police?"

It can be assumed that the men in charge of law enforcement at the local, state and national levels have considered such contingencies and made plans to suit.

One trouble with vigilante groups is that they do not really work to protect society, but only one faction of it at the expense of another. Far from contributing to lasting order, that only incites the other side to lash out in its own behalf, making the

police task far greater than it should have been.

The other trouble with vigilante groups is recalled ironically by the National Rifle Assn.'s self-description as the "foremost guardian of the American tradition."

Nothing could run more contrary to the American tradition than for private citizens to start fancying themselves policemen.

U.N. ALONE SHOULD DEFUSE MIDDLE EAST POWDER KEG

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column which appeared in the May 24 edition of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette. The editorial is entitled "U.N. Alone Should Defuse Middle East Powder Keg."

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

U.N. ALONE SHOULD DEFUSE MIDDLE EAST POWDER KEG

The currently escalated war of nerves between Israel and the Arab states is one of deep confusion, except for one dreadfully clear fact: the Near East is a powder keg which with a single foolish move or miscalculation on the part of anyone from a chief of state to buck private, could set off fierce fighting and trigger World War III.

With U.N. Secretary-General U Thant in Cairo in a desperate effort to reach some solution, the one hope is evidence that neither the Arabs nor the Israelis are anxious for a fight at this time—but both sides have made such threats and such moves as to make armed clash almost inevitable.

And Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser put a large chunk of powder-saturated fat into the fire Monday when he announced that Egypt will block Israel's access to the Red Sea.

Fortunately, Israel's immediate reaction was to wait and see whether Egypt will carry out its threat to blockade the Gulf of Aqaba—but the situation was explosively precarious at best.

The developing storm in the Middle East is particularly crucial to the United States, which is already deeply involved in an interminable shooting war in Vietnam, and which has long standing commitments to maintain peace and security in the Arab-Israeli world.

The critical nature of the current crisis, as it relates to the possibility of World War III, was cited on the floor of the Senate recently by Sen. Joseph Clark, D-Pa., who pointed out that an understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States is absolutely essential if war in the Mideast is to be prevented.

"I would think it would be as obvious to the leaders of the Soviet Union as it is to our own government," said Sen. Clark, "that an outbreak of fighting between Israel and its neighbors could quickly spread and produce a highly dangerous confrontation between the Russians and ourselves."

"Our relations with the Soviet Union have already suffered greatly as a result of our involvement in Vietnam. If, on top of this, the Middle East flares up and becomes an area of controversy, all of the progress toward that most essential detente made since the death of Stalin could be quickly dissipated, and we could find ourselves again in two armed camps, moving progressively closer from cold to hot war."

Further complicating the crisis is the probability that it didn't really develop from the threat Israel and the Arabs feel for each other, but rather stems from inter-Arab rivalries, and especially the competition between Egypt and Syria for the leadership of the Arab "revolution."

This theory seems to gain support in Nasser's startling decision to demand withdraw-

al of the 3,400-man United Nations peace-keeping force that for 10 years had patrolled the 117-mile armistice line between Egypt and Israel.

Why had Nasser, with up to 50,000 troops tied down in civil war in Yemen, taken a move that left him directly exposed to Israeli forces?

The answer seems to be partly because his early posturing had not been taken seriously enough, partly to squash the irritating charges from monarchist Jordan and Saudi Arabia that he had been hiding behind the U.N. shield—a "pane of glass" neither side had dared shatter—and partly to outdo the firebrand Syrians and restore himself as the most militant and daring of the Arab leaders.

If this was the basis of Nasser's move, it is irresponsibility at its most dangerous worst—and he must somehow be persuaded to reconsider before the tensions spark an Arab-Israeli war, and possibly more.

Some U.N. diplomats think U Thant made a serious blunder in acting too hastily in acceding to Nasser's demand to remove the U.N. Emergency Forces without an effort to emphasize the folly of such a move. However, there is little doubt the secretary-general took the only action he could once the demand was made, for no U.N. operation has ever been imposed against the will of the host country.

But, with the crisis deepening and Russia making saber-rattling statements in the midst of belligerent attitudes in both Israel and the Arab nations, what can be done to avert catastrophe?

Clearly, this is a situation that calls for strong action on the part of the United Nations to bring the full weight of the organization to bear as a restraining influence.

Some way must be found to make the U.N. effective—perhaps by persuading Israel to let the U.N. forces patrol her side of the frontier from the Gaza Strip to Sharm el Sheikh on the Gulf of Aqaba, something she has not consented to before. Such action on the part of Israel not only would bring the U.N. Emergency Force back into the picture as a shield against provocative border incidents or invasion, but also should have a great impact on softening tensions.

At any rate, the United States should avoid any unilateral intervention, but insist upon working only through the United Nations.

A COAL-TO-GASOLINE CONVERSION PILOT PLANT IS DEDICATED AT CRESAP, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, last Saturday I participated, with Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, and others, in dedicating a coal-to-gasoline conversion pilot plant at Cresap, W. Va. The plant will be operated for the Office of Coal Research under a contract with the Consolidation Coal Co., a subsidiary of the Continental Oil Co.

This synthetic liquid fuels pilot plant will utilize the technology developed by the research division of the Consolidation Coal Co., at its laboratories in Library, Pa.

The coal used in the process is pulverized, dried, and then mixed with a solvent derived from the process. Part of it is dissolved, and the coal is then subjected to heat and pressure. Through a series of filtration steps a liquid extract is obtained, and the ash is removed.

It is further processed through reaction with hydrogen in the presence of a catalyst. This results in a synthetic liquid crude material that can be further refined into high octane gasoline through normal oil refining processes.

At this stage of the process develop-

ment, natural gas is used in the manufacture of hydrogen which is then used in the reaction process. Eventually it is hoped that the hydrogen will be made from coal. Then the only raw materials will be coal, water, and air.

This pilot plant process is intended to verify the economic feasibility of making gasoline from coal at a competitive price. A successful end result will extend the Nation's liquid fuel energy reserves by hundred of years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the remarks made by me at the dedication ceremony.

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

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, DEDICATION OF COAL-TO-GASOLINE CONVERSION PILOT PLANT, MAY 27, 1967, CRESAP, W. VA.

Fifty years ago a man named John Andrews was admitted to Navy Department offices in Washington when he promised that he could furnish a substitute for gasoline at a cost of two cents a gallon. Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels and his assistant, Franklin D. Roosevelt, listened intently and then agreed that the theory should be investigated, for America was going to need all the fuel she could get to see us through World War I.

A test was arranged at Brooklyn Navy Yard. John Andrews took a small can from his satchel, asked for a bucket of water, and poured the contents of both into the gasoline tank of a test engine. At least one-third of the mixture was water, but the engine started immediately and ran until the tank was dry. Other tests were equally successful, but nothing ever came of the project because Andrews, I am informed, wanted the Navy to give him a small fortune before he would disclose the contents of his magic potion.

The whole episode was described in Secretary Daniels' memoirs. What Andrews carried in the little can was never divulged, but it has been theorized that he used acetone to absorb acetylene and produce a liquid.

Now, what if John Andrews had carried a bucket of coal into the office of the Secretary? Well, that, figuratively, is what the director of the Office of Coal Research did when he came to my office with the concept of what we are here to dedicate.

But the groundwork for Cresap's Project Gasoline and all other projects coming out of OCR dates back to the time when our present Secretary of the Interior was still a Member of the House Committee that approved the bill for the Office of Coal Research program. We were colleagues in the House when the first OCR bill was passed by Congress.

I think we should also remember the efforts of my colleague, Senator Jennings Randolph, who, as a member of the House of Representatives, during the decades of the 1930's and 1940's, pioneered in urging Federal support of coal research. It was then Representative Randolph who, in 1944, joined with the late Senator Joseph O'Mahoney of Wyoming to press for research on synthetic liquid fuels. Those two men co-authored and co-sponsored the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of 1944, which became Public Law 290 of the 78th Congress.

Senator Randolph and I in the Senate, and Representative Moore and other members of the West Virginia Congressional Delegation in the House, joined in supporting legislation to establish the Office of Coal Research, and Senator Randolph's interest in research in two vital and critical areas continues—the production of liquid fuels from coal and oil shale.

In process at the present time is a miscellany of projects to provide more economical

heat and power through use of coal; to abate air and water pollution; to provide building materials with a by-product of coal combustion that was once vented out into the atmosphere; and to filter sewage through beds of coal in the first step toward making contaminated water reusable.

A broad-scale attack on the problem of producing liquid fuels and pipeline-quality gas from coal has been largely carried through the laboratory development stage quite successfully.

The office of Coal Research program to develop improved methods of generating electricity from coal, while not yet as extensive as the liquid and gas conversion program, is equally vital to the coal industry and to the nation's energy base.

Two very promising new systems, the fuel cell and EGD (electro-gas-dynamics) are presently under development. Several other promising power systems are available for development.

To carry the presently contracted work to its ultimately necessary pilot plant stage, plus adding a few of the other promising power systems, will require funding considerably above the present level.

If the Office of Coal Research is to carry on to its originally planned objectives and return to our country maximum benefits in relation to its cost, the funds available to the Office must be greatly increased annually above that of fiscal 1967—which was really only the end of the preparatory period. This upward acceleration should be vigorously prepared for at least 10 years. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, this will be my purpose.

The Office of Coal Research has a substantial on-going program of major projects, and others available, which, I firmly believe, if carried to conclusion, will produce dramatic results not envisioned by even the more optimistic among us only a few short years ago.

We *did* foresee the potential, however, for coal and for all America in Project Gasoline. We know that it was possible to extract a high-grade motor fuel from the magic energy that is coal, but for too long it was assumed that the plentiful storehouse of petroleum reserves within the broad borders of this nation would be ample to see us through for generations to follow.

So, for too long the idea of a commercial coal-to-gasoline industry lay dormant in Files for the Future. Finally an imaginative plan was presented to the Office of Coal Research, and from that day we have been pursuing—painstakingly and patiently, but energetically and enthusiastically—the plan and the program that bring us today to this historic occasion.

As OCR Director George Fumich pointed out to members of the Independent Petroleum Association of America earlier this month, demand for petroleum products in this country will rise from 3½ billion barrels this year to 6 or 8 billion barrels in 1980, with perhaps double that amount by the year 2000. The 30 billion gallons of crude petroleum reserves are, to be sure, only a part of the total amount that lies beneath our soil, and I have every confidence that our great petroleum leaders will continually develop methods of drawing out the last drop that the Creator put there for our benefit. Yet, the stock is not inexhaustible, and to wait longer for inauguration of a program to provide substitute fuels would be sheer folly.

We may already have waited longer than good judgment—in retrospect—would dictate. Whether or not we like to think about the prospect, the supply lines for much of the foreign oil and products upon which we have come to depend could be severed tomorrow or on Monday or next month or next year. The danger is pointed out in every newspaper headline. It is not pleasant to comprehend.

An explosion in the Middle East could dis-

rupt America's energy pattern and set our wells to pumping as they never worked before. If the crisis persisted, the petroleum industry could hardly be expected to keep up the pace of producing all the liquid fuels required. An industry developed at Cressap would be needed—and quickly. Let us pray that such exigency will never materialize.

In any event, peacetime requirements alone will justify the venture into this new energy field.

In not too many years, there will be another America placed right on top of the country we now know—twice as many people, twice as many cars, twice as many airplanes and homes and factories. But no more energy in the ground than God granted in his legacy to us. What we must do is to develop all the energy that is available, and we must do it without waiting for a shortage to develop.

Today we are on the threshold of another fuel industry in West Virginia. I congratulate the Consolidation Coal Company for its diligent undertaking. I thank Secretary Udall and Mr. Fumich for their belief in a dream which we are bringing to life through this intricate structure along the banks of the beautiful Ohio.

Besides creating a necessary new source of fuel for our tomorrow, this structure carries the hope of a more fruitful life for many West Virginians. Our miners have suffered the pangs of economic ills for many years. They have waited a long time for a Project Gasoline to open new opportunities to them. I believe that that day is dawning.

In closing, I wish to say that the bituminous coal industry has suffered far too long from a lack of genuine Government interest in its future welfare, or, more specifically, from a disproportionate financial support by the Federal government in the development of atomic power as coal's competitor in the electric utility fuel market. If coal, for a few years, could be assured of at least 25 per cent of the \$200 million or more the Government is appropriating each year to the continuing development of atomic power, including development of the breeder reactor plant technology, the solutions to coal's present and future problems soon would be forthcoming.

The coal industry is strong today because of the wisdom and dedication of men in management and labor who refused to give up when coal markets declined following World War II. Such men can be relied upon to shape coal's future through research and development, but these efforts require increased support from the Government if one of the nation's most abundant sources of economical energy is to be safeguarded and most efficiently utilized for the future benefit of all Americans.

I regard coal research as the key to the energy future of the United States. I look for new efforts to increase the level of Government support for coal research, and I expect to be behind every project proposal which shows promise of making a significant contribution to the welfare of the industry and of future generations of Americans who will thus be able to rely on coal as a source of energy and new products in a wide range of modern forms.

Coal can be a cleaner fuel than ever, and a far more versatile one, through intelligently oriented research and development, fully supported by the Government. Research can and will unlock the door to a new age for mankind's oldest fuel.

DRUMMOND PRAISES L. B. J. WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, when the war on poverty was launched by President Johnson a few short months after he took over the reins of Govern-

ment, the hope and promise of the American dream gained a new dimension, a new depth. It made the job of our critics around the world a little harder.

But, for some time now both the war on poverty and particularly Sargent Shriver, the man who has so brilliantly organized and led this experiment in social justice, have been among the primary targets of an undeserved barrage of attacks from the Republicans, who are flailing about in search of issues upon which to stand in the next election.

Roscoe Drummond's column in the Washington Post for May 31, 1967, entitled "The War on Shriver," has put these attacks into the proper perspective. Said Drummond:

The volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered.

Sargent Shriver's war on poverty has the support of the majority of voters, Drummond points out. And it deserves the full support of all Members of Congress and a vote in favor of OEO's budget request when it comes before us.

I commend Drummond's column to the attention of all my colleagues.

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

THE WAR ON SHRIVER: PUBLIC BACKS FIGHT ON POVERTY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The American people are making no mistake in giving their strong support to the war on poverty.

Voters are 60 per cent behind the war on poverty and want it continued or expanded, the Harris Survey shows. Public support has been growing steadily for the last seven months.

The Nation as a whole has come to accept the war on poverty as one of the most compassionate, humane, and intelligent programs of the Johnson Administration.

And the Republican leadership in Congress, launching its own "opportunity crusade," avows that it favors all of the anti-poverty programs and backs all of the anti-poverty goals—but would do the whole thing differently.

Surely all this should be sweet music to the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Why, then, as he goes to Congress soon to defend his proposed budget, should Sargent Shriver, the coordinator-in-chief of the war on poverty, be the target of so much criticism for his administration of the program? Has he been a flop? Has he been incompetent? Has he been a dull-minded and routine administrator?

No one will argue, certainly not Shriver, that everything has come up roses in the Office of Economic Opportunity. But the volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered.

These facts ought to be borne in mind:

1. Much of the criticism comes from the extremists who pretty much cancel each other out—those who attack Shriver because they don't want the war on poverty to be doing anything and those who want Shriver to be asking for ten times as much as he is now doing.

2. The OEO has made mistakes. They should be recognized and corrected. The new

antipoverty bill now before Congress greatly tightens the program. But the OEO had to do things quickly in its early period and obviously it has not done them well. But let's not forget that if there were no OEO there would be no war on poverty. There would be no Headstart. There would be no Job Corps. There would be no Community Action and, above all, there would be little recognition on the part of middle-class Americans that poverty in the United States acutely exists—32 million men, women, and children beneath the poverty line who must be relieved.

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing departments which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

DR. JAMES R. KILLIAN ON EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the establishment of a public television system is a matter of great concern to all Americans. A new proposal aimed at getting such a system started was set forth by the report of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television.

The heart of the Carnegie Commission proposal is public television and the leading architect for the commission's grand design for public television is James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television.

How to achieve the development and distribution of high-caliber programs under the supervision and direction of a nonprofit and nongovernmental corporation; and, the other reports and recommendations of the Commission were thoroughly explored recently on Theodore Granik's award-winning public affairs program "Youth Wants to Know."

James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, responded there to a panel of Yorktown High School students' penetrating and provocative questions. Dr. Killian's appearance on the program provided an opportunity for all Americans to discover, through the eyes of America's young people, a better understanding of the important issues of our time, as discussed by an outstanding authority in the field.

I ask unanimous consent that a partial transcript of that program may appear in the RECORD.

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

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

(Created and Produced by Theodore Granik; Associate Producer, Jay B. Cutler; Assistant to the Producer, Susan Gallagher)

Youth Wants to Know Presents Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., Chairman of the Corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television.

ANNOUNCER. Youth Wants to Know—the penetrating, provocative questions of America's young people.

Mr. GRANIK. Welcome to Youth Wants to Know. Our guest is James R. Killian, Jr., Chairman of the Corporation, Massachusetts

Institute of Technology and Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television. Dr. Killian has had a distinguished career of dedicated public service. A report and recommendations of the Carnegie Commission, headed by Dr. Killian, heralded a new era for television. The Commission proposes the development and distribution of high caliber programs under the supervision and direction of a non-profit and non-governmental corporation. How to achieve this grand design for public television will be the subject of many questions by our panel of Yorktown High School students. Let's begin with you, Peggy.

Question. Dr. Killian, is there really an untapped audience for public television?

Dr. KILLIAN. I'm convinced that there is, that in our local communities there are many kinds of talent that have never been given an opportunity to display that talent and get a reaction to it on television. And I think if we have the proper media, we're going to have people coming forward with all kinds of gifts and special qualities that will be appealing on television.

Question. Even with the diversity in programming in educational television, how do you propose to attract those who are interested in mass media?

Dr. KILLIAN. If the artist who wants to reach the largest possible audience feels that he has a better opportunity to do the kinds of things that to him represent integrity, in terms of his artistic talent, I think that he will find that public television, as we have proposed it, will give him an opportunity that he hasn't had before.

Question. Are you saying, Doctor, that educational television won't pay competitive salaries as commercial television?

Dr. KILLIAN. We hope that eventually it will. Certainly educational television is not now paying competitive salaries. In fact, many of our representatives of the dramatic and artistic and musical communities have really been subsidizing educational television by contributing their services. And this is not right for the long pull.

Question. Dr. Killian, it seems that with the salaries being paid and considering where the talent is at this time in commercial television, it would seem to be that all the good talent is being utilized. How could educational television bring out that much more talent? It seems the best talent is there.

Dr. KILLIAN. You've put your finger on a very important and difficult part of the whole television problem, because it is the kind of medium that uses talent up very fast. But it seems that we ought now to begin to plan to do the kind of recruiting, the kind of training, the kind of development of new talent that will enlarge this pool that television is going to require. But this is going to take time, and it is going to take a lot of doing. And at the present time we aren't training enough new talent for television. And one of the purposes of this proposed corporation is to provide ways for training new talent.

Mr. GRANIK. Then training will be a very vital part of this?

Dr. KILLIAN. Oh absolutely, it must be.

Question. Dr. Killian, how do you think commercial television is falling to do its job?

Dr. KILLIAN. Commercial television is geared to the demands of the marketplace, it serves the advertiser. This is an important function in our society, and the Carnegie Commission did not criticize commercial television for its concentration on economic objectives. But in meeting these economic objectives, and in serving the needs of the advertiser, they have to drive for the mass audience, to produce the largest number of listeners to a given program.

Mr. GRANIK. Aren't they also worried about that valley that might develop with a public affairs program?

Dr. KILLIAN. And sometimes if they put

on a program that doesn't reach a mass audience, it tends to affect all the programs that follow.

Mr. GRANIK. The commercial Nielsens.

Dr. KILLIAN. That's right.

Question. Assuming that you do get the good talent and the new ways to present a program for public TV, what is going to make the people, the masses, want to watch it? I know, like if the President is on TV, or something, on all three channels, and I see that he is on, or maybe a moon shot or something. I immediately switch to the only channel, you know, that has something entertaining on it. And so this makes me wonder, are there all that many people really wanting to be educated and have the good stuff?

Dr. KILLIAN. I hasten to emphasize that public television, or educational television or whatever we call it, must not be limited to the lecture or the panel discussion or what might be considered to be the dull parts of education. There's no reason why it can't provide excitement and entertainment and elegance of programming that would appeal to all kinds of people.

Mr. GRANIK. In other words, we must dramatize it.

Dr. KILLIAN. That's right. We must.

Question. Dr. Killian, if Congress considers your Commission's plan for what you call public television, is there anything to prevent this from leading to perhaps a plan for public radio or even a plan for a public news paper?

Dr. KILLIAN. In the President's message to Congress and in the Magnuson Bill, which was introduced into the Senate, and the other bill into the House, radio is provided for along with television, and this Corporation that has been proposed would also help to provide more adequately for educational radio. And I'm sure that radio has a very brilliant future too.

Mr. GRANIK. Well, they've shown their need at the hearings themselves by carrying them live.

Dr. KILLIAN. Yes they have.

Question. Doctor, wasn't your Commission a little overly optimistic in expecting the excise tax proposal to pass Congress?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, we may have been optimistic, but we felt very strongly that we had to pose the issue of how in our system one can use federal funds for the support of free communications, and insulate the organization that is handling the communications, and we could find no better way than to recommend an excise tax which is a formula kind of approach, with a trust fund held by the Treasury. If someone else would invent another way to do this other than the excise tax, we would be very happy.

Question. But shouldn't some burden of the tax fall upon commercial television?

Dr. KILLIAN. This is one approach and one recommendation that many people have made that some kind of tax—the profits of commercial television, a license on sets as they do in England and some other foreign countries, there are many different alternatives, but we could find nothing so simple and direct and to us workable as the excise tax. And I would hasten to say that I think that this can be a very equitable tax, because public television when it is going as we think it will, full force, is going to reach in and touch some member of every family right from the very youngest on up. And we are, therefore, going to get very broad coverage, and, therefore, everyone will be benefiting from it.

Question. Dr. Killian, do you think that satellite communications will have an effective impact on educational television?

Dr. KILLIAN. Yes, I do, because I think the coming of satellite channels will make a veritable lower cost interconnection, more copious interconnection, will provide more channels for the distribution of television pro-

grams, so this is going to be profoundly important. However we may organize for public television by satellite, whether it is through a domestic satellite corporation as the Ford Foundation has proposed.

Mr. GRANIK. Will there be additional revenue from that?

Dr. KILLIAN. It depends on how Congress works this out. Whether there will be additional revenue, I think is still uncertain.

Question. Dr. Killian, wouldn't an excise tax be basically unfair to people who would not be interested in educational television?

Dr. KILLIAN. One can certainly argue this point, but I think the counter to that argument is what I've already stated that the comprehensiveness of the diversity of public television could be such that it touches everyone or every member of every family, so that there would be few people who would not benefit from it.

Question. Dr. Killian, I'm a little bit confused, this excise tax, I read something about it being for manufacturers and not for retail or vice versa or something like that, could you explain that? I mean, are there two possible excise taxes?

Dr. KILLIAN. No. We recommended a manufacturer's excise tax, so that under this arrangement, the company that manufactures the television set would pay an excise tax. The company would pay it. No, it would not be a tax on the individual. Now one can say that the company will pass along the excise tax in the retail price of the set, or they might, the excise tax being very low as we recommended it, they might find technological ways of reducing the cost of the set to offset the tax. One doesn't know just how this would operate.

Question. Dr. Killian, to change the subject just a little bit, if public television wants to have for one of its main goals better programming, who is going to define what better programming is?

Dr. KILLIAN. I think the American people again must define, the listeners must define what better programming is. But we have been very deeply convinced that a great body of American citizens who are not getting what they would like to get on television, because so much of the programming is directed at this mass audience, and let me use an analogy here, if I may. It is as though the book publishers of this country were concentrating only on the publication only of best sellers, and were forgetting about all the other kinds of books that we need, the text books, the need to know books, the small limited editions, and all these kinds of books that enrich our society and meet the needs of the individual. We want a television system that does that, too.

Mr. GRANIK. In other words, there may be 30 million listening to one program but there are 6 or 7 or 8 million others who would like to listen to others.

Dr. KILLIAN. This is right. We think that there are a great number of audiences in this country that are not now being reached at all, who are hungry for something, and if television can be designed to reach those people, and you add up all those different audiences, you're going to have still a very big audience.

Question. Dr. Killian, how would you be able to find out the public opinion? How would you be able to find out what kind of programming they want?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, there are many ways. Of course, the commercial people use the rating system. I would venture to hope that public television does not get encumbered with the kind of rating system that commercial television has to deal with now. But there are all kinds of ways of judging the audience response. People write in, people call in, you have different ways of polling to see what kind of audience you are getting. There have been many studies made of the audience of educational television.

Mr. GRANIK. The present rating system permits about 1300 in the whole United States to determine what the agencies buy.

Dr. KILLIAN. And, of course, the present rating systems, too, are giving some indication of how many people are listening to our educational television. So there's pretty good evidence, and the evidence shows that the audience for public television is steadily growing.

Question. Dr. Killian, if this audience is pleased by the results of the educational television, if you do accomplish a certain degree of excellence in the program which, as you say, reaches out and touches everyone, do you feel that commercial television will be released from its responsibility in this respect?

Dr. KILLIAN. I would hope not. I would hope that this would encourage commercial television to do a lot of things that it doesn't think it can do at the present time.

Mr. GRANIK. But it would still have to satisfy public interest, convenience and necessity.

Dr. KILLIAN. I think this is going to build very beneficial competition between these two. And I would also venture to suggest that public television, being freer to experiment, and not being under the pressures of the mass audience all the time, can invent new kinds of programs and new kinds of approaches to the way of reaching people that the commercial people then can pick up and enrich their own programs too. So I think these two things are going to feed into each other, and they are going to be mutually beneficial.

Question. Dr. Killian, Japan has five educational television networks, and two that are in color. Why couldn't we have more than two, more than one?

Dr. KILLIAN. Japan, I hasten to say, probably has in their educational television system probably the finest system in the world today. They are doing an extraordinary job of reaching their people, and they are spending, incidentally, something like \$350 million a year on educational television. We're spending about \$60 million a year on educational television in this country. And they are getting first rate results.

Mr. GRANIK. Does it frighten people when you say educational television?

Dr. KILLIAN. Yes it does.

Mr. GRANIK. You gave it a better name. That was always what we public affairs shows had to contend with, Dr. Killian.

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, happily, I'm an educator, and I come from an educational institution and I believe in education, but applied to television it does have a dampening effect, I'm afraid.

Question. Dr. Killian, why did your Commission decide instead of expanding the existing educational television network, why did they decide to establish a new corporation that will be much more expensive?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, our basic recommendation was that we should strengthen the local stations. We should have more of these local stations. We have 124 now. We think that ultimately to cover all the American people we should have about 380. And that those stations should be strong and independent, and they should determine what their programming should be. We don't want anyone to be telling the local station what its programming should be, or forcing on it any kind of programming. We did feel that in addition to the local stations we needed a national institution that could generate programs of national interest, to make these programs available by a system of distribution to the local stations, and that this national institution would exercise a sense of quality and build excellence and variety in the total system.

Question. Well isn't that what NET is doing now?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well NET is certainly con-

tributing importantly to this objective. But we would like to see more diversity in the sources of programming in this country. We recommended, therefore, that there be at least two national production centers, of which NET would certainly be one. And it is my own personal view that NET might well be the proper instrument for handling news programs, political broadcasting, and so on. Now I have great confidence in NET and its role in this developing system.

Question. Dr. Killian, how can we prevent government control of public television?

Dr. KILLIAN. This is one of the key questions that we are confronted with at the present time, and that is being debated in Congress, and in our own proposals we tried to accomplish this, first of all by urging that this corporate entity, the Corporation for Public Television, be a private corporation, that it receive its funds through a trust fund and it also have private funds to supplement the federal funds and that it have a board of directors who could be free and independent. We must have freedom of communications as well as freedom of the press.

Question. Dr. Killian, do you think that the recent proposal by the Washington Post for changing how directors are chosen for the Commission, would that help prevent government control?

Dr. KILLIAN. I think it important that you look at alternative ways of appointing the directors of the corporation. But the Carnegie Commission itself reached the conclusion that in its judgment the most direct and simple way would be to have the President appoint these directors and have them—half of them confirmed by Congress, half of them appointed by the President, and half confirmed by Congress, by the Senate, and they in turn appoint six more. But we don't feel that this is the only way to do this, and that there may be alternative ways of doing it. But I hasten to point out that one of the best ways in this country of getting a first rate Commission, and a first rate Board is to have the President appoint them, because important people will respond to an invitation from the President when they may not respond to some other kind of appointive process.

Question. Dr. Killian, do you think that public television can be successful without the advantages of network telecasting?

Dr. KILLIAN. Without networking? Yes I do. In fact, again, it was the judgment of our Commission that we would not like to see a networking operation unduly prominent in the system of public television. There would be networking at times in the handling of certain kinds of programs, live, in which they would be broadcast simultaneously on all the stations.

Mr. GRANIK. Couldn't they serve also, these network programs, as a model for local programs?

Dr. KILLIAN. Yes, certainly. But we would like to see this distribution system operate so that every local station was feeding into it, and every station can look at all of these programs that are being fed into this distribution system and decide what it wants to use. But we would not like to see the system get the local stations always expecting to get the principal portion of their programming from Washington and New York.

Question. Much has been said about government control of this corporation, but I think there is another consideration. The United Auto Workers have pledged \$25,000 in support of this corporation if it is formed. Do you see any danger in this contribution from pressure groups such as this?

Dr. KILLIAN. No I do not. In fact, I think we should welcome contributions from all sectors of our private—the private part of our society. And as you know, CBS, on the day that the Carnegie Commission report was released, said they would pledge \$1 million

toward the endowment for the corporation, and I am hopeful that many other corporations will provide funds toward the private endowment of the corporation, as well as foundations, and individuals. If this is dispersed and you have support from many different sources, along with federal support, then it seems to me you have the diversification that would insure freedom.

Question. Dr. Killian, to change the subject just a little, I'd like to know, the lack of communication between student and teacher now in many of the large colleges and universities, why—how would instructional—I mean, how would, you know, instructional television be a more communicative media?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, let me answer that this way. So far, I think, instructional television is not very much used in the universities. But I think we are going to see a growing use of it, and one of the ways it is going to be used is that teachers will use television to show things that the classroom doesn't permit students easily to see, and you can zero in and see something intimately on the television screen that you couldn't see. For example, scientific experiments and demonstrations done in the lecture room. But something else is coming very quickly and that is the stored kind of television in which you will have a tape or a record with an hour's television program on it, that you can go to the library and take out and play back, and have your own television program and look at it at your leisure and any time you want to do it, and I think this is going to have a very profound effect on helping students teach themselves, and this is one of the most important aspects of education.

Mr. GRANIK. Would these be programs that they could record and play later or programs already recorded for their convenience?

Dr. KILLIAN. Both.

Question. Doctor, is the university obligated to educate the surrounding community?

Dr. KILLIAN. I think the university has a very great opportunity today to make a great contribution to the improvement of its environment in its own community. Yes, the university does have an obligation to help its community. I think you will find all around this country university programs at the present time that are designed to contribute to the welfare of the people, the surrounding citizens. There is an institutional citizenship responsibility here invested in the universities, no less than an industrial corporation or individuals. And one of the great changes in education in the universities I predict in the next decade is the emphasis which we are going to see on urban affairs, and all of the different ways in which scholars and students can contribute to urban affairs. In my own institution, we have students that are tutoring disadvantaged young people in our community. We have a summer school run by students for young people who otherwise might not have these opportunities. There are a host of things that students themselves are doing in the universities that are very significant and to me they are moving to see what can be accomplished by young people working with young people.

Question. Dr. Killian, do you thus see public television dramatically changing the American way of life?

Dr. KILLIAN. I think that public television can contribute very greatly to the quality of American life. And one of the reasons that I think that led those of us on the Carnegie Commission to do so was a feeling that we must in this country address ourselves to all the many different ways in which we can contribute to the quality and richness of American life. And by improving television, we felt we could do this. May I add something else here. I come from a background in which there is great concern with science and technology. I have a very deep conviction

that one of our major problems today is how we can make technology benign, how we can take the miraculous technology of television and make it serve the best and highest aspirations of our society, and not permitting it to be addressed to trivia too much of the time. We've got to do this all along the line. And television is one of the ways in which we can make technology benign rather than an incubus for our society, and individual people in it.

Question. Dr. Killian, have there been any studies made on the effect of the impersonal nature of educational TV? Sometimes I may be irrational, but I get the idea that it is a little bit like 1984, and you sit there and you watch the tube, and you know, it is frightening.

Dr. KILLIAN. There has been a great deal of discussion about this. But one of the things that I think is ahead in this field of television technology is a two-way interactive television. There is a chapter in our report that discusses some of these future developments in technology. And I think down the road we're going to see a person sitting in front of a television screen being able to respond to the person on the screen, to record his own effects, to ask questions, to give indications of dissent or agreement. In other words, there is going to be a feedback, an interaction here, and this would get at the problem in part that you're talking about.

Question. You mentioned earlier that commercial television as it is today has to more or less fight for the money that they get, and appeal to the mass audiences.

Dr. KILLIAN. The whole public television system is impoverished.

Question. And this is unlike what the proposed corporation would do. They would be assured of their income.

Dr. KILLIAN. They would be insured of better programming, and through HEW, we recommended that they would get grants for operations, and new equipment.

Question. And yet today's commercial TV networks still show educational shows occasionally, documentaries, news programs, and so on.

Dr. KILLIAN. Frequently with great brilliance.

Question. And if your corporation, the Corporation for Public Television, were to prove itself to be fairly successful, don't you think there is a possibility that the other three commercial networks, because they have to appeal to mass audiences, might abdicate all responsibility altogether for showing any educational programs?

Dr. KILLIAN. A number of people have voiced this concern, but my anticipation would be again, as I said before, that there is going to be a competitive factor here, and if commercial television sees that some of the programs are highly successful that appear on public television, they're going to want to do them too.

Mr. GRANIK. If they began to lose some of their ratings.

Dr. KILLIAN. And I think, too, that public television will tend to change the taste of the listeners in this country. And they will begin to look to commercial television for the kinds of programs that they have been finding only on public television.

Mr. GRANIK. Instead of re-runs of re-runs.

Dr. KILLIAN. This is right. And the Nielsen ratings will start going down if the kinds of first rate public television programs would be neglected by commercial television.

Question. Dr. Killian, when I found out that CBS, you know, gave that million dollars, I was sort of amazed. That seemed to me sort of like a shoe shop giving, you know, money to a little shoe shop that might hurt the big shoe shop's business. So why did they do it, besides being nice and humanitarian and all that?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, Dr. Stanton wrote a very eloquent letter about this saying that at

CBS he and his associates had a conviction that an alternate system was needed in this country, that they would like to see the kind of system proposed by the Carnegie Commission, they thought it was sound, pluralistic, free of the controls that might otherwise encroach upon freedom of communication, and that they would like to give it a boost. And I think this is sound policy, and I think there was a very genuine conviction on the part of the people who made that decision that they would like to see a strong system of public television in the United States, and that this would be good for commercial television.

Question. Could it hurt them financially?

Dr. KILLIAN. I don't believe so. In fact, I think in the long run it may help them.

Mr. GRANIK. Dr. Stanton himself is an educator.

Dr. KILLIAN. That's right. He had his Ph. D. in psychology, as I recall.

Question. This conception of answering back the tube, though terribly exciting sounds rather frightening to me. Wouldn't this bring in the possibility of 1984 type view screens?

Dr. KILLIAN. No. Of course, 1984 is going to be a cliché in many respects, although I think the famous book was a very important event in our literary history. But I have a great conviction that we are finding ways of mastering technology so that we can turn it to humane uses, make it the servant of man and not in any way a dominating factor in our society. But we've got to constantly work at this. That's why we ought to be working at public television, because I think that we can master this miraculous inventiveness of mind, and put it to work for benign purposes.

Question. Would the Board of Directors of your proposed Corporation have the final say on political programs, say, produced by local stations?

Dr. KILLIAN. No, I would think not. They would have that final say on how the arrangements were made. For example, with NET to broadcast the speeches of political candidates. But I think that NET and the Corporation would probably want to turn panels of advisers or editorial committees that could make to them objective recommendations as to how they should handle this program.

Mr. GRANIK. I'm sorry to interrupt. I know there are many more questions. There just isn't time. Thank you, Dr. Killian for being our guest on Youth Wants To Know. Our thanks to you, panel, for your most interesting questions and to you, ladies and gentlemen, for being with us. Please join us again next week on Youth Wants To Know, where through the eyes of youth, we explore, we discover, we measure the important people, ideas and events of our time. Now this is Theodore Granik bidding you goodbye.

CONFRONTATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the explosive situation in the Middle East worries all responsible people. Not alone is there the potential of a confrontation between the two great nuclear powers of the world—the U.S.S.R. and the United States, but there are heavy overtones involving freedom of the seas. Additionally, a traditional Western-oriented ally of the United States faces threatened oblivion and American-supplied arms may once more be used against American-supplied arms.

Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, one of Washington's most eloquent and learned clergymen, had something to say on this subject last weekend which I believe

should be shared because of the erudite manner in which he explains his own ideas on this delicate situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TWIN HAVE MET

We have lived with crisis for so long that we have vulgarized the vocabulary of peril. Yet we must find words to define the horrifying meaning of the conflagration that threatens the peace of the world in Asia and now in the Middle East.

Those who believe in the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, who reject the use of military force, and who may deplore our country's military posture in Vietnam, are now brought face to face with still another challenge to principle. Is there any difference between the situation in Vietnam and that in Israel? Why should there be a question. If force is evil, it is as evil in the east as it is in the west. If the use of military power is immoral, its use must be deplored wherever it is invoked, whether in Israel or by Israel. And we must take care lest parochial bias confuse the moral issue.

It is the inescapable verdict of our religious tradition that the use of military power is an evil. But what defense is there against aggression by military power? The answer: greater military power. Power is evil because it is brutal, brutalizing and corrupting. But without the defense of power, we become its victims. Power, then, is a necessary evil. The pacifist denies that it is necessary. The militarist denies that it is evil.

Both are sincere, but both, I fear, are wrong. We are seldom called upon to choose between an evil and a good. We are frequently called upon to choose between a greater evil and a lesser one. And to stand by in pious neutrality while innocent blood is shed is the greatest evil of all. To abdicate in the face of a threat is not necessarily a good, for while my life may be no more sacred than that of my adversary, it is no less sacred. Nor is immortality to be achieved by walking humbly in the posture of the sheep led to slaughter. Power is a necessary evil which we must use with the wisdom of discretion, with self-control born of humility, and only in the just cause of survival. For no man need consider it immoral to defend his life.

No event in history springs forth, Minerva-like, full-grown, or without antecedents. The events of the past week recall the crisis of 1956 when, on October 29, Israel invaded the desert of Sinai. Israel's avowed purposes were to destroy threatening Egyptian military bases in Sinai, to eject the Egyptian invader from the Gaza Strip, to safeguard freedom of navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba, and to put an end to terrorist raids from the Egyptian border.

These objectives were achieved within 100 hours. For a brief moment, there was an opportunity to create a new era of peace in the Middle East and to eliminate Nasser as a political factor in the Arabian world. Nasser lost fully one-half of his magnificent Russian arsenal without having had the opportunity to use it. A pro-western regime would have emerged if hostilities were permitted to continue for another 48 hours. And had this happened, none would have benefited more than the Arab States.

Mr. Nasser was rescued from oblivion by the intercession of the United States. This will probably rate in history's pages as one of the greatest blunders of the century. The President of the United States demanded that Israel withdraw.

Israel had no choice but to withdraw from Suez, from Gaza, and from the Gulf of Aqaba, for she was then, as now, dependent upon the good will of the United States. But Israel

made certain assumptions. There were: That the presence of Israeli troops in Egyptian territory would be replaced by United Nations Emergency Forces; that withdrawal would be followed by a peace settlement to be sought as quickly as possible; and that at no other time would she be denied use of the Suez Canal or any other waterway leading to Israel.

These assumptions were endorsed by Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, the U.S. representative, approved by the United Nations Assembly, and further confirmed by Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

This was an American commitment. The sanctity of commitment, we are told, is the root of our involvement in Vietnam where we are fighting to prove that we will stand by a pledge once given.

We must not fall into the trap of comparing Israel with South Vietnam, or even with comparing America's commitment to Israel with America's commitment to Vietnam, for no two situations are identical. Nor is any war ever a matter of one simple dimension. Like an iceberg, the war on the battlefield is only the apparent manifestation of the underlying struggle whose major bulk is not always visible to surface view.

There is more than one war being fought in Asia. First, there is an undeniable civil war between South Vietnam and the Viet Cong. This civil struggle has become intertwined with a second war between the United States and North Vietnam, whose capital is Hanoi. To prove that these are two separate, though intertwined struggles, Hanoi will not address the reality of the South Vietnamese government in Saigon any more than we will openly recognize the existence of an entity called the Viet Cong. There is yet a third struggle in Asia, in our confrontation with Red China. And still a fourth struggle is the enigmatic and ongoing cold confrontation with the Soviet Union, which we still call the cold war.

There are, then, at least four definable wars in Asia. By the same reasoning, there are no less than five wars swirling about the Middle East.

Most obvious is the conflict between Israel and the Arab states, which headlines our present concern. But if we were to resolve this war even to Israel's hurt, the other four wars would remain to plague our peace-seeking efforts.

Always beneath the surface of the struggles in the Middle East is the hatred in many Arab circles for the modern world which is western civilization. This struggle is clothed in the pious garb of anti-colonialism, but it is basically a rejection of western democracy, an alien ideology. Israel is not the cause of the Arab rejection of the west; Israel is the west. And its very presence in its midst is regarded as an affront to Arab dignity. Her very existence is termed "aggression". But if Israel did not exist, the fury of primitive wrath would be levelled against other western installations . . . from "library" to embassy.

Never too far beneath the surface is a second struggle, that between Arab and Arab, a war which goes underground in a ratio inverse to the intensity of the other struggles. Were it not for the existence of Israel, this war would come out in the full force of its bitterness. Its victims already number the assassinated heads of more than one Arab state. Its present manifestations are between Egypt and Yemen and between Nasser's Egypt and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The prize is the domination of the Arab world. Nasser may have one eye focused upon Israel, but the other eye is upon the lush oil fields of Saudi Arabia which will be easier to tap from a military posture astride the soon-to-be-evacuated British outpost in Aden, Nasser's thrust in the Yemen is so intense that he has used poison gas. And the world is silent. Israel dampens the inter-Arab struggle and even links Arabs together in league. Israel is

hardly the cause of that dissension, only its excuse for seeking more arms. With Israel eliminated, the house of Arab unity will dissolve in a bath of blood.

There is still a fourth war whose existence was largely responsible for the fiasco of Suez in 1956. It disrupted the tri-partite alliance of England, France, and the United States. It, too, wears a pious garb, for it speaks in terms of the national interest. In truth, it has little to do with the national interest, for it is concerned primarily with corporate profit. It pays few taxes; yet it demands much. Its prize is concession to exploit the oil wealth of the Middle East. A truce has been declared in this struggle by economic armistice, but it is too soon to know the extent to which it remains a factor in the formation of American foreign policy or British foreign policy. Britain has retreated in this struggle, having conceded to United States corporations, but France has not forgotten the lesson. Here again, Israel is the mask, the pawn, and the victim, but not the cause.

The fifth war is the most insidious. It is the war between east and west, the struggle between the United States and the world of Communism, in its abstraction, and the Soviet Union in its representation.

These five wars are interrelated. One influences the other. Yet they are separate, for even if you were to solve one, the others would demand separate treatment. Some of the struggles in the Middle East are intertwined with those of Southeast Asia. The common element of the precipitate is the confrontation of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is at this point that east and west have met in bloody confrontation.

There is more and more evidence that mobilization in the Middle East was triggered not in Cairo, but in Moscow. For not one single tank could move for long in Egypt's Sinai desert without the spare parts from Russia. Not one bomber could take off from Egyptian airfields without instructions, guidance, and maintenance provided by Russia. Therefore, logical deduction should lead us to conclude that Nasser has been unleashed not only to attack Israel, but to embarrass the United States. It's the Cuba syndrome, the Berlin blockade test.

America's justification for being in Vietnam is that it has given a commitment to the government of South Vietnam to defend her against her attackers. Russia, then, has shifted the arena in which the American commitment is being tested, as if to allow the world to judge whether America is committed to safeguarding beleaguered nations as a sacred principle or whether America is simply concerned with expanding empire and arenas of influence. Whether this is Russia's intention or not, this will certainly be the result of this week of testing.

What we have in the Middle East is the explosive emergence of a marginal struggle that now shifts to center stage as part of the struggle in Vietnam. What we have in the Middle East is a conflict of world powers compounded by the rivalry of Arab states emulsified by private investment, in all of which Israel is either symptom, pawn, excuse, or mask.

Elimination of Israel, even if that could be accomplished, would not resolve any of the more basic rivalries. In this context, the familiar assertion that it is only the Arab-Israeli issue which prevents the western powers from inaugurating an era of peace and harmony in the Middle East, must take its place with other old myths which do not square with new reality.

Israel is the diversionary issue on which the Arabs have presently concentrated their fire and behind which they conduct their rivalry. By acting as the breakwater, Israel has unwittingly rendered service to the Arabs and the west.

Israel is the barometer of storms having their sources elsewhere. And just as the fall-

ing barometer warns of approaching storms, so the falling fortunes of a small democracy warns of the weakening of the democratic world.

Hawks and doves are in confusion and few show consistency in their postures. Those who are hawks in one war may be doves in another. But no one can remain uninvolved for long. Each of us must frame a judgment upon which he will base his actions.

In evaluating each struggle, we must put the test of key questions. In each separate struggle, we must ask: Who subverts his neighbor? Which side seeks to expand the arena of human dignity? Which nation turns to the ballot rather than the bullet? Which prefers tanks and rocket to economic development? Which nations clamor for war? The answers may be difficult to ascertain for the issues are complex but final judgment must be based on the answer to the key question, which nation has asked for negotiated settlement at the peace table? The answer to this question must determine the nature of our commitment and which commands our support.

Once again the handwriting is on the wall. We are being tested, weighed in the balance. We must not be found wanting.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1967," the following: "not in excess of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; not in excess of \$250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970;".

SEC. 2. Section 16(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, because of the necessary absence from the city of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on account of a death in his family, he has requested me to handle the bill today, and I shall do so to the best of my ability.

I am not as familiar with this measure, which extends the Food Stamp Act,

as is the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, the pending bill would extend the authority to appropriate funds for the food-stamp program for 3 additional years. It would authorize the appropriation of up to \$200 million for fiscal 1968, \$225 million for fiscal 1969, and \$250 million for fiscal 1970.

We have now had considerable experience with food-stamp programs. During the years between 1939 and 1943 a program was operated under the authority of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, which provides for diverting surplus commodities from the normal channels of trade. This program was suspended during World War II when our surplus stocks were used up. After the war there were many proposals for reinstatement of the program, and in 1961 a pilot operation was undertaken, again under section 32. The Food Stamp Act of 1964 was adopted in August 1964, providing authority for appropriation of up to \$75 million for fiscal 1965, \$100 million for fiscal 1966, \$200 million for fiscal 1967, and such sums as Congress might thereafter authorize for subsequent years. The pending bill, as requested by the Department of Agriculture and introduced, would have provided permanent authority for the appropriation of such sums as might be necessary. The committee felt, however, that even with the experience accumulated to date, the program is still an expanding one, and some limits should be imposed to be sure that it is kept within bounds, while maintaining orderly growth. Appropriations for 1965, 1966, and 1967 have been, respectively, \$60 million, \$100 million, and \$139.5 million. Provision of up to \$200 million, \$225 million, and \$250 million for 1968, 1969, and 1970 should permit continued orderly development.

The program, which has been well received, provides low-income families with more adequate diets and expands our markets for farm products. It utilizes the existing channels of trade and commerce and existing welfare agencies to assure efficient and effective program administration. It is purely voluntary, operating under State-approved plans.

Whenever a State desires to participate in the program, the State agency which administers federally aided public assistance programs submits a plan of operation to the Secretary, specifying the political subdivisions to be covered, the effective dates, standards for approval of applicant households, and other details. When the plan is approved the State agency has responsibility for certification of the households eligible to participate in the program and for issuance of coupons.

Eligible households are restricted to those where income is a substantially limiting factor in the attainment of an adequate diet. After their eligibility is determined, they may purchase food coupons in the amount required to provide them with a more nearly adequate diet. They do not pay full face value for these coupons, but a lesser amount, equivalent to their normal expenditures for food. Thus, the purpose is to supplement, rather than substitute for, their

normal expenditures, and to provide them with better, more healthful diets. The program does not free recipients' own funds for other purposes, nor does it transfer relief program responsibilities from the local governments to the Federal Government. Local governments are specifically prohibited from decreasing welfare grants because of program participation, and since the program requires participants to use their normal food expenditures for coupon purchase, it does not increase the feasibility of a reduction in welfare grants.

Coupons are redeemed for food by local merchants so that participants in the program are able to shop with convenience and dignity, obtaining those foods which they need and prefer. They are not restricted to a few commodities, such as cornmeal or other starches, but they may obtain some protein, vegetables, and other foods necessary to health and well-being. Coupons may not be used for tobacco, alcoholic beverages, imported meats, other products identified as imported, or any nonfood items.

Local food stores, in turn, cash the coupons at their banks. Use of the regular channels of trade strengthens those channels, as well as giving the program the advantage of the efficiency and experience of the regular distribution system.

Thus, the program involves the joint efforts of the Federal, State, and local governments, local stores and banks, and the participants themselves. By providing a better diet for low-income families in a manner which requires them to maintain their own efforts, the program contributes substantially to the health and welfare of the Nation.

In addition to controlling the growth of the program through the continuation of ceilings on appropriations, the committee amendment limits the use of funds for the program to those specifically appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that purpose. The budget for fiscal 1968 proposes that the act be carried out with funds appropriated under section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress. The committee felt that the use for this purpose of funds appropriated for another purpose is not advisable. Funds are appropriated by section 32 to be available when necessary for carrying out that section. Its purpose is to protect markets for perishable agricultural commodities and to protect the producers of those commodities. Perishable commodities cannot be held by producers until the market improves. They must be marketed when ready for market, and if the market is glutted, the producer may face financial ruin. There is not time then to appropriate funds. They should be there, available to the Secretary when needed, for the diversion of surplus stocks from the market as they are brought to the market.

Mr. President, at this point I depart from the text which had been prepared for the use of my distinguished chairman, Senator ELLENDER, to say that, inasmuch as I come from a State where the great majority of our agricultural products are perishable, I am particularly interested in the safeguarding of

section 32 funds. Those funds, derived from 30 percent of the tariff receipts of the Nation, are earmarked particularly to take care of surplus production in perishable crops that are nonprice supported—for instance, beef, pork, poultry, fruit, vegetables, and other highly perishable crops.

I have felt that the Budget Bureau has been exceedingly unwise in repeatedly trying to raid section 32 funds for use in this food-stamp program. This year, it has actually recommended raiding section 32 funds to the extent of \$195 million for the carrying on in fiscal year 1968 of the food-stamp program.

So the committee unanimously has urged the Senate, in the committee amendment, which I hope will be adopted, to require that the food-stamp program be carried out only with funds appropriated for that specific purpose. This action is consistent with the provision of the basic legislation which characterizes the program as a welfare or social program to be carried out with welfare funds, rather than an agricultural program to be carried out with agricultural funds.

The food-stamp program is a growing program. Where \$60 million was appropriated for 1965, \$139.5 million was appropriated for 1967, and the committee amendment contemplates the appropriation of as much as \$250 million for 1970. When the program is fully operative, it is contemplated that it will take about \$425 million. Whether Congress ever agrees to its going to that figure is, of course, a question for Congress to determine. The section 32 fund is similar to an insurance fund. If we begin to use some of it first for this purpose and then for that purpose, we may well find that we do not have it when it is needed.

I have one more comment about section 32 funds. At this time, when we all know that the tariff revenues are due to be diminished by reason of the going into effect of the so-called Kennedy plan figures for reduction of tariffs, we are particularly anxious that no further encroachment upon section 32 funds be inadvertently made.

Mr. President, I now move that the committee amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have nothing further to say upon this matter. As I have already announced, I am simply handling it in the absence of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who could not be here. I shall be glad to yield to any Senator who wishes to discuss this program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. Pres-

ident, I should like to ask the acting floor manager of the bill what amounts, as provided in the measure, are recommended by the committee for each of the 3 years over which the program is being extended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Those amounts are \$200 million for fiscal 1968, \$225 million for fiscal 1969, and \$250 million for 1970.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. May I ask whether or not the committee, during its deliberations on this measure, considered authorizations of higher figures than these which have just been stated by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from West Virginia, that this bill was handled in committee by the chairman of the committee, himself. The Senator may recall that the Senator from Louisiana was the father of the original food stamp bill. He himself suggested and insisted upon the figures which were placed in the bill, in the committee amendment which is now before the Senate—that is, the \$200 million, \$225 million, and \$250 million figures for the 3 years covered by this program. He was quite insistent upon that, and I know that is his conviction.

The Senator from West Virginia will see, from the list of States affected by this bill, that the State which the Senator from Florida represents in part is not affected at all. We have no food stamp program in our State.

But the Senator from Louisiana, by reason of his paternity of this bill, and for other reasons, has been very active in its furtherance; and I would not feel justified in departing from the figures which he insisted upon in the committee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I had had some indication from the Department of Agriculture that higher authorizations might be justified for fiscal years 1969 and 1970. Perhaps I should ask this question: How will the authorizations of \$225 million and \$250 million for fiscal years 1969 and 1970, respectively, compare with the amounts that have been appropriated for the program in the past 2 fiscal years?

Mr. HOLLAND. They are much greater than the amounts appropriated for the last 2 fiscal years. I shall give the last 3 fiscal years, since that covers the entire period of the operation of the bill: \$60 million in 1965, \$100 million in 1966, and \$139.5 million in 1967.

I might add that in no year was the Department able to commit and use the entire amount appropriated. For instance, in fiscal 1965, though \$60 million was appropriated, the Department used only \$35.6 million. In 1966, though \$100 million was appropriated, the Department used only \$70.5 million. We were told in committee that though \$200 million was authorized and \$139.5 million appropriated for 1967, it appeared that the total amount used this year would be somewhere between \$120 million and \$125 million.

So the amounts appropriated today are not only greatly under the amounts which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana requested be placed in the bill as limitations for 1968 and the 2 years to

follow, but it also appears the Department has never been able to use the amounts actually appropriated.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is saying that the amounts authorized in this bill for the 3 fiscal years of fiscal year 1968, fiscal year 1969, and fiscal year 1970, are in excess not only of the appropriations that were made in each of the past 3 years, but also in excess of the expenditures and in excess of authorizations for those years.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. For the present fiscal year 1967, \$200 million was authorized, \$139.5 million was appropriated and between \$120 million and \$125 million, we are told by the Department, will be expended during this year. The making available in this authorization of \$200 million for 1968, \$225 million for 1969, and \$250 million for 1970, in the opinion of the Senator from Louisiana, as stated to us with great conviction in the committee, was more than adequate, he thought, to cover the future growth of this program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Did the Department, during the hearings, attempt to justify any higher authorizations than are included in the bill before us?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Department attempted to justify appropriations without limit; in other words, an open-end authorization. I believe that the Department later talked to the Senator from Louisiana about some specific figures which were larger than these. But the Senator from Louisiana, who, as I say, has a very great interest in this program and naturally would, because he was the father of it, felt that these amounts were adequate and that they should be put in here to guarantee against growth that would be too quick a growth in the 3 years covered by the bill.

I will say to my distinguished friend that if we should find a need for greater appropriations we always have the possibility of amendment of the authorization bill, and if the Department has some new development not communicated to us, this bill has to go to the House of Representatives. I hope that the author of this bill, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], will accept the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana as to the soundness of this program and allow the bill, as included in the committee recommendations which have already been adopted, to be passed by the Senate today.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I understand that it is the judgment of the Senator from Florida, and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the committee, and the judgment of the committee that the authorizations provided in the bill before us will be ample to permit an efficient and judicious expansion of the food stamp program into areas not now participating in the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. That was certainly the statement and conviction of the Senator from Louisiana. I joined him in it. The committee unanimously approved it in the bill which is now recommended by the committee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as the sponsor of S. 953, the bill to

amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for operations of the program for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending this June 30, I have been greatly encouraged by the well-nigh unanimous support of the extension of the Food Stamp Act beyond June 30. In reading records of testimony during hearings here in the Senate, and in the House on legislation of a similar nature, I have been impressed by the wide expression of views that the food stamp program is a vital, well-administered, and effectively designed Federal program.

I had previously made my own observations as to its effectiveness of operations in my own State of West Virginia, having been closely associated with its development from the inception of the pilot program in McDowell County in 1961 to its present coverage of 48 out of West Virginia's 55 counties.

From my personal observations of the program operations in my State, and from reports on its operations in other areas of the United States, I wish to concur with the estimate expressed by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman—the food-stamp program is a success.

The program has more than lived up to the expectations under which it was undertaken. It has provided a new channel for the wise and provident use of this country's great abundance of foods to improve the diets and health of our low-income families. It has not only expanded food markets for our farmers, contributing to an increase in farm income, but it has also stimulated local economies in the areas in which the program is operating.

As a special merit of the system used by the food-stamp program—through the issuance of bonus coupons—this program has not degenerated into a system of handouts. It requires participating families to use some of their own income to purchase food. It has served to provide those who most need improved diets with an opportunity to purchase more and better food for less money. And the program has proved the wisdom of its design, in that it has been singularly free of corruption at the varied levels of its administration, according to reports available in the Department of Agriculture.

I feel that action to provide the continuation of this program and to insure an increasing availability of funds for effective expansion over the next 3 fiscal years is well considered and timely.

With regard to the views of some people that there should be matching funds required of the participating States for bonus coupons, I am convinced that this suggestion, as a minimal disadvantage, would cause a totally needless complication in what has heretofore been a smooth operating program.

I had looked into this matter prior to introducing S. 953. And I had discussed it with responsible officials within West Virginia. I concluded that such a matching requirement—which would be in addition to the costs the States now bear—would put the program out of reach of many States.

I want to go on record as approving

the committee's action in deferring any consideration of State matching requirements under the food stamp program.

I believe it is important to recognize the basic concept of the food stamp approach. We are putting a national resource to work to assist the States to improve food consumption levels among the needy. This national resource is our abundance of food. It is the Federal Government that has this national resource at its disposal—not the States.

The free food coupons that the recipients receive are but a means to put that food abundance within the reach of our low-income families. These coupons represent the added food purchasing power that moves our food surpluses into consumption rather than into Government ownership under price support and surplus removal programs.

Thus, if we were to require States to match part of the cost of the bonus coupons, we would be taxing nonexistent resources within the States—for our abundance of food is a national—not a State resource.

It is also important to remember that the States now share the cost of administering the program. The cost of carefully qualifying applicant families is a considerable one—but a necessary one to insure against waste and abuse. And the States finance the costs of safeguarding and issuing the coupons.

These State costs represent about 7 percent of the value of the Federal subsidy. So, the States are sharing in the costs.

Finally, I believe the record of the hearings clearly indicates that a State matching of the bonus coupons may likely kill the program. I know that it would pose an additional burden in West Virginia, and other Senators have testified that it would seriously threaten the program in their own States.

Many States are now hard pressed to finance basic welfare programs and the Congress is constantly called upon to consider legislation to raise the amounts provided for such programs. In the face of these facts, some States may likely, however reluctantly, decide to switch back to the surplus donation program because that program requires no State matching of the value of the surplus foods made available by the Department of Agriculture.

If we kill the food stamp program, now, with a State matching requirement, we are forcing a return to the less effective and less sufficient surplus donation program. We are forcing States and low-income people to give up a more dignified, self-help program for the poor—one that has won wide acceptance, approval, and support; the use of a program that operates through commercial channels rather than in competition with them; the economic stimulus the bonus coupons provide to the local economies of hundreds of communities throughout the country.

It is important to note that the administration has recommended that the Congress permanently extend the food stamp program.

As with any ongoing program, it is necessary for the agencies involved to

plan ahead. The present provision for appropriations for the next 3 fiscal years would provide the assurance of orderly progression. It will protect and maintain the administrative organization necessary for effective action.

I urge that the Senate pass the bill before it now—S. 953—the extension of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, and I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for having patiently answered the questions I have propounded. I also express gratitude to Senator ELLENDER and the Committee on Agriculture, and to Senator JORDAN, of North Carolina, and his subcommittee, for the prompt and effective action in reporting this bill for Senate consideration in ample time to avoid a lapse of funding authority.

Mr. HOLLAND. The committee felt that the subject matter was sufficiently important to require the early action we took.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, first, let me compliment the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the work they have done in reporting S. 953, and on its predecessor, the Food Stamp Act of 1964. The present legislation represents the continuation of a giant step forward in raising the dietary standards among the poor in the Nation.

Food stamps have now proved themselves in 3 years of national use—during which, I might add, the results have been carefully studied and open to public scrutiny.

The facts are in. They demonstrate that this is an effective program and that it can be operated at an acceptable level of Federal expenditure.

States and localities must request participation. Costs to the States and localities are such that no new areas will come into the program unless there exists a clear need. Expansion to date has been gradual and orderly.

No county is permitted to operate the food stamp program simultaneously with the commodity distribution program. So, when an area shifts to the food stamp program, there is an offset in some of the Federal costs.

I am especially pleased to see that the committee provided for another 3-year extension. This will give the States and localities time for proper planning. At the same time, Congress will be in a position to review progress and determine if the additional 3 years of experience will then require any legislative modifications.

In summary, then, the program is attaining its objectives; it has enjoyed good administration; the expansion has been well planned and orderly. The passage of this bill will further that expansion to new areas of need. I favor passage to accomplish that purpose, and I urge all Senators to do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

So the bill (S. 953) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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, the Senate is deeply indebted to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], for so graciously agreeing to handle this measure, which extends the food stamp program over the next 3 fiscal years. In managing this bill, Senator HOLLAND stepped in for the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, whose absence today was occasioned regrettably by a death in his family. Though called upon at the last moment to handle this vitally important measure, Senator HOLLAND performed the task in the truly outstanding manner that has characterized his many years of public service to the Nation. His articulate explanation of the bill assured its overwhelming approval by the Senate. We are most grateful.

We are grateful also for the contribution of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. His penetrating analysis is a welcome addition to the discussion of any measure.

Finally, the Senate may be proud of another achievement, obtained with dispatch and with full consideration for the views of every Member.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

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

At 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m. the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. MANSFIELD].

AMENDMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT OF 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, President Johnson on May 25 submitted a highly important message for improving and strengthening our political process. I am very much pleased with the message. It is not only sound, thoughtful, and comprehensive, but will be significant, I am sure, in the ultimate resolution of the difficult and vexing problems in this area.

The President speaks not only as the Chief Executive, but also from a well-spring of knowledge acquired as a sea-

soned and experienced political campaigner, and from 30 years of distinguished public service as a Representative, Senator, majority leader of the Senate, Vice President, and President.

After the searching and sometimes spirited debate which was recently conducted in this Chamber, I think it can be fairly stated that all agree that the time for action is at hand. The President's thoughtful proposals will guide our way to the achievement of our common purpose.

Briefly, here is the substance of the President's message:

First, he makes basic and fundamental proposals to revise and give new life and meaning to the laws regulating the conduct of Federal election campaigns. These proposals would place meaningful limitations on the total amount of political contributions which any individual could make, and would put teeth into the rules relating to the disclosure of contributions received and expenditures made by Federal candidates and political committees supporting such candidates.

In substance and principle, the need for these reforms is uniformly recognized. The President has given the cause of honest elections new vigor and leadership. I am confident that this Congress will enact these vital measures. Our conscience and our constituencies demand no less.

Next, and of great concern and interest to me, are the recommendations involving campaign financing. The President has called two areas to our specific attention.

First, that public financing of presidential elections should be pursued as the best means of insuring the financial independence of presidential candidates and making certain the full and free flow of issues and ideas to the voters.

Second, that Federal action is needed at other levels of the election processes to sustain and make more viable these election campaigns.

I am gratified that after the thorough consideration which I know the President has given to this matter, he has concluded that the framework and philosophy of the Long Act should be retained. Modifications and improvements are, of course, suggested. I have suggested them myself. These are comprehensive, well reasoned, and thought provoking. I know that they will be earnestly considered in our deliberations.

Moreover, I find that this message charts a course which not only is in harmony with the general approach that I have advocated, but also lies within the boundaries of the recommendations made last week by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. My respected colleague would provide for the public funding of Federal election campaigns. I am encouraged to find increasing agreement from all quarters that a system of direct public financing of presidential election campaigns has a significant role to play in our political processes.

The area of agreement is large. We must now strive together, with the guidance of the President, to work out the

details and mechanics of implementing the best system in the interests of all Americans. I look forward to working with all Senators in the days ahead, so that this problem can be resolved quickly though deliberately.

I wish to thank President Johnson for again demonstrating his deep concern for the integrity of our electoral process. I pledge myself to every effort in order that his inspired leadership and wise counsel will bear fruit before this session of Congress has completed its work.

I now introduce a bill which provides the guidelines and proposals on political campaign financing suggested by the President in his message. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] has already introduced two bills that implement other recommendations in that Presidential message. Quite rightly, those bills were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The bill I introduce today pertains only to the President's proposal for public financing of presidential elections. This bill and others already before the Committee on Finance were to be the subject of hearings by the committee which were scheduled to begin this afternoon. I understand that there has been objection, Mr. President, to holding hearings on political campaign financing this afternoon, so there will be no hearings for that purpose until tomorrow.

I ask that the bill be received and appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 1883) to amend the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESTORATION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the further consideration of the conference report on the investment tax credit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the report by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes on the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, at the time that this bill was initially before us, we felt that there was a need for it in order to encourage investment and to fulfill a commitment, that when the need for the legislation had subsided, the President would recommend that the investment tax credit and the accelerated depreciation be reinstated, and

that they should be placed into full operation in even a more favorable fashion for business than they had been before. That is what the conference report before us would do.

Senators know that I feel very strongly about the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act, and Senators know that I fought very strenuously against any weakening of that act. I believe that we should move forward rather than backward, and that we should not in any wise weaken that act unless we have something better to put on the books in its place.

It was not easy for me, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, to have to take to conference a Senate bill which contained the very type of provision I had fought so hard against.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT

I report to you now that while the conferees on the part of the Senate were not able to persuade the House conferees to accept all the Senate amendments, they did persuade the House conferees to recede on the Senate amendment regarding the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. In all candor, I must admit that I personally wish the House conferees had been more adamant or that I and my colleagues had been less persuasive.

The situation with regard to the Campaign Fund Act stands as it did at the conclusion of the lengthy Senate debate. The conferees agreed to the Mansfield motion as amended to include the Gore provision. Under the terms of the conference agreement, no funds can be appropriated and disbursed under the act until guidelines governing their distribution are adopted by law.

While I am on this matter, however, I want to point out that the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act has not been repealed. It remains on the statute books. The Finance Committee is ready to study guidelines under the instructions it received from the Senate. Hearings were to begin today in the committee. I have every confidence that they will lead to the development of guidelines which will satisfy a majority of the Senate. In the meantime, the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Advisory Board can be appointed, and with the Board's help the Comptroller General can begin—as I hope he will—to develop regulations for administering the act.

Now let me turn to the investment credit provisions of the bill. Three such provisions were considered by the conferees.

SUSPENSION PERIOD PROPERTY

The first investment credit provision dealt with the basic problem of defining the types of property which are to be denied the investment credit as a result of the suspension period. The conferees on the part of the House were adamant that the conference accept the definitions contained in the House version of the bill. In fact, I have never seen them more adamant on any provision. While we on our side tried hard to convince them to accept the Senate provision, the House conferees refused to yield. It was

only after a difficult, long, and spirited discussion that any sort of compromise on this point was reached.

The Senators will recall that under the version of the bill approved by the Senate, the investment credit would not have been available with respect to property ordered during the suspension period or with respect to property whose construction was begun or ordered by the taxpayer during the suspension period. The only exceptions to this rule were cases in which the taxpayer had entered into a binding contract before the beginning of the suspension period.

The conferees on the part of the House felt strongly that the investment credit should be made available with respect to property acquired after the end of the suspension period regardless of the time when it was ordered. They argued that the administrative problems would be formidable if the Senate version were enacted. They argued that it would be impossible to distinguish between cases in which taxpayers canceled orders and reordered after the suspension period deliberately to evade the intent of the law and other cases in which a similar cancellation and reorder were unrelated to tax consequences. They also argued that some taxpayers were required by circumstances beyond their control to place orders or begin construction during the suspension period.

As the Senate well knows from the colloquy I had with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] last Thursday, I was not pleased with the agreement we reached on this particular provision in the conference, but after long discussion of the point, and after considering the attitude of the House conferees on this point, we concluded that we must, in large part, on this point accede to the wishes of the House if we were to obtain a conference agreement. The compromise we reached, which I will describe in just a moment, represents the most that we could obtain from the House conferees on this point. You will note that it picks up \$150 million in revenue over the House version, and this, I believe, is at least one reason for favoring the conference agreement.

Under the terms of the compromise that was finally arrived at, the investment credit is denied property ordered during the suspension period—that is, before March 10—only if it was acquired before May 24, 1967. This compromise takes the House at least a short step toward the Senate provision. Property ordered during the suspension period, but delivered on or after May 24, will be eligible for the investment credit.

In connection with this basic rule, the investment credit—and in this case also, the accelerated depreciation provision—will only be denied in the case of property that is constructed if the construction was begun during the suspension period or if an order for the construction was placed during the suspension period and actual physical construction was begun before May 24. In these construction cases, the investment credit or accelerated depreciation will still be available with respect to the portion of the construction which takes place on or after May 24.

LIMITATION ON THE INVESTMENT CREDIT

Let me now turn to the remaining decisions of the conferees. Both the Senate and the House approved an increase in the existing limitation on the amount of investment credit which may be claimed by a taxpayer in any one year. Presently that limit is an amount equal to the first \$25,000 of tax liability plus 25 percent of the remaining tax liability. Last year, at the time of the suspension of the investment credit, provision was made for increasing this limit to the first \$25,000 of tax liability plus 50 percent of the remaining tax liability, as of the end of the suspension period. Both the House and Senate versions of this bill deal with the time when this 50-percent limit is to be put into effect.

Under the bill we approved in the Senate, the 50-percent limitation was to be available for taxable years ending after December 31, 1967. Under the House bill, the limitation was to be effective beginning March 10. The conferees on the part of the Senate receded on this matter of the effective date. The House conferees apparently felt that this earlier effective date for the 50-percent limitation was important because of concern over segments of the transportation industry, which are among the chief industries affected by the provision.

VIETNAM AIRLIFT

On the final amendment, the House conferees receded and agreed to the Senate provision which extends the investment credit to certain aircraft operating outside the United States. This is the so-called Vietnam airlift amendment. It will apply to certain aircraft operating under contract with the Defense Department to carry troops and supplies between Vietnam and foreign countries.

CONCLUSION

As for the revenue aspects of the conference report, the bill as agreed to by the conferees will involve a loss of revenue of \$625 million in the 4 fiscal years 1967 through 1970 as compared to the bill as passed by the Senate. The decision regarding the definition of suspension period property reduces revenues over the 4 fiscal years by \$420 million, while the change in the effective date of the 50-percent limitation will reduce revenues by \$205 million. Of the total revenue loss as compared to the Senate bill, \$175 million will occur in the fiscal year 1967 and \$360 million will occur in the following fiscal year.

Mr. President, while the number of provisions at issue in this conference was small, the conference was one in which the issues were warmly debated—perhaps as much so as any I have participated in. Moreover, the Senate conferees acceded to the wishes of the House on the one point relating to orders and deliveries further than I wish had been necessary, but I am convinced that there was no other alternative if there were to be a conference agreement.

I urge the Senate to give its prompt approval to this report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not know whether the

minority leader wishes to be here before the report is adopted, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has a statement he would like to make, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

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

THE UNITED STATES MUST PRESERVE THE PRINCIPLE OF FREE, UNHINDERED INTERNATIONAL SHIPPING THROUGH THE GULF OF AQABA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the ominous events in the Middle East during the past weeks, indicating a rapidly approaching crisis there, is of deep concern not only for the nations of the Middle East but for all the nations of the free world, especially the United States.

The Middle East has for far too long been under constant threat of violence instigated by dictator Nasser of Egypt, as well as the dictators of many other Arab countries.

For many years I have urged successive administrations of our Government to stop giving material aid to Nasser since such aid has enabled Egypt to carry out his openly proclaimed threat to destroy Israel, the only oasis of true democracy and civilization in the Middle East desert of backwardness and of ruthless dictatorships.

Heeding repeated congressional pleas both by myself and many of my colleagues, the Johnson administration has finally and properly cut off all aid to Egypt.

In this hour of crisis, I hope the United States will stand firm in resisting this latest Nasser threat and will not attempt to buy him off through a resumption of economic aid. There can be no compromise with blackmail or blackmailers.

The United States should insist that the international waters of the Gulf of Aqaba be kept truly free for all shipping, including ships flying the Israel flag.

When Egypt closed the straits leading into the Gulf of Aqaba except to shipping of which it approved, it committed an act of aggression not only against Israel but against the shipping of all maritime nations. The United States cannot stand idly by and permit its flagships to be searched by Egypt on the high seas.

Nor can the United States stand idly by and permit Egypt to starve Israel for the United States has definite commitments to Israel—commitments given repeatedly in no uncertain terms by Presidents from President Truman on.

I have for years on the Senate floor opposed the U.S. unilateral intervention in the civil war in Vietnam on behalf of a succession of inept, corrupt, and coup-imposed dictatorial governments of South Vietnam—governments enjoying no popular support and maintained in office only by the Armed Forces and

lavish funds of the United States. On behalf of those governments the United States has unilaterally committed almost 500,000 ground troops to fight a ground war in an area which many who should know is not vital to the security of the United States, and which in his campaign pronouncements in 1964, President Johnson repeatedly indicated he would not do.

But, in recent weeks, when the security of Israel has been threatened by the aggressive actions of the Arab States, the United States, despite its many prior commitments to Israel to defend its territorial integrity, has been insistent that any action in the troubled Middle East be in concert with other nations.

That is a commendable spirit on the part of the United States. It is too bad that the United States did not exhibit a similar spirit before it escalated its involvement in Vietnam.

As the New York Times has put in its leading editorial this morning:

In terms of American interest—as well as commitment—the Middle East is to be differentiated from Southeast Asia. The Middle East is the crossroads of the world, between Asia and Europe. It has been a strategic goal of Russia since Peter the Great. A reminder of this came only yesterday with the news that Russian warships are going to pass through the Black Sea Straits into the Eastern Mediterranean.

There can be no doubt that the United States stands overcommitted in Vietnam. But, as the New York Times states, if Washington "now argues that it cannot afford to take on two crucial commitments at the same time, there would be another good reason to say it is time to deescalate the war in Vietnam."

There is not time for delay. The recent meetings of the Security Council of the United Nations show clearly that on a final vote—if it should come to that after days of futile debate—the sentiment will be for a breathing spell—which will give the Arab nations time to consolidate their positions while Israel starves.

As the noted historian Barbara Tuchman stated in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post on May 30, 1967:

Meanwhile let us at least stop pretending; let us stop using the words Peace and Freedom as nice white verbal bandages to cover the gangrene underneath. I for one have had enough of hearing these words mouthed by administration spokesmen as an incantation to bewitch us into supposing that carnage in Vietnam is "freedom" and scuttle in the Middle East is "peace."

Therefore, if the other free nations should refuse or abstain from joining the United States, then the United States should not hesitate unilaterally to honor its pledges to guarantee the freedom and independence of Israel for the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba by Egypt can be viewed only as an act of aggression against that freedom and independence.

To fulfill its pledges to Israel, the United States should deploy at once the necessary units of its Armed Forces to protect all shipping desiring to pass through the Gulf of Aqaba en route to Israel, regardless of cargo and without inspection or harassment by Egypt or its allies.

As noted columnist James Reston

stated in his column in the New York Times this morning entitled "Geneva: Europe's Second Thoughts on the Cold War":

What the allies in Europe are watching now is whether the United States, which is committed to freedom of maritime commerce and the security of Israel, will apply these arguments to the Middle East crisis as Johnson has to the Southeast Asian crisis, and the paradox of it is that many of the Europeans who have been most critical of his use of force in Southeast Asia are now afraid he might not follow this line in the Middle East.

There is no other honorable course for the United States to follow than to use its forces not only to uphold the principle of freedom of the seas but also to honor its many commitments to preserve and protect the integrity of Israel.

It would be my hope that both Jordan and Saudi Arabia would immediately be warned by the United States that the military equipment which the United States gave them was for the purpose of fighting Communist aggression and not for the purpose of fighting an aggressive war against Israel.

In view of the belligerent attitudes expressed in recent days by both these Arab countries and their mobilization actions, the United States should immediately stop all military aid shipments to these countries. It was a tragic mistake for the United States to supply them with arms at all. The consequences of that folly were foreseeable.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the editorial from the New York Times of May 31, 1967, entitled "Middle East and/or Vietnam," the column by James Reston in the New York Times for May 31, 1967, entitled "Geneva: Europe's Second Thoughts on the Cold War" and the letter to the editor of the Washington Post, printed on May 30, 1967, from Barbara W. Tuchman entitled "Guns of May?"

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

[From the New York Times, May 31, 1967]

MIDDLE EAST AND/OR VIETNAM

The issues in the Middle Eastern conflict are being confused by some commentators and critics with the very different issues involved in Vietnam. Just as spokesmen for the Johnson Administration have drawn false parallels between appeasement of Hitler and what was described as appeasement of Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung, so now the terms "hawk" and "dove" are being loosely applied to the Middle East as if they had the same connotation as in Vietnam.

It is neither accidental nor illogical that many of the same Americans who are calling for deescalation and unconditional negotiations in Southeast Asia also call for firmness on the part of the United States in insisting on freedom of passage to the Gulf of Aqaba and on honoring American commitments to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel.

The United States had no such commitments with regard to South Vietnam, least of all to fight a virtually unilateral and major war on behalf of Saigon. In 1954, when the SEATO treaty was signed, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles specifically ruled out "unilateral armed intervention." While SEATO's economic and defensive commitments were indeed extended in a protocol

to South Vietnam, along with Cambodia and Laos, Saigon was not even a party to the SEATO treaty.

The other major document sometimes cited by the Johnson Administration as a commitment to Saigon was a letter from President Eisenhower to President Diem of South Vietnam on Oct. 23, 1954. In it General Eisenhower wrote of aid to Saigon, the purpose of which would be "to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." However, this aid was made dependent of President Diem creating a Government "enlightened in purpose and effective in performance." Diem failed signally to do this, as virtually every Vietnamese from Premier Ky down now recognizes.

President Kennedy just before his death and President Johnson as late as 1964 both insisted—in Mr. Johnson's words—that the war in Vietnam "ought to be fought by the boys of Asia," not by Americans. Israel is not asking the United States to fight for her. There is no commitment to do so, and in present circumstances no need to do so.

But there are commitments, which can be documented precisely, by every American President since Truman to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel, and there are also commitments by Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson in favor of upholding the right of free passage through the Strait of Tiran into the Gulf of Aqaba.

In terms of American interest—as well as commitment—the Middle East is to be differentiated from Southeast Asia. The Middle East is the crossroads of the world, between Asia and Europe. It has been a strategic goal of Russia since Peter the Great. A reminder of this came only yesterday with the news that Russian warships are going to pass through the Black Sea Straits into the Eastern Mediterranean.

In its great-power aspect the Middle Eastern crisis shapes up as a confrontation of the Soviet Union versus the United States. As the British and French were gradually forced out of the area following World War II, the United States took their place. The region is now of paramount strategic importance to this country, whereas until escalation of the Vietnam war, Southeast Asia was only a marginal power factor for the United States.

The Persian Gulf area produces 27 percent of the world's petroleum and has proved global reserves of 60 per cent. American firms have a gross investment in the region of more than \$2,500,000,000. There is nothing comparable in American interests that can be said of the Southeast Asian peninsula.

The American position has now reached the ironical stage where virtually every argument advanced for the Vietnam war—commitments, honor, security, interests, consistency, the self-determination of small nations—could be used in favor of helping Israel. However, it is not necessary nor is it valid to make such comparisons. These are two separate problems calling for different solutions, but they are alike in that they both require major policy decisions in 1967.

If Washington now argues that it cannot afford to take on two crucial commitments at the same time, this would be another good reason to say it is time to deescalate the war in Vietnam.

[From the New York Times, May 31, 1967]
GENEVA: EUROPE'S SECOND THOUGHTS ON THE COLD WAR

(By James Reston)

GENEVA, May 30.—The vicious Middle East controversy has startled our old friends and allies in Western Europe. They have been saying the cold war was over in this part of the world (blaming Washington for not knowing it), but now they are not so sure.

The Arab-Israeli crisis is a little nearer Europe than Vietnam. It is in an area where Britain and France still have important interests. Moscow is backing the Arabs and Washington is sort of backing Israel, and this has produced some interesting reactions.

All the Western European governments are playing for time. They are talking about Four-Power conferences, appeals to the World Court, and resolutions at the United Nations—all of which meet with objections from one side or the other—and they are waiting for a lead from President Johnson, who in turn, and not unnaturally, is waiting this time to see who will be with him if he challenges Nasser's blockade.

THE GATEKEEPERS

Europe has a special interest in the key issue in this Middle Eastern conflict. It is a sea-girt continent trading in the world. It is full of vast inland seas whose waters wash the shores of many lands but narrow down into gateways that could be controlled by other nations standing at the gate.

The nations of Europe, despite their ancient enmities, live too close together to accept Nasser's assertion that he has the right to close the gate to the Gulf of Aqaba just because he happens to dislike the Israelis who live inside. On that basis, Finland, Poland and even the Soviet Union couldn't get out of the Baltic, and the Black Sea powers, including the U.S.S.R., might not be able to enjoy "free and innocent passage" past the Turkish guns at the Dardanelles.

JOHNSON'S DILEMMAS

The legalities in the Arab-Israeli dispute at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba may be different, but the basic point is the same. Nasser is claiming not only the right to blockade Israel but to destroy her, and even Europe in her present mood of isolation and wishful thinking is not prepared to minimize Nasser's challenge.

Accordingly, the allies are turning to President Johnson, and he couldn't possibly be in a more difficult position, for all his arguments in defense of his Vietnam policy apply with even greater force in the Arab-Israeli dispute.

He has argued that he must keep his commitments in Vietnam or all his other commitments and hopes of world order are worthless. He has asserted that the United States must keep its international contracts even if the other parties to those contracts fail to do so. He has set out to block the expansion of Communist influence in areas vital to the interests of the United States. And he has said, in effect, that great risks and sacrifices must be taken in Vietnam in order to avoid greater risks and sacrifices elsewhere later on.

What the allies in Europe are watching now is whether the United States, which is committed to freedom of maritime commerce and the security of Israel, will apply these arguments to the Middle East crisis as Johnson has to the Southeast Asian crisis, and the paradox of it is that many of the Europeans who have been most critical of his use of force in Southeast Asia are now afraid he might not follow this line in the Middle East.

EUROPE'S MOOD

This is obviously a devilish dilemma for a President who has over half a million men engaged in a war in Southeast Asia and a quarter of a million standing guard in Europe, while France leads a campaign against American influence in Europe and American intervention in Asia.

"The United States," says The Telegraph in London, "is unequivocally committed to defending Israel against aggression, and Egypt, by closing the Gulf is equally clearly committing an act of aggression. Britain has only a secondary role to play in this

drama. She can, in essence, only either help or hinder the United States. It is time the [British] Government made its intention clear. It would be only to compound the error of Suez to allow any sense of guilt about that operation to stand in the way of clear and decisive action now."

The former British Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd, has been more precise. "The proper course is for the United States and Britain . . . to declare boldly that they will assert the right of free passage of their ships into the Gulf of Aqaba, whatever their destination and whatever their cargo. If that right is disputed, military force will be used to sustain it. I believe a clear declaration of that sort is the best way to keep the peace. . . ."

The rest of Europe is less bold, but the mood in this part of the world is much sterner than it was a month ago. The Middle East crisis has not yet reunited the allies, but it has made them question their optimism of the past, and President Johnson is obviously waiting to see what action they intend to take to back up their bolder words.

[From the Washington Post, May 30, 1967]

GUNS OF MAY?

In the crisis in the Middle East we have come to a moment of truth for this country and for the community of Western democracies. Aqaba is the crux. If the President of the United States can state as a principle that the Gulf of Aqaba is an international waterway and that a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal, and thereafter not only do nothing to implement the principle but stand by while it is violated, then we have indeed reached the ultimate paralysis of power.

This is not a process new in history. It happened to the dinosaur, it happened to the Dreadnaught and it can happen to us.

With regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict it has been a creeping paralysis for the past 10 years. After Israel's withdrawal from the Sinai peninsula, under American pressure and on the promise that her maritime outlet through the Gulf was assured, President Eisenhower engaged to use American influence and best efforts for the reopening of the Suez Canal to Israel's ships. No such efforts were ever made or even attempted by his or by succeeding administrations. We can take no comfort in being a major power if we cannot exercise the will and the strength that goes with the status.

This is—or should be—an American, not a Jewish issue. It is the American reputation that is at stake. If the United States in this crisis fails to support its stated position, because of involvement in Vietnam, then the uneasy rationale—called "resistance to aggression"—of our battle over there collapses hollowly and publicly. While we claim to fight for it in the Far East, it is nullified in the Near East, closer to home.

Israel represents the land and the nation which were the source of the Judaeo-Christian tradition to which we and the other Western nations belong and which, presumably, we uphold. As such it seems to me obvious that its integrity and security, not to say its survival, is a closer concern of ours than that of South Vietnam. To sacrifice the land of our spiritual birth, the land as an Englishman said "to which we all turn our faces in the grave," while we fight for that great democrat, Premier Ky, is an extreme of absurdity.

Yet the crisis could be our opportunity—if we met it with the nerve and firmness of intent that served us in the Cuban missile crisis. It could be used to restore the prestige we have lost, not by futile fiddling in the U.N. but by straightforward independent action, the only kind that can be effective.

To wait for multilateral action by the so-called family of nations is useless; as far as

concerns ability to act jointly and effectively for the maintenance of security, the family of nations is an illusion with which we comfort ourselves like a teething-ring. The meetings of the Security Council, as anyone knows who has attended or listened to them, have become a cynical farce.

Independent action in support of our stated policy is not intervention, nor is it something to be afraid of. Taken with courage and conviction it is what the world is waiting for—from us. It could win back the world's respect and, what is more important, self-respect.

Aqaba is the test from which the Arab nations, and behind them all the nations of Asia and Africa who are watching the performance, will take their cue. If we fail to act to confirm the principle of freedom of navigation, every person in every one of these countries will take note.

The sacrifice of Israel will not buy us time—and certainly not honor, though that is perhaps beside the point. Rather it will hasten the time that is closing in. If the Arabs, with Russia at their back, are successful in this challenge which U Thant's precipitous collapse so unexpectedly widened for them, then the period remaining to us, that is to the Western democracies, is shorter than I had supposed.

Meanwhile let us at least stop pretending; let us stop using the words Peace and Freedom as nice white verbal bandages to cover the gangrene underneath. I for one have had enough of hearing these words mouthed by administration spokesmen as an incantation to bewitch us into supposing that carnage in Vietnam is "freedom" and scuttle in the Middle East is "peace."

BARBARA W. TUCHMAN.

COS COB, CONN.

RESTORATION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO MEET DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW — UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to sit and to conduct hearings, if need be, tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, let us wait and see what the business is tomorrow. Perhaps we can work it out. After all, we cannot be in both places. I think it will be all right tomorrow. I understand the committee is meeting tomorrow morning. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; it is intended that the committee will meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We can see what the business of the Senate is tomorrow.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana tell us when he thinks we will have hearings on the debt ceiling, which expires the end of this June? Will that be before taking up the question of the censure of the Senator from Connecticut or afterward?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am in no position to say at this moment when I will suggest hearings on the debt ceiling. It would be my thought that we would definitely conduct hearings and we will have completed our action well before the debt ceiling expires, if I have anything to say about it. This bill is not expected to be passed by the House of Representatives, however, until June 7 or 8. We could not meet before that time. It would be the thought of the junior Senator from Louisiana that we would conduct hearings sometime after the House has concluded its hearings and that we would attempt to bring the bill before the Senate with sufficient time for adequate debate.

I am well aware of the record Senators have made on the subject. I shall conduct myself in light of the views of Senators and in light of the statements which I have made on the floor concerning this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator insist on his request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, Mr. President, I believe it was objected to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING CONSIDERATION OF SENATE RESOLUTION 112 RELATING TO SENATOR DODD

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader further with respect to committee hearings beginning 2 weeks from yesterday; namely, the 13th of June, when we take up the resolution relating to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the time limitation on the bill now being considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare expires on the 19th of next month. It would be my hope—and this is in accord with the notice given to the Senate—that there would be no committee meetings of any kind beginning on June 13 for the duration of the consideration of the Dodd resolution. This would apply also to the Appropriations Committee.

It would be my further hope—and I assume that the Senate would agree with me—that we would stay with the resolution, S. 112, which would be the pending matter at that time, until it is disposed of, and that we will come in early and stay late.

I believe we already have an order for the Senate to come in at 10 o'clock on the morning of June 13.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN VETERANS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 16, for its disposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 16) to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967".

TITLE I—PENSION BENEFITS

ENLARGING WIDOWS' ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

SEC. 101. (a) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of sections 302(a), 404, 532(d), 534(c), 536(c), and 541(e), title 38, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(2) for one year or more; or

"(3) for any period of time if a child was born of the marriage, or was born to them before the marriage."

(b) Subsection 103(a), title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "cohabitated with him for five or more years immediately before his death," and inserting in lieu thereof "cohabited with him for one year or more immediately before his death, or for any period of time if a child was born of the purported marriage or was born to them before such marriage,".

PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY AT AGE SIXTY-FIVE; AID AND ATTENDANCE ALLOWANCE FOR PERSONS IN NURSING HOMES

SEC. 102. (a) Subsection (a) of section 502 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "disabled if he is" the following: "sixty-five years of age or older or".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 502 is amended by inserting "(1) a patient in a nursing home or (2)" immediately after "if he is".

EXCLUSION FROM ANNUAL INCOME

SEC. 103. (a) Paragraph (7) of section 503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "amounts paid by" the following: "a wife of a veteran for the expenses of his last illness, and by".

(b) Paragraph (9) of such section 503 is amended by inserting "(A)" immediately after "amounts paid" and by inserting the following immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof: "or (B) by a widow or a wife of a deceased veteran for the last illness and burial of a child of such veteran".

(c) (1) Such section 503 is further amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(14) payments of annuities elected under chapter 73 of title 10."

(2) Section 415(g)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended (A) by inserting "and under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959" immediately before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (C), (B) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and (C) by

adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(M) payments of annuities elected under chapter 73 of title 10."

(3) Section 1441 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "except section 415(g) and chapter 15 of title 38".

PENSION INCREASES FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT

SEC. 104. (a) The table in subsection (b) of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I"		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	Equal to or but less than—	
\$600	\$600	\$104
1,200	1,200	79
	1,800	45".

(b) The table in subsection (c) of such section 521 is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I"		Column II	Column III	Column IV
Annual income		One dependent	Two dependents	Three or more dependents
More than—	Equal to or less than—			
but				
\$1,000	\$1,000	\$109	\$114	\$119
2,000	2,000	84	84	84
	3,000	50	50	50".

(c) Subsection (e) of such section 521 is amended by striking out "\$35" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$40".

PENSION INCREASES FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF WARS BEFORE WORLD WAR I

SEC. 105. Sections 531, 532(a) (2), 534(a) (2), and 536(a) of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "\$65" and inserting in lieu thereof in each such section "\$70".

PENSION INCREASES FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT

SEC. 106. (a) The table in subsection (b) of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I"		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	Equal to or less than—	
but		
\$600	\$600	\$70
1,200	1,200	51
	1,800	29".

(b) The table in subsection (c) of such section 541 is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I"		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	Equal to or less than—	
but		
\$1,000	\$1,000	\$86
2,000	2,000	67
	3,000	45".

(c) Subsection (d) of such section 541 is amended by striking out "\$15" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$16".

PENSION INCREASES FOR CHILDREN OF DECEASED VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT

SEC. 107. Subsection (a) of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "\$38" and "\$15" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$40" and "\$16", respectively.

AID AND ATTENDANCE ALLOWANCE FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF ALL PERIODS OF WAR

SEC. 108. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF ALL PERIODS OF WAR
"§ 544. Aid and attendance allowance

"If any widow who is entitled to pension under this subchapter or the provisions of

this title as in effect on June 30, 1960, is in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly rate of pension payable to her under this subchapter or such provisions, as the case may be, shall be increased by \$50."

(b) The analysis of such subchapter III, after the heading of such chapter, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF ALL PERIODS OF WAR
"544. Aid and attendance allowance."

THERAPEUTIC AND REHABILITATIVE DEVICES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

SEC. 109. Subsection (b) of section 617 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "to any veteran" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "to any veteran in receipt of pension under chapter 15 of this title based on need of regular aid and attendance."

PENSION FOR "OLD LAW" VETERANS WHO ARE HOUSEBOUND

SEC. 110. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay to a veteran who is entitled to pension under section 521 to title 38, United States Code, as in effect on June 30, 1960, and who—

(1) has, in addition to a disability rated as permanent and total, additional disability or disabilities independently ratable at 60 per centum or more, or

(2) by reason of his disability or disabilities, is permanently housebound but does not qualify for pension under such section 521 based on need of regular aid and attendance,

in lieu of the pension otherwise payable to him under such section 521, a pension at the monthly rate of \$100.

AID AND ATTENDANCE ALLOWANCE—INDIAN AND SPANISH AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

SEC. 111. (a) Section 511(c) of the title 38, United States Code, is amended by (1) inserting "(1)" immediately before "Any"; (2) inserting ", except as provided in paragraph (2)" immediately before the period at the end thereof; and (3) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) The Administrator shall pay each month to each veteran of the Indian Wars who is receiving, or entitled to receive, pension based on a need of regular aid and attendance, whichever amount is greater (A) that provided by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section, or (B) that which is payable to the veteran under section 521 of this title if he has elected, or would be payable if he were to elect, to receive pension under such section pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection. Each change in the amount of pension payment required by this para-

graph shall be effective as of the first day of the month during which the facts of the particular case warrant such change, and shall be made without specific application therefor."

(b) Section 512(a) (3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by (1) inserting "(A)" immediately before "Any"; (2) inserting ", except as provided in subparagraph (B)" immediately before the period at the end thereof; and (3) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(B) The Administrator shall pay each month to each Spanish-American War veteran who is receiving, or entitled to receive, pension based on a need of regular aid and attendance, whichever amount is greater (i) that provided by subparagraph (B) of subsection (a) (1) of this section, or (ii) that which is payable to the veteran under section 521 of this title if he has elected, or would be payable if he were to elect, to receive pension under such section pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this paragraph. Each change in the amount of pension payment required by this subparagraph shall be effective as of the first day of the month during which the facts of the particular case warrant such change, and shall be made without specific application therefor."

TITLE II—ADDITIONAL READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS

COMPENSATION

SEC. 201. (a) Section 310 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "during a period of war" the following: "or on or after August 5, 1964".

(b) Section 312 of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "period of war" the following: "or on or after August 5, 1964".

(c) Section 331 of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "during other than a period of war" the following: "or a period beginning on or after August 5, 1964".

PENSION

SEC. 202. (a) Section 501 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) The term 'Vietnam conflict' means the period beginning August 5, 1964, and ending on such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict".

(c) Such section 521 is further amended by—

(1) striking out "or the Korean conflict" in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (g), and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict";

(2) striking out "or the Korean conflict" in paragraph (3) of such subsection (g), and inserting in lieu thereof ", the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict"; and

(3) inserting "(including the Vietnam conflict)" in paragraph (4) of such subsection (g) immediately before the period at the end thereof.

(d) The catchline of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict"

(e) Subsection (a) of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict".

(f) Paragraph (1) of subsection (e) of such section is amended by inserting immediately after "Korean conflict veteran" the following: ", or (D) before the expiration of ten years following termination of the Viet-

nam conflict in the case of a widow of a Vietnam conflict veteran".

(g) The catchline of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 541. Widows of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam conflict veterans"

(h) Subsection (a) of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict".

(i) The catchline of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 542. Children of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam conflict veterans"

(j) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "521. Veterans of World War I, World War II or the Korean conflict." and substituting in lieu thereof

"521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict.;"

by striking out the subheading

"World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict"

and substituting in lieu thereof

"World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and the Vietnam conflict.;"

by striking out

"541. Widows of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans."

and substituting in lieu thereof

"541. Widows of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam conflict veterans.;"

and by striking out

"542. Children of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans."

and substituting in lieu thereof

"542. Children of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam conflict veterans."

(k) Chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out the subheading "WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT" immediately preceding section 541 of such title, and substituting in lieu thereof "WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, THE KOREAN CONFLICT, AND THE VIETNAM CONFLICT".

HOSPITAL, DOMICILIARY, AND MEDICAL CARE

SEC. 203. (a) Section 602 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 602. Presumption relating to psychosis

"For the purposes of this chapter, any veteran of World War II, the Korean conflict, or of service after January 31, 1955, who developed an active psychosis (1) within two years after his discharge or release from the active military, naval, or air service, and (2) before July 26, 1949, in the case of a veteran of World War II, or February 1, 1957, in the case of a veteran of the Korean conflict, shall be deemed to have incurred such disability in the active military, naval, or air service."

(b) Subsection (h) of section 612 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The Administrator shall furnish to each veteran who is receiving additional compensation or allowance under chapter 11, or increased pension as a veteran of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict, by reason of being in need of regular aid and attendance, such drugs and medicines as may be ordered on prescription of a duly licensed physician as specific therapy in the treatment of any illness or injury suffered by such veteran. As used in this subsection, the term 'Vietnam con-

flict' has the meaning given it by section 501(4) of this title."

(c) (1) Section 601(4) (C) (ii) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "veterans of any war" the following: "or of service after January 31, 1955".

(2) Section 601(4) (C) (iii) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "veterans of any war" the following: "or of service after January 31, 1955".

(d) Section 624(c) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "veteran of any war" the following: "or of service after January 31, 1955".

(e) Sections 641 and 643 of such title are each amended by inserting immediately after "veteran of any war" the following: "or of service after January 31, 1955".

(f) Sections 5031(a) and 5034(1) of such title are each amended by striking "war veteran population" and inserting in lieu thereof "population of war veterans and veterans of service after January 31, 1955".

(g) Sections 5032 and 5036 of such title 38 are each amended by inserting immediately after "war veterans" the following: "and veterans of service after January 31, 1955".

(h) Section 5034(1) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "war veterans" the following: "and veterans of service after January 31, 1955".

(i) Section 5035(a) (4) of such title is amended by inserting "and veterans of service after January 31, 1955," immediately after "war veterans" the first time it appears therein, and by inserting "or veterans of service after January 31, 1955" immediately after "war veterans" the second time it appears therein.

(j) Section 5035(b) (4) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "war veterans" the following: "and veterans of service after January 31, 1955".

SPECIALLY EQUIPPED AUTOMOBILES

SEC. 204. (a) Section 1901 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and by adding after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

"(b) The benefits of this chapter shall also be made available to each veteran who is suffering from any disability described in subsection (a), if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service after January 31, 1955, and if the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty."

(b) Section 1905 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by striking out at the beginning of the first sentence thereof "The benefits", and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the benefits", and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) (1) In the case of any veteran who is eligible for the benefits provided in this chapter by reason of section 1901(b) and who was discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service before the effective date of this subsection, any applicable time limitation contained in subsection (a) of this section which otherwise would have begun to run before the effective date of this subsection shall not begin to run until that date.

"(2) In the case of any veteran whose entitlement to the benefits provided in this chapter first arose by reason of the enactment of Public Law 85-857, application for such benefits may, notwithstanding the time limitations contained in subsection (a) of this section, be made within one year from the effective date of the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967."

BURIAL ALLOWANCE

SEC. 205. (a) Section 902(a) (2) (A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by insert-

ing immediately after "war" the following: "or of service on or after August 5, 1964".

(b) If the burial allowance authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, is payable solely by virtue of the enactment of this Act, the two-year period for filing applications, referred to in section 904 of such title 38, shall not end, with respect to an individual whose death occurred prior to the effective date of this Act, before the expiration of the two-year period which begins on the effective date of this Act, or, in any case involving the correction of a discharge after the effective date of this Act, before the expiration of two years from the date of such correction.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

STATUTORY AWARDS

SEC. 301. Section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) if the veteran, as the result of service-connected disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one or more creative organs, or one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, or has suffered complete organic aphonia with constant inability to communicate by speech, or deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction, the rate of compensation therefore shall be \$47 per month for each such loss or loss of use independent of any other compensation provided in subsections (a) through (j) or subsection (s) of this section but in no event to exceed \$400 per month; and in the event the veteran has suffered one or more of the disabilities heretofore specified in this subsection, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subsections (l) through (n) of this section, the rate of compensation shall be increased by \$47 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed \$600 per month.;"

BURIAL FLAGS FOR CERTAIN IN-SERVICE DEATHS

SEC. 302. Section 901 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection "(d)" at the end thereof to read as follows:

"(d) In the case of any person who died while in the active military, naval, or air service after May 27, 1941, the Administrator shall furnish a flag to the next of kin, or to such other person as the Administrator deems most appropriate, if such next of kin or other person is not otherwise entitled to receive a flag under this section, or under section 1482(a) of title 10, United States Code."

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED

SEC. 303. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1677. Special training for the educationally disadvantaged

"(a) In the case of any eligible veteran who—

"(1) has not received a secondary school diploma (or an equivalency certificate) at the time of his discharge from active duty, or

"(2) in order to pursue a program of education for which he would otherwise be eligible needs additional secondary school training, either refresher courses or deficiency courses, to qualify for admission to an appropriate educational institution,

the Administrator may, without regard to so much of the provisions of section 1671 as prohibit the enrollment of an eligible veteran in a program of education in which he is 'already qualified', approve the enrollment of such veteran in appropriate course or courses; except that no enrollment in adult evening secondary school courses shall be approved in excess of half-time training as defined pursuant to section 1683 of this title.

"(b) The Administrator shall pay to an eligible veteran pursuing a course or courses pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, an educational assistance allowance as provided in sections 1681 and 1682 of this chapter.

"(c) The educational assistance allowance authorized by this section shall be paid without charge to any period of entitlement the veteran may have earned pursuant to section 1661(a) of this chapter."

(b) (1) The analysis at the head of chapter 34, title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after "1676, Education outside the United States." the following:

"1677. Special training for the educationally disadvantaged."

(2) Section 1661(b) of title 38, United

States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "subsection (c)" the following: "and in section 1677 of this chapter".

(c) Where the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds that an eligible veteran has since June 1, 1966, and prior to the enactment of this section, received educational assistance while pursuing a course or courses of education to which he would have been entitled under section 1677, without charge to entitlement, he may restore to the veteran any period of entitlement expended in the pursuit of such course or courses.

INCREASE IN RATES OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ALLOWANCES

Sec. 304. (a) The table in section 1682 (a) (1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I Type of program	Column II No dependents	Column III One dependent	Column IV Two or more dependents
Institutional:			
Full time.....	\$130	\$155	\$175
Three-quarter time.....	95	115	135
Half time.....	60	75	85
Cooperative.....	105	125	145".

(b) Section 1682(b) (2) (B) of such title is amended by striking out "\$100" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$130".

PERIOD OF ELIGIBILITY, WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Sec. 305. (a) Section 1712(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "twenty-third birthday" each place where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-sixth birthday".

(b) In the case of any eligible person (with- in the meaning of section 1701(a) (1) or 1765 (a) of title 38, United States Code) who is made eligible for educational assistance under the provisions of chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, solely by virtue of the amend- ments made by subsection (a) of this sec- tion, and who on the effective date of this Act is below the age of twenty-six years, the pe- riod referred to in section 1712 of such title shall not end with respect to such person until the expiration of the five-year period which begins on the effective date of this

Act, excluding from such five-year period any period of time which may elapse be- tween the date on which application for bene- fits of such chapter 35 is filed on behalf of such person and the date of final approval of such application by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; but in no event shall edu- cational assistance under such chapter 35 be afforded to any eligible person beyond his thirty-first birthday by reason of this section.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 306. This Act shall take effect on July 1, 1967.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the rates of pension payable to certain veter- ans and their widows, to provide addi- tional readjustment assistance for vet- erans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the message is before the Sen- ate for its disposition.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. Presi- dent, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Sen- ate adjourned until tomorrow, Thurs- day, June 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 31, 1967:

TARIFF COMMISSION

Bruce E. Clubb, of Virginia, to be a mem- ber of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1971, vice Joseph E. Talbot, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Joe Hodson O43268, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as the Judge Advocate Gen- eral, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general, Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3442, and 3447.

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Joseph Fuller, O22901, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as the Assistant Judge Ad- vocate General, as major general, Judge Ad- vocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general, Army of the United States, under the pro- visions of title 10, United States Code, sec- tions 3037, 3442, and 3447.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral pur- suant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, having designated him for commands and other duties deter- mined by the President to be within the con- templation of that section.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

District of Columbia Crime Reduction Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, recent, shocking crimes here in the Nation's Capital have made it apparent that new legislation is needed now. Washington plays host to millions of foreign and American visitors each year. It should be a model city.

I have today cosponsored with my col- league, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS], the District of Columbia Crime Reduction Act of 1967. This bill would reduce and improve criminal pro- cedures in the District of Columbia.

It would embody the proposals of the

President for combating crime in Wash- ington and is the result of a recommen- dation by the President's Crime Commis- sion that a sweeping attack be made on crime across the country, starting here in Washington.

According to the terms of the bill I have cosponsored today, the District of Columbia Police Department would be expanded and reorganized. The U.S. at- torney's and corporation counsel's offices would be expanded. There would be ex- pansion and procedural reorganization of criminal trial sections of the District and District of Columbia sessions courts. Criminal law would undergo reform both substantively and procedurally. Correc- tional institutions and probationary de- partments would be reorganized and ex- panded as would social rehabilitation programs.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the 90th Congress will realize the urgency involved in pass- ing this bill.

Archbishop John J. Krol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the entire Cleveland community and the citizens of Ohio join in rejoicing at the nomination of Archbishop John J. Krol, of Philadel- phia, as one of the new cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church.

Archbishop John Krol is a native of Cleveland, Ohio, and a longtime resident of my congressional district where he was born. His appointment as a cardinal comes as no surprise. We in the Cleve- land area have long known of his dedi- cation and devotion to his religious duties and his support of community