

tion of a soy-based, multipurpose food to fortify flour for bread, a staple which constitutes 60 percent of the Iranian diet.

Fourth. Daule, Ecuador: "Sharecroppers have become shareholders" by financing the majority of a fortified noodle industry, organized with assistance from the foundation. They acquire stock in the corporation by small payments. Also, Meals for Millions is helping them form 11 cooperatives to buy land for farms.

Fifth. Chile: People in the country areas that are protein deficient eat what they call "harine tostada." It is a toasted blend of wheat and sugar, lacking any amount of protein value. It presents a primary opportunity for an economic use of fishmeal. The foundation has offered to build a pilot plant for producing a protein supplement of sunflower seed, soy and fishmeal. When this is added to harina tostads, it acquires food value and tastes good.

I believe that private organizations such as Meals for Millions, Inc., are an important facet of the overall effort of the United States to help alleviate the world hunger crisis. Programs such as theirs, that aim not merely at short-range goals, but seek out the root of the problem and start from there, are not only vitally important but desperately needed and should be generously supported by all Americans concerned about the plight of hungry people all around the world; people who are suffering because they lack adequate and nutritional food.

The Democratic Party and Its Democratic President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the role of dissent within political parties in

America is fundamental to the preservation of the two-party system. It is a well known fact that the Democratic party is a party of diverse views—yet one which traditionally has been able to unite behind the common goals of prosperity and equality for all.

In this sense dissent is not inconsistent with party unity. Dissent is carried on within the party, within the general framework of party ideals and goals. When we disagree with the party, we do so not in the sense of disagreeing with the broad ideals and approach but with the particular method employed at that point in time. The Democratic party and the Nation have a great President. He has guided into law one of the most progressive and forward looking platforms in history. He has brought the Federal Government into a creative partnership with States and local governments in an effort to meet human needs in education, health, housing and the war against poverty.

During the 90th Congress we have debated some of the most frustrating and difficult problems in the history of our Nation. The Vietnam war continues to escalate, riots have broken out in ghettos in cities across the country and a huge budget deficit must be met by the administration.

On the majority side of the political aisle many have found it expedient to criticize and protest without proposing alternatives. Some have looked at the results of public opinion polls and have decided that the best course to follow is that which places them in a position of having differed with the President. It is each Member's right to do that, but it is his duty to recognize that it is not enough to differ with the President purely for the sake of doing so.

The loyal opposition has found it easy to protest and criticize. They, too, have offered no alternatives—no new constructive suggestions to deal with the complex problems facing our Nation. They offer no leadership.

We, the majority party, must provide that leadership and must remain a united party.

Let me make it quite clear that the

brand of party unity which I support is not that which means blind and unreasoned adherence to the formal policy dictates of the administration. Party unity is a subtle concept which, in its most fundamental aspect, means an acceptance of the broadly conceived ideology of the political party. It means working within the framework of the party to effect those changes which are essential to the progressive development of our society. To disagree on any specific issue or set of issues is not to disassociate oneself from his party. The party is strong because it allows such dissent and will be stronger in the future by encouraging the expression of individual opinion.

I have cast my vote in this Chamber a number of times against the administration stand. This year, I voted to cut the NASA and Public Works appropriations. I voted against the appropriation for development of a supersonic transport. And I am now engaged in efforts to defeat the proposed 10-percent tax surcharge unless and until we place a tax on loophole income and reach those who avoid their contribution to the Nation's obligations through various tax loopholes.

Notwithstanding the fact that I have differed with the President on these issues, I believe that he is qualified, as no other man is, to be this Nation's Chief Executive. His record is one of excellence, it is unparalleled in our Nation's history. He has completed in 4 years the work begun by three of his Democratic predecessors spanning over 30 years. He is the leader of our party and we, as members of the Democratic Party, can be proud to have him as our leader.

I urge my colleagues in the Democratic Party to review the record of our President—the record of our party—and the meaning of party unity. Let the people know that we are and will continue to be united in the true sense of that word. We will be stronger as a party and the people of the United States will receive the benefits from our strength.

Let the Democratic Party go "from strength to strength."

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 17, 1967

(Legislative day of Wednesday,
August 16, 1967)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Our Father God, in the fresh mercies of yet another day we come with hearts grateful for Thy grace, praying that, by a strength not our own, our individual record may be kept unstained by any word or act unworthy of our best.

Thou knowest that these testing times are finding out our every weakness and calling for our utmost endeavor against

the wrong that needs resistance, and for the right that needs assistance.

Make us ever aware that in the most fateful struggle in human history—

We are watchers of a beacon whose light must never die,

We are guardians of an altar that shows Thee ever nigh,

We are children of Thy freemen who sleep beneath the sod;

For the might of Thine arm we bless Thee: our God, our fathers' God.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 16, 1967, be approved.

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

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1872) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senate is now operating under limited time. I ask unanimous consent that there be a

quorum call, the time to be charged to neither side.

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

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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 1 minute, the time not to be charged to either side.

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

MEETING OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND CHANCELLOR KIESINGER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am very happy with the communique issued jointly by President Johnson and German Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger on yesterday. I was much impressed with the sincerity, ability, and statesmanship of Chancellor Kiesinger and am fully in accord with the joint view of the two leaders that there must be no "one-sided weakening in the ability of the West to assure its security." This has not been the case up to this time.

I assume that no decision was reached on possible troop cuts and that none will be made without further talks between the two allies. The meeting was conducted on the basis of equality, of which I thoroughly approve. The meeting—I am certain—was very fruitful and very worthwhile for both countries.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

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

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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time to be taken now by the Senator from New York be not charged to either side.

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

LATIN AMERICAN BUSINESS FINDS A WAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recently there took place at the New York University Law School a meeting of leading businessmen and industrialists of the American hemisphere, sponsored by CICYP, the Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production. Leading officials of the Organization of American States, the Inter-American Development

Bank, and the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress were also present at this conference, which applied itself to the task of speeding Latin American economic development through integration, with particular emphasis on financing by the private sectors of both North and South America.

Recognizing the importance of closer cooperation between the private sectors and the Inter-American public agencies, the group agreed on the following steps:

First. Formation of a joint committee to study ways of improving Latin capital markets, with a view to increasing the rate of capital formation to about 25 percent of the gross regional product.

Second. Expanded and accelerated preparation of economic data on the private sectors' activities in national and regional development efforts.

Third. Establishment, by the public agencies and CICYP, of a working group to study the feasibility of a multinational private finance company to operate in agriculture.

Fourth. Development of a mechanism for coordinating public and private contributions to economic and social programs.

Further, the OAS has now formed a business advisory council to consult with the private sectors on OAS activities.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Journal of Commerce relating to this important meeting, be included in the RECORD.

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

LATIN BUSINESS FINDS A WAY

The spirit of inter-American cooperation fostered among the chiefs of state at last month's hemispheric summit in Punta del Este, Uruguay, was convincingly demonstrated by the private sectors of North and Latin America at another meeting held here last week.

Leading businessmen, industrialists, bankers and financiers of the hemisphere increasingly are turning their attention to spurring Latin economic development through integration. In doing so, they are laying the foundation for the common market that the summit gathering set as a goal for 1985.

In addition to increasing cooperation among themselves, private sector leaders are working closely with the international and governmental agencies of the Alliance for Progress.

Significantly, the meeting at Punta del Este devoted much attention to the role of the region's private sector, in contrast with the 1960 meeting in that city, which launched the Alliance.

The meeting held here last week, sponsored by the Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production (CICYP), brought together leading business, industrial and financial men from both continents who belong to the 25-year-old organization.

Under the chairmanship of CICYP's president, George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank of New York, the meeting also brought together top officials of the Organization of American States (OAS), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress (CIAP). They met at the New York University Law School here.

Steps for encouraging faster Latin development through greater cooperation among the hemisphere's private sectors and by the

private sectors with the international agencies, included the following:

1. Formation of a joint group to study ways to improve Latin capital markets. In order for the region to achieve dynamic economic growth, the rate of capital formation should be increased to nearly 25 percent of the gross regional product, IDB President Felipe Herrera said. The present rate is about 16 per cent, he said.

2. In cooperation with the inter-American public agencies, national private sector organizations will expand and accelerate preparation of economic data on the private sectors' activities in the national and regional development efforts.

3. The public agencies and CICYP will establish a working group to study the feasibility and general characteristics of a multi-national private finance company to operate in agriculture.

4. The groups agreed to establish a mechanism for coordinating public and private programs directed toward full economic and social development. OAS Secretary General Jose Mora said he was "impressed by the degree of social responsibility demonstrated by the private sector at this meeting."

5. The OAS has formed a business advisory council in order to keep in touch with and receive consultation from the private sectors on OAS activities concerned with private business and enterprise.

Dr. Herrera said the participants had agreed "there is no distinct or doctrinaire borderline between the public and private sectors, but that they should coexist. More and more, there are better relations between them, and in the developing nations there is a wide area of opportunities and initiatives for both sectors."

Dr. Carlos Sanz de Santamaria of CIAP said the groups agreed that "planning as an element of guidance for the region's economies was necessary because of its unlimited needs and limited means." He is taking every opportunity to urge businessmen to lead the way in integrating the Latin economies, he said.

Strongly endorsed by most participants at the meeting were the Punta del Este decisions to push for general non-reciprocal preferential treatment of all developing countries' exports of manufactures and semi-manufactures.

However, some of those attending said they doubted continental European countries would abandon their trade preference for goods from their former African colonies, or that the British would drop them for Commonwealth goods. Until they do so, those holding this view said, the U.S. should grant preferential tariffs to Latin American goods.

The dialogue between the public and private sectors got off at least to a start at the meeting. The public agency representatives detailed the scope and objectives of their activities designed to promote the region's economic and social growth, especially those undertaken with the private sector such as community development.

The CICYP officials explained the general principles of rights and duties of private enterprise. They also reported on the private sectors' important community development projects.

This kind of cooperation and dialogue can go a long way toward creating conditions for accelerating the Latin economies' growth as the integration pace picks up.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum not be charged to either side.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time to be taken on the matter I shall now discuss not be taken out of the time on the amendment.

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

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN HELPING DEVELOPING AREAS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call to the Senate's attention an article which appeared in *Business Week* for August 12, 1967, under the subject, "Business Abroad." The article concerns a concept of David E. Lillenthal, whom we all know and remember as head of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission, and who is now engaged in a private enterprise helping the developing countries. He is doing an extraordinary and constructive job along lines which I have always advocated and which I have been fighting for continually to take advantage of our private enterprise techniques.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be made a part of my remarks.

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

SELLING SELF-HELP AT A PROFIT

(NOTE.—David E. Lillenthal's 12-year-old company has shown that advising have-not nations can be good business. His next project: a plan for redevelopment of South Vietnam.)

His once lean figure is slightly paunchy. His hair—thin even in his 30s—is now nearly completely gone. Yet at 68, David E. Lillenthal retains much of the vigor that marked his earlier years as head of the Tennessee Valley Authority and then the Atomic Energy Commission. Today, 17 years since leaving the AEC, Lillenthal is taking on a new challenge: to help plan—and eventually help carry out—the economic recovery of Vietnam.

Once again he moves in the corridors of power—with President Johnson and Premier Ky at their Guam meeting, with top officials in Vietnam itself. But this time there's an important difference. Lillenthal is now chairman of Development & Resources Corp., a private profitmaking company. This fact still surprises some old-timers on Wall Street, who regarded him as a socialist symbol during his TVA days.

Perhaps more surprising, D&R is in a business—economic development abroad—that is traditionally the province of governments, foundations, and universities. Lillenthal started D&R some 12 years ago specifically to combine his experience in harnessing the resources of the Tennessee Valley with his zealous conviction that private enterprise can and should escalate the worldwide war on poverty and hunger. "The problems are too great for government alone," he says, with a slight Hoosier accent remaining from his Indiana boyhood and college years.

Concepts

Solving these problems is Lillenthal's preoccupation these days—whether he's at work in D&R's New York headquarters or sailing in his 16-foot boat in the waters off Martha's Vineyard. Many of his phrases have been heard before: "Help the people help themselves." "Release the energy of private enterprise." "Take a systems approach." But D&R is perhaps the only private U.S. company to apply all these concepts to a single program successfully.

There are other private companies doing similar work—consultants like Arthur D. Little, Inc., "think tanks" like Rand Corp., and a slew of engineering contractors. But they usually tackle only one aspect of development, such as economic studies, agricultural programs, or dam building.

D&R is different—for two reasons. First, it looks at a region's needs through a wide-angle lens—the integrated across-the-board approach that made TVA one of the most successful of the New Deal's alphabet agencies. In Colombia, for instance, it set up a TVA-like agency to develop the Cauca River for farm irrigation, flood control, and hydroelectric power. In Iran, it is helping to cultivate desert land with a field staff that includes engineers, geologists, economists, and agronomists. Similarly, D&R is quietly considering the long-talked-about plan to irrigate and reclaim desert areas of the Jordan River Valley. The Jordan idea, which Lillenthal calls "functional diplomacy," has the added benefit of providing fertile land to resettle Arab refugees.

Second, D&R carries out its plans itself, acting as prime contractor for the whole job—from blueprint to concrete, from planning to planting. Says Lillenthal: "I'm dismayed by the number of people who specialize in making studies, yet would be scared to death of carrying them out."

Wide scope

War-torn Vietnam, of course, will be unlike anything D&R has ever tried. Yet even there, the company will employ its regional, integrated thinking. It is focusing on the populous Mekong River delta, which is one of the great rice-producing areas of the world and supports half the Vietnamese living outside Saigon. The planning stage, financed by a three-year, \$3-million contract with the U.S. Agency for International Development, includes irrigation and such TVA-type projects as flood control, improvement of agricultural techniques, and pest control. "Properly developed," says Lillenthal, "the Mekong Delta could feed all of Southeast Asia."

In all, D&R has 14 projects in nine countries, including two in the U.S. Of D&R's staff of 114 (many of them TVA alumni), 37 are now abroad—in Iran, Colombia, Vietnam, Ivory Coast, Nicaragua, and Nigeria. The projects are usually performed under a cost-plus-free contract, with D&R fees totaling from \$3-million to \$5-million a year, enough to have made a profit every year for its stockholders—Lillenthal, two other D&R officers, and Lazard Freres & Co., New York investment bankers.

Iran is the best example of how D&R operates and what it can accomplish. Started about 10 years ago, the Khuzestan project there is by far D&R's largest and still accounts for about 60% of D&R revenues.

I. CULTIVATING A DESERT

Khuzestan, an Illinois-sized region in Iran's southwest corner, is vitally important to the country. It is rich in oil, potentially fertile, traversed by five rivers, and contains Iran's main port on the Persian Gulf. Yet it has been largely a hot barren desert and most of its 2½-million residents live in poverty that would make Appalachia look like the Garden of Eden.

By the mid-1950s, Khuzestan's past looked brighter than its future: Barley production per acre was less than in the days of Hammurabi. The farming tools in use were less

advanced than those used centuries ago when Khuzestan was the "granary of the Persian Empire."

New hope

Then, two things happened that were to alter Khuzestan's future. Iran became sole owner of its oil in 1954, and the Shah decided to allocate a sizable portion of the oil revenue to economic development—some \$250-million so far in Khuzestan alone.

About the same time, Lillenthal was becoming increasingly dissatisfied with his work as chairman of a small company called Minerals Separation North American Corp. Though he had made a good deal of money at it since leaving the AEC, he missed the satisfaction of public service work.

In 1954, the government of Colombia invited him to be a consultant in developing the Cauca River Valley on the style of TVA. The next year D&R was established, with the Colombian project its first job.

Accomplishments

Meanwhile, the Shah of Iran heard about the work in Colombia, and in 1956 invited D&R to blueprint the development of Khuzestan. Its plan: dam the water from the region's five rivers to provide irrigation and hydroelectric power. The soil could then be fertilized and scientifically planted; the hydroelectricity would attract industry. The Shah told D&R to go ahead, and since 1956 D&R and Iran have:

Built Pahlavi Dam, one of the world's largest, on the Dez River. Its waters irrigate 50,000 acres of privately-owned land, and soon will reach 350,000 acres. Agricultural productivity has increased 2½ times. The dam produces 130,000 kw. of electricity of an ultimate capacity of 520,000 kw.—equal to the output of Bonneville Dam in the U.S.—and prevents local flood damage that otherwise would total \$1-million a year.

Set up a government-owned, 12,000-acre sugar cane plantation and refinery that produces 40,000 tons of refined sugar annually. (Khuzestan means land of cane, but no cane had grown in Iran for 700 years.) D&R expects the success to encourage private planting of cane.

Improved agricultural techniques and crop yield by introducing farm machinery pools, credit systems, and fertilizer, and teaching farmers the land-use techniques that permit them to own their farms under Iran's land reform law.

II. LOCAL HELP WANTED

The physical part of the job was the easiest. Far more difficult was the task of enlisting the people in the program, training them, and giving them the confidence to operate on their own. And this, Lillenthal believes, is the sine qua non of any development program.

"Development isn't missionary work," he says. "If it's going to be done at all, the people themselves have to do it. This is not theory. We know it works." He believes that much U.S. economic policy abroad has failed, even when intentions were sincere, because planners have failed to involve local people. Thus, every subcontract D&R lets contains a clause for training the people.

To turn the Iranian project over to the Iranians, D&R formed the Khuzestan Water & Power Authority in 1960. Today, using D&R advice and technical services, KWPA's 3,000 employees operate the dam, sell the power, and help market the crops and sugar. "They really run the project and are really moving it forward," says John Burnett, D&R's forceful executive vice-president. "That is our key accomplishment—almost beyond hope in 1957."

Persuasion

Encouraging local participation often takes a while. The first step, according to Burnett, is to find out what the country wants to do and if it's really ready to do it. "What commitments is the government willing to make in money, people, and schedules?"

Will the people respond to change? We try to answer these questions by assessing the people's ability, energy, willingness, and performance when given opportunity."

In Iran, D&R ran a pilot agricultural program with 2,000 farmers on the 50,000 acres of newly irrigated land. "We didn't try to persuade them with talk or pamphlets," says Burnett. "We gave them fertilizer, taught them crop techniques, water management, and showed them when to harvest. These demonstrations were carried out by Iranian farmers, not Americans. When they saw how much fertilizer improved their crops, they couldn't wait to buy the stuff."

Exceptions

To be sure, D&R's across-the-board plans emphasizing native roles are not always applicable. For one thing, not every country has the natural resources of Khuzestan or Colombia's Cauca Valley, or the financial resources to carry development through. More important, not every country is prepared for such progress.

Says Burnett: "Some local money is needed and expected, but few sensible programs falter because we can't get financing. The main thing is whether the country can organize itself and make an effort on its own behalf."

Not all can. For example, D&R made a study of a West African country for the Agency for International Development and then recommended that nothing be done. "They weren't ready for a large integrated program," says Burnett. Similarly, another country declined a D&R program because it conflicted with local political and financial problems.

Vietnam

Though such local problems afflict Vietnam, the people are expected to play a major role in the country's redevelopment. "The Vietnamese are intelligent, clever, and willing to work," says Walton Seymour, D&R's vice-president for industrial development, who heads the Vietnam project. This view is supported by American construction men who have been training the Vietnamese to run and maintain heavy construction equipment. They report that the Vietnamese learn faster and work better than the average American worker. Moreover, the Vietnamese have a flair for skillful handiwork comparable to that of the Chinese and Japanese.

D&R, together with a private Vietnamese group headed by Vu Quoc Thuc, a law and economics professor at Saigon University, will devise programs to be carried out by the Vietnamese, their government, U.S. government agencies, and private companies. In addition to the Mekong Delta plans, D&R hopes to have simple farm-to-market roads built—the lack of which Lillenthal calls a "chief obstacle to agricultural development." Other programs may include reforming taxes, education, and land use.

III. IMPORTANCE OF BEING PRIVATE

A private company has certain advantages when operating in what is traditionally a public role. So politically touchy and painful are some of the decisions prerequisite for large-scale development that no government can advise another. In many countries, says and AID officer, official U.S. endorsement of a reform program is often its kiss of death. Because D&R is not an arm of the U.S. government, it is often able to steer clear of the political problems that mine the waters of economic reform.

Says D&R President John Oliver: "Countries that hire D&R are not committing themselves to U.S. policy." Adds Lillenthal: "If the government tackled some of the jobs we have, the host countries might suspect the U.S. was trying to shore up its political policy or the economic well-being of American business interests."

Another advantage in being private is that D&R can seize lucrative business oppor-

tunities that its programs uncover or develop. For example, D&R could invest in a new plant, in industry, or in mineral-rich land. So far, it has rejected such opportunities because each seemed a conflict of interest to Lillenthal. Among the ideas turned down: diamond mining in the Ivory Coast and real estate speculation in Cali, Colombia. Lillenthal says the company is now confident enough and has so established its credibility that it now would undertake good investments.

Looking homeward

D&R's future will include many more programs in the U.S. Says Lillenthal: "In terms of its aspiration and potential the U.S. is the most underdeveloped country in the world."

Lillenthal thinks that D&R's ideas—a regional approach, confidence in local people, and use of private capital—can be harnessed in this country. Two facts underlie his belief. One, contemporary problems such as blackouts, transportation needs, and air and water pollution don't stop at state or local boundaries. The physical facts of the problem—the course of a polluted river or direction of winds carrying factory smoke—call for a regional solution.

At the same time, he says, there is a trend toward decentralization—the so-called "creative federalism" in which the federal government provides money for a program planned and executed by states, municipalities, neighborhoods, or combinations of these. Some examples: the compact among five Northeastern states to purge air pollution, the model cities program, and the Bedford-Stuyvesant Renewal & Rehabilitation Corp. (of which Lillenthal is a director), which hopes to attract industry and housing to urban ghettos. Such local groups need the management and technical assistance that D&R can provide, says Lillenthal. D&R's role: establish a regional group (or help an existing one), prepare the master plan, and manage the project from start to finish.

The problem of water—supply, cost, pollution, desalinization—is one of the domestic ills that he feels fit D&R's talents. The company recently established a department of water resources, which is now helping New Jersey manage and improve its water supply. Other domestic projects have included: an economic and market study (for the U.S. Corps of Engineers) of the proposed 5-million kw. hydroelectric project on Alaska's Yukon River, and a 20-year projection (for a private company) of power needs and coal resources in the western U.S.

D&R has had little experience in tackling such domestic problems as race relations, housing, or transportation. But even here Lillenthal believes D&R management thinking could help.

Prototype

Indeed, social problems—whether in Bedford-Stuyvesant, Iran, or Vietnam—are Lillenthal's chief concern. His solutions combine the practical details he has learned since the 1930s with his vision of a new role for private business. He sees a new kind of corporation that is private in ownership, but motivated in its day-to-day business by public needs as well as private profit.

Lillenthal wants D&R to be a prototype of the public-private corporation. When he speaks of other companies getting into D&R's business, he speaks of them not as competitors, but almost as partners. No matter how successful D&R becomes, if it doesn't spawn similar companies or spread some of its ideas to existing companies, then David Lillenthal will have realized only half his vision.

NO SAD SONGS FOR LILLENTHAL

When David Lillenthal left the AEC early in 1950, he was 50 years old—too young to retire (he thought is still anathema to him),

yet old enough to be anxious about whether he could earn a good living in private business. Obsessed with the problem, he fretted aloud about it in the months before leaving government service. At Christmas, 1949, his wife gave him a beggar's tin cup and one of his friends gave him a guitar to go with it.

As it turned out, he needed neither. Between 1952 and 1955, as chairman of Minerals Separation North American Corp. (now Minerals & Chemicals Philipp Corp.) he made more than \$1 million in stock options after setting the company on an acquisition course that led to growth and profits.

Why did Lillenthal settle for the day-to-day chores of running a relatively insignificant mining company after the heady days of running the TVA and AEC? His financial concern was one reason. Also, says Lillenthal, "I wanted an entrepreneurial experience—something I missed in the government. I wanted the excitement of taking a tiny company on its last legs and helping it to grow."

PERSPECTIVE

In telling this story, Lillenthal's usual stream of anecdotes, names, and ideas slows to a trickle—as if he were trying to put those years between government service and D&R into perspective.

"You know," he recalls, "people were surprised when I embraced private enterprise. But even at TVA we designed the river development, electric rates, and credit systems to provide a climate for private business. My books [the fourth volume of his *Journals* will be published this fall by Harper & Row] are full of reverence for the ability of private enterprise."

Still, after the initial kicks of resuscitating Minerals Separation, Lillenthal "felt a sense of inadequacy." He missed the gratification of public development projects. The solution came in 1954 when Colombia invited him to be a consultant in developing the Cauca River Valley along TVA lines.

D&R

The idea for D&R, which had occurred to Lillenthal years earlier, began to take shape in his mind. After returning from Colombia, he talked the idea over with André Meyer, a friend and senior partner at Lazard Freres & Co., New York investment bankers. Meyer not only liked the idea, but helped to raise the money. "Without Meyer I don't know if I'd have had enough nerve to go to a banking house to get a joint venture going," Lillenthal says.

In any event, in 1955 Lillenthal, Gordon Clapp (another former TVA chairman), and Lazard Freres joined in establishing D&R. The company made a profit from the start thanks mainly to Lillenthal's prestige, TVA's reputation abroad, and the huge Iran contract coming so early in the company's life.

David Lillenthal now had the best of both worlds—a private company, public service work.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may institute a call for a quorum without the time being charged against the debate on the amendment.

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

Mr. JAVITS. 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. 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.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the situation which has developed this morning, after the Senate had given unanimous consent to convene at 10 o'clock and placed a time limitation on amendments, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate, when it completes its business this evening, stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

NO AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, objection will be raised to any committees meeting tomorrow from 10 o'clock a.m. on.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m.), the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 11:48 a.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair).

Mr. McCARTHY obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—
ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 1619. An act for the relief of Rene Hugo Heilmann;

H.R. 2036. An act for the relief of Carlos Rogelio Flores-Vasquez;

H.R. 2668. An act for the relief of Sevasti Diakides;

H.R. 3195. An act for the relief of Eli Eleonora Bianchi;

H.R. 3881. An act for the relief of Christina Hatzisavvas, and

H.R. 7516. An act for the relief of Song Sin Talk and Song Kyung Ho.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1872) to amend further the

Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

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

Who yields time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modification of my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the modification.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the modification be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

The modification of the amendment of the Senator from New York, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, reads as follows:

On page 41, immediately after line 10, insert the following:

"(a) Section 221(b)(2), which relates to general authority for extended risk investment guaranties, is amended by striking out '1969' and substituting '1970'. On page 41, line 15, and on page 42, lines 7 and 10, restore subsection designations '(a)', '(b)', and '(c)' of section 104 of the bill to '(b)', '(c)' and '(d)', respectively."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the purpose of my proposal is to extend the time within which extended risk guaranties may be contracted for by the AID by 1 year over and above the time fixed by the committee.

Under the committee proposal, the extended risk authority would expire on June 30, 1969. My proposal would provide that the extended risk authority expire on June 30, 1970.

Mr. President, the only reason for introducing the modification to my amendment is that yesterday the Senate sustained a change in the measure as reported by the committee, retaining the provision of the present law with respect to the 75 percent guarantee. That necessitated a change in the text of the amendment. In addition, the amendment as originally offered called for a 2-year extension of this authority.

I have now cut it down to 1 year, in an effort to meet the views of the committee, which I understand—at least, I understand this from its interim floor manager—would look with favor upon the 1-year extension, in view of the fact that the Senate had expressed its will on the nature of this program yesterday.

Mr. President, I shall not endeavor to

make an extended argument with respect to this matter, as it seems almost self-explanatory from the disposition shown by the Senate yesterday. The fact is that the Senate yesterday decided that it wished to retain the interest of banks and pension funds in the extended risk guarantee program as a means for facilitating overseas private investment in developing countries. Having decided that, we must now determine what are the time elements within which projects which involve these guarantees may be planned. The authoritative statement we have from all the banking and insurance institutions and pension funds which are involved is that the time element is of such a character that the extension given by the committee—which in the committee was consistent with its feeling against the use of the extended risk guarantee—is inadequate. To make possible the best use of this program at least another year is required—to wit, the June 30, 1970, date—to enable projects of this character to be planned according to the leadtime which is required in planning such investment opportunities in the developing countries.

It seems to me that this follows immediately the end sweep from the view expressed by the Senate yesterday, and that is why I called it up as the amendment next in line to the one which the Senate had decided yesterday.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, it is the view of the committee that not many prospective investors who would use this authority would come to believe that because the authority is not extended the full 2 years asked by the administration, the program was likely to be discontinued.

The judgment of the committee in limiting the extension of the program to 1 year followed from the action of the committee in generally setting a 1-year limitation upon the extension of all programs. That left what we thought was an adequate amount to take care of the next year of operation plus a sufficient reserve to carry beyond that, even though the authority did not extend beyond 1969.

However, speaking for the chairman of the committee, I am prepared to say that we are not particularly concerned if the additional 1-year extension to 1970 is imposed, as it is in the pending amendment, that the committee is prepared to accept it. We feel that it is not really necessary, that the important thing is the amount of money which is authorized.

Especially since we will have an opportunity to look at the entire foreign aid bill again next year, I see no particular reason for objecting to the adoption of the pending amendment, and therefore I recommend that it be adopted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the committee is far from unanimous in agreeing to an exception of the extension. I have spoken with various members of the committee. I have spoken with enough members of the committee to know that there is strong feeling within our committee that no exception should be made for any extension. I cannot say whether it is a majority or a minority, but when the Senators come to the Chamber, we will find out.

We brought to the floor of the Senate a 1-year bill, and that is how it should stay. We will be in session in 1968 to review the entire situation.

I wish to make this comment as to why I believe it should remain a 1-year bill. We should say to all the countries of the world that the status quo must be maintained, for we are in a dire crisis in the United States, and we must move very slowly. We should oppose any expansion of any program in foreign aid for the next year and take a look at the situation in 1968, having in mind what our predicament will be then.

Furthermore, this proposal for an extension—the Senator knows that I speak in deep friendship and respect—would automatically lead to another proposal to raise the ceiling with regard to guarantees. What we really would be doing would be to encourage, in a time of great economic crisis, the escape of money from the United States for investment abroad, when there is a great need for the investment of every dollar that is available in our own country to meet our own domestic needs. We should maintain the status quo.

I point out that the ceiling provided in the committee bill is \$215 million. That is sufficient, because under that ceiling they have only involved \$60 million in the past year, which gives them a substantial amount for guarantees even within the \$215 million ceiling of the committee. Their testimony before us is that they are planning for only \$120 million in the next year, which leaves them some \$15 million, under the ceiling of \$215 million.

Mr. President, let us face it. We have to decide whether or not we are going to put the economy of the United States first or the economy of underdeveloped areas of the world first. We have to decide whether or not this is a reasonable, rational allowance that we are providing in the various segments of the bill. The \$215 million of guarantee is plenty for the next year, and we should hold it to 1 year. We should not extend it to 1969 or to 1970 or to 1971. We should say that we will come back in 1968 and take a look at the situation in light of what our plight is then.

We should remember that the proposal before us is for a commitment of an extension of time that will take us beyond next year, into 1969, and we do not know what the plight of this country will be in 1969. We should not get our country in a position where we may find ourselves, as a matter of national necessity, reneging on the basis of commitments made beyond 1968. That is what the committee decided. We had long discussions in committee on this very matter. We had the AID people before us in the committee. Let the record speak for itself: AID admits that their plan for next year is only for a guarantee of \$120 million, which, when added to the \$60 million to which they have already committed themselves in the past year, amounts to \$180 million—and the ceiling is \$215 million.

My argument is that there is no showing of the need. Oh, the argument will come out later in the debate that some leadtime is needed. Well, in a time of

crisis, talk about leadtime is irrelevant and immaterial. We have to take a look at the plight of the Republic; and if we take a look at the plight of the Republic, this is no time for us to make any commitments beyond the next fiscal year.

We owe it to the American taxpayers to follow the course of caution that I am advocating this morning, and we also owe it to the American taxpayers not to commit ourselves to a guarantee of foreign investments abroad when there is such a crying need for investments in our own economy to take care of crisis problems in the United States.

When sufficient Senators are in the Chamber, I shall ask for a rollcall vote on the pending amendment. Also, I will confer with other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I speak most respectfully of the chairman of the committee, but as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I do not go along with my chairman, if he has made a suggestion to the Senator from New York that he be willing to extend the time for an additional year. I believe that would be a mistake, and I want a rollcall vote, so that every Member of the Senate can stand up and be counted and make his record as to whether or not he wants to tell the American taxpayers that we are willing to pledge ourselves and commit ourselves to a guarantee of foreign investments, on the part of American financiers, beyond 1968 and beyond \$215 million.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the first place, neither the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations nor any member of that committee has made any commitment whatever to me, and I did not make any such representation.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I did not say that the Senator did. I understood the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] said he understood that would be satisfactory to the chairman, and I rose to protest it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I do not think that there is any necessity for getting into a hassle about whether Senators made commitments. No commitment is claimed by me or by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is my principal partner in this matter. We are prepared to fight the matter on the merits. There is no need to trouble people about commitments.

Mr. President, I respectfully challenge the attitude with regard to this matter in two respects. First, I challenge the claim that it represents a drain on the American taxpayers. On the contrary, this is proposed and we want to do it because it is the way in which foreign aid can be operated without being a drain on the American taxpayer. As I understood the decision of the Senate on yesterday it was along that line of thinking.

Second, it seems to me that the Senate has decided the question of principle. The Senator from Oregon has a perfect

right to hearken back to what the committee felt was the proper principle, but the Senate rejected the committee yesterday by a decisive vote on what was considered to be a fundamental proposition involved here, which was whether or not to continue the extended risk guarantee program. The Senate has spoken on that matter.

All we are trying to do is carry out the disposition of the Senate in a practical manner. What is the use of allowing extended risk guarantees to be used by keeping the 75-percent provision if it is to be lopped off within a short time so that people cannot count on it?

Certainly, all of the amendments go together. All that my colleagues have been seeking to do is to stay with the position of the committee, but having lost bastion No. 1 they are trying to retain it with bastion No. 2 and bastion No. 3. I believe that is contrary to the disposition of the Senate. Having won yesterday, it is our duty to carry out the will of the Senate and to follow this out so that it can be implemented.

Mr. President, I represent to the Senate—and it is not only my representation but also the representation of the administrator in charge—that if we want to make this guarantee useful and meaningful, sufficient time has to be provided so that people can figure out these highly complex arrangements and deals by which it is possible to provide financing in a developing country.

Finally, as to the lack of domestic credit, I challenge anyone to produce evidence that there is a lack of domestic credit for propositions which are bankable. That is all we are talking about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is no lack in terms of domestic credit. On the contrary, it is a matter of concern that there is too much domestic credit and it may cause inflation and a requirement for the tax surcharge.

Mr. President, in this proposal I do not see that we are doing anything more than carrying out the will of the Senate and showing the American taxpayers how to take some of this foreign aid off of their backs. This is the only original idea that has come along in 20 years that would show a way to do that. I am delighted that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] feels the same way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon put this in a frame of reference of guarantee for American financiers. It is nothing of the kind. These financiers they speak of are corporate entities. It could be a bank, it could be Standard Oil of Indiana, Texaco, or United States Steel, but in every case those who administer the affairs of the corporation are not using their own money; they are using the money of shareholders. Obviously, they do not want to commit the money of a shareholder that has been developed through frugality and thrift

unless there is a chance of recapturing that investment, making it possible for them to retrieve their earnings in the case the loan of the lender is subject to difficulty, to bring those earnings back home.

Mr. President, that is what is involved here. If I were a stockholder in a company I would want the president of the corporation to take a long look and ascertain whether my money was adequately protected and coming back. It is not the financiers involved here; it is American shareholders, for the most part.

We tried for years to have this burden transferred from the shoulders of Government to the shoulders of private enterprise. They show an unwillingness to do it. Here was a program which was slow to start, with probably \$14 million committed in the first 4 years. Now, there is a chance and they should have an adequate time period and the necessary ceiling under which to work. That is why this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I shall reply to the Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois.

First, the adoption of the 75 percent instead of 50 percent by the Senate yesterday in no way involves any commitment on the part of the Senate either to extend the time for the guarantee loans or the amount for the ceiling. Those are two entirely different issues. The argument is not well taken that because we extended the percentage of the guarantee we are committed to adopting the amendment of the Senator from New York.

We are doing exactly what the Senator from Oregon said. We are urging or encouraging foreign investments by American investors in foreign lands with a guarantee from the American taxpayers. That is where the guarantee comes from. It is the American taxpayers who will have to foot the bill if the investment goes bad.

In my judgment, we have a clear duty to protect the American taxpayer at this time for a commitment beyond 1 year. Furthermore, I repeat, with respect to the ceiling, we have a ceiling of \$215 million, and have used only \$60 million of it. We have the testimony of the AID people that they plan \$120 million next year, which means \$35 million, so to speak, and they will be before us in 1968 for further consideration for whatever changes the then existing conditions may warrant.

There is not a Senator in this Chamber who can tell the Senate or the country what the fiscal conditions of the Republic will be when we meet in 1968. This is not the time, in my judgment, for our making any commitments beyond the next year in a situation such as that. Here is the place to put on the brakes to make it clear to the American taxpayer that we are going to seek to protect our policy and we are going to go along with a policy for 1 year only.

I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois, when he speaks about investors, let us talk about the guarantee of investors to go into our ghettos and build the housing needed to meet the domestic problems of this country. Let us put on

a guarantee, if that is what is sought to be done, for needed investment in our country where investors are reluctant to invest their money.

The Senator from New York challenges anyone to show any need for credit. We do not have to make hardly an argument to point out that investors are scary about investing in the ghettos and slums of America or in the problems dealing with alleviating the conditions of the poverty stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MORSE. What I am saying is that we should go slow. I am not for scuttling the program. I am for continuing it under the ceiling and the time limitation which the committee has already set up.

However, that has nothing to do with the Javits amendment of yesterday, where we raised the percentage of the guarantee from 50 percent to 75 percent. He cannot connect the two, no matter how much he argues. They are separate and distinct issues.

We have got to decide today whether we are going to extend the time period beyond a year, or whether we are going to extend the amount within the guarantee above \$215 million.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am getting somewhat mystified about the concept of the free enterprise system.

When I was in business, one of the basic ideas of capitalism was risk capital. We did not demand guarantees as a prerequisite to contracts or corporate decision.

Not too long ago, I was in Africa where there was a heavy investment on the part of an American corporation. I questioned whether the whole investment was a sound business enterprise.

Finally the American representative said, "Well, there is a lot in what you say, but after all, it does not make too much difference because we have a Government guarantee."

Mr. President, that investment was not for peanuts. The guarantee was for many millions of dollars. To the best of my knowledge, it was not a successful development at all. Therefore it stuck the American taxpayer once again.

If a corporation is willing to risk its capital in this country in competitive business—and many individuals and companies fall in the United States—but that is our system—why it is, in order to invest abroad, we have to give these guarantees; especially when we make these guarantees abroad, often we are, in effect, exporting jobs from the United States and thereby increasing unemployment.

It is all very well to take oil out of a country where it costs, say 20 cents a barrel to produce, and sell it for \$2 a barrel over here. That is better for the stockholders than to produce it for \$1.80 and sell it at the same price; but how

about the workers in this country, who are down to 8 days a month operations? That is not so good for those poor people.

This business of development abroad—there is much merit in them, I do not want to try to mislead my colleagues. But I do not see why we have to have these guarantees as a prerequisite to any risk, because if the companies in question are successful, their profits will be far greater than in the United States, primarily because of the lower standards of living of the people in foreign countries and the consequent lower labor rate.

In addition, I want to line up with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], an expert in this field, as is the present occupant of the chair at this time, the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], about all the heavy expenditures now needed for our cities where we have so many pressing problems to solve.

Let us get these same people to invest in alleviating the terrible conditions of poverty that have recently caused so much trouble in our own country. Let us guarantee those investments rather than ones in foreign countries.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I can have the attention of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for 30 seconds, whatever time he wants to take now, he is certainly welcome to take. I would like to suggest to the Senator that we must get Senators in the Chamber to vote. I have already said all I intend to say, except a 1-minute summary when enough Senators have come into the Chamber. I should therefore like to suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time taken will not be charged to either side.

Will that be agreeable to the Senator from New York?

Mr. JAVITS. That is fine.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time for the quorum not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and 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 be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Missouri as he may need for an insertion in the RECORD.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1872) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty minutes remain.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is interesting to me that my beloved friend and colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], asks us to separate this amendment in our minds from what the Senate did yesterday—to wit, the amendment to extend the guarantee authority on the extended risk guarantee till 1970. Yet he insists on arguing the case on the theory that this is an amendment to increase the ceiling. We will get around to the amendment to increase the ceiling, in due course, and the Senate will be able to work its will on that precisely, as it will be able to work its will on this.

No Senator is being confused in any way, shape, or form. We are all too sophisticated for that. The fact is, however, that the committee set out to end, in effect, the extended risk guarantee program. It decided to end it by curtailing materially its use through elimination of the 75-percent provision and by cutting it down to what meant its elimination and by limiting the time in which it was available to only 1 year—that is, the ensuing fiscal year—and by not allowing any further ceiling.

The Senate thought differently about the matter in respect to the fundamental proposition of the percentage of the guarantee. All I am arguing is that to be consistent with a policy determination, which yesterday's vote represented. It is my duty to present to the Senate the other things which must be done in order to implement the point of view of the Senate and even to present them on a minimal possible basis.

I had originally submitted an amendment for a 2-year extension. I wish to point out that the program has been consistently carried on a 2-year extension basis. Consistently it has been extended for 2 years in the regular authorization to assure prospective investors that the program will be available when the countries are ready to go forward with the programs. I cut it down to 1 year beyond the program's current expiration date, because in this foreign aid bill we wish to exercise time control.

When we come to the next amendment—and I emphasize it is the next amendment—which deals with the ceiling, I will attempt to accommodate the views which are expressed here about keeping a tight hold on the program by limiting the amount of the increase to what is absolutely indispensable to keep the program going forward.

The Senator from Oregon and other Senators may throw aside lightly the question of leadtime, but anybody who has been in business, or anyone who has been a lawyer representing business, or anyone who has tried to negotiate a large-scale deal for financing in a developing country will testify to the fact that leadtime is counted in months and years, and not in days and weeks. Therefore, if we wish to extend this program for the purpose for which we have designed it, and as the Senate has indicated it wants, we must allow for the time in which it can be done.

The only purpose of this amendment—I shall argue about the amounts later—is to provide for time heretofore provided. This is not new. The Senate has previously provided a 2-year leadtime. Nevertheless, the committee proposes to cut it to 1 year. All I am trying to do is restore, as the Senate has evidenced that it thinks this program should be continued, the time we have traditionally heretofore provided.

We have the position of the department concerned which states that this amount of leadtime is indispensable for the carrying on of the program in any intelligent way.

Finally, a great deal is made about what is being done for the slums in our country. It is a rather wry commentary that, as to an amendment I have proposed—and I do not think there is any more ardent advocate than I am as to what needs to be done in the slums of this country—it is argued that it involves some discrimination against the slums of the United States.

Mr. President, let us grow up. We are spending \$2 billion a month for the war in Vietnam. We are spending \$5 billion a year or more for space. We are spending a similar amount for public works.

We have already guaranteed—I got the figures only yesterday—over \$80 billion for mortgages for buildings in the United States. We have the demonstration cities and other programs which Congress so far has refused to go along with. There is much work for all of us to do before we come to the point of saying that, because we are extending the time limit for extended risk guarantees by 1 year, we are going to vitiate help for the slums of the United States.

I can hardly see how an argument can be made to support that contention, considering the number of things we have to do before we get to that point.

For that matter, if that is the way we feel, why not deny the whole foreign aid program? Forget the entire \$3.1 billion involved. Let us devote it to the slums. I know the Senator from Oregon would like that—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I say good naturedly that I would welcome the Senator's vote.

Mr. JAVITS. I know the Senator would like that, but that is not the way the Senate believes, and the Senator from New York is appealing for the vote of the majority of the Senate.

So I say in order to carry out the scheme of the foreign aid bill, to bring about the maximum participation of private enterprise, thereby relieving the public purse, I urge the Senate to follow out that scheme by voting for the amendment.

Finally, I should like to deal with the argument about business risks. There is plenty of willingness to take business risks in this country. There is plenty of unwillingness to take business risks in the developing countries. To compare the two is like comparing peaches to eggs. Everyone knows the developing countries have deep problems and risks which are not present in this country, problems involving expropriation, insurrection, war, unconvertibility, conditions which make impossible the

success of any business, no matter how run, restrictions on who may or who may not be employed, all kinds of taxes and other disabling restrictions within the countries, due to primitive economies, chauvinistic nationalism, and dozens of other reasons. Our effort is to endeavor to encourage private business to go into the developing areas and make these investments because it is conducive to the American will. It is not merely a question of shouldering the risks of such investments, but not to do so would be inimical to the interests of our country.

Finally, let me say that about \$300 million worth of investments have been made by the use of the extended risk guarantee, and in the process we have made money. We have not lost money. It has not been a burden on the Treasury. We have made about \$43 million in the process.

If we cannot see our own self-interest enough to make this program feasible, then we are indeed blind and impractical. I do not think we are. I think the Senate's vote yesterday showed that we are not.

It is for those reasons that I hope very much the Senate will approve the amendment, as completely consistent with the Senate's view—not a majority of the Foreign Relations Committee, I hasten to add. The chairman of the committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said the vote in committee was 7 to 6. I do not know what the vote was on this proposal, or even if it was put to a vote. But I point out that the Foreign Relations Committee is by no means a monolith on this view, and the Senate takes a different view; and because it takes a different view, I considered it my duty, with the support of the minority leader, to put forth a proposal of minimal support for implementing the will of the Senate as it already has decided it wishes to do with respect to the guarantee program. This is essentially a vital part of that particular project.

Now that no other Senators desire to speak upon the amendment—and apparently there are none—I should like to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that we again have a quorum call to advise Senators that we are ready to vote, unless some Senator wishes to speak—and there is time. But if no Senator wishes to speak, we can yield back our time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall say just a few words. I think there has been some misunderstanding about my position on these amendments. Earlier, before we voted, I discussed the extended risk matter with the Senator from New York and said that if the proposal to extend the program 1 year was all he intended to offer, and if he did not intend to raise the ceilings, I would consider that, because the 1-year extension did not seem to me to be nearly so significant in its possible impact as some of his other amendments. No one can tell what conditions will be a few years hence, or even 1 year, or 6 months hence. We may be in a much wider and more costly war. Under these circumstances, I did not want us committed to a higher ceiling than we now have.

I did not even vote to restore the 75-percent ceiling, although I voted for it

in committee. I thought it was my place to support the position of the committee.

I believe that committee members feel that we are in difficult circumstances and should curtail further commitments. It was the philosophy of the committee, in dealing with the bill, to hold the aid programs as nearly as possible in most cases to the amount appropriated last year, except for the military aid and sales program.

So I shall not accept or vote for this proposal. I understand the Senator intends to offer an amendment to raise the ceiling.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope it has been reported to the Senator that I did not even mention his talk with me, for I considered it entirely personal. I do not impute to the Senator from Arkansas or any other Senator any arrangement whatever. I could offer an amendment and then argue on it on a completely original basis.

In fairness to the Senator, I might tell him that I think, on the ceiling, although that is not involved in the amendment, I had hoped, on the basis of the minimal implication of yesterday's vote, to offer an amendment to raise the ceiling by a minimal amount, to enable the program to continue to operate for 1 year. I intend to offer such an amendment.

I had hoped to come to an agreement with the committee, not because the committee felt that way, but because it was my honest concept that what was decided yesterday, which was the fundamental principle, which we argued yesterday and which the committee lost and I won. I have lost many amendments, so I think I am entitled to win one occasionally.

But I did not, and that is the point I wish to make to the Senator. Rather, two points. First, I did not in any way invoke any conversation whatever with the Senator from Arkansas, who is my friend and with whom I would never deal on that basis unless we had actually come to an agreement, and I did not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, some of my colleagues heard it. This is not a serious matter. We all know, on some amendments which are not of vital importance, efforts are made to shorten the debate. There is nothing wrong about discussing this matter.

I understand that the Senator from Missouri has already discussed the broad implications of this program. I only wish to say that when we initiated the guaranty program, it was in a period when this country was in a very different situation from that which exists today. It was at a time, lest we have forgotten, when there existed what was called the "dollar gap." An effort was made—which I supported—to try to channel funds into Western Europe and other countries to expand trade with them. We had then a valid basis for this type of activity.

But conditions have changed. The country is in the worst position, internationally, that it has been since World War II. We are engaged in a terribly costly war, costly not only in lives, but

involving a tremendous financial cost. We face the largest peacetime deficit in our history—nearly twice as large as any other since World War II. We are asked to vote a tax increase. All of these things we know all too well. Conditions have changed.

I do not believe we should continue, as usual, a program which was initiated and justified under entirely different conditions than those which exist today. This is not inconsistency, as I see it. Times have changed, and we should adapt to the change.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Arkansas. Only this morning, I talked to the man considered the leading financial analyst in my State. He pointed out that, as of the end of this year, there will be in force in this country more than \$1 trillion in life insurance; also that today, in business and in labor unions as well, retirement plans and pension plans are featured as they are with Government employees. He noted that social security also was vitally important to many millions of Americans.

This analyst then dwelt on the point made by the Senator from Arkansas, the heavy cost of this war, and said that, in his opinion, major inflation in this country was inevitable and could come soon.

Mr. President, we know that there are many problems we have to solve here, as well as in Vietnam and many other places. We know about the great problems of our cities.

I am becoming convinced there are some in this body who just do not have a true concept of fiscal and monetary responsibility, essential if we are to maintain the integrity of our dollar. These people who apparently desire to give much to everybody might as well face up to the fact that fairly soon the chickens are going to come home to roost. When that happens those who will suffer the most are the Americans who are on fixed retirement life insurance and pension incomes, perhaps especially those who depend on social security.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And there are a lot of them.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There are tens of millions, and they are the ones who are watching. We had better realize that the reason the world has prospered in the past 20 some years has been through the printing of paper gold by the United States. Today we are forced to borrow money heavily from abroad, through the loss of our gold, in order to continue with this foreign aid program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Missouri. He is entirely correct. I think we simply have to reevaluate these policies that were originated under different circumstances than those facing us today.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and others, have written letters to me about this program. I do not think they are taking into consideration the overall problems which confront the country, such as those described in the President's

own tax message. The President stated in that message some very strong reasons this program should not be enlarged.

I grant that this proposal is not a major enlargement of our undertakings abroad; it is a small one. But the line must be drawn somewhere. The committee voted against this extension. I support the position of the committee, and I hope that the amendment will be rejected.

Is the Senator from New York ready to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JAVITS. No; I would like another minute or two.

I shall yield back my time in a minute, but I wish to answer just two points which have been made.

First, Mr. President, is the point that this program was initiated at a time when our circumstances were very different than they are now, and that therefore the program is no longer apposite today.

The answer to that, Mr. President, is that we have just begun effectively to utilize this program, based on the recommendations of the Watson committee. That is what brought this whole extended risk program to life; and that was absent up to 1966. Mr. President, we need it now more than ever; and that is why we gave it new life, because the circumstances are such that we are trying to fight in every direction, in housing, in poverty, in foreign aid. It is a way in which the private enterprise system can be brought in to take off the back of Government some of the job that Government has been doing. Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that argument completely defeats itself. This is the time that we have brought this program to life precisely because it is the time it can help us the most.

The other aspect of the matter, Mr. President, deals with the alleged adverse effect on the U.S. balance of payments. I dealt with that yesterday, but I should like to read at this point a very short memorandum from the AID, which clearly lays that argument to rest.

The memorandum reads as follows:

EXTENDED RISK GUARANTIES (NONHOUSING)—
U.S. BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS IMPACT

There is no adverse short term impact on U.S. balance of payments as a result of the Extended Risk Guaranty (Non-Housing) program. The program's policy requires that the project in which the guaranteed investment made must involve procurement of United States goods and services in an amount substantially equal to the amount of the guaranteed loan. As an example, where A.I.D. provides an Extended Risk Guaranty to cover 75% of a \$1.0 million loan, the project borrower must spend \$1.0 million in the United States for goods and services.

The long term impact on U.S. balance of payments is of course favorable. Loan interest and principal is repayable to the U.S. guaranteed lender, and the project made possible by the guaranteed loan is expected to generate dividend income for U.S. equity investors in the project.

Let me state affirmatively that U.S. investments abroad today, Mr. President, produce \$5 billion plus in returns of dividends and interest income.

It is one of the biggest means of redressing our imbalance in international

payments caused by our international obligations.

Finally, on the matter of exporting jobs, which subject was very loosely tossed around here, the fact is that overseas private investment of this kind brings jobs to the United States.

We have just pointed out that the procurement is tied in 100 percent. Everything must be spent here, and that applies to whatever is guaranteed in the investment abroad.

It is well known—and again I appeal to normal business judgment and experience—that the greatest way of feeding American exports is by American investment abroad because inevitably American parts, technology, and materials are used in the process of foreign manufacture—not exclusively, of course, but certainly more than would be true if the investment was not made in a developing country where, without the guarantee, it would not be made.

Mr. President, I sum up by saying that we are doing nothing but adding to a field that is tremendously useful to us as a nation. There is no budgetary impact. On the contrary, there is a budgetary advantage, because we make money on these guarantees and we begin to lift off the backs of the taxpayers the obligation which is assumed by private enterprise. That is what we want to do or, at least, I think that is what a majority of the Senate wants to do.

As another step toward what the Senator did yesterday, I ask that the Senate agree to the amendment as modified.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am always interested in presentations made by those who when they want more dollars to go abroad to other countries from the United States, to promote their particular program, assert that the program in question imposes no burden on our balance of payments.

We have been hearing this now for many years. But when we add all these component pluses together, we obtain a tremendous overall minus in our balance-of-payments position.

The Senate should realize, as the distinguished committee chairman has pointed out, that whereas when the program started, Marshall plan, Truman doctrine, we had \$25 billion in gold and, owed abroad \$7 billion, now we have but \$13 billion in gold and owe \$30 billion-plus abroad. I have heard some very extensive rationalizations on that point. However, I would ask some Member of the Senate to explain to me, when the largest producer of shoes in the United States, located in my State, is doing its best to make shoes with a low-hourly labor cost for the United States, how can he expect to compete with foreign countries like Japan where shoes are made on the basis of a labor rate of around 30 cents?

There should be industrial development in other countries. But if a St. Louis manufacturer wants to risk his money in a line of merchandise, he cannot go to his Government and get a guarantee. If he is right, he is rewarded with profit. If he is wrong, he loses money. That risk is at the core of our system.

Why is it necessary that the people

in this country who want to take advantage of the low labor rates of foreign countries must be guaranteed their profits, or at least be guaranteed against loss? That is fundamental to what we are discussing this morning.

I am not for discouraging any people who want to invest abroad. That is good. That is what we do invest hopefully, in this country. That is capitalism, risk capital. But I do not see why the Senate of the United States has to be a body which guarantees a profit in other countries, when that certainly is not characteristic of our system at home.

[Applause in the gallery.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries will be in order.

Who yields time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on the simplistic world theory which we just heard, it would pay, I assume, to terminate all American exports in order that we would not have to take the imports.

That same rule would apply to the importation of shoes in the United States. Let us not take any more imports. Let us forget the exports and have the maximum number of jobs in the shoe industry.

It does seem to me, however, that I hear a few whisperings from other places in the United States which think the export business is a pretty good business.

Let us remember that we cannot have it all our own way in this world and advocate this under the color of an economic argument which, to my judgment, is not very relevant.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Are these guarantees to be extended to countries such as Japan, that has just been mentioned by the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. JAVITS. No. They are strictly to be applied as guarantees to developing countries.

Mr. PASTORE. That means they would be exclusively for underdeveloped countries.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. That is why I said there is no relevance to the ceiling amount argued here, not even in this amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Because the Senator from Rhode Island has used on occasion some of the arguments just used by the Senator from Missouri, it strikes me that he argues with some measure of logic. But I think that his argument is directed to the defeat of the foreign aid bill as such not this particular amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is exactly right.

Mr. PASTORE. The issue is whether we are going to have a foreign aid bill or not. If we are not going to have a foreign aid bill, then let us just continue to water it down. As a matter of fact, judging from the experience we had last year in the controversy between the conferees of

the House and the Senate, I doubt very much that we will have an aid bill anyway. However, I say that if we are going to have a foreign aid bill, the next question is what is the most effective and economical way to achieve it. It is a time consuming, temper-testing process.

Everyone knows that the trouble here for the longest time has been that we start to consider the foreign aid bill in the Senate—that is the authorization—some time in the month of August. We get through with it some time in the month of September. We go into conference maybe until December. Then finally we have to fund the foreign aid bill as the compromise is worked out.

The precise point I want to make is that I will vote for the amendment of the Senator from New York for one reason only. If we are going to have this guarantee at all and confine it to 1 year, it will lead to waste, indecision, and confusion. The only way to do it is to give sufficient time to the people who have to make the judgment, sufficient time in which to work it out in a businesslike way. If we do not believe in the foreign aid program at all, then we ought to vote against the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am perfectly content to rest my case on the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island.

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

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am told that my time has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to each Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, let us be sure the record is straight. There is no guarantee of profit in competitive business in this country. One puts in his money and wins or loses.

We already give a 50-percent guarantee to these countries abroad. The amendment adopted by the Senate yesterday—I believe mistakenly—increased that to 75 percent. Why? Why not follow through and guarantee profits over here, especially as any loss abroad will be absorbed by the poor taxpayer who may have already incurred loss in our system over here.

If the Senator from Rhode Island does not believe that Japanese competition is relative to what we are discussing, I accept that.

There was a time when Japan was an underdeveloped country. It is now a developed country, primarily through dollars furnished by the United States, plus their hard work. Everybody knows that.

The Japanese Constitution says that country cannot have a military establishment. So it would appear they depend somewhat on us in other ways also.

Let us, however, take another country. I do not think any Senator would call the United Arab Republic a developed country. There have been recently two American company strikes of oil in Egypt. Mr. Nasser undoubtedly will smooth out

his problems with those companies as he has in the past smoothed out his problems with American politicians to the point where in recent years the United States has given him over a billion dollars in aid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we have been 3 hours on this amendment. I will do it this time, but I object to other requests.

Mr. JAVITS. Perhaps we can solve the majority leader's problem. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that, in view of what has developed, the Senator from Missouri may have 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senate has been in session since 10 o'clock—

Mr. PASTORE. But if anybody is to be given any time, it must be given to everybody. Either we all are silenced, or we all are privileged to speak.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senate was called together this morning at 10 o'clock. I have been in committee meetings all morning the Committee on Armed Services where there were important confirmations, also in the Committee on Foreign Relations. If the idea is to prevent Senators expressing their opinion on this important matter which involves further liens of billions of dollars against our already staggering debt structure, I have no further comment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. On whose time are these speeches being made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 40, as follows:

[No. 224 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Baker	Inouye	Morton
Bayh	Kennedy, Mass.	Moss
Bennett	Kennedy, N.Y.	Murphy
Boggs	Kuchel	Muskie
Brewster	Long, Mo.	Nelson
Carlson	Long, La.	Pastore
Case	McCarthy	Pearson
Clark	Metcalf	Pell
Cooper	Miller	Percy
Fong	Mondale	Prouty
Griffin	Curtis	Proxmire
Harris	Dirksen	Scott
Hart	Fannin	Sparkman
Hartke	Jackson	Tower
Hayden	Javits	Williams, N.J.
Hickenlooper	Jordan, Idaho	
Hruska	Monroney	

NAYS—40

Aiken	Ervin	Mundt
Allott	Fulbright	Randolph
Anderson	Gore	Ribicoff
Bartlett	Gruening	Smith
Bible	Hill	Spong
Burdick	Holland	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Symington
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Talmadge
Cannon	Lausche	Thurmond
Church	Mansfield	Tydings
Cotton	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Dominick	McGovern	Young, Ohio
Eastland	McIntyre	
Ellender	Morse	

NOT VOTING—11

Brooke	Magnuson	Smathers
Dodd	McGee	Yarborough
Hansen	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Hatfield	Russell	

So Mr. JAVITS' amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, last year I rose to voice my dismay at the resistance to a vital and expanding foreign aid program. I deeply regret that this resistance has grown over the past year. I rise now to affirm again the importance—to those abroad, and to us at home—of maintaining a vigorous foreign assistance program.

It is understandable that a nation entangled abroad and embattled at home, facing an Asian war which soon will cost \$30 billion a year, and an urban crisis which deserves similar resources, is skeptical of new plans to spend abroad. And it is right—indeed necessary—that

the limits, as well as the scope, of our economic commitments be clearly understood.

But this concern does not alter the fundamental premise of our program: that other nations must be helped to build decent societies "not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right." Nor does it alter the position of the United States as an island of affluence in a world of desperate poverty—and the need for us to respond to this world in revolution.

This is a revolution for individual dignity, in societies where the individual has been submerged in a desperate mass. It is a revolution for self-sufficiency, in societies which have been forced to rely on more fortunate nations for their manufactured goods and their education, cotton textiles, and calculus texts. And above all, it is a revolution to bring hope to the children.

The population of this globe grows every day, and nowhere faster than in the underdeveloped nations. In the next 15 years, the population of Latin America alone will be 50 percent greater than it is now. Already, more than half the world's people are under the age of 25; within a few years, the majority will be under 18.

We have it within our power to give to millions of these young people a greater chance at a decent life—to have a major effect now on the course of their next 30 or 40 years. Millions are without schools—and we can help to build schoolrooms; millions more are without textbooks, or teachers—and we can help to provide textbooks and train teachers; others cannot eat—and we have food.

Clean water, better housing, education and training, a job to look forward to; these things we can help to provide.

And we must.

Opportunities lost to these young people now, as we have found to our sorrow here at home, will be far harder to make up later. But a relatively modest investment now can make a difference, in 5 or 10 years, to as much as half of the world's people—including our own.

Clearly we have the resources to make that investment. The United States owns more than half the total wealth of the non-Communist world. The dozen developed countries of Europe and Japan share a total wealth about half as large as ours. The rest of the non-Communist world—the more than 100 nations potentially affected by this bill—share a total annual production of something over \$300 billion—less than half of what we, 6 percent of the world's population—consume each year. The developed nations as a group—20 percent of the world's people—consume 80 percent of the world's goods.

Yet we seem unwilling to increase, or even maintain, our aid to these nations struggling to provide decent lives for their citizens. Since President Kennedy's inaugural pledge "to those people in the huts and villages of the globe," our gross national product has increased by more than \$230 billion—yet our level of assistance is below the 1961 authorization.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 261.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. GORE in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 43, line 5, strike "\$578,000,000" and substitute "\$650,000,000".

On page 43, after line 5, insert the following:

"(2) In the first sentence strike out 'in each such fiscal year' and substitute 'in fiscal year 1967 and \$110,000,000 in fiscal year 1968'."

Redesignate subsections (2) and (3) of section 106(b) as subsections (3) and (4), respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish his amendments to be considered en bloc?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the committee authorization of \$2.7 billion is less than one-third of 1 percent of our gross national product. Yet we pledged to the United Nations in 1960 to devote 1 percent to the desperate needs of the developing nations.

And if we do not act, the fact is that we may well not survive. For I believe that we cannot endure in fortresses of wealth, surrounded by a sea of despair. A generation from now a world so divided will be even more turbulent and dangerous than the world today—particularly because the division is not merely one of wealth but of culture and even of color.

Nothing better illustrates the need for action than the state of the Alliance for Progress this year. The committee's action will cause what I regard as a damaging slowdown in the development of our Alliance for Progress efforts in Latin America. It is this action of the committee that I wish to discuss specifically.

Six years ago, President Kennedy offered a "special pledge" to the nations of Latin America "to convert our good words into deeds—in a new alliance for progress to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty."

It is to honor that pledge that I offer this amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967, together with Senator COOPER, who led the fight against the reductions in committee, and with Senator JAVITS, who has long been interested in Latin American development and offered a similar amendment on August 3.

When the Alliance was born at Punta del Este in 1961—6 years ago tomorrow—the nations of this hemisphere knew they faced a massive task. They determined to change a continent whose geography, history, social systems, and culture seemed to defy change. Of course, the battle has not been won; nor is victory in sight. But consider some of what has been done:

With the use of Alliance loans, the stagnating educational systems in Latin America are beginning to be revitalized. Twenty-four thousand classrooms were built in the first 5 years of the Alliance; 26,000 new teachers have been trained, and 100,000 more have been

given further instruction; more than 12.5 million free textbooks have been distributed. And these resources are being used: enrollment is up 23 percent in primary schools, 50 percent in secondary schools, and 59 percent in the universities.

Other Alliance loans have begun to revolutionize agriculture. Since 1961, the United States has helped to irrigate more than 1.1 million acres, and to reclaim 106,000 more. In an effort to link the farmers with their markets in villages and cities, we have helped to build 15,000 miles of roads.

Through use of program loans, we have enabled Latin American nations to stabilize their economies without causing severe dislocations in employment. Chile, for example, cut its inflation rate from 39 percent in 1964 to 17 percent last year; Brazil's rate of 140 percent as of February 1964 has been reduced during the last 12 months to 30 percent.

Despite the population increase of 3 percent a year which eats up the benefits of gross national product gains, a majority of Latin American nations did achieve the target growth rate of the 1961 Punta del Este Conference—a real per capita increase of 2.5 percent.

These are general instances of change for the better. But more important, they reflect the quiet yet dramatic changes which the Alliance, together with a new generation of Latin Americans, is helping to create throughout the Americas.

(At this point Mr. HOLLAND took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, thus, in Chile, under President Frei's program of "Revolution in Freedom," genuine land reform has at last begun to alter a feudal social structure; and Alliance funds are helping to bring modern techniques of increasing agricultural productivity to the people with a stake in the land they till.

Thus, in Peru, an attempt is being made through the "Cooperacion Popular" program, to provide technical and material assistance for small-scale, self-help projects in building the structures of a modern society in rural communities; and, with the help of Alliance funds, more than 3,000 communities participated during the first 2 years.

Thus Brazil's SUDENE, an innovative regional development authority, is beginning to tear up the centuries-old roots of hopeless poverty by bringing modern skills into this region of despair; and Alliance loans and technical assistance are a part of this effort.

These signs of progress cannot be judged in a vacuum; they must be placed in the context of a continent which is at last moving toward effective economic integration. From the start of the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress, to last April's "summit" declaration by the American Presidents, the 6 years of the Alliance have produced a steady trend toward cooperation. And, as trade barriers fall, as regional cooperation expands, the health of Latin America's economy gains.

But the battle of the hemisphere is far from won. The tide of population continues to rise, requiring desperate efforts

merely to stay even in the race against poverty. More than 80,000 hospital beds were added in 4 years—yet the ratio of beds to the population remained static at 3.2 thousand. The number of physicians increased by 33 percent in that same period; yet the ratio of doctors to patients showed almost no improvement. Indeed, such is the flood of new citizens that Latin America will have to find 140 million jobs by the end of this century, build a million homes a year, and train 200,000 new doctors by 1970.

It is apparent—as it was in 1961—that the struggle to build a new Latin America will be long and costly. We knew that 6 years ago—and we pledged ourselves to that task, nonetheless. It would be foolhardy, in my judgment, to retreat from this pledge at the very time our neighbors appear to be taking this pledge to heart, and changing their own societies.

My amendment would restore \$65 million in grant and loan authorizations for fiscal 1968. These are funds which Congress already authorized last year—at that time it authorized \$750 million for fiscal 1968; my amendment would bring the total authorization back only to \$650 million. And these are funds which the administration has said it needs—it proposed to spend \$643 million for fiscal 1968, but the committee cut back the authorization to \$578 million, \$65 million less than the proposed level of spending. Of the \$65 million, \$55 million was to be used for loans; of this, \$25 million was scheduled to have been used for educational development, and \$30 million for agriculture. The \$10 million in grants was for technical assistance for projects specifically agreed to at the April 1967 Latin summit meeting.

These amounts may not seem great—but I ask the Senate to consider what it would mean for the Alliance if the committee reductions are not restored.

First, \$25 million of the funds are loans earmarked directly for education. If we remember that Latin nations would be supplying about \$2 for every dollar loaned by the United States in this area, this reduction would mean a loss of \$75 million for the fight for a decent educational system.

What are the specific consequences of this reduction? \$25 million, coupled with the countries' contributions, would pay for 15,000 classrooms, in which 600,000 children would learn, for the first time. It is enough, in addition, to train 30,000 teachers, and to pay for the distribution of 15 million textbooks.

Each new classroom, each new teacher, each student who receives an education which he would not otherwise have had is a step toward a more democratic development, and the aid in question here is critical to building a public secondary school system which has never before existed in the Latin nations.

These loans have achieved encouraging results in the past, and can in the future. In Honduras, a loan of \$7 million is helping to build 350 classrooms, providing to 18,000 students their first experience with free public secondary schooling—and Honduras has pledged to double its own budget for secondary educa-

tion over the next 5 years, in addition to the \$3.5 million investment which it has made in this program.

Under a similar loan of \$10 million which is already in effect in Chile, that nation will be able to provide secondary schooling for one-third of its children by 1970—without sector loan support, it would take three times as long to achieve this goal.

The funds already working in Chile and Honduras constitute a total equal to about two-thirds of the loan authority which the committee deleted. Thus, what the cut means, in effect, is that three more programs of similar scope, three more efforts in other countries, will now be impossible.

I think it clear that the need for education requires us to support these programs by restoring the reduction in the loan authorization. We must not curtail our efforts at a time when they are critical to galvanize the efforts of other nations.

Second, the remaining \$30 million is to be used in agricultural improvement. Ambitious programs have already begun to revolutionize agriculture, to increase productivity, to aid farmers in self-improvement, and to stabilize food prices. The full impact of these reductions is hard to measure. But it is clear that farm credit, so important in enabling farmers to purchase seed, chemicals, fertilizers, and tools, would be denied to 100,000 farmers throughout the continent. Further, the curtailing of commodity storage facilities, and access to market programs, will reduce the supply of available food, thus raising prices for more than 1 million consumers—at the same time lowering farm income. The AID estimates—conservatively—that these cuts will be responsible for a loss of 500,000 extra tons of food production which is badly needed. The modest amount involved therefore has great significance.

Third, the \$10 million cut in technical assistance grants will impede—specifically and immediately—ambitious and promising projects of regional economic and social integration which grew out of the April summit. Plans are now underway to develop a Latin American regional science program, to be administered by a Latin American science foundation; a project for educational television; and an exploration of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The \$10 million technical assistance cut will seriously curtail all of these projects.

None of these programs—in education, agriculture, or new technologies—are “showcase projects”. They imply no military pacts or questionable commitments. They do not even represent a new economic effort since—even if this amendment is adopted—the 1968 authorization will still be \$100 million below what we authorized last year for 1968. The restoration only gives to the administration the funds it knows it can use. They are aimed as directly as possible at helping to redeem that special pledge that we offered a continent 6 years ago.

I share the concern expressed by the committee at the conduct of our foreign policy. But I am also concerned that Latin America not believe we are faltering in our commitment.

The committee's action in erasing the 1969 authorization will be taken by some in the hemisphere as disturbing evidence that our resolve is weakening, that we do not after all, intend to convert our good words into deeds—it suggests to them that we are unwilling to fulfill the long-term goals we ourselves helped set for the hemisphere.

How much more discouraging will it be if we reduce our aid in those very areas where the need is greatest—and where the promise has been born?

Six years ago the trumpet summoned us to bear the burden of a long, twilight struggle against the common enemies of man. On the eve of the Alianza's sixth anniversary—in Latin America and through the world—that trumpet still sounds—and it should not sound retreat.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from New York has made a case that needs to be made. I was interested, last week and early this week, in the debate on the wisdom of our policy in making American arms available to Latin-American countries. A great deal of concern was expressed in the argument, opposing our current policy in that respect, to the effect that such sales operated to divert needed resources of those countries from economic development that they needed to the military development that it was said they did not need. The Senator is addressing himself to that problem of economic development.

It is a curious thing to me that so many of those who fought American military policy, for the reasons I have outlined, also supported cuts which will have the unfortunate effects on economic aid to Latin America which the Senator from New York has described.

I was particularly moved as I listened to the Senator's reference to the fact that what we are talking about is a population which increasingly will be made up of young people. What we are talking about is what we should do as a country in helping to shape that future and the opportunities that these young people will have in that future.

So the cuts which are made, and the setbacks that will result from those cuts, will have longstanding effects on our ability to influence these young people of today and the world in which they will live tomorrow.

We must do what we can to insure that the thrust of their lives is toward progress for themselves, and the kind of stability and order which is the product of social justice. We should apply such resources as we can, to the purpose of maximizing our influence in a world that otherwise will generate a potential for the explosion of human frustrations.

I congratulate the Senator on his speech.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Maine for his words. I think he has put his finger on the fundamental problem. It is not just a

question of what will happen next year or during the next 6 months. What we are dealing with here is the need to try to prevent a major crisis or a major conflagration 10 or 20 years from now. Money spent now can save many lives, and much money a decade or two decades from now.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. HART. As the Senator from Maine has said, the Senator from New York has made a case which should be made and must be made, and I hope it persuades us, the Senate, to support his amendment.

Earlier today I placed in the RECORD a very brief speech of welcome to a very important group of visitors to our Nation's Capital from Latin America. I made the point that they were not statesmen or dignitaries, nor movie stars or actors. They were young men and women who were winners of a hemisphere-wide essay contest on the Alliance for Progress. They come from nations as huge as Brazil and as small as El Salvador.

But a speech of welcome to these young people is worth precisely the paper it is written on in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We will respond to their future needs and the needs of our own children best by supporting the appeal the Senator from New York now makes by restoring this money to the Alliance for Progress.

I said this group of visitors we entertained today contained no statesmen, politicians, or economists, but I should have said “not yet.” They will be the leaders of their nations in the lifetime of our own children; and our measure of support to assist these nations today, in educating the young people such as we have in the galleries at this moment, will be history's best test as to the wisdom of our judgment.

I congratulate the Senator from New York. I support his amendment, and urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I have traveled extensively throughout Central and South America. I think there is no area in the world of greater importance to the United States than the area of our own hemisphere.

I think the distinguished Senator from New York struck the right key when he said we ought to do these things because it is right to do so.

I think no one who knows the facts can help but be very much impressed with the tremendous needs and suffering and unfulfilled aspirations of the people of Central and South America, the people for whom the Alliance for Progress was designed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be shown as a cosponsor of the pending amendment.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

How much time is left, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I retain the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to clarify what actually happened in the committee on this amendment No. 261.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time distribution on the pending Kennedy amendment remain as it now stands and that the distinguished Senator from Oregon may offer a substitute to the Kennedy amendment with the 1-hour limitation thereon to interrupt the time on the Kennedy amendment. May I say it is not my intention to support the Senator from Oregon, who I understand seeks to reduce the amount reported by the committee for the Alliance for Progress. I shall, however, support the amendment of the Senator from New York which seeks to raise the amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request that the time unused remain as is, but the Senator from Oregon be given consent to offer his substitute and be given 1 hour as provided under the unanimous consent agreement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to this request—I think it would be unfair not to have the amendment of the Senator from Oregon voted on. It was filed.

I want to raise a point as to the meaning of the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday. It was my firm understanding with the majority leader that on any amendment, no matter who offered it, relating to the matter of the Church amendment or the Jackson amendment—the whole subject of arms sales—I would not agree to any limitation on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Oregon brought that up. It was understood and stated at that time that it did not apply to any amendment on that subject regardless of the sponsor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Regardless of who offered it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Regardless of who offered it. That is in the Record and is restated here for emphasis.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That should be clear.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the understanding; the printed agreement is only for the convenience of the Senators and is not the official record of the understanding and agreement reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may offer his amendment.

The Senator from Oregon is recognized. Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be taken from either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. 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. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] proposes an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] as follows:

On page 1, line 2, insert "\$508 million" in lieu of "\$650 million."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from New York, I have offered this amendment to reduce the committee authorization for the Alliance for Progress program. I may withdraw the amendment at the conclusion of my argument, but I shall use it at least for the purpose of discussing my reasons for opposing the Kennedy amendment.

I think, Mr. President, we should take a long look at the situation that confronts the Committee on Foreign Relations in respect to the Alliance for Progress program, because I do not think it is well understood by the Senate, and I think the information now available to the Foreign Relations Committee as a result of our year's study on the Alliance for Progress program shows ample reasons why we should not go beyond the committee report nor increase the finances now available to Latin American countries.

Early this year, I announced on the floor of the Senate complete approval by the Committee on Foreign Relations for my Latin American Subcommittee to conduct a year's study of the Alliance for Progress program. That study would consist of the following sections:

First, political developments within Latin America. That is being done by the subcommittee staff, and the job is 90 percent completed.

Second, U.S. trade and commercial policy. That is being done by the Library of Congress, and is 90 percent completed.

Third, inflation. That portion of the study done by Raymond Mikesell of the University of Oregon, has been completed.

Fourth, agrarian reform. That is being performed by the Land Tenure Center of the University of Wisconsin, and is in process.

These are contracts that the committee has let for a year's study of various aspects of the Alliance for Progress program.

Fourth, the aid program in Colombia as a case history. That study is being made by the subcommittee staff and the General Accounting Office, and is in process.

Sixth, the Latin American military. That study, by Edwin Lieuwen, of the University of New Mexico, has been completed.

Seventh, U.S. labor policies and activities. That study, by the subcommittee staff and the General Accounting Office, is in process.

Eighth, subversion and insurgency, by David Burks, of the University of Indiana, is in process.

I wish to say at the outset that the Committee on Foreign Relations is involved—and deeply involved—in a survey of the whole Alliance for Progress program, and that is the chief reason why, may I say, as chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, that I believe we ought to maintain the status quo until we complete the study.

As the Senator from New York knows, I speak most respectfully in my disagreement with him concerning the amendment he has offered. I think it would be a great mistake for us to increase any item of the Alliance for Progress program at this time, for the reasons that I am about to set forth.

There has been distributed to Senators a mimeographed sheet headed "Summary of Amendments Nos. 261 and 262 Offered by Senator KENNEDY of New York."

These are amendments to increase and extend the authorization for the Alliance for Progress.

The summary says:

The \$65 million which the Committee would delete from the Administration's request would have been used as follows.

There follows a listing of loans and technical assistance projects in education, agriculture, and science—generally, the most appealing aspects of the Alliance.

This is very misleading and deceptive, may I say, on the part of the AID people. The administration has always emphasized that its program presentations to Congress are "illustrative"—meaning that they show what the administration thinks—as of the time the presentation is made—it would do with the money if it got all of it. The presentations are compiled in the winter; Congress acts in the late summer or fall, and never approves all the money requested anyway. The administration then goes through an agonizing process of reprogramming, and the final result may bear little relationship to what was originally proposed.

The law requires the administration to report to Congress on significant changes in programs as compared to the original presentation. The last such report, which arrived 9 months late, required 26 single-spaced, legal-size pages to list all the changes.

In years gone by, the Foreign Relations Committee has pressed administrators of the AID program to tell it what would be cut out of the program if Congress reduced the funds. The invariable answer has been that that prospect was so exasperating that the administrators could not bear to face it. Every dollar was essential, they have always argued.

Now the administration comes forth with a detailed statement on what 10 percent of a lump sum request "would have been used for." The truth is that the administration does not know what this amount would have been used for, and is trying to panic Congress—not for the first time.

In fact, in room 104 downstairs, for the first time in the history of the handling of the AID bill, AID is maintaining a lobby that is right under the dome, a lobby to which Senators are being called for conferences and interviews with AID officials, in order to spread just this kind of propaganda.

They say the committee reduction "would have built 15,000 classrooms for some 600,000 children, trained 30,000 teachers, and provided 1.5 million textbooks."

Why did they not say that before the committee? Why did they not say before the committee that this was going to be their case? To the contrary, they never whispered a word to the committee about where the cuts would be made. The AID people acted in bad faith with the committee if they had no intention of making such a cut as this. That is not where they need to make the cut. They ought to have come before the committee before they started propagandizing the committee and the American people and said, "This is where we are going to cut."

They say the committee reduction "would have helped 100,000 farmers to increase their productivity, and would have resulted in production of an added 500,000 tons of food."

Why did they not tell the committee so? They did not even whisper it. This is shocking lobbying. The AID officials have tried to select out of the bill items that they feel will get them the most votes on the floor of the Senate. That is why the senior Senator from Oregon will, before the debate is over, may move to recommit the bill. The AID people can then be called before the Committee on Foreign Relations for cross-examination concerning their tactics in lobbying for the bill. They did not act in good faith or with responsibility, because they did not tell the Committee on Foreign Relations a single iota of what they are now putting out as propaganda in order to get votes on the floor of the Senate.

This is something that the Committee on Foreign Relations should pass on initially. The Senate ought to say to the Committee on Foreign Relations, "We want your best recommendations in regard to how the cuts should be made," rather than to let the AID people come in, after the bill has reached the floor of the Senate, and give us this kind of decision on their part, when they have never been willing, in times past, to tell us where the cuts would be made.

This is nonsense on the part of AID. If they were entirely honest, they would have said it "might" have done these things; and they would have added that it "might" also have been used to bail out some governments from the results of their own economic mismanagement.

Do not forget where the cuts could have been made. Budget support money could have been cut; the bailing out process could have been cut, rather than to make cuts in the programs for schools, housing, and agriculture.

The way AID uses most of its funds in Latin America does not encourage reforms; by postponing the day of reckoning, it makes it possible for governments to avoid reforms.

Another thing which the administration says the committee's cut would have been used for is "\$10 million in technical assistance grant funds which were for projects specifically agreed upon at the April 1967 Latin summit." Note their language: "\$10 million in technical assistance grant funds which were for projects specifically agreed upon at the April 1967 Latin summit." The truth is that no projects were specifically agreed upon at the Latin summit. A number of programs were specifically agreed upon at the Latin summit. A number of programs were specifically agreed upon, but the projects to implement the programs are not ready, because they have not been agreed upon.

The Alliance for Progress authorization approved by the committee is not a figure pulled out of the air. It is the result of a country-by-country review of the administration's presentation to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The country-by-country figures are classified, so they cannot be discussed in public, but they are available to any Senator.

Mr. President, that is where AID has us over the barrel again. I cannot stand on the floor of the Senate and tell the American people what the security facts are with respect to the Alliance for Progress. This is a kind of lobbying tactic that AID is using today to put the Senate at a disadvantage.

The figures are available to Senators if they want to go to the Foreign Relations Committee room and read them. I do not know how many will.

That is another reason why the entire bill ought to be recommitted until the Senate can apprise itself in regard to all the facts.

The committee's figure is a reduction of \$65 million from the administration's request, but it is an increase—mark you this—of \$70 million over the 1967 appropriation, and that ought to be enough.

Let us now turn to their tactics in regard to technical assistance.

The administration has been telling universities from Massachusetts to Hawaii that the committee's reduction in technical assistance funds will make it impossible for AID to fund university contracts. Many Senators have heard from universities in their home States—as I have—asking that the committee's reduction be restored.

The truth of the matter is that there is plenty of money in the bill for university contracts if AID chooses to use it that way. Instead, AID, in its lobbying tactics, has picked out the part of the technical assistance program with the most important domestic constituency and has said this is what AID would cut if the committee's reduction stands. This is another blatant attempt to panic and pressure the Congress.

The administration requested \$243 million for technical assistance. The committee approved \$210 million—the same amount that was appropriated last year.

But this is only for Asia and Africa. Technical assistance for Latin America is provided for in a different section of the bill, in the title dealing with the Alliance for Progress. And in this section,

the committee has approved \$100 million which is \$12.2 million more than was appropriated last year.

Thus, this bill contains a total for technical assistance of \$310 million, compared to a total of \$297.7 million appropriated last year, or a total of \$343 million requested by the administration.

If AID cannot find enough money in \$310 million to pay for about \$10 million in university contracts, there is something wrong with AID, not with the Congress or the Foreign Relations Committee.

One of the things wrong with AID is that it is a prisoner of its past. It starts projects and cannot end them. So whenever it wants to do something new, it does not switch its emphasis; it simply expands its total activities. The committee's reduction in the administration request is a modest effort to force AID to pay more attention to its own priorities.

Mr. President, the reduction is the result of careful, prolonged study in executive session of this committee under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] as we went through the program country by country.

Mr. President, I come to a point that I made in my speech last night that I want to reiterate. Does the Senate want to know what we ought to do? I think we owe the American people a great responsibility. I think we ought to maintain pretty much the status quo. We ought to adopt the 1-year extension. We ought to adopt the figures of the Foreign Relations Committee which I think are ample because we do not know what the fiscal plight of the United States is going to be 1 year from now. We do not even know this morning whether we will by that time be engaged in a war with China. We have not the slightest idea what the foreign policy status of the United States will be.

It would be a great mistake to make these promises for increases that never were substantiated before the committee.

My good friend, the junior Senator from New York, is bringing to the floor of the Senate today a proposal that was rejected, in effect, by the committee when we set a figure for the Alliance for Progress program.

It would be most unfortunate if the Senate today were to proceed to increase the foreign aid program with no more evidence than the Senator from New York has been able to offer the Senate to this time. The Senator appeals to our humanitarian instincts.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin-American Affairs, I want to help Latin America as soon as we are in a fiscal position where we can do it. But do not forget that what went along with the so-called agreement on programs at Punta del Este is a two-way street. There was also an agreement for self-help.

Let the Senator from New York proceed now to tell the Senate of the United States what agreements for self-help we have received from a single Latin American country.

I was a strong supporter of the program for Latin America at Punta del

Este, I urged on the floor of the Senate, as my chairman knows, when many on the Committee on Foreign Relations disagreed with me, that we should go along with the President at Punta del Este so long as it was understood that we committed ourselves to no authorization or to no appropriation. That was understood by all.

But do not forget that, at Punta del Este, the President made no commitment to a single project. He made an offer as to what help we would give with respect to programs in education, in agriculture, and in literacy, in an attempt to increase the literacy; but only on the condition that the Latin American countries would engage in a self-help program of their own. The Senator from New York cannot submit to the Senate today a single program of self-help that has been offered by a single Latin American country.

Mr. President, another aspect we should keep in mind is that we have a great internal problem in regard to our own domestic economy. I believe we should also take note that in Latin America, as well as in many other parts of the world, we are getting no help. We are getting no help from other countries. Show me the help we are getting from a Latin American country in connection with the Vietnam crisis.

We should say to all countries, including the Latin American countries, that we cannot increase our foreign outlay until we first pay for this war, costing us some \$30 billion a year; we cannot increase our foreign outlay until we stabilize our own economy and meet the conditions internally of the impoverished and the poverty stricken in our ghettos. In fact, before the day is over, I may offer an amendment to the bill to provide an investment guarantee for the undeveloped areas of America, in our rural slums and our urban slums. The American taxpayers are entitled to it. I happen to think that investors who put money into the depressed and ghetto areas of America are entitled to it, if those who invest abroad are entitled to it.

When are we going to think about a balanced program in the matter of foreign aid? All I am saying is, do not give beyond what the committee has recommended in terms of figures.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I merely wish to inquire when the distinguished Senator from Oregon says we have received no aid from Latin America for Vietnam, does he recall the fact that Brazil sent some coffee?

Mr. MORSE. I do.

Mr. GRUENING. That was the great contribution which Brazil made to our fight in Southeast Asia. They sent coffee, of which they have a great surplus. I do not believe that should be overlooked.

Mr. MORSE. We should also take into account that much of this money will go into dictatorships, into juntas, into military forces in Latin America, on which there should be some restrictions.

I will offer a junta amendment later, which will propose that none of the funds will go into either a Communist or a

military coup that seeks to overturn a constitutional government.

We all know that when Congress reduces an agency's budget, it is up to that agency to make the cuts in its program in accord with the priorities it has fixed, unless Congress specifically mentions some programs to be funded or not to be funded. The same is true of AID in applying the committee language to the Alliance for Progress.

In response to the contention of the Senator from New York, I would point out first that nothing now being done is "cut" in either the committee bill or in the amendment I propose. The Alliance is operating on a budget of \$508 million in appropriations last year, plus the recoveries and carryovers that still apply to the pending bill.

With a \$30 billion minimum war cost, with the serious ghetto and rural slum area in this country, give me any reason why the American taxpayers should be asked to pay a 10-percent surtax, if we continue to increase the indebtedness of the United States?

The American taxpayers are crying aloud, if you will listen to them. Impose a tax increase and at the same time increase this foreign aid program as the Senator from New York proposes in the pending amendment, and you will hear from them at the polls. Let me say to the American people, you see to it that every Member of Congress and the White House hear from you at the polls, if this type of fiscal irresponsibility comes to characterize the foreign aid bill this year. What the administration and the Senator from New York are seeking are new programs. That is the last thing about which we should be thinking. They are asking to add money for education and agricultural programs in Latin America that will be obtained only by subtracting them from our domestic budget and increasing the debt of the American people. I am in favor of continuing our present program in Latin America through the Alliance. But how can we justify increasing it, when we are cutting the same programs at home? The administration, on the average, is cutting 40 to 60 percent on domestic programs, and the Senator from New York proposes today that we increase a foreign aid program in the Alliance for Progress program.

Second, the really sad thing about the material the Senator from New York is presenting is that it demonstrates more clearly than I have ever been able to demonstrate that the bulk of American assistance in Latin America has very little to do with the basic social improvements without which there never can be progress in that part of the world.

The figures AID present show that unless the additions are made to the Alliance budget, programs expected to be started for education and for agriculture have to be added on to the previous mountain of program loans and general industrial development or they will not be undertaken. Not only are they not priority items with the administration, but also, they are at the very bottom of the totem pole.

It has been my entire case for 5 years that we are putting our money into the wrong things abroad. Instead of the \$215 million in program loans AID intends to expend under this program, it should be devoting that money to education, agriculture, and housing. We should not have to add on such vital items—they should constitute the heart of the Alliance itself. I have said so ad infinitum, year after year.

One might ask the Senator from New York, Why not have an Alliance program consisting solely of \$65 million for education, agriculture, and the new technical assistance projects? That might be a sounder program than the one we have. If these are essential, if they are important, if they are one particle as important as the administration seeks to imply, they would be amply funded—yes, they can be enlarged and expanded and multiplied many times over in the funds called for in the committee bill. They can be amply provided for in the funds my amendment carries.

I say to the Senator, and to the administration:

Use the money we are currently using in the Alliance for these meritorious purposes instead of for the general support of governments that find it easier to knock at the door of the U.S. Treasury than to clean their own houses.

That brings me back to the self-help need with respect to which the Latin American countries are sorely failing.

Look at Peru, about which we have read in the papers recently. AID is promoting a program loan in Peru in the amount of \$40 million, according to the New York Times. It seems that some strings are tied to it in the form of required fiscal reform. They are distasteful to Peru, because her wealthy classes are not accustomed to paying taxes.

So the Peruvian Government has rejected the terms offered by the United States. It is betting on the U.S. Embassy knocking down the terms, and eventually giving Peru the money without the strings of fiscal reform attached.

I say to the Senate, there is \$40 million that accounts for well over half the money the administration thinks should go into education and agriculture. Make clear to Peru that if she is not yet politically ready to live up to the clear terms and conditions and requirements of the Alliance for Progress, we will use the money in places where conditions are more receptive, or we will hold the money ourselves until Peru is ready to participate as a meaningful partner in the Alliance.

The same is true of Brazil, where tens of millions should be used for purposes far more important to Brazil than the program loans we give her in order to subsidize her inflationary economy.

No, there is ample money in the Alliance for education, agriculture, and technical assistance, any time AID wants to use it for those purposes. So long as it squanders it on program loans for the political support of governments we want to keep in power, it is an affront to the American taxpayers to come in with a list of education and similar programs that will be starved for money unless more money is provided.

I also call attention to the Inter-American Bank bill that has just been reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It calls for a U.S. contribution to the soft-loan window of the Inter-American Development Bank of \$300 million a year each year for 3 years. That compares with the \$250 million a year we previously had been providing.

That amount is additional aid to Latin America. That amount is in addition to the money in the committee report. That is an additional reason why there can be no justification for the Kennedy amendment increasing further the amount. Under the Inter-American Bank bill there is provided \$300 million a year. That is AID money. I do not care what name is placed on it, it does not change the fact that it is American dollars going into Latin America to the tune of \$300 million through another spigot.

There will be \$50 million boost in funds for the Alliance under that measure. I favor it; I voted for it in committee, and I shall support it on the floor.

But how can we justify two increases in two separate programs, when the money already going into that part of the world is not being used for the very purposes which the administration labels as vital and urgent? If AID really considers them vital and urgent, they will get money out of what we are providing. The plain truth is that AID would not dare apply its funds to education and agriculture, and then come before Congress and ask for \$65 million or any other sum for program loans to Brazil, or Peru, or Colombia, or Panama, even though they all can be dispensed with at great saving to American taxpayers and at great value to the people of Latin America who would get some changes made if it were not for the support of the status quo which American money assures.

I regret that the Senator from New York did not offer the kind of amendment that would have been truly meaningful in this situation. He could have offered an amendment that would have earmarked out of the committee authorization the education, agriculture, and technical assistance programs he thinks should be included in the program. There is plenty of money there for it. If AID has not given them priority—and they obviously have no priority at all downtown or more money would not be needed for them—then the Senate can give them priority by specifying in the bill that we want these programs to be funded.

Mr. President, that is the answer to the Senator from New York; not to up the money but to say to AID, "You have to use the \$65 million for the very programs that the Senator from New York is urging should be financed."

In my opinion, it is in that direction that Congress will have to move in the future. But we certainly should not move in the direction of adding on more and more funds to a program that is already misdirected in the thrust of its purpose and the places where the bulk of its money is expended.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLINGS in the chair). The Senator has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the moment I shall close, but I want to say we should make clear that we are not going to go beyond the figures in the committee bill. We should say to Latin America, after the thorough work of the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee on a country-to-country basis, that this should be the top figure.

Let the Senator from New York offer another amendment; let him offer an amendment that earmarks \$65 million, within the amount of money in the committee bill, for these educational, agricultural, and housing programs. That is the way to do it rather than to increase the amount of the committee bill.

Furthermore, I want to say, and I say in behalf of the committee, I do not think this is being fair with the Committee on Foreign Relations, when it has undertaken a year's study, hired recognized specialists to make a study of the Alliance for Progress program, to go ahead and appropriate more money than the committee is recommending. We are not asking for less money than was appropriated. We are asking in this bill for \$70 million more. That is not understood on the floor of the Senate, and that is where the ceiling should be placed.

As I advised the chairman of the committee, I introduced the amendment because I wanted the time to make the remarks and to provide the discussion I have given in regard to the facts that confronted us in the full committee and my Subcommittee on Latin America.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 15 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Arkansas has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, to add to the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, he outlined very ably what the proposal of the Senator from New York would do compared with the authorization in the bill.

I call attention to the fact that the amendment of the Senator from New York would actually increase the authorization above the executive branch appropriation request for fiscal year 1968. In other words, he is asking us to authorize more than the executive requested in appropriations. The executive requested \$643 million in appropriations; the existing authorization is \$750 million. The Senator from New York is requesting an authorization of \$650 million, or \$7 million more than the executive branch thought it might get. Mr. President, I wanted to make that statement for the RECORD.

The Senator from Oregon made it clear that the bill now provides \$70 million more than was appropriated last year.

As I have said on other occasions, the approach of the committee was that in view of our great difficulties, internal as well as external, that we would be doing very well to hold to the amount appropriated last year; although in this case, because of special interest in Latin America, we did increase the authorization by \$70 million.

Therefore, the result is that we have increased by 14 percent the overall authorization for the Alliance to a total of \$578 million; and increased by 13 percent, or \$12.3 million, the amount available for grants.

I would say this is one of the exceptions in favor of increases that the committee approved. I believe that is all we reasonably should give. I think that in too many instances, in the case of Latin America, we have allowed our sentiments and natural interest in Latin America to override our judgment.

Mr. President, I wish to read for the RECORD a brief statement about the Alliance for Progress by President Frei, of Chile, who is generally considered to be one of the most progressive leaders of Latin America. The statement appeared in the April issue of Foreign Affairs. The excerpts are as follows:

Many Latin American governments have used the Alliance as a bargaining lever to obtain increases in U.S. aid precisely so as to avoid changing their domestic situation. These governments have committed themselves to internal reforms which later they knowingly allowed either to become a dead letter, or worse, to be completely controlled or used for the benefit of those in power.

Later, in the same article, he wrote:

The problem is not one of financial resources only, though at certain times these have been scant when compared with the legitimate needs of the region. It is essentially a political problem requiring the expression of the will to change, together with the acceptance of the measures needed to bring about this change.

I believe that is a sound statement. The Senator from Oregon has said, other members of the committee have said, that this is a two-way program. I think we are doing all that is justified in view of our own domestic circumstances and in view of the failure of the nations concerned to take necessary steps toward fiscal and social reform within their own countries.

I hope the Senate will not accept the amendment and that it will support the committee.

The committee went into this program at great length. There was long discussion about it and there was strong support for the action taken. I only wish to add further that the illustrative material supplied by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] in the support of his amendment No. 261 is, as the Senator from Oregon has said, inaccurate in that the AID people themselves—in fact, no one can make the assertion as a practical matter, or say with any assurance at all that it bears any relation to what will actually happen, because they do not know. They have not given this information to the committee in this form because they cannot give it. This is merely the expression of the views of the sponsor of the amendment as to what he

would like to see done. I do not think it is accurate to say that it would have been used in this manner. It is customary in AID, whenever any cut is made, to pick out the most popular aspect of the program and say, "This is what is being cut." It is simply the usual way to try to make as strong a case as they can; whereas, they do not know how it would be cut. The projects in many cases have not yet been developed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor for the moment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is one of the few instances that I shall vote against the committee; in committee I did not vote to reduce funds for the Alliance for Progress. I shall vote to restore the full amount for Latin America.

If there is any area in the world which should receive primary consideration by this country, it is not Western Europe, it is not Asia, and it is not Africa; but it is and should be the Latin American part of the Western Hemisphere.

That area has not achieved as much as was anticipated, but in many respects there certainly has been done a great deal to bring about a working, viable situation so far as the Alliance for Progress is concerned. I refer specifically to Mexico and to what it has accomplished, not only in its own behalf, but under the aegis of the Alliance and even in extending the program to other countries, especially Central America.

Thus, I would hope that the Senate would give this particular amendment the most serious consideration. I think of all the amendments which have been offered, or may be offered, that this one—designed to strengthen the Alliance—could well be the most meritorious.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I only wish to say that I agree with much of what the Senator says as to relative importance. But he knows as well as we all do that when it comes to Southeast Asia he knows that as a practical matter we cannot get any cuts on activities in Southeast Asia. Neither he, nor I, can do much about administration requests for that area. The war is already estimated to cost \$30 billion a year.

Now coming to Western Europe, the Senator proposes that we cut down our troops. I have supported that move, as have many other Senators. But what did our efforts run up against? We were met with a very strong movement, led by some of the most distinguished citizens of this country—among them Mr. McCloy—who came down to Washington and talked to us. So the Senator is thwarted in that effort. Thus, as a practical matter—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not thwarted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because the committee is still in existence and will con-

tinue to be during the entire session of this Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It has not taken any action.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It still has time to act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How long has it had? Several months.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The committee has existed for several months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall yield time to the Senator from Montana on my own time.

Yes. It is well to say Latin America is more important and that the cuts should come somewhere else, but as a practical matter we cannot cut it anywhere else. I reiterate we are not cutting the program or even holding it to the level of the program last year. We are actually allowing \$70 million more in spite of the war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Regardless of the war in Southeast Asia, the problems and the population in Latin America are going to continue to increase. What happens next door to us is a great deal more important to this Nation than what happens 8,000 to 10,000 miles away.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is why I think Latin America should be given priority in this bill and at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. But we recognize that there is nothing we can do about Southeast Asia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I realize that. I appreciate the situation in which the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Montana, and other Senators, find themselves, but I also recognize the extreme importance and significance of Latin America as a whole in relation to our future. That is the issue here.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield me 1 minute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from New York, really, has the floor, but I will be glad to yield to the Senator, if that is agreeable to him.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to reply to the majority leader. We are putting in \$70 million more. We are maintaining the program plus \$70 million more. We are waiting for their self-help offers. The fact remains that the Latin American countries have not kept faith yet in coming forth with a self-help program upon which the President's commitments are based. The President's commitments come into force as the Latin American countries come forth with their programs.

I do not think that we should be upping this new amount for which the Senator from New York is asking until we get our reports back.

The majority leader asked us at the beginning of this year to make a surveillance of the expenditure of funds which have been appropriated and authorized. We have kept faith with him in the Latin American Subcommittee. We have entered into contracts with universities and experts and we are getting

their reports. As soon as Congress adjourns, we will start subcommittee hearings in regard to the matter. We are giving enough for now. We will continue with a great program in Latin America which will have a good psychological effect, I think, upon them, in making perfectly clear that they must come forward with their self-help programs in order to get more. I think we have gone as far as we can justify going in light of domestic needs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There may be a difference of viewpoint but there is no difference on the part of any who have spoken as to the primary significance and importance of Latin America itself in this hemisphere.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Much has been made of the 1968 program that it will be \$70 million more than the 1967 program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The authorization is for \$70 million more than the appropriation of last year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. These figures for 1968 of \$578 million in the bill, as it has been submitted—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was \$508 million last year?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The proposal now is to increase the \$70 million with still another \$65 million?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Which is more than the administration itself submitted in its appropriation request—\$7 million more than the administration requested in appropriation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] has the floor, unless the Senator does not wish to continue.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen minutes remain to the Senator from New York.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] such time as he may require, if the Senator from New York does not wish to proceed.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator from Kentucky is going to speak.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. I also join as a cosponsor with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I do this on my own judgment, for all of us have to make our own decisions based upon the evidence and our view of the importance of the foreign assistance program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the speech of President Kennedy on March 13, 1961. President Eisenhower before and President Johnson since have supported

these aims and I believe so do the American people.

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

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY AT A WHITE HOUSE RECEPTION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND FOR THE DIPLOMATIC CORPS OF THE LATIN AMERICAN REPUBLICS, MARCH 13, 1961

It is a great pleasure for Mrs. Kennedy and for me, for the Vice President and Mrs. Johnson, and for the Members of Congress to welcome the Ambassadorial Corps of our Hemisphere, our long time friends, to the White House today. One hundred and thirty-nine years ago this week the United States, stirred by the heroic struggle of its fellow Americans, urged the independence and recognition of the new Latin American Republics. It was then, at the dawn of freedom throughout this hemisphere, that Bolívar spoke of his desire to see the Americas fashioned into the greatest region in the world, "greatest," he said, "not so much by virtue of her area and her wealth, as by her freedom and her glory."

Never in the long history of our hemisphere has this dream been nearer to fulfillment, and never has it been in greater danger.

The genius of our scientists has given us the tools to bring abundance to our land, strength to our industry, and knowledge to our people. For the first time we have the capacity to strike off the remaining bonds of poverty and ignorance—to free our people for the spiritual and intellectual fulfillment which has always been the goal of our civilization.

Yet at this very moment of maximum opportunity, we confront the same forces which have imperiled America throughout its history—the alien forces which once again seek to impose the despotisms of the Old World on the people of the New.

I have asked you to come here today so that I might discuss these challenges and these dangers.

We meet together as firm and ancient friends, united by history and experience and by our determination to advance the values of American civilization. For this New World of ours is not a mere accident of geography. Our continents are bound together by a common history, the endless exploration of new frontiers. Our nations are the product of a common struggle, the revolt from colonial rule. And our people share a common heritage, the quest for the dignity and the freedom of man.

The revolutions which gave us birth ignited, in the words of Thomas Paine, "a spark never to be extinguished." And across vast, turbulent continents these American ideals still stir man's struggle for national independence and individual freedom. But as we welcome the spread of the American revolution to other lands, we must also remember that our own struggle—the revolution which began in Philadelphia in 1776, and in Caracas in 1811—is not yet finished. Our hemisphere's mission is not yet completed. For our unfulfilled task is to demonstrate to the entire world that man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by free men working within a framework of democratic institutions. If we can do this in our own hemisphere, and for our own people, we may yet realize the prophecy of the great Mexican patriot, Benito Juárez, that "democracy is the destiny of future humanity."

As a citizen of the United States let me be the first to admit that we North Americans have not always grasped the significance of this common mission, just as it is also true that many in your own countries have not fully understood the urgency of the need to lift people from poverty and ignorance and despair. But we must turn from these

mistakes—from the failures and the misunderstandings of the past to a future full of peril, but bright with hope.

Throughout Latin America, a continent rich in resources and in the spiritual and cultural achievements of its people, millions of men and women suffer the daily degradations of poverty and hunger. They lack decent shelter or protection from disease. Their children are deprived of the education or the jobs which are the gateway to a better life. And each day the problems grow more urgent. Population growth is outpacing economic growth—low living standards are further endangered—and discontent—the discontent of a people who know that abundance and the tools of progress are at last within their reach—that discontent is growing. In the words of José Figueres, "once dormant peoples are struggling upward toward the sun, toward a better life."

If we are to meet a problem so staggering in its dimensions, our approach must itself be equally bold—an approach consistent with the majestic concept of Operation Pan America. Therefore I have called on all people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress—*Alianza para Progreso*—a vast cooperative effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose, to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work and land, health and schools—*techo, trabajo y tierra, salud y escuela*.

First, I propose that the American Republics begin on a vast new Ten Year Plan for the Americas, a plan to transform the 1960's into a historic decade of democratic progress.

These 10 years will be the years of maximum progress—maximum effort, the years when the greatest obstacles must be overcome, the years when the need for assistance will be the greatest.

And if we are successful, if our effort is bold enough and determined enough, then the close of this decade will mark the beginning of a new era in the American experience. The living standards of every American family will be on the rise, basic education will be available to all, hunger will be a forgotten experience, the need for massive outside help will have passed, most nations will have entered a period of self-sustaining growth, and though there will be still much to do, every American Republic will be the master of its own revolution and its own hope and progress.

Let me stress that only the most determined efforts of the American nations themselves can bring success to this effort. They and they alone, can mobilize their resources, enlist the energies of their people, and modify their social patterns so that all, and not just a privileged few, share in the fruits of growth. If this effort is made, then outside assistance will give vital impetus to progress; without it, no amount of help will advance the welfare of the people.

Thus if the countries of Latin America are ready to do their part, and I am sure they are, then I believe the United States, for its part, should help provide resources of a scope and magnitude sufficient to make this bold development plan a success—just as we helped to provide, against equal odds nearly, the resources adequate to help rebuild the economies of Western Europe. For only an effort of towering dimensions can ensure fulfillment of our plan for a decade of progress.

Secondly, I will shortly request a ministerial meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, a meeting at which we can begin the massive planning effort which will be at the heart of the Alliance for Progress.

For if our Alliance is to succeed, each Latin nation must formulate long-range plans for its own development, plans which establish targets and priorities, ensure monetary stability, establish the machinery for vital social change, stimulate private activity and initiative, and provide for a maximum national ef-

fort. These plans will be the foundation of our development effort, and the basis for the allocation of outside resources.

A greatly strengthened IA-ECOSOC, working with the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Inter-American Development Bank, can assemble the leading economists and experts of the hemisphere to help each country develop its own development plan—and provide a continuing review of economic progress in this hemisphere.

Third, I have this evening signed a request to the Congress for \$500 million as a first step in fulfilling the Act of Bogotá. This is the first large-scale Inter-American effort, instituted by my predecessor President Eisenhower, to attack the social barriers which block economic progress. The money will be used to combat illiteracy, improve the productivity and use of their land, wipe out disease, attack archaic tax and land tenure structures, provide educational opportunities, and offer a broad range of projects designed to make the benefits of increasing abundance available to all. We will begin to commit these funds as soon as they are appropriated.

Fourth, we must support all economic integration which is a genuine step toward larger markets and greater competitive opportunity. The fragmentation of Latin American economies is a serious barrier to industrial growth. Projects such as the Central American common market and free trade areas in South America can help to remove these obstacles.

Fifth, the United States is ready to cooperate in serious, case-by-case examinations of commodity market problems. Frequent violent change in commodity prices seriously injure the economies of many Latin American countries, draining their resources and stultifying their growth. Together we must find practical methods of bringing an end to this pattern.

Sixth, we will immediately step up our Food for Peace emergency program, help establish food reserves in areas of recurrent drought, help provide school lunches for children, and offer feed grains for use in rural development. For hungry men and women cannot wait for economic discussions or diplomatic meetings—their need is urgent—and their hunger rests heavily on the conscience of their fellow men.

Seventh, all the people of the hemisphere must be allowed to share in the expanding wonders of science—wonders which have captured man's imagination, challenged the powers of his mind, and given him the tools for rapid progress. I invite Latin American scientists to work with us in new projects in fields such as medicine and agriculture, physics, and astronomy, and desalinization, to help plan for regional research laboratories in these and other fields, and to strengthen cooperation between American universities and laboratories.

We also intend to expand our science teacher training programs to include Latin American instructors, to assist in establishing such programs in other American countries, and translate and make available revolutionary new teaching materials in physics, chemistry, biology, and mathematics, so that the young of all nations may contribute their skills to the advance of science.

Eighth, we must rapidly expand the training of those needed to man the economies of rapidly developing countries. This means expanded technical training programs, for which the Peace Corps, for example, will be available when needed. It also means assistance to Latin American universities, graduate schools, and research institutes.

We welcome proposals in Central America for intimate cooperation in higher education—cooperation which can achieve a regional effort of increased effectiveness and excellence. We are ready to help fill the gap in trained manpower, realizing that our ulti-

mate goal must be a basic education for all who wish to learn.

Ninth, we reaffirm our pledge to come to the defense of any American nation whose independence is endangered. As its confidence in the collective security system of the OAS spreads, it will be possible to devote the constructive use a major share of those resources now spent on the instruments of war. Even now, as the government of Chile has said, the time has come to take the first toward sensible limitations of arms. And the new generation of military leaders has shown an increasing awareness that armies cannot only defend their countries—they can, as we have learned through our own Corps of Engineers, they can help to build them.

Tenth, we invite our friends in Latin America to contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States. We need teachers of your literature and history and tradition, opportunities for our young people to study in your universities, access to your music, your art, and the thought of your great philosophers. For we know we have much to learn.

In this way you can help bring a fuller spiritual and intellectual life to the people of the United States—and contribute to understanding and mutual respect among the nations of the hemisphere.

With steps such as these, we propose to complete the revolution of the Americas, to build a hemisphere where all men can hope for a suitable standard of living, and all can live out their lives in dignity and in freedom.

To achieve this goal political freedom must accompany material progress. Our Alliance for Progress is an Alliance of free governments, and it must work to eliminate tyranny from a hemisphere in which it has no rightful place. Therefore let us express our special friendship to the people of Cuba and the Dominican Republic—and the hope they will soon rejoin the society of free men, uniting with us in common effort.

This political freedom must be accompanied by social change. For unless necessary social reforms, including land and tax reform, are freely made—unless we broaden the opportunity for all of our people—unless the great mass of Americans share in increasing prosperity—then our alliance, our revolution, our dream, and our freedom will fail. But we call for social change by free men—change in the spirit of Washington and Jefferson, of Bolivar and San Martin—not change which seeks to impose on men tyrannies which we cast out a century and a half ago. Our motto is what it has always been—progress, yes, tyranny no—*progreso si, tirania no!*

But our greatest challenge comes from within—the task of creating an American civilization where spiritual and cultural values are strengthened by an ever-broadening base of material advance—where, within the rich diversity of its own traditions, each nation is free to follow its own path towards progress.

The completion of our task will, of course, require the efforts of all governments of our hemisphere. But the efforts of governments alone will never be enough. In the end, the people must choose and the people must help themselves.

And so I say to the men and women of the Americas—to the *campesino* in the fields, to the *obrero* in the cities, to the *estudiante* in the schools—prepare your mind and heart for the task ahead—call forth your strength and let each devote his energies to the betterment of all, so that your children and our children in this hemisphere can find an ever richer and a freer life.

Let us once again transform the American continent into a vast crucible of revolutionary ideas and efforts—a tribute to the power of the creative energies of free men and women—an example to all the world that liberty and progress walk hand in hand. Let us once again awaken our American revolu-

tion until it guides the struggle of people everywhere—not with an imperialism of force or fear—but the rule of courage and freedom and hope for the future of man.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it is my view, that the reduction in authorization by the Foreign Relations Committee was too severe in the case of the Alliance for Progress. I opposed the reduction in the committee, and I oppose it now. It is difficult to specify exactly that a reduction is too large or too small, or that none should have been made, unless such a large sum is involved that commonsense provide an answer. But I will answer the argument supporting the reduction.

The administration requested a \$750 million authorization for fiscal year 1968, and it was authorized by the Congress last year. But after doing so last year, the committee has authorized this year \$578 million, a reduction of \$182 million, reversing its position.

The amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] would increase the authorization from \$578 million to \$650 million, an increase of \$72 million, and the approximate amount requested for appropriations. It is not a large increase for the Alliance for Progress.

There are special circumstances related to our assistance program for the Alliance for Progress which are unique.

I recognize very well that the claims of the war in Vietnam press down on all of us. They must be met as long as Americans fight. The claims on our domestic economy are of great concern to us. They too must be met. But we must remember also that an assistance to Latin America is in our interest, is essential to our security, and that it is a constructive arm of our foreign policy, and a peaceful arm of foreign policy.

While I do not think it is justified, claims are made around the world that our attention is entirely engrossed in war. I think it unfortunate if the Congress by reducing radically its assistance programs give support to the claim of belief that we are not interested or interested as much in the constructive, peaceful policies which we have followed so long.

I would like to point out other ways indicating that our relationship to Latin America is unique and distinct from other areas.

The history of the evolution of the Alliance for Progress itself, while I do not have time to trace it, points out its intended permanency and cooperation between the United States and Latin America. I believe that a former President of Brazil, as I have read proposed in a Pan America Association in 1960, the Act of Bogotá, was signed by the United States and the Latin American States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. May I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Congress enacted, in 1960, the Latin American Development Act supporting the aims and programs which the present bill supports but which the committee has cut.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator mentioned the President of Brazil. Who was it?

Mr. COOPER. First. Then it was a part of our basic—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who was it?

Mr. COOPER. Kubitschek.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What has happened to him?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He has had all his political rights removed; has he not?

Mr. COOPER. I believe so, but I am not speaking of one man. I am speaking of a concept, of the position of our country, under President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson, a position which fostered, and joined in the establishment of the Alliance for Progress. The Congress encouraged it by its act in 1960, the formation of the Alliance. We have an important relationship with Latin America which the Congress and the Executive should not back away from.

It is important to our security. We would hope the social and economic conditions of those countries would improve so that they would become economically viable, that they would become more secure, and that the living and social condition of their people would improve.

Advances have been made in political, economic and social conditions. This cannot be challenged. All I say is that we should continue to support the Alliance as generously as we can. I do not think the request of the amendment of the Senator from New York is unreasonable. It is in the spirit and challenge of the late President Kennedy for the future of the Alliance. I give it my support, and I very much hope the Senate will support the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I agreed to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

I yield 2 minutes to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I support the amendment of my colleague from New York for reasons which are rather specially related to work which I have been doing for a very long time now. Hence I took the liberty of asking my colleague to yield some of his precious time.

What disturbs me deeply about this cut is that it is a cut in authorization. This is not an appropriation bill. Many Members present are members of the Appropriations Committee, including the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. The appropriation process will take care of many of the arguments being made here. We are pretty sophisticated about what we appropriate. But the authorization will be looked upon in Latin America as a vote of confidence or no confidence in the future of the Alliance for Progress. This is what disturbs me. We are not saving money by cutting the authorization, but we are jeopardizing

the relationships of the United States with the Presidents of the other Latin American Republics.

The most important thing we should think about, far transcending anything involved in the authorization, is implementing the common market agreed to at Punta del Este. That is the biggest piece of self-help they can engage in.

Knowing Latin America as I do—and I respectfully submit I have worked for years with friends in Latin America in trying to get a common market to help establish ADELA, and in other areas—I know that such a cut as this will have a deleterious and discouraging effect in the very areas where I believe we should encourage them.

The gross national product of the Latin American countries has gone up very markedly. They have done well with the Alliance for Progress effort, and all the countries other than Brazil and Argentina have met the goals, or almost met them, which were set 5 or 6 years ago. They have engaged in self-help.

Conditions in Latin America have changed materially, as evidenced by the testimony of the speeches in previous years on the floor with respect to interest rates and other deficiencies and excesses, but have not been heard this year.

The fundamental point is that the big target now is the common market. It is indispensable to our country and the future and security of the whole Western Hemisphere.

The Latin Americans complain that we have our eye on Europe and on Asia, and the personal sensibilities in Latin America are all important.

So, to my mind, the decisive argument for this amendment is that, the Latin Americans having taken us at our word as to what they consider the authorization to be, we must keep our word, knowing that, in terms of the purse, that will be taken care of in the appropriation process.

For that reason, I was honored to join my colleague [Mr. KENNEDY].

I think I know the implications in Latin America of what we do. In Latin America the personal relationship is all important. The knowledge that they can rely on one and take his word and that he is consistent in his policy is all important. We are not dealing with great bodies of public opinion there, or great bodies of individuals. We are dealing with presidents. They have centered around them the whole following and the conviction of their countries. It is critically important that we make them feel that we honor them. So close to the time when we have gotten a commitment from them with respect to the common market, it would do great damage, it would dent our relationships, if we regressed on the authorization figure that we had set last year, and to which they looked to us as the extent of the U.S. commitment. I think that is the decisive point—

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator used the word "commitment." Do we have a commitment from our Government? Who entered into the commitment?

Mr. JAVITS. We have a commitment, in my judgment, to allow to be authorized what we said heretofore would be authorized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How did such a commitment come into being?

Mr. JAVITS. We authorized it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who is "we"?

Mr. JAVITS. Congress. Last year, the Alliance was authorized for \$697 million and at \$750 million for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. They had a right, when they read it, to rely on it. We can cut the appropriation three-quarters and it would mean nothing at all, in terms of Latin America, as would cutting the authorization.

That is all I am really arguing. That is the temper of Latin America, and those of us who worked there very ardently—at least I feel that way—understand that, and that is why I think the authorization request is critically important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from New York that the money is in the bill. The money is there to do the very things he is talking about. But what the Senator is seeking to do is add some more money, so that the AID people can do some things the Comptroller General's report says ought to be stopped. I shall enlarge later upon the most recent report from the GAO on the Alliance for Progress, trying to call attention to the inefficiency of the AID people in handling the Alliance for Progress program.

That is why I say we should not give them more money until we clean up the Alliance for Progress program and the AID administration of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I think I yield to no one in this body in my long-time demonstrated interest and sympathy for Latin America. I believe my connection with it antedates that of any other Member of this body. Forty-five years ago I went to Mexico as a journalist representing Collier's and other publications to report on the revolution. My writings contributed to change the then prevailing attitude of hostility toward that really important, useful revolution, as a result of which Mexico has become the outstanding example of self-help and progress among the Latin-American countries.

In 1933 I was the adviser to the U.S. delegation at the Seventh Inter-American Conference where we launched Roosevelt's good-neighbor policy.

Two years ago, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Committee on Government Operations, I made a study of the AID program in five Latin American countries. I regret what I found and what I reported on the best of those countries, Chile is found in a Senate document, consisting of 229 pages, entitled "U.S. Foreign Aid in Action, a Case Study."

We selected Chile because, of all the Latin American countries, it was the one that had the most favorable pre-

disposition toward success. It is a country that is ethnically homogeneous; it is a country that is more democratic than others; it was free from oppression and the curse of dictatorship which bedevils so many other countries; it had an enlightened President and an enlightened democratic legislature.

Yet the record shows that a large part of the AID money sent there was wasted; and the conclusion is inevitable that less money would do a far better job for the Alliance for Progress than the amount we are proposing to pour in. It has already been pointed out that we are giving more money, through this bill, than the executive has asked for.

There is another aspect, which I shall not discuss in detail. The distinguished chairman of the committee has read some extracts from an article by Eduardo Frei Montalva, the President of Chile, published last April in Foreign Affairs, in which he points out that the Alliance for Progress is not achieving its objectives, that after 5 years land reform has barely been started, that taxation is lacking, and that the program is bogging down because of the way our funds are being misused. I recommend a reading of President Frei's article which coming from an outstanding Latin American merits our attention.

There is another aspect. When the senior Senator from New York tells about the deleterious effects on Latin America if we fail to add these additional \$70 millions, I would like to call attention to the deleterious effect upon the American people of being asked to cut and cut and cut on our domestic programs, our aid to education, our aid to health, our slum clearance and resource development, our pollution abatement, our war on poverty, our war on crime, housing, slum clearance, highway construction, flood control, all the fine programs so brilliantly enacted in the 89th Congress and thereby promised to the American people. Those needed and overdue domestic projects are going down the drain at the same time we are being asked to give more money to Latin America, which has done little to cooperate with this Alianza program and is doing almost nothing toward self-help. I certainly object with the President asking for a 10-percent surtax, for us to go ahead and increase expenditures abroad. I think it is positively shocking. I do not think the American people will appreciate that at all. I think it will have a far more deleterious effect upon the American people if these amendments are agreed to than if they are voted down, as the pending amendment should be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I spoke a few moments ago about the latest critical report of the GAO in regard to the administration of foreign aid. As the Senate knows, the stack of reports from the GAO criticizing the administration of foreign aid by AID is very high. The latest one, which I wish to refer to, follows.

The report by the GAO shows that

AID and the Alliance made little, or insufficient effort to find other sources of loan money for borrowing nations, although AID is supposed to be the loan agency of last resort. I quote from the report:

Our examination of 35 loans totaling about \$347 million made by AID to 15 Latin American countries during calendar years 1963 through 1965 showed that, on the majority of these loans, the records in regard to AID's determinations did not demonstrate that AID had taken into consideration the borrowers' ability to obtain financing from other free world sources prior to the authorization of these loans by AID.

We found that, with the exception of formal solicitation of the Eximbank's interest in 32 of the 35 loans, there was no formal AID or loan recipients to solicit other free world sources of finance, including private sources in the United States. Because of the lack of documentation, we were unable to determine whether informal solicitations were made. . . .

Moreover, if AID loans are made when financing from other free world sources can be obtained, loan funds may not be available to help other applicants who are solely dependent on AID for financial assistance, or, if such funds are not needed elsewhere, AID's future appropriations can be reduced.

On the basis of the results of our review, we concluded that (1) AID in Washington did not adequately document any efforts made to obtain financing from these sources, (2) AID Missions did not take reasonable actions to ensure that adequate efforts were made by loan recipients to obtain financing from other free world sources, (3) AID Missions did not document any efforts made to obtain financing from other free world sources, and (4) procedure and instructions issued by AID for determining financing available from other free world sources were inadequate and should be clarified and strengthened.

This is the type of report we get from the Comptroller General in regard to the inefficiency and maladministration of AID time and time again, as a result of the investigations that the Comptroller General makes around the world.

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

Mr. MORSE. I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Oregon 1 additional minute.

Mr. MORSE. The report goes on to say that although U.S. officials testify to congressional committees that it is their policy to make loans only as a lender-of-last-resort, the Government Accounting Office found the policy was only haphazard. Its documentation refers to what it calls AID-initiated loans, for which no free world alternative sources were sought at all.

I conclude my argument by saying we cannot, in my opinion, justify increasing these amounts for foreign aid proposed in this amendment and others yet to be offered, and then say to the American taxpayers, "We are going to raise your taxes by a 10-percent surtax increase." The American taxpayers are entitled to be protected here on the floor of the Senate this afternoon from amendments which cannot be justified in the interests of the financial rights of the American taxpayers.

We are giving to Latin America, in the committee bill, \$70 million more than was

appropriated last year. I say that is exceedingly generous, and we have a right to say to our Latin American friends, "Come on, now, and keep the commitment that is involved on your part, if we are going to go ahead with the programs that we are willing to help you with, that the President talked about at Punta del Este."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall only take a moment. I simply wish to call attention to one or two facts.

Here we are giving \$70 million more, by this bill, than they had in appropriations last year. Do not forget, furthermore, that we recently reported from that committee a bill carrying \$900 million for Latin America, for the Inter-American Bank. That is in addition to what is in this bill. One of the reasons I think we felt justified, among other reasons which the Senator from Oregon mentioned about our own problems, is the fact that we are giving the Inter-American Bank \$900 million. We have authorized it; that is, I am assuming that Congress will approve it, to help Latin America. I think that is a preferable way.

I think it is better administered in many respects. It establishes programs and procedures in which they participate over a longer period. I think it is a sounder way in which to do it. It has \$3 million for 3 years.

That bill has been reported, and the bill will be taken up, I understand, after the pending bill has been disposed of. However, I cannot understand why we feel that we must continue this program at the existing level in view of all these other circumstances the Senator from Oregon has mentioned—the failure in Vietnam, the reluctance of the administration to trim our costs in Europe because they insist on keeping the troops there, and our domestic problems in Detroit and elsewhere.

I think that the committee bill is very sound, and it is all that I can support.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the argument made by the Senator from New York is that certain programs will have to be sacrificed unless this amount is allowed. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not accurate to say certain programs—certainly not the ones he mentioned. Those are the most popular ones.

It is the custom of the AID people to say that the most popular programs will be the ones to be cut. There is nothing in the present setup to assure any such cuts. They have plenty of money contained in the bill as reported with which to carry out those particular programs.

The AID people have picked out the most popular programs and say: "This is what we will sacrifice."

Mr. PASTORE. Within the discretion of the AID agency, they can carry out those programs if they desire to do so with the available money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly correct.

Mr. PASTORE. And they can sacrifice others.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I understand that from the amount of money to be provided for the Alliance for Progress program, 41 percent will be expended in the field of agriculture.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. These are illustrative programs. The programs do not have to be sacrificed. They can vary the amount appropriated in any way they want.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. But as submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations, there is 41 percent in the field of agriculture, 18 percent in the field of education, and 4 percent in the field of health. Therefore, nearly two-thirds of all of the money that is going into the Alliance for Progress program would be in the fields of agriculture, education, and health. The rest of it would consist of 17 percent for industry and direct assistance to private enterprise, 10 percent for transportation and power, 3 percent for labor, public administration, and public safety, 3 percent for community development and housing, and 3 percent for general programs.

These are all important areas. I do not know where AID will get the money for the expanded programs discussed at Punta del Este if we do not adopt the amendment I have proposed. Indeed, AID has informed me that this amendment is crucial because there is no other source from which the money for expanded educational and agricultural efforts can be obtained.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a broad illustration as to the areas that we think are important. The actual program is still at their complete disposal.

Many of the so-called projects have not been developed at all. This is something that they dream up. This kind of overall program has been emphasized, but after this money is appropriated, they have discretion to put it where they like.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate voting against the amendment, and my reasons for doing so are clearly set forth in the 1966 report of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I read what the committee members said with respect to the 1966 foreign aid program:

Foreign aid should not remain sacrosanct when it comes to apportioning the war's financial cost among Federal activities. Belt tightening because of the war must not be restricted to domestic programs, but should include our foreign aid programs as well. American citizens should not be called upon to accept reductions in programs which affect their daily lives, see their taxes increase, war cost spiral while the foreign aid program remains unaffected.

How can we vote to reduce domestic services and increase foreign services? How can we do that and, in addition, vote for new taxes?

There must be a belt tightening. Shall we do this only at home, or shall we also

do it with respect to the foreign aid program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. I will end with one comment that I think is accurate with regard to the Senator from New York.

The Senator talks about these precise divisions and leaves the impression that these are projects that form a very large part of this program and reflect in the balance-of-payments problem. In other words, if they buy too many Cadillacs, they must pay for them. So, this money goes into what is called programing. It is budget support in one sense, but it is for the purpose of balancing the budget. A great deal of it is not in any project that is mentioned here at all.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, let me say in answer to what has been said that I believe the Alliance funds have on the whole been utilized well in the past. I think most programs under the Alliance have been well worthwhile.

I listened to the Senator from Oregon state that there have not been any self-help programs established in Latin America.

I have seen, as I am sure that the Senator from Oregon has seen, self-help programs there. After the Punta del Este Conference this year, Chile established a major self-help program in the field of land reform.

The money that we would make available under my amendment would be most useful and would be put to worthwhile uses.

The Senator from Arkansas knows, when we talk about the fields of education, agriculture, and health, the difference that these funds would make in the lives of many thousands of children. This money would make a great difference in the lives of many tens of thousands of children in the Latin American countries.

For that reason, if for no other reason, such an expenditure would be worth while. In addition, it would be in our own self-interest to do it.

We in the United States cannot survive on our island of affluence surrounded by a sea of degradation and poverty, an ocean of people who feel that there is no hope or future in their lives.

We have an opportunity to do something now which would be effective. What we do now can make a major difference a decade or two decades from now. What we do now can make a major difference in what the world will look like 10 or 20 years from now.

As the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations knows, we went through a crisis in October of 1962. We were prepared at that period to call for an invasion of Cuba because the Communists had placed missiles in Cuba.

As that episode indicates, there is far too great a potential for political insta-

bility in Latin America. Almost all of the Latin countries have the potential of becoming so unstable that they would accept a Communist government.

Communist China has the atomic and hydrogen bombs. She may decide 10 years from now to put missiles in Latin America.

It would be of tremendous help if we could send enough aid into those countries to be able to prevent that kind of a situation from arising. I think that we would be terribly shortsighted if we did not do this.

The people in those countries should realize that we are their friends and are willing to make sacrifices to enable them to have an education. They should be able to count on us for the assistance that will lead them toward the ability to make a decent living for themselves and their families.

I think that is what this legislation is about. That is why it is so important—not just from a humanitarian point of view, but from the point of view of the future of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from New York that when he speaks about self-help the fact is that Latin American country after Latin American country has not come forward with a self-help program.

Second, if the Senator seeks to give assistance in the field of education, health, agriculture, and housing, it can be done under the amount of money contained in the bill, which is, as the chairman has said, \$70 million above last year's appropriation.

I want to give some suggestions as to how to get the money. If the Senator has any doubts as to the illustrative figures that have been used, the AID people have never testified that these were the figures they were going to put into housing, agriculture, and education. They can do it under the figures contained in this bill. They can stop budget support. They can cut back on military support. They can stop, in my judgment, in a number of other ways that the Senator talks about, the waste that the Government Accounting Office has found they are guilty of in the expenditure of the funds they are getting.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] for this magnificent statement and for his continuing and inspired leadership in this field.

At the summit meeting at Punta del Este last April, the Chiefs of State of this hemisphere reaffirmed their support for the objectives of the Charter of Punta del Este which established the Alliance for Progress in 1961.

They agreed on the necessity of closer multilateral economic cooperation among the nations of the hemisphere.

They also agreed that in order to obtain the objectives of the Alliance—for

the political, economic, and social development of the hemisphere—it was absolutely necessary to greatly accelerate all of our efforts to develop the vital agriculture and education sectors.

For their part the Latin American nations are increasing their own self-help measures for the development of agriculture and education. This is absolutely necessary to raise the standards of living for all of their people.

During the past 6 years the institutional capabilities of the multilateral assistance measures of the Alliance for Progress have gathered momentum and have enabled the countries of the hemisphere to accelerate efforts for their own development. In order to carry on the momentum that has been established during the first 6 years of the Alliance, the Presidents of the hemisphere asked for help. President Johnson agreed to return from the summit meeting at Punta del Este and request of the Congress an additional \$100 million to support the new accelerated programs for the development of agriculture and education.

The \$100 million fits well within the \$750 million which we in the Congress authorized last year for the Alliance for Progress.

Senator KENNEDY's amendment would restore the \$65 million which was cut from the President's fiscal 1968 appropriations request for the U.S. contribution to the Alliance for Progress. Mr. President, I support Senator KENNEDY's amendment because I believe with him that we must continue to support the programs of the Alliance for Progress to support the objectives of the Alliance which were multilaterally agreed to at Punta del Este in 1961.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]. If present and voting, the Senator from

New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTAÑA] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 225 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Anderson	Javits	Moss
Bayh	Kennedy, Mass.	Muskie
Brewster	Kennedy, N.Y.	Nelson
Case	Kuchel	Pearson
Clark	Long, Mo.	Pell
Cooper	Magnuson	Percy
Griffin	Mansfield	Randolph
Harris	McCarthy	Ribicoff
Hart	McGovern	Scott
Hartke	McIntyre	Sparkman
Hayden	Metcalf	Tydings
Inouye	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Jackson	Morton	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Ervin	Monroney
Baker	Fannin	Morse
Bartlett	Fong	Mundt
Bennett	Fulbright	Murphy
Bible	Gore	Pastore
Boggs	Gruening	Proxmire
Burdick	Hansen	Smith
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Spong
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Tennis
Cannon	Holland	Symington
Carlson	Hollings	Talmadge
Church	Hruska	Thurmond
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Tower
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Lausche	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Long, La.	Young, Ohio
Eastland	McClellan	
Ellender	Miller	

NOT VOTING—9

Allott	Hatfield	Russell
Brooke	McGee	Smathers
Dodd	Montoya	Yarborough

So the amendment of Mr. KENNEDY of New York was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 275

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 275 and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 40, amend line 22 to read as follows: "amended (1) by striking out '1967' and substituting '1968' and (2) by striking out '\$210,000,000' and substituting '\$200,000,000'."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate

will please be in order. The attachés will please find seats in the Chamber and be seated.

How much time does the Senator from Oregon yield unto himself?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that I do not intend to use all of the 30 minutes of time that is allowed with respect to this amendment, as far as my statement is concerned. I have already covered the arguments pertaining to this amendment in connection with preceding speeches I have made on other amendments. I do not believe in redundancy. I shall save the time of the Senate.

Mr. President, all this amendment does is to reduce the figure in the committee bill from \$210 to \$200 million, which may seem not to be very important but reduces the amount to the appropriation for this year.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we still cannot hear the Senator, and the conversation is not among the attachés.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall repeat: All the amendment would do would be to reduce the amount for technical assistance from \$210 million, which is the figure in the bill, to \$200 million.

It may be said that that is not a great deal of money but it reduces the figure to the amount of the appropriation for this year.

As I have said earlier yesterday and today in my discussion of other amendments, I do not think that we can justify going over the appropriation for this year. We guarantee to them, as far as the Senate is concerned, that we will allow them the same amount of money as we appropriated last year, as far as the appropriation is concerned.

Mr. President, I have long been a supporter of technical assistance in the Senate. I do not yield to anyone in support of the Alliance for Progress program. It came out of my committee, in the first place. The then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, and the senior Senator from Oregon made the motion that provided for the studies to spend \$150,000 that the Senate made available to my subcommittee for an examination of the Latin American situation. We entered into contracts with universities across this country and with recognized authorities on Latin America to make these studies for us.

They were to find the facts as to what the situation was in Latin America, vis-a-vis the U.S. image, what we could do and should do to be of help to improve that image, and to meet some of the serious situations in Latin America. They were to give us facts and their recommendations.

I stood shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Massachusetts, who was a member of my subcommittee, and other members of my subcommittee in the consummation of those studies. He took the recommendations to the White House with him, and as he said so many times,

out of the recommendations of those studies came his announcement of one of the many great acts of statesmanship of President Kennedy, and I consider this to be one of the greatest.

Mr. President, that is where the Alliance for Progress program came from.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a clarification?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not square the amendment which I understand is before the Senate with the bill. I cannot find it. Do we now have before us the Senator's amendment No. 275?

Mr. MORSE. Amendment No. 275.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot find the application of that language in line 22 on page 40.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be frank with the Senator. The amendment was prepared by the professional staff of the committee. I assume the citation is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is no amount in the bill, and the date which appears in the amendment of the Senator is the same as the date that is already in the bill. That is what causes the confusion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under those circumstances, I temporarily withdraw the amendment and offer another amendment until we can have the clarification by the staff.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator withdraw his amendment?

Mr. MORSE. I withdraw the amendment temporarily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would like to substitute for this amendment my amendment in regard to the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—I have a very short talk, and since I am into it now, I should like to proceed with it—that I may be allowed to proceed briefly outside the pending legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

L. B. J.: A BOLD AND INNOVATIVE HOUSING PRESIDENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this morning the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Robert Weaver, announced the start of an immediate test program to involve further the genius of

private enterprise in the field of public housing. This new program, a bold evolution of the 18-month-old "Turnkey" public housing experiment, was recommended by the blue-ribbon Kaiser committee.

The committee, headed by Edgar F. Kaiser, president of Kaiser Industries, Inc., and consisting of such distinguished Americans as George Meany and Whitney Young, and investment bankers, Gaylord A. Freeman and John A. McCone, is but one of the many task forces of the Nation's best and most practiced minds the President has commissioned to study urban housing. And its recommendation is but one in a series of proposals that promise to revitalize the American city.

In 1965, an outstanding group of Americans answered the President's call—and after exhaustive study, devised what is now known as the rent supplement program, an ingenious plan to provide decent housing for the poor through the use of private industry and private capital. That task force included our present Under Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Robert C. Wood, and mutual savings banker, Saul Klamman.

A year later—in 1966—another distinguished group of Americans—including Kermit Gordon, Charles Haar, Robert Wood, and Ben Heineman—formulated the model cities program, an imaginative and massive commitment by the Federal Government to the problems of our cities.

Now we are moving ahead with a new approach to meet the housing needs of our low-income families.

As I am sure my colleagues know, the Johnson administration inaugurated less than 18 months ago a new concept in the field of public housing. This was Project Turnkey. The idea was to cut the confusion, the time lag, and the redtape in planning and building public housing projects by encouraging private industry to use their own vast experience to devise and develop their own projects for local public housing authorities—with a minimum of interference. What we have neglected for half a century cannot be made right in a year or even a decade.

But I am pleased to see these new developments designed to come to grips squarely and wisely with the problems of urban America, and I congratulate the President and all who had a part in them.

In summary:

This will not require any new laws. We can improve the machinery we have.

Private builders will build these projects.

Private firms will operate and manage the projects.

Because the costs will be less, the rents will be lower—perhaps by as much as \$15 a month.

The financing method—bonds issued by local authorities—will be attractive because they will be interest free and backed by the Government.

This concept is still in its infancy, but there is ample evidence—right here in the District of Columbia, for example—to show that it is working, and

working well. It is working in reduced costs, and it is working in reduced delays in providing low-cost housing where we need it and when we need it.

Today, the President has added a new dimension to this program. Under the present "Turnkey" concept, the private builder completes his project under the terms of his fixed-price contract and then turns it over to the local housing authority. The Kaiser committee has recommended that we go a step farther; that we keep private industry involved by letting private management firms operate the projects after they are completed.

President Johnson has accepted this recommendation and has directed Secretary Weaver to begin an immediate test program to determine whether this plan will provide one of the needed answers in this critical area.

Let me emphasize: This is a test program—an answer-seeking program. But it does offer promise of cleaning the cobwebs out of the old public housing program; of providing the first major overhaul of public housing since the New Deal.

Even if it is successful, it will not be an end-all in itself. But we have learned that there is no easy answer to revitalizing urban America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum written for the President on August 16, 1967, by Edgar F. Kaiser, on the President's Committee on Urban Housing, relating to this program.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE

ON URBAN HOUSING,

Washington, D.C., August 16, 1967.

Memorandum for the President.

From: Edgar F. Kaiser.

At the outset, you charged our Committee to study programs that would stimulate private enterprise to building and manage low-income housing, and reduce the cost and time required to replace substandard units. In the course of our work and, at your request, we have reviewed a proposal of Secretary Weaver's and we have concluded that it deserves prompt attention.

This new program is a variation of the "Turnkey" public housing program now authorized. It will not require new legislation.

The program would work as follows:

1. A private developer would offer to build and sell to a local public housing authority a housing development at a fixed price.
2. The local public housing authority would review and approve the site and the plans, and negotiate a purchase price after obtaining two appraisals.
3. The local housing authority would negotiate a management contract with private management—either the private developer or some other entity. This is the element which is different from the present "Turnkey" approach.
4. The developer would construct the housing project.
5. The local housing authority would issue tax exempt Federally-backed local housing authority bonds to finance the capital cost of the project. These bonds would be sold on the private market, which finds them attractive because of the tax-exempt feature and the federal backing.
6. HUD would issue an annual contribution contract to cover the difference between

(a) the annual cost to amortize the investment and operate the project and (b) tenant rentals.

Based upon our preliminary review, it appears that, while this proposal is not the whole answer, it does have promise and it is consistent with your objectives of involving private enterprise more deeply in housing for low and moderate-income families.

If there is a significant recognition of the profit element in both construction and management, we believe private enterprise could be interested in developing housing packages for sale to local authorities. This could substantially increase the stock of low-income housing. Further, private construction on a "Turnkey" basis would be likely to reduce costs below those usually achieved by the process of preparing detailed plans for public bidding.

The private management concept could encourage the development of a management industry skilled in handling the special problems of operating low-income housing. Costs and some of the prejudice against public housing might be reduced as professional management techniques are brought to bear on particular projects. Perhaps equally as important, the introduction of competing private management techniques might encourage some flexibility in the traditional management approach of the local public housing authorities. This, together with a program to encourage the sell-off of public housing projects to co-ops and to private families, could materially improve conditions in many of the public housing projects.

Our Committee believes this new program merits an immediate pilot effort. We recommend that HUD proceed under its existing authority and within its existing unit authorizations to initiate a pilot program based on the new approach. This would provide valuable specific content to the proposal and demonstrate the feasibility of its new feature—the negotiation of workable management contracts with responsible private entities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I think the record will show that President Johnson has devoted more time and attention to the problem of our cities than any other President in our history.

But the problem is so enormous, the needs so great, that there is simply no shortcut to progress. We are today trying to rebuild cities that have been neglected for more than 100 years.

We are trying to build not only new housing, but pleasant housing; not only new communities, but efficient and attractive communities; not only new recreational areas, but functional and inspiring recreational areas.

This is an awesome task. And it is clear that if we are to succeed in rebuilding urban America to serve the needs of the people, we must count upon the efforts of private industry.

That is why I am so enthusiastic about the Turnkey project announced today by President Johnson.

This experimental program will—hopefully—tell us a great deal about the effectiveness of private industry in the public housing field. As we know, this program will allow a private developer to plan, build, and administer a public housing project.

We need more public housing—and we need it fast. But if these public housing projects are to really do the job, they must be built to last. And by that I mean to be efficient to people's needs a decade

from now. And they must be well planned, effectively managed, and well run.

I commend the President for inaugurating this project. All of us in Congress appreciate the experimental nature of Turnkey, and hope to learn a great deal about the best utilization of private industry in similar projects in the future.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S TURNKEY PROGRAM—A BOLD AND EXCITING VENTURE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I want to join with the distinguished Senator from Alabama in expressing my enthusiastic support for the President's directive today to begin an experimental Turnkey public housing program.

I, too, believe that this action today demonstrates President Johnson's deep commitment to rebuild urban America—a commitment that began from the moment he assumed the Presidency.

The President and the Congress have begun a wide range of programs to meet head on the persistent and serious problems of city life in this country. And we have quickly discovered that there are no overnight miracles to progress in this field.

Slums have existed in our cities since the early 1800's. In fact, there are many buildings in our urban ghettos that have continually housed generations of Americans for more than 100 years.

So we know that the task before us is immense.

But we also know that there are many roads to heaven, many new techniques that must be tried, many new starts made to demonstrate what will and will not work.

I believe that private industry has a vital role to play in the restoration of urban America. All of us know that local public housing authorities leave much to be desired in creating bold and workable solutions.

The public housing people seldom possess the kind of talent and energy necessary for the kind of projects we all want for the urban poor. And it is small wonder that they function at all—faced as they are with mountains of red tape and constant delays.

A public housing authority must first find the land on which to build, negotiate a purchase price, buy the land, get the architect, plan the project, hire the contractors, supervise the building, and rent and maintain the completed structures.

There is no question in my mind but that private industry—operating through profit incentive—can function more efficiently and effectively from start to finish.

The Turnkey program will allow private builders to complete their project under the terms of their contract and continue to run it after completion.

We all hope that the results of this experiment will prove the feasibility of expanding such private enterprise projects throughout urban communities. And I think there is reason to be hopeful.

The genius of American industry is more than equal to this enormous task. Certainly government—Federal, State, and local—cannot do the job alone. If we are to succeed in rebuilding our cities

to meet the needs of modern life then we must count upon the efforts of all sectors of society, public and private.

I commend President Johnson for embarking on this bold and imaginative venture. I believe all of my colleagues will join with me in hoping that this new Turnkey program provides new answers and insight into one of the great problems confronting America in the 1960's—the problem of city living.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1872) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 272

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 272 and ask that it is stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to S. 1872, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes: On page 39, line 22, strike out "\$600,000,000" and substitute "\$500,000,000".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to explain to the Senate what this amendment would do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. MORSE. Ten minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this amendment reduces the authorization for the Development Loan Fund by \$100 million, from the committee figure of \$600 million to \$500 million.

It does not, however, represent a reduction in the present program, because appropriations for fiscal 1967 were \$500 million; the amendment continues the program at its current rate.

Why, indeed, should the United States undertake now to do for foreign countries needing development what we are not willing or able to do for American States and cities needing development; namely, to increase their Federal financing?

I call attention to the language in the committee report, which quotes our report on the supplemental foreign aid authorization for fiscal year 1966. At that time the committee said:

Foreign aid should not remain sacrosanct when it comes to apportioning the war's financial costs among federal activities. Belt tightening because of the war must not be restricted to domestic programs but should include our foreign aid programs as well. American citizens should not be called upon to accept reductions in programs which affect their daily lives, see their taxes increased and war costs spiral, while the foreign aid program escapes unaffected and undiminished.

Look at education programs in the January budget. They were slashed by 40 to 60 percent despite the importance of their impact upon cities and rural

communities needing special help the most. The poverty program was maintained at a stationary level of activity, even though one might have expected that Congress would look first at the needs of our own people before providing hundreds of millions for the needs of foreign governments.

In addition to the reductions budgeted in January, we now hear that further domestic budget cuts have been ordered by the administration. One story reports that departments have been directed to show where 15 percent of their budgets can be cut out.

Foreign aid is not a part of the war in Vietnam, for which all these other sacrifices are being asked of the American people. Why should foreign aid be exempt? Instead of being slashed like everything else, the request for authorizations and appropriations for foreign aid represented increase after increase in last year's foreign aid program.

That is what the administration is asking for. Do not forget, as I have said so many times on the floor of the Senate, that the foreign aid bill submitted each year by the administration is but a small part of the foreign assistance program of the Government.

Once again, we are faced with a foreign assistance program of the Government, including foreign aid, of over \$7 billion.

Certainly, in my judgment, with that great expenditure of largesse on the part of the American taxpayers, an increase in foreign aid cannot be justified.

On page 6 of the committee report, the statistical picture is presented.

Mr. President, I would urge all Senators to study that statistical record.

It shows that last year there was available from appropriations, carryovers, recoveries, and receipts, a total program of \$3.343 billion. For fiscal 1968, the administration is asking for a program that would total \$3.769 billion. That amounts to nearly a 13-percent increase.

Mr. President, let the administration justify that to the taxpayers of this country when at the same time it is asking for a 10-percent surtax increase.

This is the request for appropriations, not authorizations.

I want to support my President wherever I can support him; but there is going across this country a tidal wave of criticism against this administration in regard to its fiscal policy, when it asks for a 10-percent increase in surtax and then propose a 13-percent increase in foreign aid, at the very time when there ought to be a tightening of the foreign aid belt. We ought to be making clear to our friends whom we have been helping throughout the world since 1946 that we are in a plight now. We are in war, though undeclared it is. We are in a war costing us already \$30 billion a year, and as we escalate it more, it will cost us more. We are in a war that has already killed 15,000 American soldiers and seriously wounded over three times that number and inflicted other wounds, not listed but serious, and, let me say, extremely painful to the subjects, of thousands more.

We are confronted with a serious domestic issue—a problem—in our country.

We are in a very bad financial condition within the Republic.

I am just simply at a loss to understand men who can sit here and vote to increase foreign aid and go along with proposed budget cuts of 40 to 60 percent on domestic aid needs.

In my judgment, there is a greater domestic aid need for the underdeveloped areas of America than there is a foreign aid need for the underdeveloped areas of the world.

The figure I am using is present level of appropriations. This administration is making an appropriation request of \$3.769 billion in the field of foreign aid, which is 13 percent above last year.

Tell it to the American people. Let the American people understand it. I want to say most respectfully they are insisting on knowing more in these troublesome times, because they are pinching financially. Tell it to the elderly. Tell it to those on fixed income. Tell it to those on social security. Tell it to the unemployed.

The sad fact is that in the ghetto areas of this country we have tens of thousands of fellow citizens who are illiterate and who also are functionally illiterate—illiterate in the sense that they cannot read and write, functionally illiterate in the sense that they have never been trained so that they are employable.

We have our domestic problems. I am not saying stop the foreign aid, but I am saying we cannot justify increasing it. We cannot justify a 13 percent increase in development loans abroad in light of the domestic needs of the people of this country, in light of the uncertainty which

faces us with a major war on our hands. Someone may say, "Didn't you misspeak, Senator?" No, I did not. This is the most major air war we have had. This is a war in which we have been dropping more bombs on Vietnam in a day than we ever dropped in a week during not only the European war, including Africa.

The Foreign Relations Committee made some reductions in the authorizations sought by the administration. But they were paper reductions. For development loans, AID figures show that last year, appropriations in the amount of \$500 million; unobligated balance from the prior year in the amount of \$59 million; reimbursements and receipts in the amount of \$20 million; recoveries in the amount of \$40 million; and a transfer out of the Fund for other uses in the amount of minus \$385,000, left a total program of \$619 million for the Development Loan Fund.

This year, the comparable figures under the committee bill show \$600 million of the full amount is appropriated; \$33 million in reimbursements and receipts; \$55 million in recoveries, for a total of \$688 million that would be available under the committee bill. This is about \$70 million more than the funds that were available last year.

Even the committee bill would allow \$70 million more than last year.

I ask unanimous consent that the figures I have just cited, shown in chart form, be printed in the *Record* at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

(In millions)

	Appropriations	Unobligated balance from last year	Transfer between categories	Recoveries and receipts	Estimated recoveries	Total
Fiscal year 1967.....	\$500	\$59	—\$0.385	\$20	\$40	\$619
Fiscal year 1968 (under committee bill, if full amount authorized is appropriated).....	600	33	55	688

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I know it is hard, in the midst of a debate such as this, in which Senators are inclined in too many instances to have their minds made up, to get them to pause long enough, before they vote, to look at the facts. I want to point out that the committee bill, really, on the basis of the statistics I have just given, authorizes \$70 million more than was used last year.

The committee bill, even after the reductions made in the administration bill, still carries with it an increase in development lending, in other words, of about 11 percent above last year's program.

My amendment scarcely represents a reduction at all, in light of the fact that it would reduce amounts available by only \$30 million below last year's level.

Can anyone demonstrate to me any situation, or present any evidence, or cite any testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee that justifies an increase in the Development Loan Fund as called for in the bill? Can anyone point to any reason for increasing this Fund at a time when domestic programs are being cut back, one after another, and will

apparently be cut back further in the months ahead?

I am not asking the Senate to gut the foreign aid program in this amendment; I am asking only that we maintain economic loans abroad at their levels of last year and not increase them in the face of the growing demand upon our resources made by the war in Vietnam, and the growing demand on our resources that cry out for help in connection with the domestic problems we have.

All I am saying is that we say to our friends abroad, "We are not going to cut back, but we are not going to give you more. We are not going to deny a development loan program, but we are not going to increase it. We want you to understand it. We want you to see our plight. Out of respect for your associations with us, out of your appreciation for the generosity that we have granted in the past, over \$20 billion since 1946, we say to you we are in trouble. We have our problems. We have got to take them up first. We are going ahead and lend you what we have in the past. We cannot give you more now. We have our own taxpayers to think about and their problems."

Therefore, my amendment proposes to put into the bill the figure of appropriations of last year. It reduces the \$600 million figure to \$500 million.

I think it is a commonsense amendment. I think it is a fair amendment. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am very sympathetic with the motive and purpose of the Senator from Oregon in further trying to restrict our foreign aid expenditures, but the committee considered this matter at great length, and, as the Senate knows, we trimmed the \$774 million requested to \$600 million.

I believe, on balance, the committee was wise in arriving at this conclusion. There are some very great needs, particularly in the areas of India, Pakistan, Turkey, and Korea which will benefit from the development loan program. I would recommend to the Senate that it follow the committee's recommendation in leaving the amount of the authorization at \$600 million. I do not know what the Committee on Appropriations will do. Last year, they appropriated only \$500 million. Nevertheless, I believe it would be wise to leave the authorization at \$600 million.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I wish to accommodate some Senators who need to get to the airport.

As far as I am concerned, my good friend the Senator from Arkansas proves my point when he says the Committee on Appropriations last year appropriated \$500 million. I think that is all we should authorize this year.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. When we authorize the \$500 million, we are doing it on a very sound principle. We are saying as a matter of policy—and I think this should be our policy at this time—that while we are not going to authorize more than was appropriated last year, we are willing to go along with the amount of money that was appropriated last year. If the conclusion to be drawn from what my friend from Arkansas says is that the Committee on Appropriations might not follow our advice, that is for them. Of course, we could authorize \$600 million, and the Committee on Appropriations reduce it far below \$500 million, if they want to.

But what we are saying to the American people is that we as the Senate believe these countries ought not to receive more than they got last year, which is

\$500 million. That is the purpose of my amendment. I think it is a commonsense amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

I yield back the remainder of my time.
Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 226 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Anderson	Ervin	Morse
Baker	Fannin	Mundt
Bennett	Fong	Murphy
Bible	Gruening	Pearson
Boggs	Hansen	Proxmire
Burdick	Hartke	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Spong
Cannon	Hollings	Stennis
Church	Hruska	Symington
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Talmadge
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Dirksen	Magnuson	Tower
Dominick	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NAYS—43

Alken	Cooper	Holland
Bartlett	Fulbright	Inouye
Bayh	Gore	Jackson
Brewster	Griffin	Javits
Carlson	Harris	Kennedy, Mass.
Case	Hart	Kennedy, N.Y.
Clark	Hickenlooper	Kuchel

Lausche	Mondale	Prouty
Long, Mo.	Morton	Scott
Long, La.	Moss	Smith
Mansfield	Muskie	Sparkman
McCarthy	Nelson	Tydings
McGovern	Pastore	Williams, N.J.
McIntyre	Pell	
Miller	Percy	

NOT VOTING—9

Allott	Hatfield	Russell
Brooke	McGee	Smathers
Dodd	Montoya	Yarborough

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of my friend, the distinguished Senator from Iowa—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will take their seats. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up again amendment No. 275, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 40, amend line 22 to read as follows: "amended (1) by striking out '1967' and substituting '1968' and (2) by striking out '\$210,000,000' and substituting '\$200,000,000'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has used 6 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. May I have the attention of my friend, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 24 minutes remaining on this amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Sensors will recall that when I called up the amendment earlier, the Senator from Iowa raised a question as to whether or not it was in proper order. I told him that I believed it was. It had been prepared for me by the legislative counsel, carrying out my instructions. I have spoken with the Senator from Iowa since, and he agrees with me that now it is in proper order, and I desire to explain why it is in proper order.

The proposed amendment changes line 22 on page 40. In effect, it strikes out line 22 and adds a new line 22; and that is why the Senator from Iowa—or, for that matter, the Senator from Oregon—could not cite the figure \$210 million in the bill. Well, it is not in the bill because the effect of striking out line 22 is really to amend the statute. The result is that, like the committee bill, the amendment would change the date 1967 of section 212 of the existing law, from the 1967 date to a 1968 date.

In addition, my amendment would further amend section 212 of existing law by striking out "\$210 million" in existing law and changing it to "\$200 million." The figure \$200 million does not appear in the bill, but it does appear in section 212 of existing law. That is the

figure I am changing, and that is what in effect is being amended. Legislative counsel says that is the way it must be done to change the date of existing law and change a figure in existing law.

So the argument that I started to make before remains pertinent—namely, this amendment, so far as technical assistance is concerned, reduces \$210 million in the existing law to \$200 million.

You may think it is not a great saving; but it leaves the same appropriation amount that is available this year. As you know, I stated earlier in the debate that I was going to buttress most of my arguments on the premise that we should not send out of the Senate this afternoon a bill in which we increase the amount of money or propose to increase the amount of money over what we are now pouring into foreign aid. We should maintain it at existing levels, which include \$200 million in appropriations, not \$210 million. That is my premise.

I do not wish to dwell on this matter at great length, because you have heard me almost ad infinitum. All I am saying is that I believe that should be the guiding principle of the foreign aid bill this year. We owe it to the people of our country, and we owe it to the financial soundness of our country.

We ought to recognize that no one here can tell what our situation will be a year from today. Therefore, to do as much is enough. To do more, in my judgment, we cannot justify.

So I rest my case on the appropriation amount of \$200 million for this year, and I recommend that we write that figure into the authorization bill this year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not know that anything can be said from what we said in connection with the pending amendment. Technical assistance is a proven activity that has been carried on for a long time. This proposes a further cut of \$10 million from the program after the Senate has just cut \$100 million from development loans. The Committee on Foreign Relations considered this matter at great length. We put restrictions on the number of countries to receive aid.

Mr. President, I see no reason to change the committee recommendation. Therefore, I hope the Senate will support the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the form of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute amendment will be stated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back my time on the amendment so that the Senator from Alabama can offer his substitute amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. SPARKMAN. One-half hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be one-half hour of debate on the amendment of the Senator of Alabama, the time to

be equally divided between the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Alabama, or whomever they may designate.

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

The substitute amendment of the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 40 of the bill, strike out lines 21 and 22, and insert:

"(b) section 212, which relates to authorization, is amended by striking out '1967' and '\$210,000,000' and inserting '1968' and '\$243,000,000', respectively."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Relations that technical assistance funds be cut by \$33 million raises serious questions which should be examined in detail. This is one matter which was decided without a rollcall vote by the committee. In general, the committee proposes increased activity in assisting agricultural development and family planning in the less-developed nations; but, at the same time, the committee would reduce the funding necessary to achieve those very results. It would appear that the committee with one hand is taking away funds, while with the other hand it presses for more accomplishments.

Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate to page 61 of the report, under title X, in which directions are given to the AID program to do additional work in family planning. We have heard a great deal of discussion on the floor of the Senate with respect to how badly this type of work was needed, particularly in Latin America. We direct them to do more in family planning, in the field of agriculture, and the production of food.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this item does not apply to Latin America. Latin America's technical assistance is carried in the Alliance for Progress program. This is for technical assistance outside of Latin America; is that not correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe it is. I think it is technical assistance within the program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Regardless of whether it is or not—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It makes a lot of difference in the argument. If it does not apply to Latin America it makes much difference as to the area to be served by this item.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I used the term Latin America but it could apply to any part of the world. Population expansion is a problem in practically all undeveloped nations of the world and so is the problem of food production.

The approach to the problem seems confused. With title X, the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations urges additional attention to the population problem. With section 211(d), the report urges expansion of the capability of American colleges and universities to contribute to development. But at the

same time the report also recommends \$33 million less for technical assistance. I have introduced an amendment to restore this \$33 million.

Mr. President, technical assistance is old point 4 program—the program that over the years has successfully transferred American skills to the developing countries. This people-to-people program is essential to helping the less developed nations meet their growing needs for food; helping these nations educate their people; and helping these nations keep their citizens—and especially their children—healthy.

The most pressing problem, of course, is feeding people, and I would like to concentrate on that aspect of the technical assistance program. Without advisers, experts, technicians who can help them to identify and solve their food, education, health and other problems these nations have little hope for progressing.

The facts of the race between food and population have become all too familiar. Every day, somewhere in the world 10,000 people die of starvation and malnutrition. Every day, there are 20,000 more people to feed than the day before. Food production in the world stood still last year, while population grew by 70 million.

The population of the world—3½ billion—is now increasing at 2 percent each year, the highest rate of increase in history. World population will double in 35 years. World demand for food, recently, has been growing at an average 4 percent each year. Food production has been going up by only about 2.8 percent per year.

On a global basis, the facts of the race between food and people are awesome enough. But viewed in terms of the gap between the developed world and the underdeveloped, similar-sounding facts suddenly seem positively frightening. The President's Science Advisory Committee projects more than four times as many people in the less developed nations as in the developed by the end of the century. In less than 20 years, by 1985, food needs worldwide will be up by one-half; but the needs of the less developed nations will be double what they are now.

When the Science Advisory Committee made its report on the world food problem in May, it stressed that it had been "unable to devise any new or original statement of the food problem." It said that "all has been repeated, reiterated and rephrased," so that the American public now seems to have lost its "ability to respond to the stimulus."

Perhaps the Congress has been similarly inured. Perhaps, repeated warnings have made the Congress less sensitive to the problem—not more concerned. Perhaps, in place of determination to attack the problem, the Congress is becoming resigned, and is no longer focusing.

Some of our colleagues feel the country is weighed down with the food burden it has been carrying for other parts of the world, with the \$20 billion in food aid which the United States has provided to the less developed world over the past 13 years. Food aid by the people of the United States has been impressive. But,

certainly it is clear to all that the problem is not that the United States should find ways to feed the world. The problem is how we expand the capacity of the needy countries to produce more of their own food.

Our challenge is not to nourish the world. It is to assist the new nations toward food independence. That will require that we fund much-needed technical assistance.

The Science Advisory Committee was specific as well as urgent about the time left to solve the problem. The Committee stated that—

The world food problem is not a future threat. It is here now and it must be solved within the next two decades.

The Committee offered hope. It said that if the problem is solved during the next 20 years, it will be manageable for the years thereafter.

Mr. President, technical assistance provided under the U.S. foreign assistance program applies both to helping poor nations to produce more food and to helping those nations which desire to control population growth. There are two sides to the problem of providing food for hungry mouths—agricultural production and family planning.

The Science Advisory Committee warned that to avoid reaching what it called "an economically or ecologically irreversible state of imbalance—between food and people—it is imperative to institute intensive programs of family planning now."

It said that food supply will be critical throughout the immediate future. And it said that solving the population problem that will exist after about 1985 "demands that programs of population control be initiated now."

Mr. President, food in the world cannot be significantly increased—and family planning cannot be instituted—merely by transplanting capital and equipment from one country to another, from the rich to the poor.

If this were a solution, technical assistance would not be necessary. But the problems of food and population will not be solved by exporting anything or giving away or selling anything. It is not a question of one country doing the job for another. It is a matter of people teaching and people learning. It is people developing drive and skills and direction to shape economies that can feed themselves—to shape modern life out of primitive life.

What is true of the food problem is true of the population problem: both require extensive local leadership and the widest local participation. The Science Advisory Committee put it that—

The twin problems of food and population imbalance have one feature in common that adds immeasurably to the difficulties . . . success will mean convincing millions of citizens in the developing nations to take individual action.

Central directives alone will not limit the size of families. Executive decrees by themselves will not grow more food.

Mr. President, the technical assistance programs of the Agency for International Development have been grappling

with this very aspect of the problem. Not perfectly. Not adequately, in terms of the levels set by the report of the Science Advisory Committee. But at least pointing in realistic directions.

One out of every five AID technicians working in Africa, Asia, and Latin America is working to train the local agricultural specialists, doctors, nurses, and health workers that it will take to make the attack on food and population effective. A total of 1,200 farm experts financed by AID worked in 55 countries last year, improving credit and marketing facilities, setting up research programs and rural cooperatives, demonstrating how fertilizer, better seeds and crop rotation can better the output of food. It is a slow business, and not glamorous. The contributions these workers made, step by step last year, will not solve the problem. But without their contributions—slow step by slow step—there can be no progress toward solutions.

The Science Advisory Committee reports that the less densely populated parts of Latin America and Africa still offer substantial new land to bring into cultivation. In Asia, on the other hand, most arable land is already in use. In Asia there must be higher yields out of land already under cultivation. And this means expanded irrigation; multiple cropping; use of new, high-yield varieties of plants; more use of fertilizers and pesticides and more and better machinery—in short, much more intensive farming. Capital and equipment will be important, but only if there is sound, experienced technical assistance.

Persuading a subsistence farmer to adopt new techniques is difficult. If that farmer is to use better seed, better fertilizer, if he is to use pesticides and mechanical equipment and new methods of irrigation, he must have instruction and guidance. Training local people to bring all these elements together in economies that need more food is what technical assistance is all about.

The matter of technical assistance under the Alliance for Progress is a separate matter which I will not attempt to cover. However I would like to note that the Committee subjected technical assistance under the Alliance to a cut which parallels the reduction proposed for non-Alliance technical assistance.

Let me now outline the effects of cutting \$33 million from technical assistance as the committee proposed.

First, it is important to realize that present projects—work now in progress—will require 85 percent of the technical assistance program initially proposed to the Congress for fiscal year 1968. If the authorization is reduced by \$33 million, new projects put off last year will be postponed again.

The alternative would be to proceed with some of the projects now on the drawing boards and to cut off other work prematurely. For example: a team of American university professors setting up a new agricultural school in one country could be sent home. Or a project to develop farmer cooperatives could be terminated. It is one possible approach, but it is not sensible.

Second, and let there be no mistake

about this: a \$33 million reduction in technical assistance would hit particularly hard at research into family planning and food production.

Third, a \$33 million reduction would hit particularly hard at implementation of section 211-D which is to provide AID grants to finance development work by colleges and universities. Academic centers have been forced to turn down some AID contracts; they have been unable to do this work while fulfilling their other obligations. Grants under this section would help to finance some of the research and other academic backing that are needed for effective technical assistance. And, as I mentioned earlier, the Foreign Relations Committee has urged that this program move ahead quickly.

Fourth, in Africa, a great deal of the AID program consists of technical assistance. In the original authorization request submitted to the Congress, almost half of all technical assistance funds requested for the three regions outside Latin America were slated for Africa. A \$33 million reduction would hit particularly hard at the entire U.S. aid program in Africa.

Fifth, if the United States fails to do what is necessary in technical assistance this year and in the near future, it faces a large burden of charity in the longer future—unless America would turn its back on starving people, which I cannot believe would happen. Last month, a group of agricultural experts wrote the Foreign Relations Committee that the cost of technical assistance in the present, compared to food shipments required in the future—if there were no technical assistance—"could well be in the magnitude of \$1 to \$50." Mr. Felix Belair of the New York Times has calculated that on this basis, the proposed cut of \$33 million in the authorization could mean \$1.5 billion in additional direct U.S. food shipments to countries which will be unable to meet their own food needs.

I believe the United States should not expect to make up—and should not be expected to make up—the food deficits of the new nations into perpetuity. It is not in our interest to do so. It would not be in the interest of the developing nations either. They seek to be economically strong and independent, and it is in the world's interest that they should achieve that goal.

In his state of the Union message to this Congress in January, President Johnson said:

Next to the pursuit of peace, the really greatest challenge to the human family is the race between food supply and population increase.

The President warned: "that race is being lost."

But in its report to the President, the Science Advisory group found we are not destined to certain defeat. It found that the solution to the food problem of the next 20 years is possible—biologically, technically, and economically. It stated the importance of getting on with the job now.

Mr. President, if U.S. foreign aid is indeed to address itself to the major problem confronting the world at this time in history, it is clear that our capac-

ity to provide a full measure of technical assistance must be maintained.

Approval of the President's full request for \$243 million in technical assistance funds is not only advantageous, but imperative.

We pour out millions of tons of food to India and many other countries and all of the time we are urging that they should be taught to increase their food production. Under title X we direct them to do more in that field. And yet we take away from them the funds with which to do it.

I think it would be a bad move to cut the program from the amount that was requested, and at the same time put additional responsibilities on them.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the amount the Senator is suggesting the amount which has been asked for?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. I am suggesting the amount which was requested, and no more.

Mr. PASTORE. And the committee cut it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The committee cut it and I am offering to restore it.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We gave them this additional burden without the additional money.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to identify myself with the Senator's amendment. I support his proposal. My experience has been that technical assistance is the greatest leverage of anything we do in the field of foreign affairs. In that respect, it has a definite identity with what I have been trying to do in the course of this debate in the private enterprise field. This is the kind of move which produces results far out of proportion to the expenditure and we should encourage its use, and especially tie it in with self-help.

I realize, as the Senator from Arkansas has said, that there is a provision for technical assistance in the Alliance for Progress program, but this proposal would provide assistance to economic aid outside of the Alliance for Progress program.

Mr. President, I believe that the proposal of the Senator would bring us a far greater return per dollar than the amount of money we are spending.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is the old point 4 program aimed at education, food, and health.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as I understand the thrust of this amendment, it is to provide the developing countries throughout the world with access to the great technological developments of the United States, through cooperative arrangements with our various universities, private institutions, and industries, in order to develop skills in the peoples of these developing nations and areas.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama if my understanding is correct, that the United States, under the technical assistance authorization as reported by the Foreign Aid Committee, will not be able to develop any new programs in this technical assistance area; that all we will be doing is funding existing programs; and that we will not be able to develop the kinds of new programs in which there has been a demonstrable need and interest expressed by the developing nations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It is also my understanding that there are hundreds of programs which could be developed were this \$33 million available, which would use those funds effectively in trying to meet problems such as disease in Africa, and other worthy and important projects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Is it further my understanding that it is the belief of the distinguished Senator who is offering the amendment that there has been demonstrated a need for these funds; that it is perhaps the area in which our aid and assistance is perhaps most productive in terms of the multiplier effect, in that the young people who come here, are trained, and go back to their countries, would provide the reforms, initiative, and technology which is so desirable; and that really, for the dollar that is invested, do I understand that this is the most productive and useful kind of investment to provide technical and industrial know-how?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. West Virginia University has been carrying forward a program in Africa. I know of the program and the desire of the university to continue its creative and helpful assistance. Would this program be involved?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. It is directly connected with it and it is doing a splendid job.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a clarification?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Vietnam is not included in this; it receives aid under the supporting assistance program.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill limits to 40 the number of countries that can be furnished technical assistance; last year there were 48. Therefore, we will have eight fewer countries participating in the program, with the same amount available as last year. The argument with respect to no new program and no changes does not stand up. This money can be used in a variety of ways, according to their own set of priorities. There will be more money per country than we provided last year.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Would the Senator specify the eight countries which have been eliminated from receiving this kind of technical assistance?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. That is for the administration to decide. They are the ones to evaluate the countries which have the highest priority. The administration takes the view that we should be in every country, apparently. But the committee does not accept that view.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. On what basis did the committee decide whether it should be 48 or 40 countries? They must have had some kind of rationale for restricting the technical assistance which would be authorized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In our long experience with this program, watching it in operation for many years, we believe that there is a desire to proliferate into all too many countries—to become everyone's "big brother." The committee believes that policy is unsound, and that our efforts should be concentrated on fewer countries rather than spreading the effort so thin so that they do not really accomplish our aid objectives anywhere. That is the reason for limiting the number to 40. We do not attempt to pick the countries—that is for those who administer the program to do.

They present an illustrative program to the committee—how they plan to distribute the various kinds of aid by country. The administration and the committee have always agreed that the countries should not be specified in the law. This is for reasons beyond whether the Congress should have the responsibility of picking the country. It would be bad policy to spell out the countries in the law because they should retain some flexibility. But the argument that it is up to us to choose the countries is not valid, in my opinion. We should limit our restrictions to setting a ceiling on the number of countries which can receive aid. That we did.

I think 40 is too many myself. I do not think we should be self-appointed guardians for all the countries in the world and try to insinuate ourselves into their internal affairs by this means. If we operate with 40 this year, I would hope that next year we might make it 30. But that is not for the Senate to determine today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I modify my amendment and send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It is, I am sure, the understanding of the Senator from Alabama that there certainly are great needs in the developing countries of the world, and that this increase of \$33 million is absolutely essential and in fact would merely restore the funding to the level proposed by the President.

I want to make one observation: I find it difficult to understand how we are able to reduce the number of countries from 48 to 40 without indicating which countries or which types of programs should be eliminated from tech-

nical assistance. It is my understanding that the assistance provided in the technical assistance program is for disease control, education and the like—hardly the type we should want to restrict, since it works directly on human beings and their institutions. Is that not correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Technical assistance and development loans are the two mainstays of AID's development assistance program. Through the development assistance program, AID provides U.S. skills and commodities to help less developed countries help themselves to grow economically, socially, and politically.

The exact mix of development loans and technical assistance varies from region to region and country to country, but as far as it is possible to generalize about the mix, the more advanced of the developing countries require capital loan assistance to sustain investment in expanding economies; the less advanced countries, on the other hand, tend to require more technical assistance, for their primary needs are human skills and institutional organization. It is technical assistance, then, which is aimed at those countries most in need of help to build and sustain a viable economic system.

A skilled and trained citizenry working together in a variety of sound institutional frameworks is the engine of growth for less developed countries. The tasks the less developed countries have set for themselves are enormous; they are striving to achieve in a few decades the stage of economic growth which the more advanced nations have achieved only over a period of centuries. The technical assistance program uses American skills and know-how to help these less developed nations meet their goals.

AID is increasing its use of non-Government U.S. institutions and talents to carry out technical assistance programs. American universities, business firms, labor unions, cooperatives and other such organizations now supply about 45 percent of the technicians working on AID programs overseas. About 85 percent of all AID-financed educators abroad are working on contracts with AID, and they represent 74 American colleges and universities.

Another aspect of the technical assistance program is international training. This is a training program which takes place in the United States, financed almost entirely with technical assistance funds allocated for country programs. There are now about 10,000 AID-sponsored foreign nationals from the less developed countries studying in the United States. This reflects the fact that trained manpower is a developing nation's prime asset, and, if a promising project overseas cannot continue to be financed, skilled technicians can keep the momentum going and eventually take the project over and make it the full responsibility of the less developed country involved.

The \$33 million cut from the President's request will mean that technical assistance programs in Africa, the Near

East, and Asia will either be cut short or not expand as planned by both the countries involved and AID. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has authorized \$210 million for the technical assistance program for fiscal year 1968. This is the same amount authorized for fiscal year 1967. Work now in progress in these less developed countries of Africa, the Near East, and Asia will require fully 85 percent of the budget that was initially proposed, \$243 million. Thus, it is apparent that a \$33 million reduction means that existing programs can be continued only at existing or reduced levels, while new projects that were put off last year, reflecting congressional cuts, will be postponed again. We have urged the less developed countries of the world to help themselves, and we have offered our technical skills to help them. The massive resources of our universities, of our hospitals, and above all, of our reservoir of highly skilled personnel—we have said to the less developed countries that these resources will be available to them for training and demonstration assistance.

The effect of this \$33 million cut proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee is to indicate to these less developed countries that we stand only partly ready to help them develop the skills they so desperately need. They have planned for sound expansion, as is indeed in part one of the purposes of developing a skilled manpower resource in the less developed countries.

A few specific examples of the accomplishments of the technical assistance programs suffice to show its worth.

More than 97,000 foreign technicians and professionals have been brought to the United States for advanced education or training;

More than 378,000 teachers have been graduated from colleges and schools established with AID assistance. These graduates today provide, for example, 70 percent of the teachers in Ethiopia and 45 percent of the teachers in Iran;

During the past 6 years 240,000 classrooms were constructed with AID help;

An estimated 32 million African children will be immunized against measles and smallpox during a 5-year program;

Malaria eradication projects are being carried on in 15 countries. The annual number of cases of malaria has been cut back, in recent years, from 350 million to less than 100 million, and most of this cutback is attributed to U.S. supported malaria eradication programs.

A cholera epidemic reached emergency proportions in the Middle East in 1964-65, and AID was instrumental in establishing an emergency preventative program which kept the epidemic from reaching the disaster stage;

The AID program in Tunisia is designed to increase agricultural production on an average of 3.8 percent a year, mainly through training of individual farmers;

In the fall of 1966, King Hassan of Morocco launched a self-help effort to increase grain yields by 30 percent, to be assisted in part with an \$800,000 technical assistance grant for instruction on seed and fertilizer use;

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has trained by arrangements through AID, many thousands of people from less-developed countries in the skills needed for establishing electric cooperatives in their countries.

In short, the technical assistance programs deal with education in its broadest sense, and with institution building—those two areas so crucial to full scale and meaningful economic development for those nations struggling to bring to their peoples the advantages of a high standard of living.

In his appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Administrator of AID, William S. Gaud, said this about technical assistance programs:

The fundamental needs of these countries are for education, full bellies, good health, and the ability to handle their own problems. Our technical assistance programs are directed at these objectives. It is the old point IV.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to restore the \$33 million to bring the technical assistance funding level up to the amount requested by the administration.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included at this point in the RECORD a short description of the technical assistance program, prepared by AID.

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

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Technical assistance plays a unique role in the development process. It works directly on the human participants and on their institutions, rather than on the physical resources that people work with. In AID's technical assistance program, the U.S. Government finds itself allied with leading American universities, consulting firms and other business, labor unions, and cooperatives, as well as several international organizations.

The U.S. Government has made it a primary condition of its assistance that developing nations which receive our aid must also help themselves to the maximum possible extent. What technical assistance does is give people an increased capability to do just this. Without this capability, the rest of our aid—and all the capital the less developed countries can mobilize for development—will be vastly less productive.

A severe cut in technical assistance funds would present AID with a cruel dilemma. Whichever horn of the dilemma was selected, there would be a marked loss of momentum and opportunity. Either new technical assistance project starts would have to be foregone or existing projects would have to be cut down, stretched out, or terminated.

Our new project starts are mostly in the areas of food production, family planning, nutrition, and training. With much of the less developed world in a state of potential famine, these activities take on a crucial significance. Yet it is in these areas that a reduction in funds would cut deepest. The President's Science Advisory Committee, in its recent report, strongly advocated a larger volume of technical aid to raise world food production, along with adequate long-range planning and funding. Applying a technical assistance funds cut to our new project starts in these areas would be a serious retrograde step.

The alternative, a very difficult one, is to apply much of the cut to existing projects. If this were done, much of the time and ef-

fort invested in the past would be lost. Technical assistance projects require a long series of steps. Experts must be recruited, universities and other U.S. contractors selected, trainees in the less developed countries identified and processed. Good working relations must be established with villagers, officials, and others in the host country. Suspending a going project means breaking this chain and losing the benefit of all the work done so far. Yet there are many instances in which this would have to be done if we were to protect even a few of our new project starts related to the War on Hunger.

The following is only a small sample of existing or proposed technical assistance projects which might have to be eliminated, reduced in scope, or phased out in time if technical assistance funds are cut:

A series of Summe Science Institutes in India, for which we supply books, teaching aids, and laboratory equipment in cooperation with the National Science Foundation; a similar program is in its initial stages in Pakistan;

A program to improve tax administration in Turkey, being carried out by a team from the Internal Revenue Service;

A campaign to eradicate rinderpest in West and Central Africa, in which AID is cooperating with the European Economic Community and the Scientific, Technical and Research Commission of the Organization for African Unity;

A rural development program in the Philippines, which aims to increase rice and corn production in 11 provinces where there has been social unrest.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama wishes to modify his amendment. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "\$200,000,000", and insert "\$243,000,000".

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to comment on one point relative to that last exchange. I said that we limited it to eight fewer than we had last year. I failed to add that the administration itself, in its illustrative programs, has called for 42 plus seven to receive small self-help funds. They reduced it themselves, anticipating, I suppose, we would put a limit of 40 on the number of countries which could be aided.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield me 4 minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Alabama knows that in modifying his amendment all he does is increase my figure of \$200 million to \$243 million, as I understand it. So that it is an outright "upping" amendment.

In other words, he is saying to us that we should authorize more than the committee recommended by the difference between \$210 million and \$243 million.

I want to make clear that my amendment and the issues we have before us do not apply to Latin America. Latin America is covered by the Alliance for Progress. The bill carries \$100 million in technical assistance for the Alliance countries.

It does not apply to Vietnam. Vietnam is out.

It does apply to Africa and other areas in Asia. And in my amendment, we are going to have \$200 million, which we have under the present policy. I do not know the slightest justification for increasing this assistance next year, in view of the plight which confronts us.

That is my case.

As the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out, the administration itself has recognized, even this last year, that it should cut back. So it has cut back from 48 to 42 countries. We say that we did not make that for the 42, that we should go to 40.

We show next year that we should go further, but in view of the decline in the number of countries which the administration itself has admitted is justified, I think that the \$200 million of my amendment is ample.

I think the \$243 million offered by the Senator from Alabama is simply a proposal to do more than the committee proposes. It is an upping amendment and I hope that it will be defeated.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and to express my support for this amendment.

The purpose of the amendment is to restore the \$33 million cut by the committee from the authorization request for technical assistance. The committee authorized \$210 million for fiscal 1968, the same amount authorized for fiscal year 1967. This amendment would set the authorization at \$243 million.

Many changes and adjustments have been made in the foreign aid program since President Truman recommended the point 4 program for technical assistance in 1949, but in my view this program remains one of the most beneficial of our efforts over the years. Of all the billions of dollars expended for various types of foreign aid, the amounts for this program have been among the most constructive.

To offer scientific and technological analysis and to share knowledge and skills represents assistance in its purest form. It is a form which is least subject to criticism as being imperialistic and most open to favorable response by developing nations. And it is one of basic importance in the effort to assist the hungry, the diseased, and the illiterate people in the world to attain a better way of life.

The technical assistance program is directly involved with those areas for maintaining human life and development of human dignity: food, health, and education. If there is a necessity to reduce foreign aid, it is my view that the technical assistance program is one of the last places to make a cut. I have supported the military assistance program in the past and continue to do so. It is a necessary response to the world situation and the tensions between nations, but I believe it is more expendable than technical assistance for agriculture and health and education.

Of course, the technical assistance program needs to be reviewed. Not all the grants in the past have been effective. The committee has indicated its concern by imposing a limit of 40 countries which

can receive technical assistance, exclusive of the Latin American nations whose technical assistance programs are not subject to the limitation.

The additional \$33 million requested by the administration is needed. In January of this year the Office of the War on Hunger was created within AID. Its purpose is to consolidate all functions related to the war on hunger and to intensify the effort to meet this serious problem.

The world problem of food supply and population is acknowledged on all sides, and the problem is not diminishing. Through Public Law 480 and other programs we have been making a substantial contribution to the food needs of the hungry people of the world. This is of temporary assistance, but it is not enough in the long run.

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber, transmitted last month to President Johnson by Chairman Sherwood O. Berg, contains a section on "Food Aid and Foreign Economic Development Policy."

The Commission states:

The solution to the coming world food crisis cannot be found in the agriculture of the United States or any other developed country. If our farm output were expanded in order to distribute more free food, it would postpone the day of reckoning by only 10 to 15 years.

The Commission report continues with the statement:

The new mouths born in the developing areas of the world by 1980 will need an estimated 300 million additional tons of grain or its equivalent. This is near the present total production of the United States, Canada, and Western Europe combined. Obviously, the developed nations could not long carry this heavy and increasing burden, even with a drastic cut in their own standards of living.

For the long run, the bulk of the additional food will have to come from expanded food production in the hungry nations themselves.

In view of the limitations of assistance by way of direct food aid, the Commission makes a recommendation for a substantially expanded technical assistance program.

It states:

The Commission recommends that the United States should significantly expand its technical aid effort recognizing that technical assistance is a long-range effort and must be organized and funded for efficient long-range operations. The focus should be on developing institutions within the developing countries to carry out research, training, and extension, provide credit, and perform the other functions needed to support a modern and efficient agriculture. This country should assist in training a generation of local scientists, teachers, technicians and administrators in the developing countries to assure the on-going process of growth.

The modest increase in the administration request for authorization for technical assistance is not enough to accomplish what the Commission recommends, but it is a step and it should be supported.

The effective use of technical assistance is a gradual process in agriculture and results are slower to achieve. The technology of building factories and dams can more easily be transmitted;

adaptation may be necessary in the construction process but the technology of an electric generation plant is much the same whether a nation is developed or underdeveloped.

This is not the case with agriculture where there has to be adaptation not only of technology but of the kinds and varieties of food plants. There are also different problems of soil, climate, plant, and animal diseases to be met in each region.

Another distinguished Presidential Panel has also recently issued a report: The Panel on the World Food Supply of the President's Science Advisory Committee. This report, issued in May, is perhaps the most comprehensive and authoritative study made in this country on the world food supply. Its conclusions and recommendations on the need for technical assistance to increase the food supply has many similarities to the report of the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber.

The Panel states:

The vast majority of the increased production must take place within the developing countries themselves.

The Panel points out the need for adaptive research in order to make the modernization of agriculture possible in developing nations and the members stress the need for technical assistance. They state:

Increasingly, United States foreign assistance should take the form of knowledge, technical aid, adaptive research, education and institution building.

The scarcest and most needed resource in the developing countries is the scientific, technical, and managerial skill needed for systematic, orderly decision-making and implementation. Through technical assistance programs, the United States should emphasize guidance, education, and the development of indigenous capabilities. . .

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that sections of these two reports dealing with technical assistance for agriculture be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, along with the list of citizens who served on each group.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the technical assistance program with its emphasis on agriculture and on increasing the production of food in developing nations is an essential part of the war on hunger. The peoples of these nations want more efficient means of growing and marketing food. They seek new and improved sources of food. They are aware of their problems of agriculture, of food supply and population, of health and diet, of the need for skills and training so they can adopt new methods. But they need technical assistance to help them secure these objectives. The food problem is necessarily of concern to us, and it is one in which we can and should take leadership.

I do not believe the Senate should reduce the amount the administration has requested for moving forward in this area and for increasing our effort in the war on hunger, and I urge that the amendment be adopted.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT, "THE WORLD FOOD PROBLEM," MAY 1967, VOLUME I, PAGES 17-21

3.7.0 MEETING THE NEED FOR MORE FOOD

For the next several years, any major expansion of the world food supply will be dependent on increased production from conventional sources and upon more efficient utilization of available foodstuffs through reduction of waste and spoilage. *The vast majority of the increased production must take place within the developing countries themselves.*

3.7.1. There is no panacea

Periodically, the news media draw attention to ongoing research on systems which offer possibilities as new sources of human food. Because there is a strong tendency to portray these as possible "solutions" to the world food problem and because the public is drawn understandably to such panaceas, this publicity undoubtedly lessens concern about the seriousness of the food supply in the developing nations.

The Panel has examined carefully and in detail the several new processes which are under current study. "Single cell protein" derived from fermentation by yeasts or bacteria of carbohydrates, hydrocarbons, or cellulose is particularly promising. A great advantage of single-cell protein is that it can be produced independently of agriculture or climatic conditions. However, there are major unsolved problems of scale of production, processing characteristics, nutritive quality, consumer acceptance, and cost which remain to be worked out. It will be several years, at least, before even a decision concerning the possible usefulness of such materials in the food supply can be made.

Methods for extraction of protein directly from green leaves have been devised and deserve careful consideration and further research since the materials utilized are frequently wasted or are fed to animals. Again, many problems of nutritive quality, scale, cost, and acceptability must be solved before evaluation of the usefulness of this material will be possible.

Investigations of the processing of algae as human food have been unrewarding thus far because of the excessive cost of deriving a product that is safe for human consumption. It now appears that the usefulness of algal materials economically derived as a by-product of reclaiming sewage and other waste waters will be as a feed for livestock.

In summary, some nonconventional sources of food appear to offer great potential for the long-term but in the judgment of the Panel none of these can be expected to lessen the problem of increasing food production from conventional sources during the next two decades.

Furthermore, the magnitude of the world's food problem is so great that nonconventional sources, when and if they become available, may be needed to supplement rather than supplant modernized agriculture. The problem will be with us for so long, however, that every effort must be made now to invent new processes and develop known ones to produce novel foodstuffs. In order to provide a reasonable probability that the long-range potential of unconventional food sources may be realized within two decades, we must accelerate research on these methods now.

3.7.2 Animal sources

There are good opportunities for improved production of livestock and increased utilization of fishery resources, including fish farming (aquaculture), in the developing countries. These deserve emphasis and exploitation because animals are capable of converting to food different types of by-products and forages that cannot be consumed directly by people and for the significant contribution that they can make to im-

proving the quality of protein in diets and earning foreign exchange. A process of producing fish protein concentrate (FPC) appears to hold promise for the future although major problems of scale, technologies for different species, and consumer acceptability must be solved before its usefulness can be evaluated.

3.7.3 Agricultural production

It is, therefore, evident that the bulk of the increase in food supply must come from increased production of farm crops. There are two ways in which agricultural production can be increased: by bringing more land under cultivation or by increasing yields of land under cultivation.

Until the present time, most of the increase in food production in the developing countries has been achieved by extending traditional farming methods over a larger area of cropland. Substantial opportunities remain to bring additional land under cultivation in the less densely populated areas of Latin America and of Africa, but the vast majority of arable land in Asia is already in use. While there are marginal possibilities for using small additional areas, it is clear that as the population continues to grow, the amount of cropland per person in the Asian countries will diminish progressively.

In Asia, a shift to increasing crop production by intensifying agriculture and using modern methods to improve annual yields on land under cultivation will be mandatory. Even in Latin America and Africa, the increasing cost of clearing additional land may well make it more economical in many regions to concentrate on elevating yields rather than expanding cultivated areas.

To increase yields, a major expansion of irrigation facilities will be necessary to make multiple cropping possible independent of wide variations in seasonal rainfall. It also will be necessary to develop and utilize new, high-yielding varieties of plants, to develop and utilize plants with a higher quality of protein, to increase the use of fertilizers and pesticides, and to employ improved farm machinery. Increased capital investments and increased expenditure on the part of farmers will be required to make these tools of modern agricultural technology available. These are the techniques that have been employed so successfully in the developed countries to transform farming into a business.

The transition from traditional farming to modern agriculture will be difficult and expensive for the hungry nations but it is absolutely essential if their food needs are to be met. There is no alternative.

3.8.0 THE NEED FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The modernization of agriculture in the developing countries will involve capital investment, provision of inputs in the form of seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, water, and machinery, organization of distribution and marketing systems, education of agricultural specialists and extension workers, provision of production incentives for individual farmers in the form of land-reform and pricing policies, and other changes in social and economic structures.

Critical to the success of all of these measures, however, is the necessity for adaptive research needed to gain an understanding of the principles governing plant and animal production under the conditions, soils, and climates existing in the developing countries.

3.8.1 Agricultural technology is not transferable

Modern scientific agriculture has been brought to flower in the temperate regions of the developed world. In the tropical climates where the bulk of the world's low-income people live, scientific agricultural efforts have been concentrated on the traditional tropical export crops: sugar, tea, coffee, cocoa, bananas, and rubber. Only recently have food crops received serious attention.

The products of technology and "know-how" cannot be transferred directly to the developing nations. Many plant varieties transferred to different climates fail to flower or set seed if, indeed, they survive at all. Livestock may become non-productive or die. Adaptive research must be accomplished within the developing countries. A blueprint for a bicycle or a steel mill can be shipped overseas and utilized without alteration but the blueprints and architecture for a food crop must be developed overseas. There, as in the United States, new plant varieties, each better than the last, must be produced frequently to increase plant resistance to insects and disease.

There is an urgent need to carry out this adaptive research, to establish strong indigenous institutions, and develop the manpower that will enable the poor, food-deficit nations to carry out the self-sustaining, continuing programs of research and development that are essential to modern food production.

3.8.2 The task of technical assistance

Increasingly, United States foreign assistance should take the form of knowledge, technical aid, adaptive research, education, and institution building.

The scarcest and most needed resource in the developing countries is the scientific, technical, and managerial skill needed for systematic, orderly decision-making and implementation. Through technical assistance programs, the United States should emphasize guidance, education, and the development of indigenous capabilities—for the long term—because the task in the developing nations has only just begun and will continue for many decades to come.

In recent years, United States programs of technical assistance have largely given way to capital assistance and the purpose and value of each has become blurred. The important distinction between these two instrumentalities of aid should be recognized and each should be employed sharply and effectively to reinforce the other in helping those developing countries that are willing to make the effort to solve the complex problems of feeding their people and improving the quality of their lives.

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT: "FOOD AND FIBER FOR THE FUTURE," JULY 1967, PAGES 131-133

PART D: FOOD AID AND FOREIGN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The widening food gap in the world has serious implications for U.S. foreign policy for foreign trade, our agricultural economy, and the U.S. economy as a whole.

Hunger and the threat of famine on a continental scale impose a threat to world order, to political stability, to the established patterns of doing the world's business. With the breakdown of order, whatever economic advancement is now taking place in hungry countries would halt, with diminishing economic output, increasing unrest and turmoil, and threatening of world peace. All nations, including the United States have a vital concern with alleviating hunger and political violence.

Since 1958, the 38 very poor nations—those with an income of under \$100 per person a year—have suffered an average of two major outbreaks of violence per country. That is a great deal of conflict. What is worse, it has been predominantly prolonged conflict. There is an irrefutable relationship between violence and economic backwardness.

As the single nation doing about half of the world's total business, controlling more than half of its realized wealth and enjoying a standard of income and well-being without parallel in the world, the United States must accept a leadership role in combating this problem.

Food aid

The solution to the coming world food crisis cannot be found in the agriculture of

the United States or any other developed country. If our farm output were expanded in order to distribute more free food, it would postpone the day of reckoning by only 10 to 15 years. Moreover, this would allow populations in the developing countries to increase without a corresponding increase in their own food production. Then, when we and the other developed countries meet the practical limits of our land and technology, there would simply be more people to live in hunger and deprivation.

As President Lyndon B. Johnson said in a recent message:

"The present food crisis is without parallel in the history of mankind. International co-operation backed by self-help is imperative. We in America can provide only a small margin of the human and material resources needed for food development. The major effort—the will—the leadership—the labor—and, indeed even most of the resources—must come from the low-income countries themselves."

The new mouths born in the developing areas of the world by 1980 will need an estimated 300 million additional tons of grain or its equivalent. This is near the present total production of the United States, Canada, and Western Europe combined. Obviously, the developed nations could not long carry this heavy and increasing burden, even with a drastic cut in their own standards of living.

For the long run, the bulk of the additional food will have to come from expanded food production in the hungry countries themselves.

U.S. aid programs for developing countries should be shifted much more heavily toward technical assistance for increasing food production and population planning in the developing countries themselves, with less emphasis on direct food aid.

Food aid should be available for disasters, crises, and emergencies, and as a transitional measure to help developing countries as a part of definite, short-term plans for agricultural self-help. However, it should be fully coordinated with long-run aid programs to guard against the danger of diminishing incentives to indigenous food producers or contributing to the complacency of local government authorities.

There may be a positive role for food aid in some development projects. For instance, food could be used as part of the wages paid to workers on an irrigation dam or a farm-to-market road.

We must recognize the built-in dangers of food aid, especially the danger of discouraging indigenous agricultural production. Our food aid must be safeguarded and administered with a hardheaded insistence on maximum self-help.

Developing countries frequently tend to emphasize industrial development in allocating their scarce development resources, to the detriment of their agricultural development. The U.S. economic aid program in some instances may have encouraged some of these tendencies or at least not resisted them strongly enough.

Looking to the future, it is clear that agriculture must receive an important place in the plans of these developing nations.

The self-help factor is recognized in the U.S. "Food for Freedom" legislation of 1966, which shifts the emphasis of the program from disposal of U.S. agricultural surpluses to providing the food and fibers needed in the recipient countries, and also directs aid to countries which exert the greatest effort toward solving their own food production problems.

Some countries depend heavily on U.S. food aid, and they probably will have to remain so for at least a few years ahead. Otherwise a short crop will push them directly into famine, or unabated population growth will draw them into creeping famine.

However, continuous food aid even to these countries should be made contingent on effective plans, demonstrably implemented, to improve their own agricultures and reduce their birth rates.

A massive technical assistance program

The world's food and population problem can only be solved through active population control efforts and faster development of agriculture in the hungry countries.

Therefore, it is recommended that U.S. aid programs for developing countries should be shifted much more heavily toward technical assistance for increasing food production and population planning in the developing countries.

Most of the developing countries will need considerable assistance for quite a long period of time to achieve rapid, sustained growth. By themselves, they lack the trained manpower, the institutions, and the capital.

This technical assistance program will have to be considerably larger than any program this country has carried out in the past. Presently, U.S. annual economic aid, including money, technical assistance and education, amounts to only .003 percent of the gross national product. It is less than 4 percent of the annual defense budget. Ideally, the U.S. will substantially increase its appropriations for aid to the developing countries—but a considerable gain in effectiveness could be achieved simply by shifting aid funds from food aid to technical assistance.

The Commission recommends that the United States should significantly expand its technical aid effort recognizing that technical assistance is a long-range effort and must be organized and funded for efficient long-range operations. The focus should be on developing institutions within the developing countries to carry out research, training, and extension, provide credit, and perform the other functions needed to support a modern and efficient agriculture. This country should assist in training a generation of local scientists, teachers, technicians and administrators in the developing countries to assure the on-going process of growth.

The Nation should orient its policies toward helping these countries develop the large amounts of public and private development capital that will be needed to achieve the agricultural "takeoff."

The President's Science Advisory Committee, Donald F. Hornig, Chairman.

Members of the Panel on the World Food Supply:

Ivan L. Bennett, Jr., Chairman, Deputy Director, Office of Science and Technology, Washington, D.C.

H. F. Robinson, Executive Director, Administrative Dean for Research, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Nyle C. Brady, Director of Research, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

Melvin Calvin, Professor of Chemistry, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Milton S. Eisenhower, President, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Samuel A. Goldblith, Professor of Food Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Grace A. Goldsmith, Professor of Medicine, Tulane University School of Medicine, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Lowell S. Hardin, The Ford Foundation, New York, New York.

J. George Harrar, President, The Rockefeller Foundation, New York, New York.

James G. Horsfall, Director, The Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, New Haven, Connecticut.

A. T. Mosher, Executive Director, Agricultural Development Council, New York, New York.

L. Dale Newsom, Professor of Entomology,

Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

William R. Pritchard, Dean, School of Veterinary Medicine, University of California, Davis, California.

Roger Revelle, Director, Center for Population Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Thomas M. Ware, Chairman, International Minerals and Chemical Corporation, Skokie, Illinois.

Stuart G. Younkin, Vice President, Agricultural Research, Campbell Soup Company, Camden, New Jersey.

Claire L. Schelske, Technical Assistant, Office of Science and Technology, Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON FOOD AND FIBER

Sherwood O. Berg, Chairman, Dean, Institute of Agriculture, University of Minnesota.

Harry B. Caldwell, Executive Vice President, Farmers Cooperative Council of North Carolina.

Willard W. Cochrane, Dean, International Program and Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Minnesota.

G. W. Cook, Chairman, General Foods Corporation.

George C. Cortright, Chairman of the Board, National Cotton Council.

Woodrow W. Diehl, Farmer, Iowa.

Edmund H. Fallon, Executive Vice President, Agway Inc.

Carl C. Farrington, Vice President for Development, Agricultural Group, Archer Daniels Midland Company.

Frank Fernbach, Assistant to the President, Special Projects, United Steelworkers of America.

Roscoe G. Haynie, President, Willson & Company Inc.

Fred V. Heinkel, President, Missouri Farmers Association.

Roy Hendrickson, Executive Secretary, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

William A. Hewitt, Chairman, Deere & Company.

George K. Hislop, President, National Wool Growers Association.

J. G. Horsfall, Director, The Agricultural Experiment Station, New Haven, Conn.

Herbert J. Hughes, Farmer, Nebraska.

D. Gale Johnson, Dean, Division of Social Sciences and Professor of Economics, University of Chicago.

Herman S. Kohlmeier, Broker, New Orleans, La.

Robert Magowan, Chairman, Safeway Stores Inc.

L. L. Males, Farmer and Conservationist, Oklahoma.

Edward F. Mauldin, Farmer, Partner, Prout & Mauldin, implement dealership, Chairman, First Colbert Bank, of Leighton, Ala.

Paul Miller,¹ President, University of West Virginia

W. B. Murphy, President, Campbell Soup Company

Ernest J. Nesius,² Vice President, West Virginia Center for Appalachian Studies and Development, Director, Cooperative Extension Service, West Virginia University

Leon Schachter, Vice President of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL-CIO.

Janice M. Smith, Head, Department of Home Economics, University of Illinois

Lauren Soth, Editor of the Editorial Pages, Des Moines Register

Jesse Tapp,³ Retired Chairman of the Board, Bank of America

¹ Resigned from the Commission, July 29, 1966.

² Replaced Paul Miller, November 1, 1966.

³ Died January 19, 1967.

Jay Taylor, President, Texas Livestock Marketing Association
 Herman Wells, Chancellor, Indiana University
 John Wheeler, President, Mechanics and Farmers Bank of Durham, N.C.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ADAPTIVE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I should like to discuss money and miracles.

First, money. The Foreign Relations Committee has recommended that the Congress cut technical assistance funds in the Agency for International Development authorization bill by \$33 million.

That amount of money is sizable. It could purchase perhaps a dozen fighter airplanes for our defense. It might be enough to erect a new Government office building. Not the new Rayburn Office Building used by the other body, however. That cost \$95 million, so the \$33 million could only buy about one-third of it.

Or, Mr. President, we could turn that \$33 million back into technical assistance programs for AID and buy some miracles.

I do not use the term "miracle" lightly. Yet what else can you call what happened to a farmer named Ghennappa, in Mysore State in India?

Like most of his neighbors in that poor section of the vast subcontinent, Ghennappa did not have much land—just 5 acres. Planted in sugar cane, he managed to net about \$134 a year from his fields.

Now \$134, Mr. President, will not stretch very far, particularly if, like most Indians, you have a large family, and the \$134 is your total annual income.

Then came the miracle. Agricultural specialists from the University of Tennessee, working in close cooperation with the Mysore State University of Agricultural Sciences, decided to improve Indian agriculture by trying the Rockefeller Foundation-developed high-yielding corn hybrids on irrigated lands. The maize developed under the Rockefeller-supported national corn breeding program included some hybrids specifically adaptable to South India.

After field tests proved out their theories, the Tennessee University extension economists and the Mysore State University team talked some small village farmers into "taking the plunge." The farmers were supplied with information, fertilizer, and credit provisions, but no concessional prices were given Ghennappa and his neighbors risked their own, or borrowed money, and planted their acreage in maize.

That was the miracle, Mr. President.

Now, instead of \$134 a year, Ghennappa receives more than \$3,000 a year from his 5 acres. Growing three crops a year, Ghennappa's corn brings in \$600 an acre. One year's corn production on each of his 5 acres produces 5,500 pounds per acre per crop, or 16,500 pounds per acre per year. This breaks down into 15,000 pounds of grain, and about 150 tons of cattle fodder.

When we compare these totals with the estimated present Indian production of about 1,050 pounds per acre per year for rice, you begin to understand that what happened to Ghennappa is, indeed, a miracle.

The Agency for International Development can be very proud of its part in this effort. Through the University of Tennessee contract for adaptive research—and this comes under technical assistance, the \$33 million fund which the Foreign Relations Committee would have us deny to AID—the Mysore State University of Agricultural Sciences was designed in its entirety.

The local government became interested in the opportunity for a food production program because of AID technical assistance. AID people trained virtually all the leadership in the local university, and provided the direct technical and organizational assistance for this program. The Rockefeller Foundation's corn-breeding program provided the seed stock, and the Oxford Famine Relief Society provided the fertilizer, which the farmers, however, purchased at the prevailing market price.

When we consider the kind of miracles which can be worked for \$33 million I think the wisdom of restoring this money to AID's technical assistance program becomes manifest.

This sort of miracle represents the finest kind of adaptive research—using the information, the techniques, the ideas, which have proved to be successful in the United States or some other developed nation, and adapting them to the needs of the underdeveloped nations.

This is, truly, the essence of foreign aid. This is the art of foreign aid. It is perhaps the greatest weapon in our arsenal to fight the war on hunger.

Last year, Congress adopted my adaptive agricultural research amendment as part of the foreign aid authorization bill. It provided that a high priority should be given in food-deficit nations to efforts to increase agricultural production, particularly through the establishment and expansion of adaptive agricultural research programs designed to increase per-acre yields in those nations. This effort calls upon our universities—particularly our land-grant colleges—to play a major role in improving agriculture overseas.

We tend to forget that the tremendous productivity of American farmers is based upon years and years of research into new seed varieties, new fertilizers, and new methods of cropping. We are constantly today in the United States developing new grains to increase yield, specially adapted to climate and soil conditions.

We simply cannot transplant U.S. seeds, soils, and fertilizers, and expect the same results in arid, or tropical regions. They must be tailored to conditions in each country.

The cut in technical assistance funds would curtail this crucial effort, at a time when we are close to seeing some results. I recently received a strong letter on this point from Dean Sherwood Berg of the University of Minnesota. Dean Berg is a brilliant student of world food problems, and more recently served as Chairman of the President's National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber. I ask unanimous consent that Dean Berg's letter be printed in the Record.

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

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
 August 11, 1967.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
 U.S. Senator,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I have been greatly disturbed by the action accorded the foreign economic aid appropriation bill in recent Senate debate. This is particularly true of those portions of the legislation which relate to technical assistance.

I strongly encourage you to urge your Senate colleagues to give full support to the AID technical assistance appropriation.

This is the time for a renewal of support for efforts by our government to contribute to world peace through technical programs aimed at world hunger, poverty and disease. I am particularly concerned that we continue to attack the world food problems. No one needs to explain to you the awesome dimensions of the problem or its significance to our nation's future in the world community. What you may not know is that we just now stand on the threshold of success.

AID, its predecessors, the U.S. Land-Grant Universities, and others have struggled for many years to find ways to accelerate agricultural productivity in developing nations and begin to build the other elements of an adequate world food supply system. This long period of struggle and often failure has, like the early years in the lives of our State Universities, been a period of learning. Some of us are for the first time confident that we are beginning to put the essential pieces together. We now see the absolute essentiality of sustained technical assistance efforts, particularly in adaptive research and technical education.

The recent efforts that AID has made through funding of research and in planning for use of Section 211d were tremendously important improvements. Also, in the past 2 or 3 years, more than 20 of our State Universities have created administrative dimensions for sustained efforts relating to international agriculture. Minnesota, and these other State Universities, have organized themselves to contribute, through strong technical programs in agriculture to the solution of the world's food problem. University agriculture programs abroad, mostly financed by AID, are just now being structured for a truly effective attack on food needs. We are ready to support effectively our national government's efforts abroad. We hope that the Congress will make it possible for the State Universities to provide the technical assistance of which we are now capable of generating with cooperating nations throughout the world.

I would also like to underscore the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber in this regard. The Commission concluded that the world's food and population problem can only be solved through more rapid development of agriculture and through active population control efforts in hungry countries. As the single nation doing about half the world's total business, controlling more than half of its realized wealth and enjoying a level of income and well-being without parallel in the world, the United States must accept a leadership role in combating the widening food gap.

Therefore, the Commission recommended that U.S. aid programs for developing countries should be shifted much more heavily toward technical assistance for increasing food production and population planning in the developing countries.

The Commission recommended further that the United States should significantly expand its technical aid effort recognizing that technical assistance is a long-range effort and must be organized and funded for efficient long-range operations. The focus should be on developing institutions within the developing countries to carry out re-

search, training, and extensions, provide credit, and perform the other functions needed to support a modern and efficient agriculture. This country should assist in training a generation of local scientists, teachers, technicians and administration in the developing countries to assure the ongoing process of growth.

I am aware of your sensitivity and commitment to resolving the problem of world hunger. I have admired the legislation you have sponsored and brought into being. If I can assist you in any manner in furthering your efforts in bolstering world agricultural development, I shall be most happy to do so.

Most sincerely,

SHERWOOD O. BERG,

Dean, Institute of Agriculture and
Chairman, National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief excerpt from the Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, which stressed the urgency of technical assistance and adaptive agricultural research.

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

3.8.0 THE NEED FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The modernization of agriculture in the developing countries will involve capital investment, provision of inputs in the form of seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, water, and machinery, organization of distribution and marketing systems, education of agricultural specialists and extension workers, provision of production incentives for individual farmers in the form of land-reform and pricing policies, and other changes in social and economic structures.

Critical to the success of all of these measures, however, is the necessity for adaptive research needed to gain an understanding of the principles governing plant and animal production under the conditions, soils, and climates existing in the developing countries.

3.8.1 Agricultural technology is not transferable

Modern scientific agriculture has been brought to flower in the temperate regions of the developed world. In the tropical climates where the bulk of the world's low-income people live, scientific agricultural efforts have been concentrated on the traditional tropical export crops: sugar, tea, coffee, cocoa, bananas, and rubber. Only recently have food crops received serious attention.

The products of technology and "know-how" cannot be transferred directly to the developing nations. Many plant varieties transferred to different climates fail to flower or set seed if, indeed, they survive at all. Livestock may become non-productive or die. Adaptive research must be accomplished within the developing countries. A blueprint for a bicycle or a steel mill can be shipped overseas and utilized without alteration but the blueprints and architecture for a food crop must be developed overseas. There, as in the United States, new plant varieties, each better than the last, must be produced frequently to increase plant resistance to insects and disease.

There is an urgent need to carry out this adaptive research, to establish strong indigenous institutions, and develop the manpower that will enable the poor, food-deficit nations to carry out the self-sustaining, continuing programs of research and development that are essential to modern food production.

3.8.2 The task of technical assistance

Increasingly, United States foreign assistance should take the form of knowledge,

technical aid, adaptive research, education, and institution building.

The scarcest and most needed resource in the developing countries is the scientific, technical, and managerial skill needed for systematic, orderly decision-making and implementation. Through technical assistance programs, the United States should emphasize guidance, education, and the development of indigenous capabilities—for the long term—because the task in the developing nations has only just begun and will continue for many decades to come.

In recent years, United States programs of technical assistance have largely given way to capital assistance and the purpose and value of each has become blurred. The important distinction between these two instrumentalities of aid should be recognized and each should be employed sharply and effectively to reinforce the other in helping those developing countries that are willing to make the effort to solve the complex problems of feeding their people and improving the quality of their lives.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I need not remind the Senate that mankind faces the grave danger of extinction through overpopulation and dwindling food supplies. All of us have seen the grim statistics, and looked at the charts and graphs which spell doom unless we undertake a massive program of increasing agriculture and simultaneously manage to control population growth.

In the face of these very real threats to the future of civilization, the Foreign Relations Committee would have us cut down the amount that the war on hunger can apply to adaptive research. But this is not the place to make savings. The task before us, if we are to win the war on hunger, is gargantuan.

It is not a matter for pinch-penny tactics. We must revolutionize agriculture throughout most of the world, in the space of a very few years. We must convince millions, eventually billions, of individual men and women, most of whom are illiterate, and living in remote areas, to limit their fecundity.

To provide enough food for the billions now alive, and those to be born in the next 35 years, by which time the world will have doubled in population, it is of the utmost urgency that we vastly increase the yield per acre of existing farmlands. In addition, we are going to have to do everything within our power to utilize the remaining arable lands now under the plow. If we can, we must also reclaim the arid and desert regions.

The tasks I am mentioning are not either-or propositions. They are musts. For if we do not win the war on hunger, famine, and pestilence, war and revolution will. Man does not live by bread alone. But if he is denied bread, he quickly becomes a snarling, savage animal.

This is no time to quibble about \$33 million. We had best get our priorities in order here, and consider, not how to save \$33 million here, and \$50 million there, but how to keep our planet habitable for men and women and children.

Do we have the will to win the war on hunger?

That is the real question we face today. If we have, we must face up to the enormity of these critical problems, and do something about them. If we do not have the will to win, then we should write out

our last wills and testaments, and leave the shambles to those who come after us.

Foreign aid may not be the most popular bill enacted by the Senate each year. But it may very well prove to be the most necessary bill.

Perhaps we expect too much return on our foreign aid investment. Perhaps we expect that because we have attempted to help, other peoples and other governments should love us.

I submit that we do not need love. Certainly we all feel distress when nations which we have fed and clothed and given shelter to suddenly turn on us, and denounce us as imperialists.

But we should be bigger than to expect love and friendship. If we can contribute to the peace of the world by making it a better place to live in, if we can feed the starving and give them hope, I say that is enough.

Nor should we expect sudden and dramatic results from our foreign aid investment. Revolutionizing agriculture, bringing the message of freedom and individual dignity to illiterate men and women who inhabit jungle hovels, and some of the other things we are trying to accomplish, cannot be done overnight. These are long, slow, agonizing processes.

The AID official who brought us the story of farmer Ghennappa, put it this way:

The entire story indicates what can be done on food production with sustained, scientifically oriented technical assistance, coupled with the availability of agricultural inputs such as seed and fertilizer. It indicates also something of the time and effort required. If we hang with it to make certain something in the system doesn't break down, agricultural production in Mysore State might increase amazingly in a decade.

Development is a process of decades, not years. The President's Science Advisory Committee also makes the same point, Mr. President, in its excellent report, entitled "The World Food Problem," on page 24, volume I:

If the United States is to deal seriously and productively with international development . . . funding and programs must be placed on a long-range basis, not budgeted and funded hand-to-mouth, from year to year. Foreign economic assistance is doomed to frustration and failure if the responsible agency is forced to deal only with quick payoff projects and to show results tomorrow in order to survive the next budget cycle.

So, also, we should note the following quotation, also from the PSAC report:

The Panel is convinced from its study of the world food problem that food shortages and high rates of population growth in the developing countries are not primary problems. Rather, they are manifestations of a fundamental difficulty, lagging economic development in the hungry countries. We find the prospects for the future both sobering and alarming.

As we now view the situation, the United States faces two choices:

1. The first is for the United States to continue to provide technical and capital assistance and private investment to poor countries willing to make the self-help effort to achieve self-sustaining growth. Our foreign assistance program would then continue to be largely an American effort with coordinating relationships with the United Nations organizations and other international institutions. While this course might lead to some improvement over the

status quo, it would not suffice to meet the food problem because, for all its economic resources, the United States cannot possibly accomplish the immense task of alleviating the world food problem alone. This course would be unsuccessful in halting or reversing the rapid deterioration of the population-food situation in the developing countries and the world would continue to lose ground.

2. The other alternative is for the United States to take the lead in mounting a global effort, in concert with other developed nations and with international organizations, that will bring to bear the technical skills and capital resources needed to reverse the downward course of the developing countries and to restore the chance of their peoples for a better life.

We are unanimous in the belief that, at this point in history, a new long-term policy direction is indicated urgently—a policy that deals massively, directly, and effectively with this central problem of today's world.

We are unanimous, also, in the belief that the United States must assume leadership of the free world and all of its international institutions in a coordinated, long-range development strategy for raising the economic level of the poor nations, thereby meeting the threat of hunger, increasing the volume of world trade and economic activity, and contributing to the achievement of the goal of ultimate importance, a lasting peace.

Mr. President, the credentials of the experts—more than 100 of them—who reached the above conclusions, are beyond reproach. These are eminent scientists, economists, agricultural experts, educators, and industry leaders.

These men, who have faced up to the crisis, demand action—and not the kind which reduces appropriations for technical assistance by \$33 million.

Here is a major recommendation on technical assistance from the PSAC report, volume I, page 38:

United States technical assistance should be made an equal partner with capital assistance and the structure of the foreign assistance organization should reflect this emphasis. Appropriation authorization should be on at least a five-year basis and, insofar as possible, should be considered and evaluated separately from capital assistance. The goal of United States technical assistance should be more than imparting special knowledge. It should include creation of indigenous professional manpower and permanent, independent institutions able to sustain themselves for the future; as well as data collection, research and information, and analysis of county problems. Present tours of duty for technical assistance personnel should be lengthened, as the experience of two decades has shown. The recommendations of the Gardner Report, "AID and the Universities," concerning personnel, career opportunities in development, and long-term engagement of universities and government agencies should be implemented as soon as possible.

And again, Mr. President, still another recommendation:

Each executive agency should be given an administrative and Congressional mandate to 'man for' long-term foreign assistance, rather than 'squeeze out' projects from domestic personnel. The dichotomy of 'domestic' vs. 'foreign' interest is no longer tenable and must be eliminated as a short-term view so that the technical expertise and manpower of the entire Federal establishment can be made directly available for foreign aid, as needed, without subterfuge or indirection.

That, I submit is the sort of action this Congress should be taking toward foreign aid and technical assistance—not hack-

ing \$33 million away from AID, but giving them the money, and the manpower, and the lead time they need to accomplish the miracles they can achieve in the hungry world.

Take wheat, for example. Wheat constitutes such a large proportion of the world's food supply that, even though it normally has a relatively low protein content, it is the world's largest single source of protein for human consumption.

More protein is obtained from wheat, for example, than from all animal products combined. The University of Nebraska, in a cooperative arrangement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, has done more research than any other institution on the protein content of wheat. Genes that increase protein content by as much as 25 percent have already been identified. However, little has been done to explore the full range of possibilities, or to introduce these genes into commercial wheat varieties, largely because the exceptionally high protein content is presently found in the soft wheats which are not suited for the American type of bread-baking uses. I might mention here that Americans do not need to consider wheat as a primary source of protein, since most Americans receive their protein intake from animal sources—meat, poultry, eggs, milk, cheeses, et cetera.

Now in addition to staff competence and good facilities, the University of Nebraska also has the locational advantage of being able to work on both soft and hard wheats, as well as on wheats with winter or spring growth habits.

Under an adaptive research contract with AID, Nebraska University scientists will screen the world wheat collection for additional high protein strains, and these high protein characteristics will be introduced into wheat varieties important to the hungry nations.

These modified varieties will be evaluated first in Nebraska and then, quite rapidly, in selected less developed countries. If they prove successful, and there is every reason to believe they will, another miracle of adaptive research will have brought closer the day when we can truly hope to save the world from starvation.

Our geneticists have gone forward to the outer limits of technology in cross-breeding plants. It is now possible, Mr. President, to say quite literally that a plant is a manmade creation rather than a miracle of nature.

There are dozens of important examples of adaptive research being carried on by the universities through AID contracts, Mr. President, and I have mentioned only a couple of them.

In my own home State, the University of Minnesota has undertaken a contract with AID to work in Tunisia, to do an intensive economic analysis of that country's agricultural sector, and to improve the capabilities of the Tunisian Ministry of Agriculture.

These important studies will be under the able direction of Dr. Willard Cochran, the internationally well-known agricultural economist who is the dean of the university's international programs, and Dr. John Blackmore, director

of foreign agricultural programs for the University of Minnesota.

This research contract, which just started last month, is an important example of the transfer of agricultural decisionmaking, and analytical know-how; a bold attempt to develop indigenous competence in resource management—the Minnesota team will be able to recommend whether to put in wells or irrigation systems, whether to plant wheat or forage crops, to establish a set of priorities for the Ministry of Agriculture—but all of this American know-how must be adapted to Tunisia.

That is the secret ingredient which makes our best projects so successful—the realization that just because it works in Minnesota, it would not necessarily work in Mysore, or Minas Gerais. Local soil content, local water, local climate, local ways of doing things, these must be taken into consideration. Only when these factors are put into the equation, do we have the margin for success.

We must have that success. The future depends upon it.

The crisis we face demands the best of us, not the worst. Let us face it bravely. Let us win the war on hunger.

Let us—at the very minimum—restore the \$33 million for technical assistance in the bill before us.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for his important leadership on this issue. I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to support the Senator from Alabama in his efforts to restore the \$33 million cut in technical assistance. In my estimation, this is one of the most indefensible cuts made by the Foreign Relations Committee—the one which will hurt most.

There is a basic shortage of trained personnel in underdeveloped countries. Without the utilization of skilled U.S. technicians, and the training of local people in these skills, we cannot possibly achieve the goals we seek. We cannot turn the corner to put underdeveloped countries on their feet, moving toward self-sufficiency.

As one example, if the \$33 million cut is allowed to stand, there is little hope of funding the programs established in section 211(d) of the 1966 AID authorization act, and for which an authorization has again been requested this year. This section authorized \$10 million to establish educational programs in the universities for training of specialists for AID foreign service, but the program has not been inaugurated because no funds have been appropriated. The outlook for it is bleak unless we take action here today.

One of the areas in which there is a great lack of trained personnel is in irrigated agriculture. I am told that manpower is short, almost to the point of catastrophe. Those of us who come from areas of the United States where our lands must be irrigated, know what the use of proper irrigation techniques can do for other areas of the world where water is short. Some of the current food shortages—shortages which the United States is being called upon to make up—might be alleviated if enough trained personnel on arid-land agricultural de-

velopment were available to show farmers in underdeveloped areas how to get the most production from their irrigated lands.

The Utah State University at Logan, Utah, which is a great center of water research and water-oriented activities in the Rocky Mountain area, is well-equipped to train specialists in irrigation, and would welcome the opportunity. It was in Utah, as everyone knows, that irrigation was first introduced in 1847 by English speaking Americans, the Mormon pioneers. We have been working ever since on improved techniques and programs.

Utah State University has been invited to form a consortium with Colorado State University and the University of California to train personnel for arid-land agricultural development, and would be happy to do so. If adequate funds are authorized in this bill before us today, this important program could be inaugurated.

I mention the shortage of skilled agriculturalists as only one aspect of the technical assistance program which would be affected by the cut made by the committee.

There will be a serious setback in the small African countries if the cut stands. In these countries, technical assistance is the major part of the programs in the area, and the programs for population control and other major health programs would feel the cut in a harsh way.

I do not believe that we can afford to allow these things to happen.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 56, as follows:

[No. 227 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Anderson	Hill	Muskie
Bayh	Inouye	Nelson
Brewster	Javits	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Pell
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Percy
Clark	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Cooper	Mansfield	Sparkman
Gore	McCarthy	Spong
Harris	Metcalf	Tydings
Hart	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Hayden	Moss	

NAYS—56

Aiken	Fulbright	Miller
Baker	Griffin	Monroney
Bennett	Gruening	Morse
Bible	Hansen	Mundt
Boggs	Hartke	Murphy
Burdick	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Proity
Cannon	Hollings	Proxmire
Carlson	Hruska	Ribicoff
Church	Jackson	Scott
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Smith
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Dirksen	Kuchel	Symington
Dominick	Lausche	Thurmond
Eastland	Long, La.	Tower
Ellender	Magnuson	Williams, Del.
Ervin	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	McGovern	Young, Ohio
Fong	McIntyre	

NOT VOTING—12

Allott	Hatfield	Russell
Bartlett	McGee	Smathers
Brooke	Montoya	Talmadge
Dodd	Morton	Yarborough

So Mr. SPARKMAN's amendment to Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRUENING. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the presiding officer state what the issue is? There has been so much noise that Senators could not understand.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 275) of the Senator from Oregon, which the clerk will state for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 40, amend line 22 to read as follows: "amended (1) by striking out '1967' and substituting '1968' and (2) by striking out '\$210,000,000' and substituting '\$200,000,000'."

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 228 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Baker	Ervin	McClellan
Bennett	Fannin	McGovern
Bible	Fong	McIntyre
Boggs	Gruening	Miller
Burdick	Hansen	Morse
Byrd, Va.	Hartke	Murphy
Cannon	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Church	Hollings	Stennis
Cotton	Hruska	Thurmond
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Jordan, Idaho	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Long, La.	Young, Ohio

NAYS—52

Aiken	Hill	Muskie
Anderson	Holland	Nelson
Bartlett	Inouye	Pastore
Bayh	Jackson	Pearson
Brewster	Javits	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Percy
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Proity
Case	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Clark	Lausche	Scott
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Smith
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dominick	Mansfield	Spong
Fulbright	McCarthy	Symington
Gore	Metcalf	Tower
Griffin	Mondale	Tydings
Harris	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Moss	
Hayden	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—12

Allott	McGee	Russell
Brooke	Montoya	Smathers
Dodd	Morton	Talmadge
Hatfield	Randolph	Yarborough

So Mr. MORSE's amendment No. 275) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 267

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 267.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 65, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

"PART IV—JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

"SEC. 401. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new part IV to read as follows:

"PART IV—JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

"SEC. 701. DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—Recognizing that dramatic, far-reaching, and portentous changes have occurred in recent years in the realities of world politics and the interrelationships of nations, it is the sense of the Congress that there is an urgent need for a thorough review and reevaluation of United States foreign economic and military assistance in the light of present and anticipated future conditions. It is the purpose of this part to establish a joint congressional committee to undertake this review and reevaluation with a view to obtaining for the Congress and the Nation a better understanding of what our role in present and future world affairs should be, and how our foreign assistance can best reflect that role and serve the national interest.

"SEC. 702. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE.—There is established a joint congressional committee on foreign aid (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to conduct a full and detailed investigation and study of the entire field of foreign assistance programs. The joint committee shall be composed of seven Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, three of whom shall be members of the minority party appointed after consultation with the minority leader, and seven Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, three of whom shall be members of the minority party appointed after consultation with the minority leader. Not more than four members appointed from the Senate shall be members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and not more than four members appointed from the House of Representatives shall be members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

"SEC. 703. DUTIES.—The joint committee shall conduct a full and detailed assessment and evaluation of present and anticipated world conditions, United States foreign assistance programs, and goals of United States foreign policy in order to determine those objectives best calculated to further our national interests and the most efficacious means and programs of attaining these aims in light of changing national and international political and economic conditions and the importance of foreign assistance in the conduct of our foreign affairs under these conditions. The joint committee shall submit an interim report to each House of Congress as to the results of its investigation and study as soon as possible after the date

of enactment of this part and not later than one year after such date shall submit a final report to each House of Congress with respect to its activities, investigations, and studies under this part, together with such recommendations (including specific recommendations for legislation) as it determines appropriate in light of its study. The joint committee shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of its final report.

"SEC. 704. VACANCIES; SELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.—A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"SEC. 705. HEARINGS; SUBPENA POWER.—In carrying out its duties under this part, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or by any member designated by him or by the joint committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The provisions of sections 102-104 of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the joint committee, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses, provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

"SEC. 706. STAFF AND ASSISTANCE.—The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government, and also of private research agencies.

"SEC. 707. EXPENSES.—The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the joint committee, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee or by any members of the joint committee duly authorized by the chairman."

On page 65, line 5, strike out "IV" and substitute "V".

On page 65, line 6, strike out "401." and substitute "501."

On page 67, line 16, strike out "402." and substitute "502."

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas will suspend, and the Chair will try to get some order.

The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it is my

intention to ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment. I do not anticipate that it will take any longer than 10 minutes to cover the matter.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, last evening I had placed in the RECORD a rather lengthy statement in support of my amendment.

I will not do anything more than to summarize that statement at this time.

The debate this year, as is always the case, is one of vigor and characterizes much of the discontent surrounding our foreign aid program. It has been emphasized by the action of the Foreign Relations Committee and by the amendments offered on the floor which, in many cases, have gone beyond the usual amendments to cut or add money or, in this case, to limit the number of nations which may receive benefits, as we discussed earlier today.

I think it involves, beyond that, basic policy issues such as the numerous amendments concerning the sale of arms to nations around the world.

I indicated in my statement that it seemed to me that there were four causes of discontent.

One is a lack of confidence in the administration of the foreign assistance bill. Another is the recognition that so many of those policies that served us and served us well in the forties and fifties are inadequate in the late sixties.

Another is a recognition that we cannot and, perhaps, should not seek to dominate world affairs as we did immediately after World War II.

Another is a recognition that the situation in Vietnam is affecting all that we do in this particular field.

I take note that the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday morning and in prior hearings has been seeking to have some definition of what our world commitments are and what the role of Congress should be in determining foreign policy and our commitments throughout the world.

The pending amendment would establish a joint congressional committee composed of some 14 Members to review and reassess not only our foreign policy goals, but also the role of the foreign assistance program in relation to our foreign policy. It would be composed of seven Members from each House, at least three from the minority party, and no more than four Members from the Foreign Relations Committee or the Foreign Affairs Committee. These latter Members would lend the expertise that they possess. We would also have the benefit of new ideas from the people on this committee.

The committee, under the terms of the pending amendment, would report within 1 year. I will not recite all of the objectives that seem valid to me as set forth on page 6 of the statement which is on the desk of each Senator. The objectives are not limited by any means to those that are mentioned. However, they are, in my judgment, some of the crucial things that Congress can and should do to serve this country concerning a real

expression on the foreign assistance program.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the pending amendment was submitted only yesterday, and no opportunity has been afforded the committee to study the measure. It seems to me that if this proposal is to be pursued seriously, it should be introduced as a bill and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration.

No hearings have been held on the subject.

This proposed joint committee would be given a staff and subpoena power, and yet all that it could do would be to make recommendations. The committee would not be authorized—and properly so, of course—to report a bill.

If any subject has been studied at great length, it is the foreign aid program. I do not think that any further study is needed by a new committee at this time.

I do not believe that a committee of this nature could get at what really afflicts foreign aid. I do not believe that lack of study is why there is so much dissatisfaction.

Many new problems have arisen as a result of our foreign and domestic troubles. These new circumstances and policies have caused the committee and the public, I believe, to view foreign aid differently from the way we have viewed it in the past. I do not believe that this is the proper time or place to undertake to create a brandnew study committee, without having conducted any hearings on the question at all.

The matter should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for hearings and a determination as to whether or not this proposal has merit.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the argument I want to make against the proposal is that what it really proposes is that we, in effect, create a Joint Foreign Relations Committee for a specific purpose.

I think the proposal seriously reflects on the Foreign Relations Committee.

The Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House are perfectly competent to deal with an investigation of foreign aid. We are doing it all the time.

I talked earlier this afternoon of how we are conducting a further investigation of foreign aid in connection with the Alliance for Progress and how other subcommittees of our committee are carrying out the instructions of the distinguished majority leader earlier this year to investigate the policies that fall within their jurisdiction.

I am a little at a loss to understand why the Senator would seek to substitute some independent committee for the jurisdictional rights, powers, and pre-

rogatives of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House.

Mr. PEARSON. I yield myself 1 minute.

I will say to the Senator from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that he is, of course, absolutely correct that this matter was not submitted to the committee. However, I thought it was consistent with the achievements sought by the chairman in the recent hearings seeking to define the role of Congress and our commitments throughout the world.

I simply say to the Senator from Oregon that if it is viewed as a reflection upon the committee, it was not so meant, and I would not want that to be the interpretation received by the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to the review of the role of Congress in foreign relations and with regard to our commitments, we have already started hearings. We had a hearing yesterday, we had one this morning, and we will have hearings on Monday and Wednesday of next week. That study is in progress. If further study is required, we will do it.

It is an extremely interesting subject, I may say, but it is already underway.

Mr. PEARSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea"

and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 65, as follows:

[No. 229 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Baker	Griffin	Pearson
Boggs	Hruska	Percy
Carlson	Javits	Prouty
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Curtis	Kuchel	Thurmond
Dominick	Mansfield	Tower
Fannin	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Murphy	

NAYS—65

Aiken	Hansen	Metcalf
Anderson	Harris	Miller
Bartlett	Hart	Mondale
Bayh	Hartke	Monroney
Bennett	Hayden	Morse
Bible	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Brewster	Hill	Muskie
Burdick	Holland	Nelson
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Pell
Cannon	Jackson	Proxmire
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Clark	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Sparkman
Cotton	Lausche	Spong
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Eastland	Long, La.	Symington
Ellender	Magnuson	Tydings
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Gore	McGovern	Young, Ohio
Gruening	McIntyre	

NOT VOTING—12

Allott	McGee	Russell
Brooke	Montoya	Smathers
Dodd	Morton	Talmadge
Hatfield	Randolph	Yarborough

So Mr. PEARSON's amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 268

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 268 and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 56, line 15, strike out "subsection is" and insert in lieu thereof "subsections are".

On page 57, line 13, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 57, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

"(t) No assistance shall be furnished under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, in or to any country which has severed or hereafter severs diplomatic relations with the United States or with which the United States has severed or hereafter severs diplomatic relations, unless (1) diplomatic relations have been resumed with such country and (2) agreements for the furnishing of such assistance or the making of such sales, as the case may be, have been negotiated and entered into after the resumption of diplomatic relations with such country."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes on this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to deny aid to countries which have severed relations with the United States and to keep that aid from going to them until relations have been resumed.

My amendment is a simple amendment, and I wonder whether the chairman would be willing to accept it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have consulted with the Senator from Alaska about this measure. I think it is a good amendment, and that what he proposes should be the policy of the Government. In any case, I am glad to accept the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Do Senators yield back the remainder of the time?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Several Senators requested third reading.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we are not ready for third reading. I would like to have the attention of the majority leader to find out what other amendments are to be offered.

I have two more amendments to offer and I thought that other Senators had amendments. I thought the Senator from Iowa had an amendment and that the Senator from Alaska had another amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. I have another amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as far as I know—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. May we have order so that we may hear the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as far as I can determine we have two possible amendments by the Senator from Oregon and one possible amendment by the Senator from Alaska. Does anyone know the wishes of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we have two amendments, one by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and one by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

Mr. MANSFIELD. So that on the other side there will be one amendment by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and one amendment by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and that is about it. That would be five amendments. At the rate we are going I would hope that it would be possible to finish tonight.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not intend to use all of my time on my two amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope that no Senator takes all of his time.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the majority leader the following question: If we were to finish tonight, would the Senate meet tomorrow and will committees be permitted to meet tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, under the circumstances, both will occur. Passage of the pending bill will be followed by the

Defense appropriation bill, which is long overdue now.

Mr. CLARK. I assume, though, that there will be no votes on it tomorrow; is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, that is up to the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I ask what the answer was with reference to the meeting of committees tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If we have concluded on the pending business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is it—that is what I wanted to know.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The reason why we will meet tomorrow is that we wasted 3 hours this morning while committees were in session and we had to declare a recess until we could be sure that Senators would be here.

AMENDMENT NO. 276

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am now ready to proceed with my next amendment.

I call up my amendment No. 276, and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to S. 1872, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes: On page 48, line 5, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$40,000,000".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in cooperation with the distinguished majority leader, I discussed this amendment, along with other Senators, at some length last night. Some Senators will find my argument in the RECORD. I will thumbnail it now.

Mr. President, my proposal would reduce the contingency fund from \$50 million to \$40 million—a \$10 million cut. I discussed this last night from the standpoint of what I think is a sound basis for the proposed cut.

Let me take the Senate back to a history of the development of the contingency fund.

The contingency fund was never designed to be a fund to be used at the arbitrary discretion of a President of the United States for almost anything he might decide to use it for.

What has happened is that under the contingency fund, the President, on some occasions, has been using it for budget support money, using it for various grants that he, in the wisdom of his discretion, decides upon and draws upon the contingency fund for.

That was never the purpose for which the contingency fund was first established.

The basis of a contingency fund is to have one for the President to use in the event of a great crisis or national emergency, so that he can proceed immediately to make money available pending his coming to Congress with a message, or appearing in person before a joint session of Congress, to get funds to continue aid in connection with some great emergency.

There has been a great deterioration in the use of the contingency fund. I speak most respectfully because I am not talking about individual Presidents, I am talking about what has developed in the

history of administrations in the Office of the President.

Suppose there is an attack upon us in some part of the world. The President has a contingency fund so that he can respond immediately. It should be limited to those situations in which he should act, and act quickly, in order to provide funds to get something that is of a national emergency characteristic.

Certainly a contingency fund should not be permitted to continue to develop into a general purpose fund which the President can use, sort of by way of concealment.

I spoke last night about the separation of powers doctrine which is related to the hearings which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has been conducting. We have gone a long way already in the breakdown of the balance of power check and the balance of power relationship between the executive and legislative branches.

Everyone knows that if there is an emergency, and the President thinks we should appropriate funds, he can make his case quickly and get up here with a message or get up here to a joint session of Congress. If he makes his case, he will get the money.

That is a far cry from what the contingency fund has come to be used for.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table which is printed on page 182 of the hearings.

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

Approved uses of the contingency fund through June 30, 1967

[Source: Agency for International Development]

Africa:	Thousands
Ivory Coast: Loan for public safety commodities	\$275
Lesotho: Independence Day gift.....	100
Sudan: Grant for technical assistance purposes: Highway construction administration project.....	3,700
Total.....	4,075

East Asia:	
Indonesia:	
Grant for technical assistance purposes (training activities resumed under Presidential determination)	1,300
Budgetary support loan for commodities	17,000
Total.....	18,300

Latin America:	
Dominican Republic:	
Grant for public safety commodities	276
Grant for technical assistance purposes: To augment program of new government.....	1,900
Budgetary support loan for commodities	5,000
Guatemala: Grant for technical assistance activities involving urgent security-related considerations	1,099
Haiti: Grant for malaria eradication program	400
Panama:	
Program assistance loan.....	5,600
Program assistance grant.....	1,388
Grants for urgent technical assistance activities	2,600
Grant for technical assistance.....	600

Approved uses of the contingency fund through June 30, 1967—Continued

[Source: Agency for International Development]

Latin America—Continued	Thousands
Uruguay: Grant for technical assistance purposes: Impact program requiring immediate funding	400

Total	19,262
-------	--------

Near East/South Asia:	
Jordan: Extraordinary budget support	2,000
Regional: Grant for cholera control: Emergency stockpile of vaccines and equipment	457
Total	2,457

Nonregional:	
International aid coordination:	
Grant for administrative expenses of supporting office for new Asian Development Bank	70
General technical services: Expansion of malaria eradication program	500
Office of Private Resources: Surveys of investment opportunities	150
Administration: American schools and hospitals abroad	600
Disaster relief:	
Drought	120
Civil strife	42
Hurricanes	288
Floods	460
Earthquakes	1,185
Ambassador's authority	755
Refugee relief	1,775
Emergency stockpile	100
Total	6,045

Grand total	50,139
-------------	--------

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to cite a few examples which the President has used the contingency fund for.

To the Ivory Coast for a loan for public safety commodities, \$275,000.

What has that got to do with the historic purpose of a contingency fund? Nothing.

What emergency is involved there? None.

I know that I am on delicate ground here, but I speak most respectfully about the Office of the President. I simply say that we should not be making a "kitty" available, or a slush fund available, or whatever descriptive term we want to apply to it, for the President to use at his will, simply because it is more convenient than using regular aid categories. This is breaking down the separation of powers doctrine. We are seeking to turn over to the President what amounts to a legislative function. He decides on a Presidential foreign aid program on his own, which is not what is called for. A foreign aid program should be passed by Congress and the President either signs it or vetoes it.

Next item, Lesotho, independence day gift \$100,000.

Sudan, a grant for technical assistance purposes, highway construction administration project \$3,700,000.

Why in the world is that coming out of a contingency fund? If they want that kind of aid program for these countries, come on up to Congress with a bill.

Next item, east Asia, Indonesia—grant for technical assistance purposes—training activities resumed under Presi-

dential determination—\$1,300,000. Budgetary support loan for commodities, \$17 million.

Why, I ask?

Why do we give that kind of arbitrary, discretionary power to the office of the President? There is no national emergency involved there.

Jordan, extraordinary budget support, \$2 million.

Regional—grant for cholera control—emergency stockpile of vaccines and equipment, \$457,000.

There would be no trouble getting these funds through the regular legislative course.

International aid coordination, grant for administrative expenses of supporting office for new Asian Development Bank, \$70,000.

General technical services, expansion of malaria eradication program, \$500,000.

Then there is drought relief, ambassador's authority, refugee relief, emergency stockpile—all I am saying is that I think the contingency fund is developing into being abused.

When I ask for the elimination of \$10 million, that will still leave \$40 million. That is plenty. \$40 million to respond quickly to a disaster involving the national interest should be enough temporarily. A message can be sent to Congress; or the President can come up in person to a joint session of Congress, and everyone knows that the President will get the money, if he can make his case.

That is my argument, Mr. President. Some persons do not like legal arguments, but my argument is based on a sound legal premise—whether or not we are going to keep the check-and-balance system vital, viable, and working in this democracy of ours.

Symbolically, this is a good amendment, too. I think it is a wise thing for the Senate to make the cut in the contingency fund, because note will be taken of it downtown, and I think it is a good check to impose upon the President.

Mr. President, as far as I am concerned, I am ready to yield back my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate unduly. This is a relatively minor amendment. We could all argue about a few dollars one way or the other. The committee has already considered the authorization for this contingency fund. I think the authorization approval by the committee is about the right amount.

I am willing to yield back my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have the Senator from Arkansas take the amendment to conference so I do not have to ask for a rollcall vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is going to be in conference.

Mr. MORSE. But a vote is important.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have already cut it from \$100 million to \$50 million. It seems to me that is sufficient. The Senator wants to cut it another \$10 million.

I agree that there is no way of proving that that amount is exactly right.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The committee cut the request from \$100 million to \$50 million. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that the committee, in the last several years, has been cutting the emergency fund each year?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The contingency fund.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I asked the staff assistant to get me the figures.

With due regard to the Senator from Oregon, he enumerated a number of uses to which this money is put, but on page 182 of the hearings there is a list of many other uses to which the money has been put—for disaster relief, drought, \$120,000; civil strife, \$42,000; hurricanes, \$288,000; floods, \$460,000; earthquakes, \$1,185,000.

We have got it down pretty low, Mr. President.

I concur in the statement that if the amount were cut by \$10 million it would make no difference in conference, but the fact is that the committee has been conscious of this fund. We have cut it year after year. We cut the President's request from \$100 million to \$50 million this year.

A member of the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee has provided me with figures showing the vigor exercised by the Foreign Relations Committee in reducing the amounts authorized for use to the President as an emergency fund.

In fiscal 1963, the amount of the authorization was \$300 million. The appropriation was \$250 million.

In 1964 the authorization was \$160 million. The appropriation was \$50 million.

In 1965 the authorization was \$150 million. The appropriation was \$99.2 million.

In 1966 the authorization was \$239 million. The appropriation was \$139 million.

In 1967 the authorization was \$110 million. The appropriation was \$35 million.

I submit these figures as a demonstration that members of the Foreign Relations Committee have been completely alert to the need of reducing the amounts allocated for emergency use.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. All the good purposes to which the Senator has alluded are in the list which I have put in the RECORD. That is what the \$40 million would be for.

Mr. President, one could not imagine a greater need than \$40 million when one keeps in mind the emergency nature of the contingency fund, and when he keeps in mind the fact that the President can send up to the Congress an emergency message.

We did not have a great discussion of it in committee when I announced

that I would seek to get the amount cut to \$40 million.

I would that my chairman would take the amendment to conference, but if not, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment is yielded back.

The yeas and nays are requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA].

If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 230 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Baker	Curtis	Hartke
Bennett	Dominick	Hill
Bible	Eastland	Hollings
Boggs	Ellender	Hruska
Burdick	Ervin	Jordan, Idaho
Byrd, Va.	Fannin	Long, Mo.
Byrd, W. Va.	Gore	McClellan
Church	Gruening	McGovern
Cotton	Hansen	McIntyre

Metcalf
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Prouty

Proxmire
Scott
Spong
Stennis
Thurmond

Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—46

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Brewster
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Harris
Hart
Hayden

Hickenlooper
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
Miller
Mondale

Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Ribicoff
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—14

Allott
Brooke
Cannon
Dodd
Hatfield

McGee
Montoya
Morton
Nelson
Randolph

Russell
Smathers
Talmadge
Yarborough

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of my fellow Senators, I do not plan to take long on my amendment, but I should like to point out a few things about it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator call up his amendment?

AMENDMENT NO. 271

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 271, as modified, and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 57, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

"(u) In any decision to provide or continue to provide any program of assistance to any country under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, there shall be taken into account the status of the country with respect to its dues, assessments, and other obligations to the United Nations; and where such country is delinquent with respect to any such obligations, the Administrator shall furnish the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the assurance given by the government of the country concerned of paying all of its arrearages and of placing its payments of such obligations on a current basis, or a full explanation of the unusual or exceptional circumstances which render it economically incapable of giving such assurance."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time consumed by the quorum call be charged to neither side.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the dis-

tinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the distinguished minority leader, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. At this time, I ask unanimous consent that there be a 20-minute time limitation on the pending amendment, 15 minutes to be under the control of the Senator from Iowa, and 5 minutes under the control of the chairman of the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. MILLER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator from Iowa yield himself?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, the basis for my amendment is pretty well registered on page 237 of the hearing transcript.

Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will try to obtain order.

The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. MILLER. On page 237, Senators will find a table which may be somewhat shocking. That table lists 56 nations which are members of the United Nations and which are recipients of our foreign aid, but which, as of last December 31, were more than 1 year behind in the payment of their dues and assessments to the United Nations. As a matter of fact, 40 other nations were delinquent in one way or another, making a total of 96 nations receiving foreign aid from the United States, and delinquent, in some respect, in the payment of their dues and assessments to the United Nations.

The deplorable situation, plus the fact that it has long been our general policy to support the United Nations, is the basis for my amendment.

The way our foreign aid program is working out is inconsistent with that general policy. There ought to be some way of tying in a consideration of the payment of United Nations dues and assessments by a nation with payments to such nation under our foreign aid program. This is a matter that has become increasingly worse. On April 5, 1962, when I first offered this amendment, only 25 nations receiving our foreign aid were more than 1 year behind in the payment of their dues and assessments to the United Nations. The next year, in November 1963, when the amendment was next offered, the number had risen to 35. When it was next offered, on August 10, 1964, the number was up to 41. On June 8, 1965, the number was up to 46. Today the number is up to 56—56 nations receiving foreign aid from the United States are more than 1 year behind in the payment of their dues and assessments to the United Nations. In addition, 40 others—or a total of 96—are delinquent in one way or another.

Our foreign policy has long been to support the United Nations as an organization which has the potential—if the principles of its charter are adhered to—of helping secure a more orderly and

peaceful world. The financial assistance the United States has provided the United Nations and its specialized agencies clearly demonstrates this support. For fiscal 1967, the United States will contribute a record \$233 million for this purpose, which will bring our total support since the inception of the U.N. to \$2.9 billion. This is nearly one-half the \$6 billion expended by the U.N. during this period. During the current fiscal year, the United States will be paying approximately 30 percent of the cost of the United Nations and its 11 specialized agencies, nearly 40 percent of the Cyprus and Middle East peacekeeping forces, 40 percent of the U.N. Development Program and the Children's Fund, and up to 70 percent of special relief programs. In addition, we have purchased some \$76.2 million of United Nations bonds under authority extended by the Congress to purchase 50 percent of the subscriptions made under a \$200 million U.N. bond issue designed to relieve a serious financial crisis in the U.N.

Notwithstanding the strong support of the United States, the United Nations has been in a worsening financial position as a result of the failure of member nations to pay their dues and assessments. As of December 31, 1966, delinquencies in the regular budget and the Congo and Middle East peacekeeping operations totaled over \$167 million. Of 117 members of the United Nations as of December 31, 1966, 108 were delinquent in one form or another as of last February 8. Of these, 96 received foreign aid from the United States, and their combined arrearages amounted to \$65 million. The Soviet Union was delinquent in excess of \$76 million and other Eastern bloc nations—including Poland—were delinquent in excess of \$27 million. It is apparent that the Soviet Union and its bloc must bear the primary responsibility for the financial crisis in the U.N. However, it should not be overlooked that there are 96 members of the United Nations which have been receiving foreign aid from us and which by their very numbers as well as total combined arrearages of \$65 million, contribute materially to the crisis.

One might well ask the question whether, if the 96 nations receiving our foreign aid were reasonably current in their dues and assessments, the weight of world opinion would not long ago have persuaded the Soviet Union and the other members of its bloc to pay up their delinquencies.

There seems to be an inconsistency between our foreign aid programs and our foreign policy with respect to the United Nations. It would seem that one of the first requirements for eligibility to receive our foreign aid should be that the recipient nation is supporting the United Nations. Instead, it almost appears that one of our guidelines is that the recipient nation be contributing to the financial crisis of the U.N. by failing to pay its dues and assessments. At least this is the way it has worked out. Something should be done about it.

Each year since 1961, when I first became alarmed over the worsening financial situation in the United Nations, I have offered an amendment designed to do something about it. Until last year my

amendment was resisted by administration leaders, but no better solution to the problem was proposed. The attitude seemed to be that if the Congress did nothing about it, the problem would eventually go away. Last year the Senate adopted my amendment, but, due to administration negativism, it was dropped in conference.

With a view to trying to move our Government off dead center, I am this year offering a somewhat different amendment which is designed to require our foreign aid administration and its officials to pursue the goal of seeing to it that those nations which receive our foreign aid live up to their commitment to the Charter of the United Nations by paying up their delinquencies in dues and assessments and keeping their payments current.

Under my amendment, the foreign aid Administrator and his assistants must take into account the status of each country in this payment of its dues, assessments, and other obligations to the United Nations in determining whether and to what extent any program of assistance shall be furnished or continue to be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act. In the case of a nation which is delinquent, the Administrator must furnish the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee a report of the assurance such nation has given of paying up its delinquencies and placing its payments on a current basis, or a full report of the unusual or exceptional circumstances which prevent it from giving such assurance.

I can envision a rare situation where such unusual or exceptional circumstances exist, as, for example, in the case of Nationalist China, whose share of the U.N. budget has continued at approximately the same percentage since it became a charter member of the United Nations, although such percentage is unrealistic when related to the economy of Taiwan. But, for the most part, the scale of dues and assessments has been established according to each member's relative ability to pay, taking into account its individual economy, so, as I have said, it would be a rare case where such unusual or exceptional circumstances exist. Because of the political situation existing in a country at a particular time, it might be that the administrator could not obtain assurance from the government officials that delinquencies would be promptly paid up and accounts placed on a current basis. This might well result in a suspension of our foreign aid. If a particular foreign aid program was deemed vital to our national security interest, it might be prudent to nevertheless move ahead with the program without suspension. In any event, the appropriate committees of the Congress would be kept fully advised, as they should be. And if it was determined that the discretionary authority in the hands of the administrator had been unwisely exercised, I am confident that the committees would initiate appropriate legislative action.

The amendment squares with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice rendered July 20, 1962, on the question put to it by the General Assem-

bly of the United Nations in resolution 1731(XVI) of December 20, 1961, whether expenditures authorized by the General Assembly relating to United Nations peacekeeping operations in the Congo and Middle East constituted "expenses of the Organization" within the meaning of article 17, paragraph 2, of the charter, to be apportioned in accordance with the power granted the General Assembly by article 19, paragraph 2. My amendment further squares with Resolution 1854 (XVII) of the General Assembly accepting this advisory opinion. Both the regular dues and the assessments for peacekeeping operations are taken into account in determining whether a country is in arrears.

To give the Senate a picture of how serious the situation is, I have prepared a table showing 56 of the 96 nations receiving our foreign aid which were delinquent in their dues and assessments as of last February—the latest information available. These 56 nations were over 1 year delinquent and 35 of the 56 were over 1 year delinquent in regular dues alone. The table shows the total arrearages, the portion of the arrearages more than 1 year delinquent, the amount of U.S. foreign aid extended during fiscal year 1966, and the total foreign aid extended for all years. When considered in relation to the amount of our foreign aid, the burden of paying up the delinquencies is—in the overwhelming number of countries—insignificant.

For example, it will be noted that Afghanistan's total delinquencies as of December 31, 1966, came to \$122,297; but during fiscal 1966 we furnished her over \$40 million in foreign aid. The amount of delinquencies was less than four-tenths of 1 percent of our foreign aid for just 1 year. Argentina's arrearages totaled some \$2.5 million; but during fiscal 1966 we furnished her nearly \$45 million in foreign aid. Practically all of the 96 countries which are delinquent received foreign aid far, far in excess of the amount of their delinquencies to the United Nations.

I have prepared another table showing the countries over 2 years delinquent and thus subject to the loss of voting rights under article 19 of the charter. Of the 35 countries listed, 21 received U.S. foreign aid during fiscal year 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that the two tables to which I have referred be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MILLER. The situation has been worsening. When my amendment was first offered in the Senate on April 5, 1962, there were only 25 nations receiving our foreign aid which were more than 1 year delinquent.

On November 12, 1963, when the amendment was next offered, the number had risen to 35.

When it was next offered on August 10, 1964, the number was up to 41.

On June 8, 1965, I pointed out at the time the amendment was offered that there were 46 nations subject to the amendment.

On April 27, 1966, when I appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations

Committee, the number was still 46. Today, as I have already pointed out, it is up to 56. And bear in mind there are another 40 of our foreign aid recipients which, though not over 1 year in arrears, are in arrears in one way or another.

I believe I can safely predict that until we correlate our foreign aid programs with our foreign policy in support of the United Nations, bad as things are today,

they will grow even worse. Those nations which are keeping current in their payments will be encouraged to become delinquent, for they see us extending foreign aid without distinction between themselves and delinquent nations. Those nations less than 1 year in arrears will be encouraged to become even more delinquent, for they see us extending foreign aid without distinction be-

tween themselves and those more than 1 year in arrears.

The United States has an opportunity to reverse this unfortunate trend. My amendment represents a meaningful step in gearing our foreign-aid policy into our foreign policy of support for the United Nations. The stake is very high—a viable United Nations serving the cause of a more orderly and peaceful world.

EXHIBIT 1

TABLE 1.—COUNTRIES RECEIVING FOREIGN AID AND OVER 1 YEAR IN ARREARS IN U.N. DUES AND ASSESSMENTS

Country	Total U.N. arrears	U.N. arrears, calendar year 1965 and prior	U.S. aid, fiscal year 1966 (millions)	Total U.S. aid, fiscal years 1946-66 (millions)	Country	Total U.N. arrears	U.N. arrears, calendar year 1965 and prior	U.S. aid, fiscal year 1966 (millions)	Total U.S. aid, fiscal years 1946-66 (millions)
Afghanistan.....	\$122,297	\$64,748	\$40.4	\$349.2	Mali.....	\$107,912	\$61,872	\$2.7	\$18.8
Argentina.....	2,525,528	1,466,619	44.9	767.7	Mauritania.....	88,191	42,151	.1	2.9
Bolivia.....	175,794	129,754	40.4	470.7	Mexico.....	1,499,753	1,393,330	129.3	1,251.0
Brazil.....	1,673,140	579,702	415.7	3,234.8	Nepal.....	52,722	6,682	13.2	99.1
Burundi.....	174,790	128,754	.1	7.2	Nicaragua.....	104,202	78,162	21.7	132.5
Central African Republic.....	12,215	6,960	.5	3.3	Panama.....	51,244	45,989	16.9	172.6
Chad.....	66,051	20,011	1.2	5.3	Paraguay.....	132,125	86,085	16.0	106.5
Chile.....	574,488	366,633	124.5	1,254.4	Peru.....	201,218	162,826	50.6	677.6
China.....	19,593,100	14,701,401	152.8	4,957.3	Poland.....	5,486,598	4,393,562	7.5	558.4
Congo (Kinshasa).....	104,468	46,919	42.8	356.9	Portugal.....	406,314	233,666	3.5	518.1
Costa Rica.....	82,520	36,480	19.2	156.0	Rwanda.....	64,215	18,175	3.9	5.4
Dahomey.....	45,516	1.3	10.0	Saudi Arabia.....	235,095	154,526	4.3	143.1
Dominican Republic.....	199,563	153,523	116.6	322.3	Senegal.....	87,069	41,029	6.0	25.1
Ecuador.....	134,330	76,781	33.9	281.8	Sierra Leone.....	70,479	24,439	4.9	31.7
El Salvador.....	12,441	7,186	11.2	121.1	Somalia.....	85,737	39,697	5.4	52.9
France.....	19,589,190	17,032,152	20.7	9,449.2	Spain.....	2,157,844	2,009,932	158.7	2,089.9
Gambia.....	62,040	16,000	.3	4.4	Sudan.....	270,054	200,995	19.7	108.7
Greece.....	295,747	8,000	110.1	3,835.0	Syria.....	120,117	62,568	.7	83.8
Guatemala.....	49,100	39,845	9.6	213.9	Tanzania.....	6,359	1,104	6.9	51.5
Guinea.....	74,522	28,482	7.2	76.3	Thailand.....	28,824	2,430	61.3	494.6
Haiti.....	176,475	130,435	3.5	106.4	Togo.....	48,792	37,924	2.2	12.1
Honduras.....	33,490	16,794	14.4	87.7	Uganda.....	99,947	53,893	3.9	21.3
Iraq.....	349,680	257,601	5.4	118.2	United Arab Republic.....	644,515	379,788	60.5	1,156.5
Italy.....	1,403,276	544,242	71.6	6,261.2	Upper Volta.....	111,895	65,855	1.6	17.3
Ivory Coast.....	83,653	37,613	5.5	31.3	Uruguay.....	444,616	329,518	9.0	131.3
Jordan.....	167,085	121,045	48.0	557.0	Yemen.....	210,783	164,743	2.8	33.2
Laos.....	83,649	37,609	55.6	475.6	Yugoslavia.....	388,568	333,269	140.8	2,828.4
Lebanon.....	36,173	29,603	.1	88.4					
Libya.....	83,653	37,613	3.2	233.7	Total (56).....	61,143,646	46,571,231	2,154.8	44,646.7

Source: State Department 10:01A Report, Feb. 15, 1967, based on data supplied by United Nations Controller's Office, Feb. 14, 1967; Agency for International Development, Statistics and

Reports Division, Office of Program Coordinator, report on "U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants," Aug. 22, 1966.

TABLE 2.—NATIONS SUBJECT TO LOSS OF VOTING RIGHTS UNDER ART. 19, U.N. CHARTER

Country	Total U.N. arrears	Amount in excess of 1966 and 1966 U.N. arrears	U.S. aid, fiscal year 1966 (millions)
Albania.....	\$118,207	\$28,377
Argentina.....	2,525,528	458,244	\$44.9
Byelorussian S.S.R.....	2,618,832	1,277,336
Cuba.....	893,998	444,850
Czechoslovakia.....	4,845,557	2,031,980
France.....	19,589,190	3,878,203	20.7
Hungary.....	2,478,932	1,034,244
Poland.....	5,486,597	2,015,987	7.5
Rumania.....	1,385,950	483,020
South Africa.....	1,746,035	404,539
Ukrainian S.S.R.....	9,958,552	4,876,345
U.S.S.R.....	76,382,562	37,891,935
Yemen.....	210,783	120,952	2.8
Bolivia.....	175,794	85,975	40.4
Bulgaria.....	636,578	254,802
China.....	19,593,100	10,048,690	152.8
Congo (B).....	134,131	44,301
Dominican Republic.....	199,563	109,733	116.6
Haiti.....	176,475	86,645	3.5
Iraq.....	349,680	170,021	5.4
Jordan.....	167,085	77,254	48.0
Nicaragua.....	104,202	14,372	21.7
Ecuador.....	134,330	22,043	33.9
Paraguay.....	132,125	42,294	16.0
Saudi Arabia.....	235,095	77,894	4.3
Spain.....	2,157,844	518,453	158.7
Sudan.....	270,054	135,310	19.7
Syria.....	120,117	7,830	.7
United Arab Republic.....	644,515	127,995	60.5
Upper Volta.....	111,895	22,064	1.6
Uruguay.....	444,616	220,043	9.0
Burundi.....	174,790	84,959	.1
Total.....	151,202,726	67,096,690
Total for those 21 nations receiving U.S. aid for fiscal year 1966.....	53,003,378	18,324,961	768.8

¹ The payments required to avoid being subject to art. 19.

Source: Computed from State Department 10:01A Report, Feb. 15, 1967, based on data supplied by the United Nations Controller's Office, Feb. 14, 1967; updated State Department report; "U.S. Contributions to International Organizations," H. Doc. 445, 89th Cong., 2d sess., June 27, 1966; Agency for International Development, Statistics and Reports Division, Office of Program Coordinator, report on "U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants," Aug. 22, 1966.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a similar amendment was offered and adopted last year. I think the policy that it expresses is the correct one.

Many recipients of foreign aid do not pay their U.N. dues, and they ought to do so.

The pending amendment, in effect, directs the AID Administrator to take into account the status of the proposed recipient's U.N. contributions.

Many of the amounts owed by AID recipients are quite small. Of course, there are many countries over which we cannot exercise any influence in this manner. They consist of the major U.N. debtors; France, Russia, and others who are not recipients of aid. There is nothing that we can do by this method to influence them to pay.

I favor the basic objective of the amendment. I am sure that most Senators do.

I took the amendment to conference, last year, and in the form in which it was then written, they would not accept the amendment. I would be very willing to accept the amendment and do my best to persuade the House conferees to accept it.

It seems to me that the way the amendment is drafted gives sufficient leeway to the Administrator that he does not have to do anything that would really be offensive. He is instructed to use his best efforts to persuade the recipient

country to pay its dues. And these countries ought to pay their U.N. debts.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand the position of the chairman of the committee.

In my judgment, this is a matter for the United Nations to be deciding and not the Senate of the United States.

Do not forget that we must assume, along with Russia, a large share of the responsibility for the article in the United Nations Charter that calls for the payment of the assessments and arrears, failing which a country will lose its voting privilege. I think that is the way it ought to be handled.

I was against the compromise that the United States accepted. We never should have yielded. We should have insisted on a rollback and made the United Nations make the decision.

In the last year of Adlai Stevenson's service at the U.N. that is the position that was taken.

They were then afraid that the action was going to result in our perhaps losing a majority vote on something in the United Nations. So we receded. However, here again, I think we are trying to exercise direction over the United Nations ancillary to the procedure of the United Nations.

This matter ought to be fought out in the United Nations. That is where it ought to be fought out. And we ought to put up a fight and see that it is made

perfectly clear as to what our position will be if the dues are not paid.

On the other hand, I would be less than honest if I did not say that there is some merit in the position of the argument of the Senator from Iowa and the position of the chairman of the committee. I would be more inclined to go to that approach after we had really made the battle in the United Nations, which the United States has never done.

We have followed the policy of expediency there instead of the policy of principle.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 24, as follows:

[No. 231 Leg.]
YEAS—62

Aiken	Byrd, Va.	Dominick
Baker	Byrd, W. Va.	Eastland
Bartlett	Church	Ellender
Bayh	Cotton	Ervin
Bible	Curtis	Fannin
Burdick	Dirksen	Fulbright

Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche

Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie

Nelson
Prouty
Ribicoff
Scott
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—24

Anderson
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper

Fong
Gore
Hart
Holland
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
McCarthy

Moss
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Proxmire
Smith
William, N.J.

NOT VOTING—14

Allott
Brooke
Cannon
Dodd
Hatfield

Hickenlooper
McGee
Montoya
Morton
Randolph

Russell
Smathers
Talmadge
Yarborough

So Mr. MILLER's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill. The yeas and nays were ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO NOON TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, earlier in the day it appeared rather dubious that we would finish this bill today. Accordingly, the distinguished majority leader set the convening time for 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. In view of what has transpired this afternoon, I thought perhaps he might take a second look at that matter and that the Senate might convene a little later, perhaps at the usual hour of 12.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to take a second look and to do what I know the entire membership of the Senate would desire.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JAVITS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be recognized for up to 30

minutes at the conclusion of the approval of the Journal on tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief period for the transaction of routine business at an appropriate time tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that later today there be a period for the transaction of routine business.

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

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1872) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Following the disposal of the pending bill, it is the intention of the leadership to call up Calendar No. 479, H.R. 10738, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. I would urge all Senators to be in the Chamber tomorrow. This is an important bill carrying about \$75 billion in appropriations.

Mr. President, the statement heretofore made by the joint leadership with respect to committees not meeting tomorrow is hereby abrogated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with some trepidations, may I make so bold as to propound an inquiry concerning the possible program for the balance of the week after tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I doubt very much that we will be able to finish a bill as big as the Defense appropriation bill in 1 day. However, following that bill, when it is completed, we will take up Calendar No. 486, S. 1688, the bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act, which comes from the Committee on Foreign Relations. There is a notation here to be sure to notify the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the prospect for a Saturday session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no session on Saturday.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make the following statement on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who sponsored the two printed amendments which dealt with raising the ceiling on private guarantee investments abroad. We did not bring up those amendments advisedly. We felt, having established the basic principle of a year's extension and full continuance of the extended risk guar-

antee, and being rather confident that from the other body there will be an opportunity to increase the ceiling in conference, we wanted to give the conferees an opportunity to consider the situation and examine into the operation of AID. There was no disposition on our part to rush into matters. We are confident they will decide on a businesslike basis in accord with the policy decisions made by the Senate as to the just and intelligent thing to do. It is for that reason that we did not bring up the amendments.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for years we have struggled to get this foreign aid burden off the shoulders of Government and into the domain of private enterprise. If they are going to do it and do it in a businesslike way there have to be guarantees because I do not believe the leaders of enterprises who are administering the money of shareholders can take a full risk, and there should be a chance not only to retrieve their capital but an opportunity to make sure earnings can be brought back to this country.

This morning it was pointed out that an attempt is being made to try to put this on the backs of the American taxpayer. When the Government does it the taxpayer takes up the whole load, and not just a part of it. Therefore, this is a good deal.

This program should be continued; it should have a longer time period. I do not say so much about the money because that is not an important aspect at this moment, but we have today a ceiling at 75 percent which the Senate voted, and a provision to give them until 1970. To make at least a worthwhile program we owe that much, I think, to the American taxpayers and those who are willing to take this load.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator the following question: Is it not true that premiums have exceeded losses on this program in the years since its inception?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to add one point on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. The Senator from Florida had in mind offering an amendment which I was going to co-sponsor on housing guarantees, in order to increase them. I think for the same reason we have refrained from offering our increases in the ceiling on the commercial and banking guarantees, he, too, has refrained. I believe that explanation in his absence is forthcoming.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a few minutes.

First, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senate. This is the first time in my memory that we have been able to dispose of the bill in 4 days. The bill moved rapidly. I think the Senate has been extremely wise in the decisions that have been made in connection with the bill.

I particularly wish to commend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for the work they did in committee and on the floor of the Senate, and for the cooperation they have had from the entire Senate.

I believe this has been one of the most significant debates the Senate has ever had on a foreign aid bill.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to say, as one of those who sometimes voted for foreign aid legislation and sometimes voted against it, in this roll-call I shall vote for it because I think the Committee on Foreign Relations has done a more businesslike and workmanlike job on the foreign aid legislation than has been done at any time in the history of the Senate. I congratulate the chairman of the committee and the Senators who serve on the committee for having tightened a lot of loopholes and made genuine progress in giving the Congress more control over this program.

If, as happened a year ago in conference, our conferees are compelled to yield to administrative pressure and open up all of these avenues of expenditure and magnify executive control, I shall vote against the bill, but in the present form it deserves the support of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I associate myself with the statement of the Senator. I shall do everything that I can to hold the bill as it is. I could not have supported the bill if the Senate had not sustained the committee's work on it. I will let the bill languish in conference indefinitely if we cannot reach a satisfactory agreement on the major proposals.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not like to be presumptuous, but I shall risk being presumptuous because it will be in the realm of fact when I say that I am presumptuous enough to speak for all of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations in stating that we appreciate the leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in handling this bill in our long and prolonged hearings, the markup, and the reporting of the bill. It has been a great pleasure to serve with him on the committee.

(At this point, Mr. SPONG assumed the chair.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. I have had the best cooperation possible in the committee and on the floor of the Senate.

I conclude by commending the staff of the committee. They have given great attention to this matter. If there is anyone who has questions with respect to the bill, I am sure that Mr. Holt and Mr. Jones can answer them. This is one of the most complicated bills that ever comes before the Senate.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, from many responsible, propublic organizations in Michigan, I have received calls, wires, and letters urging adequate authorization for foreign economic assistance. As suc-

cinct and persuasive as any, and raising the point made by all, is a letter from Irene Wise, speaking for the Jackson County, Mich., League of Women Voters. To bring it to the attention of the Senate as we vote today, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

JACKSON COUNTY LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS,
Jackson, Mich., August 16, 1967.

DEAR SENATOR HART: We are deeply concerned about the moral and practical difficulties involved in being a wealthy and prosperous country in a world where hunger is the concern of the majority. Much has been learned in recent years about effective use of economic assistance money. Long-range development assistance is crucial to protect the massive investment that this country has already made in the world's developing countries. We never thought this would be an easy job with quick results. To fail to support economic assistance programs now would be to abandon any peaceful efforts to show these countries there's a better way than communism.

We urge you to be very careful and thoughtful with your Foreign Assistance Act vote.

Sincerely,

IRENE WISE,
Foreign Policy Chairman.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have voted for many foreign aid cuts in the past several years, but I have generally voted for the foreign aid authorization bill.

I am voting against the bill today because I do not believe there is justification for the amount authorized, especially in view of the pending proposal for a 10-percent surcharge on personal income taxes.

As I have recently stated, I am against the proposed surcharge on personal income until such time as adequate reductions are made in wasteful and unnecessary spending programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [ALLOTT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 232 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Aiken	Hayden	Mondale
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Baker	Hill	Moss
Bartlett	Holland	Mundt
Bayh	Inouye	Muskie
Boggs	Jackson	Nelson
Brewster	Javits	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Case	Kuchel	Percy
Clark	Lausche	Prouty
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Dirksen	Long, La.	Ribicoff
Dominick	Magnuson	Scott
Fong	Mansfield	Smith
Fulbright	McCarthy	Sparkman
Gore	McGovern	Spong
Griffin	McIntyre	Tydings
Harris	Metcalfe	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Miller	Young, Ohio

NAYS—26

Bennett	Fannin	Morse
Bible	Gruening	Murphy
Burdick	Hansen	Stennis
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Symington
Cotton	Hollings	Thurmond
Curtis	Hruska	Tower
Eastland	Jordan, N.C.	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Jordan, Idaho	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—14

Allott	Hatfield	Russell
Brooke	McGee	Smathers
Cannon	Montoya	Talmadge
Church	Morton	Yarborough
Dodd	Randolph	

So the bill (S. 1872) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make the necessary technical and clerical corrections in the bill.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the foreign aid bill this year, as in past years, met with wide and diverse views expressed by many Senators. It authorizes a most significant and critical program, and unanimity, of course, cannot be expected. I do wish to point to the manner in which all Senators participating in the discussion, while arguing their often differing positions, sought to maintain the dignity of the discussion, keeping it at all times on the highest plane.

The manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], again demonstrated his deep

understanding of this Nation's involvement abroad. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, he has contributed consistently to the profound dialog that has pervaded the foreign assistance program of the United States since its inception.

His contribution this year, as in past years, was forthright, enlightening, and provocative. The Senate is once again extremely grateful to Senator FULBRIGHT.

The ranking minority member of the committee, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], is similarly to be commended for his diligent efforts both in committee and here in the Chamber. He cooperated with the same deep devotion and dedication that has characterized his many years of service in this body.

Joining to assure orderly and efficient Senate action was the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] whose deep insight into our foreign-aid program and broad understanding of its effect have always been of great benefit. The Senate appreciates particularly the efforts of those who in urging their amendments strongly, sincerely, and in some instances successfully, in no way impeded the final disposition of the measure. I, of course, refer to the Senators from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and Texas [Mr. TOWER] whose views are always most welcome, always highly thoughtful.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] certainly exhibited his capacity to cooperate generously by directing the swift disposition of his many amendments. He, too, is to be commended for maintaining a discussion of the highest order. The same may be said of the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and Mr. KENNEDY], and their splendid cooperation was truly exemplary.

Also joining to assure prompt action today were the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] also should be singled out for their typically outstanding contribution. Many others—too numerous to recall at this time—also deserve commendation. I wish to convey my deep appreciation to them, and, indeed, to the entire Senate for the cooperative efforts shown by all, for the many fine contributions, and for joining to assure a discussion which credited all of us.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6056) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide rules relating to the deduction for personal exemptions for children of parents who are divorced or separated.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 1282. An act to provide for the withdrawal of wine from bonded wine cellars without payment of tax, when rendered unfit for beverage use; and

H.R. 2470. An act to provide for the free entry of one rheogoniometer for the use of Tufts University, Boston, Mass.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 16) to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 479, H.R. 10738, Defense Department appropriations. I do this so that it will become the pending business tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10738), making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference on behalf of myself, and Senators BIBLE, MANSFIELD, DIRKSEN, TYDINGS, KENNEDY of New York, DOMINICK, PROUTY, BYRD of West Virginia, METCALF, HARTKE, GRUENING, HART, MCCARTHY, PELL, NELSON, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, PROXMIRE, BAYH, and YOUNG of Ohio, a bill providing for the election of members of the District of Columbia Board of Education. The bill is identical to H.R. 12373, introduced by Congressman McMILLAN in the House of Representatives on August 15, 1967. The bill carries out the recommendations contained in President Johnson's message of August 16, 1967, to the Congress pertaining to the election of the District of Columbia School Board.

The bill is substantially the same as title XVI of S. 1118, the District of Columbia home rule bill passed by the Senate on July 22, 1965. Title XVI is contained in S. 315, the home rule bill I introduced in the Senate on January 12, 1967. I ask unanimous consent that title XVI of S. 1118 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

TITLE XVI—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL BOARD

Creation of school board

SEC. 1601. (a) There is hereby established the District of Columbia Independent School

Board, which shall have control of the public school system of the District. Such Board shall consist of fourteen members, one elected from each ward, as provided in title VIII. The School Board shall be an independent agency of the government of the District.

(b) On the effective date of this title the control of the public school system of the District and the functions of the Board of Education shall vest in the School Board and the Board of Education shall be abolished.

Transfer of personnel, funds, and property

Sec. 1602. (a) The vesting of such functions referred to in subsection (b) of section 1601 shall be deemed to be a transfer of the personnel necessary for the administration of such functions and of the records and unexpended balances of appropriations and other funds which relate primarily to the functions so transferred.

(b) All the right, title, and interest in and to the personal property and real property (including any buildings thereon) which is under the control of the Board of Education immediately prior to the effective date of this title shall, on and after such effective date, be held by the School Board. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall decide any question arising out of this section.

Qualifications

Sec. 1603. No person shall hold the office of member of the School Board unless he (1) is a qualified voter, (2) is domiciled in the District and resides in the ward from which he is nominated, (3) has, during the three years next preceding his nomination resided and been domiciled in the District, (4) has, for one year preceding his nomination, resided and been domiciled in the ward from which he is nominated, (5) holds no other elective public office, (6) holds no position as an officer or employee of the government of the District or any appointive office, for which compensation is provided out of District funds, and (7) holds no office to which he was appointed by the President of the United States and for which compensation is provided out of Federal or District funds. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this section.

Pending proceedings, existing statutes

Sec. 1604. (a) No suit, action, or other judicial proceeding nor any administrative proceeding lawfully commenced shall abate solely by reason of the taking effect of any provision of this title. Such proceeding shall be continued with such substitutions as to parties and officers or agencies as the court or agency deems appropriate.

(b) Any statute concerning, or administrative action concerning or taken by, any officer or agency from which any function is transferred under this title shall, except to the extent made inapplicable by or under authority of law, continue in effect as if such transfer had not been made. After such transfer references in a statute or administrative action to an officer or agency from which a transfer is made shall be deemed to refer to the officer or agency to which the transfer is made.

(c) As used in subsection (b), the term "administrative action" includes any rules, regulation, order, contract, policy, determination, directive, grant, authorization, permit, requirement, or designation.

Repeal of laws

Sec. 1605. To the extent that any provision of law is inconsistent with any provision of this title such provision of law is repealed.

General powers

Sec. 1606. (a) The School Board shall manage and control the public school system of the District. In carrying out its responsibility for the management and control of the pub-

lic school system of the District, the School Board shall have power to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in its own name in any court of component jurisdiction and to take such action as it determines is necessary to carry out such responsibility.

(b) (1) The School Board may take any action (including the disposition of any real or personal property which the School Board determines is excess to its needs) with respect to (A) any real and personal property transferred to the School Board under this title, and (B) any other real or personal property acquired by the School Board under this title, as the School Board determines is necessary for the purpose of carrying out the powers and duties granted or transferred to it by this title.

(2) The School Board may acquire by condemnation or otherwise real property in the District which the School Board determines is necessary for the purpose of carrying out the powers and duties granted or transferred to it by this title. Condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of real property for such purposes shall be conducted in accordance with the procedural provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States," approved March 1, 1929 (D.C. Code, secs. 16-619-644). The title to properties acquired under this title shall be taken by and in the name of the School Board and proceedings for condemnation or other acquisition of property shall be brought by and in the name of the School Board.

(c) The School Board is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for it to carry out its responsibility for the management and control of the public school system of the District.

Superintendent of Schools

Sec. 1607. (a) The School Board shall appoint a Superintendent of Schools who shall have a term of office of three years.

(b) The School Board shall have power to remove the Superintendent at any time for adequate cause affecting his character and efficiency as Superintendent.

(c) The members of the School Board shall hold a meeting to appoint a Superintendent on the date the office of Superintendent becomes vacant after the effective date of this title. Subsequent meetings of the School Board, at which a Superintendent shall be newly appointed or reappointed, shall be held on the date of expiration of the term of office of the individual holding the office of Superintendent on such date.

(d) The Superintendent may attend all meetings of the School Board (except those meetings held to consider the appointment of a Superintendent), and shall have the right to speak on all matters before the School Board, but he shall not be a member of the Board or have the right to vote.

(e) The Superintendent shall, subject to direction by the School Board, administer the school system of the District. In administering such school system, the Superintendent shall—

(1) have the direction and supervision of all matters pertaining to instruction in all the schools under the School Board,

(2) recommend in writing to the School Board the appointments of, and all other personnel actions affecting, all officers, teachers, and others subordinate to him, and

(3) perform all such other duties as the School Board may prescribe.

Personnel

Sec. 1608. (a) The School Board shall have the power on the written recommendation of the Superintendent to appoint, and take other personnel actions affecting, the employees of the School Board. The School Board may take such other action in accordance with the provisions of this section with respect to the employees of the School

Board as it determines is necessary to carry out its responsibility for the management and control of the public school system of the District.

(b) (1) The provisions of the District of Columbia Teacher's Salary Act of 1955 and any other law relating to the appointment, salary, assignment, and position classification, advancement and promotion, tenure, status, seniority, dismissal, and other personnel matters pertaining to teachers, school officers, and other employees of the School Board applicable to such employees immediately prior to the date of their transfer under section 1603 to the School Board shall remain applicable to such employees after their transfer until the School Board adopts by resolution a substantially equivalent personnel employment system, covering salary and other items set forth in this sentence.

(2) The Act of January 20, 1920 (relating to retirement of District public school teachers before July 1, 1946) and the Act of August 7, 1946 (relating to retirement of District public school teachers after June 30, 1946), shall continue to be applicable until such time as the School Board may by resolution provide a substantially equivalent retirement system for the employees covered by such Acts, and the funds created by such Acts shall at the time such retirement system is provided by the School Board be transferred to the jurisdiction of the School Board.

(3) Nothing in this title shall be held or considered to effect any reduction in salary, or any reduction in employment rights or benefits pertaining to appointment, assignment and position classification, advancement and promotion, tenure, status, seniority, retirement, dismissal, and other personnel matters pertaining to any employee in a position under the Board of Education immediately prior to the date of his transfer to the School Board under section 1603, until—

(1) he leaves such position, or

(2) he is entitled to receive salary at a higher rate or increased or additional employment rights and benefits pertaining to the items referred to above, by reason of the operation of this title or other applicable law, but, when such position becomes vacant, the salary and employment rights and benefits applicable thereto shall be fixed in accordance with this title.

(c) Contracts with teachers shall be in writing, and shall state the length of time the school is to be taught, the compensation per week or month, and such other matters as may be agreed upon, including payment by the calendar or school month. The contract shall be signed by an officer of the School Board and the teacher, and shall be filed with the Secretary of the School Board before the teacher enters upon performance of the contract.

(d) On the written recommendation of the Superintendent the School Board may discharge any teacher for incompetency, inattention to duty, partiality, or any other good cause. A teacher may be discharged only after a full and fair investigation made at a meeting of the School Board held for that purpose. A teacher shall be permitted to be present at such meeting and to make a defense, and he shall be allowed a reasonable time to prepare his defense.

Meetings; officers

Sec. 1609. (a) The members first elected to the School Board shall hold a meeting on the second Monday in January 1969, at which time they shall take the oath of office and elect officers. Thereafter the School Board shall annually hold a meeting on the second Monday in January of each succeeding year at which time new members shall take the oath of office and officers shall be elected. The officers of the School Board shall consist of a President and Secretary chosen from the members of the School Board. The School Board shall also hold meetings every

month on a date set at the previous meeting. Special meetings may at any time be called by any officer upon notice to members, by registered or certified mail, mailed not less than five days before the meeting.

(b) Meetings of the School Board shall be open to the public, except that the School Board may close to the public those meetings dealing with the appointment or the termination of contracts of employees of the School Board, plans for the acquisition of real property, or the licensing of institutions to grant degrees. Voting at any meeting open to the public shall not be by secret ballot. A quorum shall consist of eight members. If a quorum is present, a majority of the members present may decide any question, except those questions requiring, by reason of any provision of this title, more than a majority vote of those present and voting.

Expenses

Sec. 1610. The members of the School Board shall receive no salary as such, but shall be paid a per diem of \$20 for each day of service at meetings or while on the work of the Board and may be reimbursed for any expenses legitimately incurred in the performance of such service or work.

Liability of members

Sec. 1611. The members of the School Board shall not be personally liable in damages for any official action of the School Board performed in good faith in which the members participate, nor shall any member of the School Board be liable for any costs that may be taxed against them or the School Board on account of any such official action by them as members of the School Board; but such costs shall be charged to the District and paid as other costs are paid in suits brought against the municipality; nor shall the School Board or any of its members be required to give any supersedeas bond or security for costs or damages on any appeal whatever.

Fiscal year

Sec. 1612. The fiscal year of the School Board shall begin on the 1st day of July and shall end on the 30th day of June of the succeeding year.

Budget

Sec. 1613. The School Board shall annually on the first day of October transmit to the Mayor of the District of Columbia an estimate in detail of the amount of money required for the public schools for the ensuing year and the Mayor shall transmit such estimate to the District Council.

General account

Sec. 1614. The School Board's general account shall consist of all the Board's funds except those in the capital construction account. Funds in the general account shall be used for the operating expenses of the School Board, except that the School Board may by resolution transfer funds from the general account to the capital construction account.

Capital construction account

Sec. 1615. (a) The capital construction account shall consist of funds appropriated to the capital construction account by the Council, and funds transferred by resolution from the general account to the capital construction account.

(b) Funds in the capital construction account may be expended for acquisition of land, construction of buildings and improvements, and purchases of school equipment.

Revenues for operating expenses

Sec. 1616. The operating expenses of the School Board (including expenses incurred with respect to the general administration of the District public school system, supervision of School Board employees, and instruction of pupils in such system, the District of Columbia Teachers College, vocational

education, operation of buildings and grounds and maintenance of equipment, repair and maintenance of buildings and grounds, and contributions to the teachers' retirement and annuity fund) for the first fiscal year beginning after the members first elected to the School Board take office shall be financed in the same manner as such expenses of the Board of Education for the prior fiscal year were financed.

Statutes repealed

Sec. 1617. The following Acts are hereby repealed:

(1) The Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 31-101).

(2) The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the appointment of public school employees between meetings of the Board of Education", approved April 22, 1932 (D.C. Code, sec. 31-106).

Technical amendment

Sec. 1618. The first section of the Act of March 1, 1929 (D.C. Code, sec. 16-619), is amended by inserting after the words "any board or commission of the United States" a comma and the following: "including the District of Columbia Independent School Board."

Definitions

Sec. 1619. As used in this title, the term—
(1) "School Board" means the District of Columbia Independent School Board created by section 1601 of this title.

(2) "Board of Education" means the Board of Education of the District, created by section 2 of the Act of June 20, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 31-101).

(3) "Superintendent" means Superintendent of Schools appointed by the School Board under section 1607 of this title.

(4) "School election" means any regular election for members of the School Board.

(5) "Employees of the School Board" includes teachers, school officers, and other employees of the School Board.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a portion of the committee report on S. 1118 pertaining to title XVI be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

TITLE XVI—BOARD OF EDUCATION

S. 1118, as it was introduced, abolished the Board of Education, and thereby provided the District Council complete discretion in determining the future organization of the Board. The committee approved an amendment to S. 1118 which provides for the Board of Education to be elected directly by the people.

Under the amendment, as approved, elections for members of the Board of Education would be nonpartisan. The Board would consist of 14 members, with 1 member elected from each of the 14 wards, for terms of 4 years each. As provided in section 803(e), seven members would be elected every 2 years, thus assuring continuity—of experience on the Board and attentiveness to the wishes of the electorate. The amendment, as approved by the committee, does not provide the Board of Education with any independent taxing or borrowing authority. The Board would be required to seek approval of its budget from the District Council as in the case of any other municipal agency.

It was the intent of the committee that the public school system of the District of Columbia shall continue to be under the control of the Board of Education as under prior law. It was the further intent of the committee that the Board of Education shall con-

tinue to exercise its control in accordance with the provisions of laws applicable to the school system which existed immediately prior to the date of enactment of this act until such time as such laws are changed by the District Council, the qualified voters, or the Congress, in which case the Board of Education shall exercise its control in accordance with such laws as are changed.

The purpose of this amendment is to secure the direct responsiveness of the electorate on matters of educational policy that the direct election of individual school board members would achieve.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the elected school board bill, which I have just introduced, creates an 11-member school board. Eight of the 11 members will be elected from school electoral districts and three will be elected at large. The bill also establishes requirements for school board membership. It also provides for a 4-year term of office for board members.

As I said yesterday in the Senate when I spoke in behalf of and in support of the President's message to the Congress in which he recommended the election of a school board in the District of Columbia, I would prefer to have true home rule for the District of Columbia, but it is recognized that it is not possible to get a true home rule bill passed in this Congress. However, I think we have made another giant stride, as I said yesterday, toward the eventuality of a true home rule bill.

Therefore, I endorse President Johnson's reorganization plan for the District of Columbia and the President's elected school board proposal contained in his message to the Congress yesterday because I believe that it is the very best that we can obtain at this time. In my judgment, it is a stride forward toward the ultimate goal of true home rule for the Nation's Capital.

I pledge my support to the President, to the Members of the House, and my colleagues in the Senate in trying to bring about this long-overdue, needed reform to which the bill I have just introduced directs its attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks an editorial contained in today's Washington Post entitled "Hope Ahead," and also an editorial contained in today's Washington Daily News entitled "Another Step Forward." Both editorials endorse the need for an elected board of education in the District of Columbia.

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

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 17, 1967]

HOPE AHEAD

President Johnson's strong endorsement of an elected Board of Education for the District of Columbia makes the proposition pretty nearly unanimous. Congressman John L. McMillan, it must be acknowledged, beat the President to it by introducing a bill to the same effect even before the White House announcement. Unaccustomed as we are to hailing the Chairman of the House District Committee as a great emancipator, we do so today with gratitude and fervor. The District Committee's ranking Republican member has joined the chairman in sponsorship. The Minority Leader of the House has promised to support the proposal. All in all, there is high hope ahead.

The terms of the measure introduced by Mr. McMillan and approved by the President seem altogether sound and reasonable. The Board would have 11 members, eight to be elected from city wards, three from the city at large. Surely this makes more sense than a Board of Education chosen by District judges who, as Mr. Johnson said, have "neither accountability to the community nor responsibility for the operation of the District government." Election of a school board will not of itself solve Washington's educational problems, of course, but it will provide the basis of an opportunity to solve them.

The elected school board proposed by the chairman of the House District Committee would be a fitting accompaniment to the District Reorganization Plan recently approved by Congress over his opposition. It would be, as Mr. McMillan is doubtless well aware, a second step toward home rule—an aspect of self-government tremendously significant for this community. It would give Washingtonians governance of a vital phase of their local affairs. And if control over the education of their children can be entrusted to the people who live here, can control over the rest of their purely municipal interests be far behind?

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 17, 1967]

ANOTHER STEP FORWARD

When President Johnson, Sen. Wayne Morse and Rep. John McMillan agree wholeheartedly on anything it would seem time to examine the circumstances for evidence of covert collusion.

However, in the case of the proposal to give District citizens the right to elect the members of the School Board, everything seems aboveboard. We are heartily in favor of the plan.

A few days ago, Rep. McMillan, chairman of the House District Committee and long a proponent of the principle that residents of the District are political morons, produced a bill providing for an 11-man School Board to be elected by the citizenry. Yesterday, President Johnson, who last week saw his D.C. government re-organization plan come to fruition, heartily indorsed the McMillan plan by putting forward an exactly similar proposal—without mentioning Mr. McMillan. Finally, the often dissident Sen. Morse, long a supporter of self-government for the District, backed the School Board bill. So, lacking unforeseen snags, it seems that D.C. citizens will be given another somewhat meaty bone to chew.

All of which is to the good. According to the plan, the new School Board would have no powers beyond those enjoyed by the present board, the members of which are appointed by Federal judges here. However, presumably the members of the new board would more specifically represent the varying areas within this community and would, of course, be more responsive to the wishes of the citizens as a whole. So, we hope the proposal rides through on a wave of Congressional good will—and quickly.

Mr. MORSE. Now, Mr. President, I am particularly pleased to have the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong] presiding over the Senate at this moment as I call attention to a little bit of history I have uncovered in regard to the District of Columbia School Board.

Historically speaking, I find that Washington's first school board consisted of 13 members, with seven members appointed by the city council and six elected by the major contributors to the school system, such private contributions used along with Government funds to support the Washington public schools.

The first Washington board of trustees of the Washington public schools held its first meeting August 5, 1805 in the Supreme Court Chamber of the U.S. Capitol Building. Elected unanimously as the first president of the board of trustees was President Thomas Jefferson, who was then in his second term as President of the United States, and President Jefferson held the office of president of the board of trustees until he left the Presidency of the United States.

In a letter to a member of the school board dated August 14, 1805, from Monticello, Va., President Jefferson wrote that he would be pleased to carry on his duties as president of the Washington public school trustees to the degree that "the duties of paramount obligation will permit."

That was very typical of his great dedication, as the Senator from Virginia knows, to free education in the United States.

I thought this little bit of history would—at least I hoped it would—cause some of us in the Congress of the United States to recognize that there is some interesting historic precedent for our moving forward in regard to bringing the School Board much closer to the people of the District of Columbia.

I hope it will be my privilege and pleasure in the not too distant future—within, I hope, certainly the next Congress—to have a home rule bill passed that will give to citizens of the District of Columbia not only the right to vote for a School Board, as this bill provides, but give them the right of first-class citizenship to vote on all matters of municipal self-government.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill I have introduced be appropriately referred, and that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2317) to amend the act of June 20, 1906, and the District of Columbia election law to provide for the election of members of the board of education of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2317

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 31-101), is amended by striking out the first paragraph of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) The control of the public schools of the District of Columbia is vested in a board of education to consist of eleven members, three of whom are to be elected at large, and one to be elected from each school election ward established under the District of Columbia Election Act. The election of the members of the board of education shall be conducted on a nonpartisan basis and in accordance with such Act.

"(b) Of the members of the board of education initially elected, five shall serve for terms of two years and six for terms of four years. The members who shall serve for terms of two years shall be determined by lot. The term of office of a member of the board of education elected at a general election shall begin on the fourth Monday in January next following such election. The members may receive compensation at a rate fixed by the District of Columbia Council, which shall not exceed \$2,400 per annum.

"(c) (1) Each member of the board of education elected from a ward shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the school election ward from which he seeks election, (B) have, for the one-year period immediately preceding his nomination, resided in the school election ward from which he is nominated, (C) have, during the three years next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else, and (D) hold no other elective office. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"(2) Each member of the board of education elected at large shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the District of Columbia, (B) have, during the three-year period next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else, and (C) hold no other elective office. A member will forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"(d) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (e) of this section, every member's term shall be for four years and shall expire on the fourth Monday in January. A member may serve until his successor has taken the oath of office and may serve more than one term.

"(e) Whenever, before the end of his term, a member of the board of education dies, resigns, or becomes unable to serve, such vacancy shall be filled as provided in section 10(e) of the District of Columbia Election Act.

"(f) The board of education may appoint a secretary, who shall not be a member of the board of education, and they shall hold stated meetings at least once a month during the school year and such additional meetings as they may from time to time provide for. All meetings of the board of education shall be open to the public, except committee meetings dealing with the appointment of teachers."

(b) The second, third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs of such section 2(a) are redesignated as subsections (g), (h), (i), and (j), respectively.

(c) Subsection (b) of such section 2 is repealed.

Sec. 2. The Act entitled "An Act to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President of the United States and of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes", approved August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1101 et seq.), is amended as follows:

(1) The first section of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1101) is amended by inserting immediately after "Vice President of the United States" the following: "the members of the board of education of the District of Columbia."

(2) Section 2 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1102) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) The term 'ward' means a school election ward established by the Board under section 5(a) (4) of this Act."

(3) Paragraph (4) of section 5(a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1105(a)(4)) is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon the following: "; divide the District into eight compact and contiguous school election wards which shall include such numbers of precincts as will provide approximately equal population within each ward; and reapportion the wards accordingly after each decennial census".

(4) Section 7 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1107) is amended—

(A) by striking out in subsection (d) "during each presidential election year" and inserting in lieu thereof "during each even-numbered calendar year"; and

(B) by striking out in subsection (e) "Municipal Court for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions".

(5) Section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1108) is amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(h)(1) Except in the case of the three members of the board of education elected at large, the members of the board of education shall be elected by the qualified electors of the respective wards of the District of Columbia from which the members have been nominated. The nomination and election of a member of the board of education, and candidates for such office, shall be governed by the provisions of this Act.

"(2) In the case of the three members of the board of education elected at large, each such member shall be elected by the qualified electors of the District of Columbia. The nomination and election of such a member of the board of education, and candidates for such office, shall be governed by the provisions of this Act.

"(1) Each candidate in a general election for member of the board of education shall be nominated for such office by a petition (1) filed with the Board not later than thirty days before the date of such general election; (2) signed by no less than two hundred and fifty persons who are duly registered under section 7 in the ward from which the candidate seeks election, or in the case of a candidate running at large, signed by not less than two hundred and fifty persons who are duly registered in the District of Columbia; and (3) accompanied by a filing fee of \$100. Such fee may be refunded only in the event that the candidate withdraws his nomination by writing received by the Board not later than three days after the date on which nominations are closed. The Board may prescribe rules with respect to the preparation and presentation of nominating petitions and the posting and disposition of filing fees. The Board shall arrange the ballot so as to enable a voter to vote for any one duly nominated candidate for the board of education.

"(j)(1) The Board is authorized to accept any nominating petition as bona fide with respect to the qualifications of the signatories thereto if the original or facsimile thereof has been posted in a suitable public place for at least ten days. Any qualified elector may within such ten-day period challenge the validity of any petition by a written statement duly signed by the challenger and filed with the Board and specifying concisely the alleged defects in such petition. Copy of such challenge shall be sent by the Board promptly to the person designated for the purpose in the nominating petition.

"(2) The Board shall receive evidence in support of and in opposition to the challenge and shall determine the validity of the challenged nominating petition not less than eight days after the challenge has been filed. Within three days after announcement of the determination of the Board with respect to the validity of the nominating petition, either the challenger or any person named in the challenged petition as a nominee may apply to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for a review of the reason-

ableness of such determination. The court shall expedite consideration of the matter and the decision of such court shall be final and not appealable.

"(k) In any election, the order in which the names of the candidates for office appear on the ballot shall be determined by lot, upon a date or dates and under regulations prescribed by the Board."

(6) Section 9 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1109) is amended—

(A) by striking out "for electors of President and Vice President" in the second sentence of subsection (b); and

(B) by striking out "Municipal Court for the District of Columbia" in subsection (e) and inserting "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions".

(7) Section 10 of such Act (D.C. Code, section 1-1110) is amended—

(A) by striking out the second and third sentences of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and the second sentence of paragraph (2) of such subsection;

(B) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new paragraphs:

"(3) A general election for members of the board of education shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in the month of November which is in an even-numbered calendar year and which begins more than ninety days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph and on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of each even-numbered calendar year thereafter.

"(4) Except in the case of a candidate running at large, if no candidate for the office of member of the board of education receives a majority of the votes validly cast in the ward from which he was nominated, a runoff election shall be held in such ward on the twenty-first day following the date of the election in which such votes were cast. The two candidates who received respectively the highest number and the second highest number of votes validly cast in such ward shall run in such runoff election, except that if more than two candidates received the same number of votes validly cast in such ward and the number of votes validly cast for each such candidate was higher than the number of votes validly cast in such ward for any other candidate, all the candidates who received the highest number of votes validly cast in such ward may run in such runoff election. If in any case (other than the one described in the preceding sentence) a tie vote must be resolved to determine the two candidates who received respectively the highest number and the second highest number of votes, the Board may resolve such tie vote by requiring the candidates receiving the tie vote to cast lots at such time and in such manner as the Board may prescribe.

"(5) In the case where the requisite number of candidates running at large for the office of member of the board of education do not receive a majority of the votes validly cast in the District of Columbia, a runoff election shall be held on the twenty-first day following the date of the election in which such votes were cast, and the Board shall by regulation, prescribe the method for conducting such runoff election among those candidates receiving the highest number of votes at such original election."

(C) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) All elections prescribed by this Act shall be conducted by the Board in conformity with the provisions of this Act. In all elections held pursuant to this Act the polls shall be open from 8 o'clock antemeridian to 8 o'clock postmeridian. Candidates receiving the highest number of votes in elections held pursuant to this Act shall be declared the winners, except when otherwise required by the provisions of subsections (a)(4) and (a)(5) of this section."

(D) by inserting after "In the case of a

tie" in subsection (c) the following: "vote in any election other than an election for members of the board of education,";

(E) by inserting after "official" in subsection (d) the following: ", other than a member of the board of education,"; and

(F) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Whenever before the end of his term, a member of the board of education dies, resigns, or becomes unable to serve, such vacancy shall be filled at the next general election which occurs more than forty-five days after the date such vacancy occurs. The board of education shall choose a person to serve the remainder of such unexpired term of office or to serve until a person elected to serve the remainder of such unexpired term takes office, whichever first occurs. Any person appointed upon this subsection shall have the same qualifications for holding such office as were required of his immediate predecessor."

(8) The following new sections shall be added at the end of such Act:

"Sec. 15. No person shall be a candidate for more than one office in any election. If a person is nominated for more than one office, he shall, within three days after the last day on which nominations may be made, notify the Board, in writing, for which office he elects to run.

"Sec. 16. This Act may be cited as the 'District of Columbia Election Act.'"

Sec. 3. The term of office of the members of the board of education appointed under section 2 of the Act of June 20, 1906, before the date of the enactment of this Act shall terminate on the date on which at least six of the members first elected to the board of education take office.

THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at one time I thought I would offer this afternoon, in connection with the foreign aid bill, an amendment that would cause a cessation of any foreign aid on the part of the United States toward any country whose constitutional government was overthrown by a military coup or a Communist coup until such time as constitutionalism returned to that country.

Mr. President, I think that we have succeeded in impressing upon the administration the growing, strong feeling in Congress about the hasty recognition on the part of the United States of coup governments, be they communistic or military, after the overthrow of a constitutional government. So I decided to adopt the suggestion of some of my colleagues that we ought to give the administration this next year to see if it, on its own volition, will change the course of action that has come to dominate the recognition policy of the United States in connection with coup governments.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a chronology of successful coups involving the military in the various countries of the world from January 1962 through June 1967.

There being no objection, the chronology was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CHRONOLOGY OF SUCCESSFUL COUPS INVOLVING THE MILITARY: JANUARY 1962 TO JUNE 1967

1962

January 16, Dominican Republic. A military coup headed by Major-General Pedro Rafael Rodriguez Echavarria ousted Joaquin Balaguer. Two days later the council of state re-

gained control with Dr. Rafael Filiberto Bonnelly as president.

March 2, Burma. Premier U Nu was ousted in a coup led by the head of the army, General Ne Win.

March 28, Syria. The civilian government was overthrown by the army because of dissatisfaction over the union with Egypt. President al-Qudsi was later reinstated.

March 29, Argentina. A military coup replaced Arturo Frondizi with Jose Mario Guido.

June 18, Peru. Manuel Prado was deposed by a coup which established control by a military junta.

September 27, Yemen. An attempted coup by the army started the Yemeni civil war which continued throughout the time period under review.

1963

January 13, Togo. President Sylvanus Olympio was assassinated in a military coup which established another civilian government under Nicolas Grunitzky.

February 8, Iraq. An army coup ousted the regime of General Kassem because of his "leftist" tendencies.

March 8, Syria. The Baath Party of Syria, with strong support in the army, overthrew the military-civilian government.

March 30, Guatemala. Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes was overthrown by the Defense Minister, Colonel Enrique Peralta Azurdia.

July 11, Ecuador. Carlos Julio Arosemena Monroy was ousted in a military coup.

September 25, Dominican Republic. Juan Bosch was deposed by a military coup.

October 3, Honduras. Ramon Villeda Morales was overthrown in a military coup.

November 1, South Vietnam. The Diem government was overthrown in a military coup.

1964

January 30, South Vietnam. A military coup led by Major General Nguyen Khanh ousted the government of Major General Duong Van Minh.

April 1, Brazil. A military and civilian uprising led to the forced exile of Joao Goulart and installed a new government headed by Humberto Castello Branco.

April 19, Laos. Rightist generals staged a coup against the neutralist government of Prince Souvanna Phouma. The U.S., U.S.S.R., France and Britain protested the coup as being a violation of the Geneva accord. Four days later Souvanna Phouma was restored.

November 6, Bolivia. A military coup forced Victor Paz Estenssoro to flee. He was replaced by General Rene Barrientos Ortuño.

November 30, Sudan. The military regime of General Abboud was forced out of office by a civilian uprising. A civilian government came into power.

1965

February 18, South Vietnam. Army and marine units staged a bloodless coup which resulted in the February 21 resignation of General Khanh.

April 24, Dominican Republic. Donald Reid Cabral was overthrown in a military coup and a provisional government headed by Garcia-Goody was instituted.

June 19, Algeria. President Ahmed ben Bella was ousted by a military coup led by Colonel Houari Boumedienne.

September 30, Indonesia. A coup attempt and a counter-coup the following day set forces in motion leading to the establishment of the military as the de facto power in Indonesia with Sukarno as figurehead president.

November 25, Congo-Kinshasa. President Joseph Kasavubu was deposed by Major General Joseph Mobutu.

December 22, Dahomey. General Christophe Soglo assumed power after the failure of the provisional civilian government installed after the forced resignation of Migan Apithy.

1966

January 1, Central African Republic. President David Dacko was ousted by a military coup led by General Jean Bedel Bokassa.

January 4, Upper Volta. Lt. Colonel Sangoué Lamingana ousted President Maurice Yameogo.

January 15, Nigeria. Army officers overthrew the federal and regional governments. Most major government leaders were assassinated. Major General Aguiyi Ironsi assumed command of the new military government.

February 23, Syria. The left wing of the Baath Party with the aid of military elements took over control of the government from the right wing of the Baath Party.

February 24, Ghana. The army ousted President Kwame Nkrumah. Major General Joseph Ankrah assumed command of the 8-member military ruling council.

March 29, Ecuador. The Armed Forces High Command ousted the ruling military junta. Yerovi Indaburo was sworn in as provisional president.

June 28, Argentina. President Arturo U. Illia was ousted in a bloodless coup. Lt. General Juan Carlos Onganía became president.

July 29, Nigeria. A second military coup overthrew Major General Ironsi and established a new military government under Lt. Colonel Yakubu Gowon.

November 29, Burundi. King Ntare V was overthrown by the Prime Minister, Michael Micombero and a group of army officers.

1967

January 13, Togo. President Nicolas Grunitzky was overthrown in a coup led by Colonel Etienne Eyadema.

March 21, Sierra Leone. The army took over control of the government after a disputed election.

April 21, Greece. The Greek army took control of the government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there has been a surprising number of those coups, almost invariably followed by U.S. recognition, and that recognition followed by the further expenditure—and in my judgment waste, for the most part—of American taxpayers' dollars, with those very military forces in the underdeveloped areas of the world in many instances, because that is what many of these countries represent, trampling freedom underfoot.

That has been the result of this mistaken policy of recognition on our part in too many instances.

I once said here on the floor of the Senate, and also in the Cabinet Room when I was called down there to give advice with a few other Senators concerning the recognition of a military junta in Latin America, "If you will only get in touch with your democratic friends in Latin America, the presidents of the countries who represent your democratic friends, you will get a unanimous recommendation against the recommendation of the State Department"—which at that time was a recommendation to recognize a military coup. It was then that I said, "If you do that, then once again when the chips of freedom are down in Latin America, the United States usually walks out on freedom." That is what we did then, and that is what we did in connection with a good many instances set forth in the chronology of successful coups involving the military from January 1962 to June 1967.

Mr. President, I voted again against the foreign aid bill this afternoon. I shall continue to vote against foreign aid bills

until my Government reforms foreign aid, because my position on foreign aid is determined in no small measure by the findings of the Comptroller General of the United States in report after report which he has filed with the Congress of the United States as, really, an agent of the Congress.

Do not forget that the Comptroller General is our agent, and the critical reports that he has filed now for some years against foreign aid are reports that set out in minutia the corruption, the inefficiency, the waste of the American taxpayers' dollars that results from our foreign aid program in so many parts of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

So I voted against the bill this afternoon because we have not cleaned up foreign aid, because this administration has not cleaned up foreign aid, and because the Congress ought to insist on that cleansing process before we continue to waste the American taxpayers' dollars by the hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in which it has been wasted since 1946.

I said in the debate this afternoon that our Government has poured into foreign aid, with congressional approval, something over \$20 billion—I think it is slightly over \$21 billion—of the American taxpayers' money. I think the taxpayers of the United States are entitled to have such a policy adopted. Whenever we are willing to adopt a foreign aid bill in which there is a much greater assurance that our money will go to benefit the mass of the people in the countries for which the money is supposedly appropriated, I will start voting for it.

When we start decreasing more and more the money for military aid that goes into many of these underdeveloped countries—a type of aid that keeps down freedom, a type of aid that is not needed in order to maintain internal order, but a type of aid, as I have said so many times, that is used to build up a tyrannical military class that tramples freedom underfoot, and exploits the masses of the people—when we are willing to stop that kind of aid, the Senator from Oregon will be ready to vote for some foreign aid.

When we are willing to transform foreign aid from a program in which we make agreements with governments instead of insisting that the money go into projects that will benefit the economic well-being of the mass of the people in the aided countries, I will start voting for foreign aid.

Mr. President, much of this money that goes into foreign aid is siphoned away from the taxpayers of the United States to government officials abroad, much of it lining their pockets rather than feeding their people. When we begin to seek to correct that condition, I will start voting for foreign aid again.

I repeat that I am willing to vote \$3 of economic aid into projects for every dollar that my Government is willing to subtract from military aid and budget support. Do not think that we can justify having the American taxpayers

supporting a budget in a country that is so wasteful of its own resources that it cannot efficiently plan its budget in order to live off its own income plus what we can help it develop, through a loan program, by way of projects that will increase the economic productive power of the country.

Here we are, pouring millions of the American taxpayers' dollars for these nonessential expenditures into countries with a per capita income of less than \$300 a year, and in some instances less than \$200 a year. I want to help those people, but I do not want to be a participant in exploiting them. That is what is happening, as too many of them suffer under the control of tyrannical governments which the United States, unfortunately, recognizes, and by its aid program helps keep in power.

I believe that what we must do, as soon as our own financial situation permits it, is reform our foreign aid programs so that it is characterized chiefly as a program that develops economic projects in a given country which will accrue to the benefit of the people of that country.

Mr. President, as I have said throughout the debate yesterday and today, and as I have said time and time again in our discussions in the Committee on Foreign Relations as we marked up this bill, I cannot vote for foreign aid at this time until my Government recognizes that domestic needs should come first, and foreign aid second. Yet we have been pressured by this administration, through its State Department and its AID and White House lobbies, to try to get a foreign aid bill through the Senate, in this historic hour, far above the figure that the Committee on Foreign Relations brought to the floor of the Senate, with AID lobbyists even occupying an office in the Capitol building of the United States, for the first time in our history in connection with a foreign aid bill.

I say that is not putting our domestic interests first. I voted against the bill because, in my judgment, further savings ought to have been adopted by the Senate. I did my best to get further savings adopted. Mr. President, we have an administration which is about to unleash its powerful lobby forces upon the Congress of the United States to increase the taxes imposed on the American taxpayers with a 10-percent surtax increase. They have made no case for it. In my judgment, they have made perfectly clear, by the attitude they have taken on the foreign aid bill, that they should not get the tax increase until they first deliver to the American people those changes in their fiscal policy whereby they can save, in my judgment, many millions of dollars out of foreign aid, out of budget support, out of military expenditures, out of moon projects. As I have stated, it is more important to put tens of thousands of men in this country now out of employment in jobs, than it is to put one man on the moon. Those great sums of money for the so-called space program can wait and should wait. Go ahead with a reasonable amount for a research program, but not with the un-

conscionable expenditure that is being proposed to get a man on the moon.

Mr. President, have we become so irrationally vain that we think we have just got to get someone on the moon before the Russians get someone on the moon? The Russians have not got anyone on the moon yet, and I do not care if they do. What I do care about is the domestic plight of tens upon tens of thousands of fellow Americans who are both functional illiterates and actual illiterates because they cannot read and write—functional illiterates in that they have not developed that degree of literacy necessary for employability. That is a great domestic issue which confronts us, and that is why I am at a loss, with all due respect to my fellow Senators, to see how the Senate can pass a bill for foreign aid as high as the one passed this afternoon. I voted against it because, as I have pointed out, not one of us can tell with the slightest accuracy what kind of fiscal situation the country, and therefore the American taxpayers, will be in a year from today. We ought to serve notice on all these countries that are the beneficiaries under this bill that they, too, ought to be expected to tighten their belts as far as their governments are concerned, until the United States is able to solve the crisis that confronts us.

We are at war. We are killing more of our men by the hour in South Vietnam. Everyone knows my complete disapproval of this war, and my view that we never should have been involved in it. And, Mr. President, in the light of the testimony of the Under Secretary of State this morning, I should say that any more testimony from any high official of the Johnson administration of that nature ought to give me the votes for the resolution that I intend to offer, in due course, to rescind the Tonkin Gulf resolution. We cannot listen, now, to State Department witnesses, and escape the conclusion that they really think they can make war against China without a declaration of war, on the basis of the arbitrary discretion of the President of the United States, with the advice—and the bad advice—of his Secretary of State, his Secretary of Defense, and his other close advisers on foreign policy.

Mr. President, these are critical times. When we find this rapid trend toward government by executive supremacy in this country, my judgment is that we ought to call a halt, as a Senate, and put into operation our checking power. That is why I made that plea this afternoon, in the course of the debate on the foreign aid bill.

While I have made this brief statement of my reasons for opposing the foreign aid bill, there are a good many others I have not mentioned in this short speech, but I have mentioned them in other statements I have made on the floor of the Senate. However, I wanted the people of my State readily to have access to this record I have made during the last few minutes, setting forth the major reasons as to why I voted against the foreign aid bill.

I voted against the bill, when all is said and done, because I thought it was the best way to promote and protect the

legitimate interests of the American taxpayer.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.
(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF 10TH MEETING OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

A letter from the Chairman of the Senate delegation, Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the 10th meeting of that group, held at Ottawa and Montreal, May 10-14, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"H. CON. RES. 87-XX(67)

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Federal Government to cancel the passport of Stokely Carmichael

"Whereas Stokely Carmichael, the violent and inflammatory leader of the black power movement and former head of the Student Non-Violent Coordination Committee, has traveled freely throughout this country advocating and initiating riots, rebellion, and the overthrow of law and order, and

"Whereas this hate-monger's visits to various cities of the nation have led in every instance to riots and violence accomplish-

ing in many instances burning, looting and bloodshed. In resigning from SNCC, Carmichael announced that he would spend the summer organizing 'black resistance' to the war in Viet Nam. On May 16, he told a screaming crowd of Negroes in Washington 'There is no need to go to Viet Nam and shoot somebody who a honky says is our enemy. We're going to shoot the cops who are shooting our black brothers in the back in this country. That is where we are going.' In this same speech, recorded by radio and telecasts throughout the country, he called President Johnson a 'buffoon' and a 'honky' and said 'the honky is lying about Viet Nam,' and

"Whereas Carmichael has purposefully and systematically set out to undermine the respect of his listeners for the established heroes of this country, he calls Calvin Coolidge 'a dumb honky,' George Washington 'a dumb honky who had slaves,' and Abraham Lincoln 'another dumb honky.' He urges Negroes to riot and admittedly terms these riots as rebellions. He tells his followers that the black man does not need to apologize for these rebellions and 'if a honky tried to shoot him, kill him before God gets the news.' Carmichael's influence with his people is not to be underestimated when he sets a mob chanting endlessly against the Viet Nam war 'Hell no, we won't go,' and

"Whereas Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a regional report of a Congressional Committee on some of Carmichael's activities, stated that Carmichael in exposing his black power movement has been in frequent contact with Max Stanford, field chairman of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), a highly secret all-Negro, Marxist, Leninist, Chinese Communist-oriented organization which advocates guerrilla warfare to obtain its goals in that this organization had headed and guided Stanford in forming a black panther party in New York City as well as in other areas of the United States, and

"Whereas it has been learned that Carmichael, who is not a native of this country and whose strange influence is creeping out in unexplained areas is now out of the country and has gone to Czechoslovakia. He has stated his intention of going to Hanoi in North Viet Nam and is now in Cuba as Fidel's 'Guest of Honor' for the purpose of attending a 'revolution school,' and he has called upon Negro Americans to wage a guerrilla fight to the death, and

"Whereas the said Stokely Carmichael traveled to Cuba in violation of the State Department's travel ban,

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida, the Senate concurring:

"The the Federal Government cancel the passport of that blasphemous and profane Communist revolutionary, Stokely Carmichael, and that he be denied readmittance to this country as an undesirable alien or on any other available grounds that will prevent his returning to vilify and overthrow the United States of America.

"Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, the Supreme Court, to the Office of Immigration and the State Department with the respectful but urgent request that action be taken to deny Stokely Carmichael reentrance into this country.

"TOM ADAMS,
"Secretary of State."

A resolution, adopted by the National Association of Women Lawyers, at Honolulu, Hawaii, relating to support of law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Robert B. Parke, of Houston, Tex., praying

for assistance relating to the collection of a debt owed him for services performed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendment:

S. 778. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 516).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2162. A bill to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev. (Rept. No. 524); and

H.R. 7362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain properties within the Colonial National Historical Park, in Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 523).

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

H.R. 3717. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. M. Richwine (Rept. No. 522);

H.R. 4809. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willifred S. Shirley (Rept. No. 517);

H.R. 5967. An act for the relief of Albert P. Morrell (Rept. No. 518); and

H.R. 6452. An act for the relief of John E. Coplin (Rept. No. 519).

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

S. 294. A bill for the relief of Eloy C. Navarro (Rept. No. 520).

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

S. 798. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes (Rept. No. 521).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 2531. An act to provide for the disposition of the unclaimed and unpaid share of the Loyal Creek judgment fund, and to provide for disposition of estates of interstate members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma or estates of members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma dying without heirs (Rept. No. 526).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1165. A bill to provide for disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians on behalf of the Mississippi Bands and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands of Chippewa Indians (Rept. No. 525).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Thomas D. Lambros, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio;

Richard B. Kellam, of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Virginia;

John A. MacKenzie, of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Virginia; and

Robert R. Merhige, Jr., of Virginia, to be

U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Virginia.

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Paul R. Ignatius, of California, to be Secretary of the Navy;

Townsend Hoopes, of Virginia, to be the Under Secretary of the Air Force;

Chaplain (Brig. Gen.) Francis Leon Sampson, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Army, as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States;

Vice Adm. William E. Gentner, Jr., U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral;

Marion E. Carl, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps, for temporary appointment to the grade of major general; and

Edward J. Doyle, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, also as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 151 general and flag officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

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

Brig. Gen. Glenn David Walker, Army of the United States, colonel, U.S. Army, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States; and

Col. George William Dickerson, U.S. Army and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in addition, I report also 2,255 promotions in the Air Force in the grade of colonel and below and 1,606 promotions in the Army in the grade of colonel and below. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nominations will lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from Maine.

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

Thomas R. Aaron and sundry other officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force;

Jack V. Doriot and sundry other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2307. A bill to provide procedures for calling constitutional conventions for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. BROOKE):

S. 2308. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 2309. A bill to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

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

S. 2310. A bill to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol Buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2311. A bill for the relief of Dr. Evelio Francisco Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 2312. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Ingram; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 2313. A bill for the relief of Kyu Won Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2314. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S. 2315. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant to certain joint endeavors organized by hospitals the same tax exemptions as are accorded to the participating hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2316. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of an additional amount of up to \$250 for the acquisition of a burial plot for the burial of certain veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PROKEMIRE, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2317. A bill to amend the act of June 20, 1906, and the District of Columbia election law to provide for the election of members of the board of education of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

RESOLUTION

THE THOMASITE TEACHERS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 160) to extend greetings to the Congress of the Philippines on the 66th anniversary of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers in the Philippines; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION ACT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish procedures for calling constitutional conventions for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, upon application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution.

In recent weeks there has been much information, misinformation, and ignorance displayed on the subject of amending the Constitution by a convention called by the State legislatures. With the sudden realization that 32 State legislatures already have called for a new Federal constitutional convention, many persons have concluded that the Nation is on the verge of the worst internal crisis since the Civil War. They have warned that if any such a convention is called the result will surely be a constitutional nightmare. They foresee a runaway convention proposing wholesale amendments abolishing the Bill of Rights, repealing the income tax, providing for the election of the Supreme Court, and the like. Even those persons who favor a constitutional convention and view it as the highest forum for the expression of the will of the people, are quick to agree that the Congress, in seeking to implement the provision in article V for the convening of a convention upon application of two-thirds of the States, would be virtually without precedent to guide it in answering the myriad sensitive questions involved.

Amendment of the Constitution is too important a subject to remain thus enshrouded in darkness. And I hope by the introduction of this bill to evoke some light—through committee hearings—and to reduce to orderly processes the chaos, and indeed, the anarchy, that threatens in the absence of such legislation.

At the outset I should say that the problem dealt with in this bill transcends the issue that brought it to light. It would be grossly unfortunate if the partisanship over State legislative reapportionment—and I speak as a partisan on that issue—should distort an attempt at clarification of this process for amendment of the Constitution. For certainly we must recognize that the amendment process in the long run must command a higher obligation and duty than any single issue that might be the subject of that process.

The first, and foremost, question presented by this bill is whether Congress has the authority under the Constitution

to define the processes for amendment by convention. I certainly believe that it does, but I nevertheless recognize the existence of the problem.

The second overriding question is whether the process of amendment by State convention may be restricted to the proposal of specific amendments or must also provide for a convention authorized to propose a wholly new Constitution. My own reading of history convinces me that the individual amendment process was what the Founding Fathers anticipated. A totally new Constitution was, perhaps, to be accomplished by Jefferson's notion of a revolution every generation or so, but not, I think, by the processes set forth in article V—provided by those who had struggled so hard and so long to bring forth the basic document on which our liberties remain so dependent. But I cannot deny that others have forcefully put the argument for general as distinguished from specific amendments.

Once past these fundamental questions, the bill is concerned with details—far from unimportant details—of defining the orderly processes by which amendment by State convention should proceed. Over what span of time should the State legislative applications for constitutional amendment remain viable? Should the consent of the Governors of the States be a part of the amendment process? May an application once forwarded to Congress be rescinded by further State legislative action? How shall the convention be apportioned? How shall members of the Convention vote, by State or per capita? What powers shall Congress have in these proceedings? What process should be prescribed for ratification?

To all these questions, the bill provides answers. Whether these answers are the best answers, remains to be decided after exposing the proposed legislation to the valuable scrutiny of committee hearings. For myself, I can say that I am open to conviction about every question except the necessity for action on this issue, action that may—indeed, must—forestall either chaos or the equally awful prospect of this Congress refusing to abide the commands of the fifth article of the Constitution. These two paths can bring us only to disaster. The provisions of this bill—as they shall be amended in light of the evidence to be adduced—offer, I think, a hope of avoiding that disaster.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2307) to provide procedures for calling constitutional conventions for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution, introduced by Mr. ERVIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2307

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

APPLICATIONS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

SEC. 2. The legislature of a State, in making application for a constitutional convention under article V of the Constitution of the United States, shall, after adopting a resolution pursuant to this Act, petition the Congress stating, in substance, that the legislature requests the calling of a convention for the purpose of proposing one or more amendments of a particular nature to the Constitution of the United States and stating the specific nature of the amendment or amendments to be proposed.

APPLICATION PROCEDURE

SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of adopting or rescinding a resolution pursuant to section 2, the State legislature shall adopt its own rules of procedure.

(b) Questions concerning the State legislative procedure and the validity of the adoption of a State resolution cognizable under this Act shall be determinable by the State legislature and its decisions thereon shall be binding on all others, including State and Federal courts, and the Congress of the United States.

(c) A State resolution adopted pursuant to this Act shall be effective without approval by the Governor of the State.

TRANSMITTAL OF APPLICATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) Within 60 days after a resolution to apply for the calling of a constitutional convention is adopted by the legislature of a State, the secretary of state of the State, or if there be no such officer, the person who is charged by the State law with such function, shall transmit to the Congress of the United States two copies of the application, one addressed to the President of the Senate, and one to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(b) Each copy of the application so made by any State shall contain—

(1) the title of the resolution,

(2) the exact text of the resolution, signed by the presiding officer of each house of the State legislature, and

(3) the date on which the legislature adopted the resolution; and shall be accompanied by a certificate of the secretary of state of the State, or such other person as is charged by the State law with such function, certifying that the application accurately sets forth the text of the resolution.

(c) Upon receipt of a copy of any such application, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives shall cause copies to be made thereof and shall forthwith send a copy thereof to the presiding officer of each House of the legislature of every other State.

EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF APPLICATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) An application submitted to the Congress by a State pursuant to this Act, unless sooner rescinded by the State legislature, shall remain effective for six calendar years after the date it is received by the Congress, except that whenever the Congress determines that within a period of six calendar years two-thirds or more of the several States have each submitted an application calling for a constitutional convention on the same subject all such applications shall remain in effect until the Congress has taken action on a concurrent resolution, pursuant to section 8, calling for a constitutional convention.

(b) A State may rescind its application calling for a Constitutional Convention by adopting and transmitting to the Congress a resolution of rescission in conformity with the procedure specified in sections 3 and 4, except that no such rescission shall be

effective as to any application made for a constitutional convention upon any subject after the date on which two-thirds or more of the State legislatures have applications pending before the Congress seeking amendments on the same subject.

(c) The Congress of the United States shall have the sole power of determining whether a State's action to rescind its application has been timely taken.

CALLING OF A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

SEC. 6. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Senate to maintain a record of all applications received by the President of the Senate, and it shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives to maintain a tabulation of all applications received by the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the States for the calling of a constitutional convention upon each subject. Whenever the Secretary or the Clerk has reason to believe that such applications made by two-thirds or more of the States with respect to the same subject are in effect, he shall so report in writing to the officer to whom those applications were transmitted, and such officer thereupon shall announce upon the floor of the House of which he is an officer the substance of such report. Pursuant to such rules as such House may adopt, it shall be the duty of such House to determine whether the recitation contained in any such report is correct. If either House of the Congress determines, upon a consideration of any such report or of a concurrent resolution agreed to by the other House of the Congress, that there are in effect applications made by two-thirds or more of the States for the calling of a constitutional convention upon the same subject, it shall be the duty of that House to agree to a concurrent resolution calling for the convening of a Federal Constitutional Convention upon that subject. Each such concurrent resolution shall (1) designate the place and time of meeting of the convention; (2) set forth the particular nature of the amendment or amendments for the consideration of which the convention was called; (3) prescribe the time within which any amendment or amendments proposed by such convention must be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States or be deemed inoperative; and (4) specify the manner in which such amendment or amendments shall be ratified in accordance with article V of the Constitution. A copy of each such resolution agreed to by both Houses of the Congress shall be transmitted forthwith to the presiding officer of each House of the legislature of each State.

(b) The convention shall be convened not later than one year after the adoption of the resolution.

DELEGATES

SEC. 7. (a) A convention called under this Act shall be composed of as many delegates from each State as it is entitled to Representatives in Congress. Each delegate shall be elected or appointed in the manner provided by State law. Alternate delegates, in the number established by State law, shall be elected or appointed at the same time and in the same manner. Any vacancy occurring in the State delegation shall be filled by appointment of one of the alternate delegates in the manner provided at the time of his election or appointment as an alternate delegate. No alternate delegate shall take part in the proceedings of the convention unless he is appointed a delegate.

(b) The Secretary of State of each State, or, if there be no such officer, the person charged by State law to perform such function shall certify to the Vice President of the United States the name of each delegate and alternate delegate appointed or elected pursuant to this section.

(c) Delegates shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be

privileged from arrest during their attendance at a session of the convention, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in the convention they shall not be questioned in any other place.

(d) Each delegate and each alternate delegate shall receive compensation at the rate of \$50 per day for each day of service and shall be compensated for traveling and related expenses in accordance with the provisions of sections 5701-5702 and 5704-5708, inclusive, of title 5 of the United States Code. The convention shall fix the compensation of employees of the convention.

CONVENING OF CONVENTION

SEC. 8. (a) The Vice President of the United States shall convene the constitutional convention. He shall administer the oath of office of the delegates to the convention and shall preside until the delegates elect a presiding officer who shall preside thereafter. Before taking his seat each delegate shall subscribe an oath not to attempt to change or alter any section, clause or article of the Constitution or propose additions thereto which have not been specified in the resolution calling the convention. Upon the election of permanent officers of the convention, the names of such officers shall be transmitted to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the elected presiding officer of the convention. Further proceedings of the convention shall be conducted in accordance with such rules, not inconsistent with this Act, as the convention may adopt.

(b) The Congress shall appropriate moneys for the payment of all expenses of the convention.

(c) Under such regulations as the President shall prescribe, the Administrator of General Services shall provide such facilities, and each executive department and agency shall provide such information, as the convention may require upon written request made by the elected presiding officer of the convention.

PROCEEDINGS OF CONVENTIONS

SEC. 9. (a) In voting on any question before the convention each State shall have one vote which shall be cast as the majority of the delegates from the State, present at the time, shall agree. If the delegates from any State present are evenly divided on any question before the convention, the vote of that State shall not be cast on the question.

(b) The convention shall keep a daily verbatim record of its proceedings and publish the same. The votes of the States on any question shall be entered on the record.

(c) The convention shall terminate its proceedings within one year after the date of its first meeting unless the period is extended by the Congress by concurrent resolution.

(d) Within thirty days after the termination of the proceedings of the convention, the presiding officer shall transmit to the Archivist of the United States all records of official proceedings of the convention.

PROPOSAL OF AMENDMENTS

SEC. 10. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, a convention called under this Act may propose amendments to the Constitution by a majority of the total votes cast on the question.

(b) No convention called under this Act may propose any amendment or amendments of a general nature different from that stated in the concurrent resolution calling the convention. No controversy arising under this subsection shall be justiciable but shall be determined solely by the Congress of the United States.

APPROVAL BY THE CONGRESS AND TRANSMITTAL TO THE STATES FOR RATIFICATION

SEC. 11. (a) The presiding officer of the convention shall, within 30 days after the

termination of its proceedings, submit the exact text of any amendment or amendments agreed upon by the convention to the Congress for approval and transmittal to the several States for their ratification.

(b) Upon the expiration of the first period of 3 months of continuous session of the Congress following the receipt of any proposed amendment by the Congress, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, acting jointly, shall transmit such proposed amendment to the Administrator of General Services for submission to the States, but only if prior to the expiration of such period the Congress has not adopted a concurrent resolution disapproving the submission of the proposed amendment to the States on the ground that its general nature is different from that stated in the concurrent resolution calling the convention.

(c) Upon receipt of any such amendment or amendments, the Administrator of General Services shall transmit exact copies of the same, together with his certification thereof, to the legislatures of the several States.

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

SEC. 12. Any amendment proposed by the convention and submitted to the States in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall be valid for all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when duly ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States in the manner and within the time specified in the concurrent resolution calling for the convening of the convention.

PROCEDURE FOR RATIFICATION

SEC. 13. (a) For the purpose of ratifying proposed amendments transmitted by the States pursuant to this Act the State legislatures shall adopt their own rules of procedure except that the acts of ratification shall be by convention or by State legislative action as the Congress may direct. All questions concerning the validity of State legislative procedure shall be determined by the legislatures and their decisions shall be binding on all others.

(b) Any State resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution shall be valid without the assent of the Governor of the State.

TRANSMITTAL OF RATIFICATIONS

SEC. 14. The secretary of state of the State, or if there be no such officer, the person who is charged by State law with such function, shall transmit a certified copy of the State resolution ratifying any proposed amendment to the Administrator of General Services.

RESCISSION OF RATIFICATIONS

SEC. 15. (a) Any State may rescind its ratification of a proposed amendment except that no State may rescind when there are existing valid ratifications of such amendment by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

(b) Any State may ratify a proposed amendment even though it previously may have rejected the same proposal.

(c) The Congress of the United States shall have the sole power of determining all questions relating to the ratification, rescission, or rejection of amendments proposed to the Constitution of the United States.

PROCLAMATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 16. The Administrator of General Services, when three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States have ratified a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, shall issue a proclamation proclaiming the amendment to be a part of the Constitution of the United States.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENTS

SEC. 17. An amendment proposed to the Constitution of the United States shall be

effective from the date on which the legislature of the last State necessary to constitute three-fourths of the legislatures of the United States, as provided for in article V, has ratified the same.

FEDERAL RURAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL AID

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, 11 New York legislators today introduced bills designed to help smaller cities and towns provide additional water storage facilities to first, minimize water pollution problems in smaller rivers and streams during periods of drought; and, second, construct reserve water storage facilities in anticipation of future industrial and community needs.

I am introducing, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the bill in the Senate, and a companion measure was introduced today in the House by Representatives DANIEL E. BUTTON, BARBER B. CONABLE, JR., CHARLES E. GOODELL, JAMES R. GROVER, JR., FRANK J. HORTON, CARLETON J. KING, ROBERT C. McEWEN, ALEXANDER PRINTE, OGDEN R. REID, and HOWARD W. ROBISON.

I wish to pay special tribute to the fine work done in this matter by my colleagues in the House, and particularly by Representative CONABLE, from the 37th Congressional District in upper New York State.

Specifically, the bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide:

First, Federal grants of up to 50 percent to localities for the construction of multipurpose water management projects to insure high water quality standards on smaller rivers and streams. The bill authorizes \$5 million for this purpose.

Second, Federal grants of up to 50 percent to localities for the maintenance of reserve water supplies to allow future industrial or community growth. Authorization for this portion of the bill is \$5 million.

Congress has made great strides in recent years in facing up to the grave problem of water pollution, but, of necessity, has concentrated on the larger bodies of water. The bill we are introducing today is designed to fill a gap in recent legislation by allowing Federal assistance to water quality control projects on the smaller rivers and tributaries which are the lifelines of so many of our smaller cities and towns. In addition, these streams, in periods of drought, carry concentrated pollutants into the larger rivers, working against all our larger water pollution control projects.

Under existing law, Federal contributions to localities for dam and reservoir construction can only be made for flood prevention—so-called single-purpose facilities—recreation, and/or wildlife preservation. Under the first section of the proposal introduced today, a municipality could get a 50-percent Federal contribution to enable it to store water for release during critical periods of low streamflow. The facility for storing water would probably be part of a reservoir or dam built for flood prevention, recreation, or wildlife purposes.

The bill is not designed to provide a substitute for adequate antipollution

treatment at the source, but to enable continually flowing streams to serve an essential function of diluting and carrying away waste not completely purified by treatment.

Streams and small rivers unfortunately are still being used for disposal of sewage and other pollutants and probably will continue to be so used. Consequently, there is a need and desire in many small watershed programs to incorporate water quality management. In New York State, for example, 18 projects are planned for 1967 and 1968, 14 of which will serve only the single purpose of flood prevention. Many of these could be designed to allow for another purpose—release of water for quality control. It is estimated that a single-purpose reservoir costing approximately \$100,000 would only require an additional \$25,000 to provide water quality control, if this additional capacity were included at the time the reservoir was constructed. If water quality control capacity were added to a single-purpose structure later on, the additional cost would be from two to four times more than if it had been added initially, according to Department of Agriculture estimates.

New York State is not alone in its upstream water pollution problems. The need in other States has been pointed out in Federal reviews of small watershed project work plans. Although the need has been recognized, no Federal assistance is now available.

The second section of the bill recognizes that water is often a significant factor in community growth. The availability and quality of water is a prime consideration of many industries in locating or expanding plants. If we are to enable our small cities, towns, and rural areas to hold the population they now have and to grow, job opportunities need to be opened.

This section provides for 50-percent Federal assistance to allow for more complete development of dam sites at the initial stages of construction so that water reserves will be available for future municipal and industrial use. At present these reserves can be provided only if the city or industry is willing to bear 100 percent of the cost. This section is designed to make more complete use of multiple-purpose features of water control and to provide financial help to localities that might want to include municipal or industrial water supply in small watershed projects.

In order to meet anticipated municipal or industrial water supply storage needs, it is estimated annual costs will actually be approximately \$10 million with the Federal contribution of 50 percent amounting to \$5 million. These estimates are based on projections contained in a study of 126 planned reservoirs prepared for the Water Resources Council in 1966.

I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may also be printed as part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2308) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention

Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. BROOKE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2308

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (68 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 1001-1008), is amended as follows:

(1) Clause (A) of paragraph (2) of section 4 is amended by striking out "or recreational development" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "recreational development, or water quality management, but the Secretary shall not bear any portion of the cost of works of improvement for water quality management in any case in which such works of improvement are to be provided as substitutes for adequate treatment or other methods of controlling waste at the source".

(2) Clause (B) of paragraph (2) of section 4 is amended by striking out the first proviso and all that follows thereafter, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That, in addition to and without limitation on the authority of the Secretary to make loans or advancements under section 8 of this Act, the Secretary may pay for any storage of water for anticipated future demands or needs for municipal or industrial water included in any reservoir structure constructed or modified under the provisions of this Act not to exceed 30 per centum of the total estimated cost of such reservoir structure where the local organization gives reasonable assurances, and there is evidence, that such demands for the use of such storage will be made within a period of time which will permit repayment within the life of the reservoir structure of that part of the cost of such water supply storage which is to be borne by the local organization: *Provided further, That the local organization shall agree, prior to initiation of construction or modification of any reservoir structure including such water supply storage, to repay not less than 50 per centum of the cost of such water supply storage for anticipated future demands: And provided further, That the part of the cost to be borne by the local organization shall be repaid within the life of the reservoir structure but in no event to exceed fifty years after the reservoir structure is first used for the storage of water for water supply purposes, except that (1) no repayment of such cost need be made until such supply is first used, and (2) no interest shall be charged on such cost until such supply is first used, but in no case shall the interest-free period exceed ten years. The interest rate used for purposes of computing the interest on the unpaid balance shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 8 of this Act".*

(3) Subsection (4) of section 5 is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Any plan for works of improvement involving an estimated Federal contribution to construction costs in excess of \$250,000 or including any structure having a total capacity in excess of twenty-five hundred acre-feet (a) which includes works of improvement for reclamation, irrigation, or the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution, or which affects public or other lands or wildlife under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, (b) which includes Federal assistance for floodwater detention structures, or (c) which includes features which may affect the public health, shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, respectively, for his views and recommendations at least thirty days prior to transmis-

sion of the plan to the Congress through the President. The views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as the case may be, if received by the Secretary prior to the expiration of the above thirty-day period, shall accompany the plan transmitted by the Secretary to the Congress through the President".

SAUGUS IRON WORKS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site.

The Saugus Iron Works is a careful reconstruction of the first iron works in the 13 Colonies, built upon the original foundation. The proposed site is on the south bank of the Saugus River, near Boston, and includes a wooden frame house built about 1640, a forge with four water wheels, a stove furnace, and a slitting and rolling mill. In addition there are three foot bridges and a picnic area across the Saugus River.

The iron works were operated successfully from 1648 until 1670, producing rod iron which was subsequently fashioned into the nails needed for construction in colonial America. The ore was mined from neighboring farms, the charcoal produced from nearby forests, and power to turn the wheels was generated by damming the Saugus River.

From these small beginnings in Saugus, we have developed a steel industry capable of producing 150,000,000 tons of raw steel per year and employing 550,000 Americans—an industry whose operations effect every aspect of American life. It would be extremely fitting that the first iron works in America be set aside for the enjoyment of our citizens. The Iron and Steel Institute has not only restored this historic iron works, but has also donated it to the American people. I think the institute deserves the appreciation of all of us for its work.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will act favorably on this legislation in the near future.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a list of the historic structures exhibited at Saugus be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2309) to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2309

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve in public ownership the first sustained integrated ironworks in the Thirteen Colonies, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the

boundaries of the area generally depicted on drawing numbered NHE-SI-71003, entitled "Proposed Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site," dated May 1967, which is on file in the Department of the Interior. The property acquired pursuant to this section shall be known as the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall administer the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666).

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated \$400,000, to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The list presented by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts is as follows:

The historic structures owned and exhibited by the First Iron Works Association, Inc., are as follows:

1. *Ironmaster's House.*—A wooden frame dwelling with original sections dating from the 1640's. It was restored to its historic form in 1915 and contains period furnishings.

2. *Forge.*—A re-created, timber frame, open building which has four water wheels (overshot and undershot) and is in excellent condition.

3. *Furnace.*—A re-created stone and timber structure which is in excellent condition.

4. *Slitting and Rolling Mill.*—A re-created open frame building which has two overshot water wheels and is in excellent condition.

5. *Charging Bridge.*—A re-created wooden frame structure which is in good condition.

6. *Pier and Bulkhead.*—Re-created wood frame structures that are in fair condition.

7. *Warehouse.*—A re-created small frame structure that is in good condition.

In addition, there are several nonhistoric structures on the Association's property. These are as follows:

1. *Temporary Museum.*—A relocated wood frame structure with an asbestos shingle roof which is in fair condition. It houses artifacts archaeologically excavated, including one-third of the furnace wheel and the 500-pound hammerhead for the forge hammer.

2. *Visitor Contact Station.*—A small frame shed that is in fair condition.

3. *Maintenance Building.*—A small work shed which is well located and removed from visitor view, but is in need of complete reconstruction.

PRESERVATION OF SAFETY WITHIN THE U.S. CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol Buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2310) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol Buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2310

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes", approved July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193f) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided by this Act, it is forbidden for any person willfully to discharge any firearm, firework or explosive, willfully to set fire to any combustible matter, willfully to make any harangue or oration, or willfully to utter loud, threatening, or abusive language in said United States Capitol Grounds.

"(b) Except as authorized by regulations which shall be promulgated by the Capitol Police Board, it is forbidden for any person to carry upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings any firearm or other dangerous weapon, any explosive, or any explosive device or incendiary device.

"(c) It is forbidden for any person or group of persons—

"(1) willfully to enter or remain upon the Floor of either House of the Congress, to enter or remain in any cloakroom or lobby adjacent to such Floor, or to enter or remain in the Marble Room of the Senate, unless such person is authorized, pursuant to rules adopted by that House or pursuant to authorization given by that House, to enter or remain upon such Floor or in such cloakroom, lobby, or room;

"(2) willfully to enter or remain in the Gallery of either House of the Congress in violation of rules governing admission to such Gallery adopted by that House or pursuant to authorization given by that House;

"(3) willfully to engage in any act of physical violence, to make any harangue or oration, or to utter loud, threatening, or abusive language in the Gallery of the Senate, in the Gallery of the House of Representatives, or in any public area or corridor of any of the Capitol Buildings;

"(4) by means of force or violence to enter or remain in the Chamber of the Senate, the Chamber of the House of Representatives, or any room within any of the Capitol Buildings set aside or designated for the use of either House of the Congress or any Member, committee, subcommittee, officer, or employee of the Congress or either House thereof;

"(5) willfully to enter or remain in any room within any of the Capitol Buildings which has been set aside or designated for the use of any committee or subcommittee of the Congress or either House thereof, at any time at which such committee or subcommittee is engaged in deliberations which are not open to the public, with intent to intrude upon, impede, or disrupt such deliberations;

"(6) with intent to impede, disrupt, or disturb the orderly conduct, in any room in any of the Capitol Buildings, of a public hearing before any committee or subcommittee of the Congress or either House thereof, to engage in any act of physical violence, to make any harangue or oration, or to utter loud, threatening, or abusive language; or

"(7) wilfully to obstruct, or wilfully to impede passage through or within, any public area or corridor of any of the Capitol Buildings or any subway connecting two or more of such buildings.

"(d) Nothing contained in this section shall forbid any act of any Member of the Congress, or any employee of a Member of the Congress, any officer or employee of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, or any officer or employee of either House of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, which is performed in the lawful performance of his official duties."

(b) Section 7 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193g)

is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the words "United States Capitol Grounds", the words "or within any of the Capitol Buildings".

(c) Section 8 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 193h) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. Offenses against sections 2 to 7, both inclusive, of this Act, and attempts and conspiracies to commit such offenses, shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding \$250, or imprisonment not exceeding sixty days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, prosecution for such offenses, attempts, and conspiracies to be had in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions upon information filed by the United States Attorney or any of his assistants: *Provided*, That in any case in which public property is damaged in an amount exceeding \$100, or in which an assault or battery is committed in the course of or incident to an offense against section 6 or section 7 of this Act or in the course of or incident to resistance to arrest for such an offense, the offense shall be punishable by imprisonment for not more than five years upon indictment and conviction in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia."

(d) Section 16(a) of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193m) is amended by—

(1) Striking out the words "except section 9", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "except sections 6(b), 6(c), 6(d), 7, and 9"; and

(2) Striking out the words "Senate Office Building", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Senate Office Buildings".

INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS TEST

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, next week the Senate Finance Committee will hold hearings on proposed amendments to the Social Security Act. It is with a great deal of concern that I turn my attention today to the social security program and in particular, to what is known as the retirement test under that program.

Presently, a retired worker between the ages of 65 and 72 is subject to what in my opinion is a penalty for his incentive. If a worker between these ages earns in excess of \$1,500 he must suffer the loss of \$1 of social security benefits for every \$2 he earns. If he is employed full time and earns more than \$2,700, his social security benefits are lost at the rate of \$1 for every \$1 that he earns above that amount.

During the 89th Congress, when the Senate was considering the Social Security Amendments of 1965, we had occasion to review the so-called earnings test and raised the then level from \$1,200 to \$1,800 and the \$2,400 level to \$3,000. However, when the bill went to conference the House insisted that the amount be cut back to \$1,500 and \$2,700 respectively. I regretted that the Senate was forced to yield in that particular instance.

While I agree with the underlying purpose of the retirement test, I feel that its present levels are totally unrealistic in regard to today's economy and must be increased.

The House bill, H.R. 12080, which I understand will be taken up in the House this week, recognizes this fact by recommending an increase in income levels from \$1,500 to \$1,680 and from \$2,700 to \$2,880. Although I agree that there should be an increase I do not believe the

House bill goes far enough. It is estimated that over 760,000 people will be given relief by this House provision and their incentive to supplement the social security benefits.

However, in view of the fact that the poverty level has been established at \$3,000 a year it is my feeling that a person receiving the minimum social security benefit should be allowed to supplement his income sufficiently to rise above this poverty level. I am therefore introducing a bill today which would increase the income levels from \$1,500 to \$2,400 before a social security recipient has his benefits reduced. This will mean that an individual receiving the recommended minimum of the House proposal—\$50 a month or \$600 annually—would be able to earn an additional \$2,400 and still retain his full social security benefit.

It is estimated that my proposal, by permitting retired workers to earn \$200 monthly, or \$2,400 annually, would benefit three times more persons than under the present House proposal or approximately 2 million individuals. The very magnitude of the number of persons affected by the retirement test emphasizes the need for improvement in this particular part of the social security program.

Another feature of my proposal is that it retains the present two-step reduction in the benefits of a retired worker. Thus, a worker earning between \$2,400 and \$3,600 yearly would be subject to a reduction of \$1 of benefits for every \$2 of wages. For earnings above \$3,600, his benefits would then be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis. This two-step feature, in continuing the present method at higher income levels, tends to lessen the severe impact on a retired worker's benefits. It permits a worker to earn more at the lower income levels and still receive a greater proportion of his social security benefit. For those who are receiving higher yearly wages, the reduction in benefits is greater in recognition of the fact that they are not truly retired.

I intend to explore this subject further when the Committee on Finance has occasion to consider the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1967.

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

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

The bill (S. 2314) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2314

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) (B) of subsection (f) of section 203 of the Social Security Act are each amended by striking out "\$125"

wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$200".

(b) Paragraph (1) (A) of subsection (h) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out "\$125" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$200".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall be effective with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TAX EXEMPTIONS TO CERTAIN JOINT ENDEAVORS ORGANIZED BY HOSPITALS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant to certain joint endeavors organized by hospitals the same tax exemptions as are accorded to the participating hospitals.

The proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code, creating a new section 501(c)(18), is necessitated by the inability of the Treasury or the Internal Revenue Service to find authority in the present statute to grant the exemption required. In an effort to reduce hospital operating costs, it has been proposed by many, including Members of Congress, the Public Health Service, and the President, that hospitals join together to pool their resources and scarce personnel, make maximum use of equipment and plant, and avoid expensive duplication of materials and services. In many communities this has been done. A group of nonprofit hospitals will have created a single entity to perform activities that the member hospitals have been doing by themselves, such as laundry, purchasing, recordkeeping, or data processing services. However, adverse consequences have resulted to these organizations because of inability to obtain a tax exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

When a tax-exempt hospital performs these functions for itself, there is no tax problem. When a hospital performs these services for other hospitals, or joins with other institutions to create a joint venture, unfortunately, tax exemption is denied to the entity conducting the joint activity. The reasons given by the Internal Revenue Service are these:

(1) Under the regulations to section 502 of the Internal Revenue Code, the group, joint or cooperative efforts of hospitals would be "feeder" organizations, intended to feed profits of business ventures to the exempt institutions. The regulations also deny tax exemption where the organization has a "multiple parentage" although exclusively made up of nonprofit organizations.

(2) Even if the joint activity were not a "feeder" corporation, it would not be entitled to exemption under section 501(c)(3) because, of or by itself, it would not be engaged in the charitable, educational or scientific functions which are the basis for the exemption of its member hospitals.

Why is a Federal tax exemption needed? For one reason, it is essential in order to attract grants from charitable foundations and gifts from individuals. Neither would be willing to donate without assurance of tax deductibility of the gift. Second, accounting practice sometimes shows income, subject to tax, as a "paper profit" when, for example, loans are amortized more rapidly than the depreciation of the plant or equip-

ment they have financed. And third, without the appropriate federal exemption, in many States the organization would be denied exempt status under State law and would be faced with real estate, sales, and income taxes; that is why organizing as a consumers' cooperative is not practical.

The proposed amendment would add a new subsection to the Internal Revenue Code, section 501(c)(18). It would give statutory recognition of the exempt status of joint, group, or cooperative organizations created by nonprofit hospitals, as if the organization's activities were conducted by the member hospitals individually. Personnel of the joint venture also would enjoy the same benefits as accrue to employees of nonprofit hospitals.

The amendment would encourage hospitals to do collectively some of the activities they now perform individually, but at less cost and greater efficiency than is currently possible. Also, in no way does the amendment reduce the Treasury's actual revenue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2315) to amend the Internal Code of 1954 to grant to certain joint endeavors organized by hospitals the same tax exemptions as are accorded to the participating hospitals; introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2315

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(18) Organizations, otherwise meeting the requirements of paragraph (3)—

"(A) all of whose owners or members are—

"(i) hospitals referred to in section 503 (b) (5) which are exempt from tax under subsection (a),

"(ii) hospitals which are a constituent part of an organization described in paragraph (3) which is exempt from tax under subsection (a), and which if organized and operated as a separate entity would constitute an organization described in paragraph (3), or

"(iii) hospitals which are owned and operated by any one or more of the following: the United States, a State, the District of Columbia, or a possession of the United States, or a political subdivision or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, and

"(B) whose activities are limited to the performance of services and functions, solely for their owners or members, which if performed on its own behalf by an owner or member that is exempt from tax under paragraph (3), would constitute an integral part of its exempt activities.

For purposes of this title, the performance of such an activity by such an organization shall be considered a charitable purpose (constituting the basis for its exemption under subsection (a)), and such an organization shall be considered to be a hospital referred to in section 503(b)(5) and described in, or

exempt from taxation under this subtitle by reason of, paragraph (3). In addition, for these purposes such an organization shall be considered to receive its financial support from the same sources as do its members."

CEMETERY LOT ALLOWANCE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill today, for appropriate reference, to provide cemetery lot allowance not to exceed \$250 to be paid to the families of deceased veterans.

This measure is made necessary by the recently announced policy of the Defense Department to restrict burials at both the Arlington and Alexandria National Cemeteries. That decision has definitely placed an unfair financial burden on the families of deserving veterans. This measure is designed to relieve part of the burden.

I believe that this policy, similar in form of payment to the burial allowances of the Veterans' Administration and the social security system, is preferable to the furnishing of burial facilities by the Government. The Administration agreed with this in its official policy announcement of February 20, 1967, entitled "Future of the National Cemetery System."

With the growing shortage of national cemetery facilities, it is certainly my hope that the Senate will proceed to the swift consideration of this measure. We cannot let those down who have given so much of their time and fortitude to the Nation.

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

The bill (S. 2316) to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of an additional amount of up to \$250 for the acquisition of a burial plot for the burial of certain veterans, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE THOMASITE TEACHERS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, immediately after the close of hostilities ending the Spanish-American War, attention was given by American military authorities to the creation of a public school system in the Philippine Islands. Even before civil government was inaugurated at Manila, July 4, 1901, under William Howard Taft as Governor General, broad programs of free public education were initiated.

The previous educational system under Spanish rule aimed at educating a privileged elite in the Spanish language; it had not initiated a program of broad and popular education. At no time during the three centuries of Spanish domination had there been more than one school teacher per 5,000 inhabitants. Under the American philosophy of education, the situation changed rapidly. As early as a few days following military victory, Philippine school-age children had been assembled into classes by American soldiers and instruction began in English. Within 3 weeks of American military occupation, seven large public schools in Manila

had been reopened, staffed for the most part by American soldiers who had some previous teaching experience.

Enlarging these programs of public instruction under professional American civilian schoolteachers became one of the priority and immediate goals of the American Government. This had the full support of President William McKinley who set in motion, a year before civil government in the Philippines under Governor General Taft, an "education bill for the Philippines."

Introduced in the American Congress on April 7, 1900, the bill became law as Act No. 74 of the 56th Congress, dated January 21, 1901. The role of the special Civil Service Commission to carry out the provisions of the new act was described as follows:

It will be the duty of the Commission to promote, and as they find occasion, to improve the system of instruction already inaugurated by the military authorities. In doing this, they should regard as of first importance the extension of a system of primary education which shall be free for all and which shall tend to fit the people for duties of citizenship and for the ordinary avocation of a civilized community. This instruction should be given, in the first instance, in every part of the islands in the language of the people. In view of the great number of languages spoken by the different tribes, it is especially important to the prosperity of the islands that a common medium of communication be established and it is obviously desirable that this medium should be the English language.

To initiate the groundwork of the Commission, the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the U.S. War Department at Washington selected from a national competition the names of 508 young American schoolteachers to go to the Philippines. They were to be the first group of American schoolteachers to pioneer a new system of public education in the Philippine Islands in the English language. They came from almost every one of the 45 States then in the American Union and represented almost every American college.

They sailed for Manila from San Francisco on July 23, 1901, aboard the U.S. Army transport ship named the *Thomas*. These 508 schoolteachers became known in the Philippines as the "Thomasites" and are still remembered in the Republic of the Philippines today by that name.

In retrospect, they were in their day precursors of today's Peace Corps volunteers, enjoying the same affection throughout the Philippine provinces as the volunteers enjoy today. Through their work they effected the inauguration of a broad national free public educational system based on instruction in the English language. Their work resulted ultimately in English becoming a common language of the Filipinos, long divided by the 87 dialects of their Malayo-Polynesian languages. Today, English is an official language of the Philippine government and is as widely spoken over a broad range of social groups as Tagalog, the most prevalent dialect. English is the language of business, most mass media, religious instruction, science, and the arts.

A month after its departure from the west coast of the United States, the U.S.S. *Thomas* on August 23, 1901, ar-

rived in Manila Bay. Its 508 young American schoolteachers soon departed for their posts in cities and villages scattered throughout the Philippine Islands. Some of the areas to which they were sent had not yet been subdued by the military. Each teacher, however, was armed with no more than a copy of his Civil Service Commission appointing him a schoolteacher under the congressional act of January 21, 1901.

The young Thomasite teachers faced many problems in their new life in a tropical country in many ways different from the life lived then on the American mainland. Health and medical care were primary problems. The teachers were young, accustomed for the most part to temperate and seasonal climates. Many succumbed to malaria and tropical diseases. In the old South Cemetery near Manila is a section containing the graves of several of these American teachers. In the isolated barrios where many of the teachers taught, there were no doctors and a clinic was more often many miles away.

The lack of communications also harassed the schoolteachers' lives. In many places there were no postal services or railroad connections. The teacher's pay check was often months late in arriving, and if he had not been able to obtain credit, usually from the local Chinese shopkeeper, he would have been in desperate straits.

The Thomasites taught in many places where there had not previously been schools or school buildings, and through their incentives new schoolhouses were built. In some towns the school was an empty rice warehouse. In other rural areas it was a nipa hut with the Filipino youngsters sitting on simple bamboo poles.

Like their Peace Corps volunteer successors, the Thomasite teachers were involved in what 66 years ago amounted to community development and rural reconstruction, jobs which the earlier Spanish-schooled teachers had disdained as being below their intellectual level and demeaning to the social dignity of a schoolteacher. The Thomasites taught the rudiments of family and community sanitation. They taught nutrition. They introduced gardening projects in the schools and taught the children the pleasure and lore that comes from tending small vegetable and flower plots.

These projects often met at first with social difficulties and suspicions since digging in the earth, cultivating the soil, planting, weeding, picking fruit and vegetables amounted in the Spanish tradition, to work for peasants only, and was hardly connected with educating the mind. But the Thomasites persisted, and in the long run contributed as much in democratizing the people as in improving their diet. Many basic American virtues were imparted by the Thomasites and entered into the Philippine psyche—a respect for hard work, industry, punctuality, and the pleasure derived in surveying a job completed and well done. These were radical new ideas, as radical as the loftier ideals of the American Declaration of Independence or the American Constitution which the teachers taught in their classrooms.

The Thomasites were among the first to introduce organized athletics in the schools of the Philippines. In a May 1967 report to President Ferdinand E. Marcos, entitled "Toward a National Sports Development Program," the Secretary of Education, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo credited the Thomasites with being among the pioneers in physical education programs in the Philippines.

The work schedules of the Thomasite teachers in the Philippines 66 years ago read like the schedules of some of the overworked teachers in large cities of the United States today. They taught regular primary school classes Mondays through Fridays 5 hours a day, and adult education classes of 1½ hours three times a week. Those in the city schools visited schools in the remoter barrios regularly and on these trips supervised and guided the Philippine teachers who often had only the crudest classrooms and most primitive teaching materials. Educational materials received from American civil authorities in Manila, were used by the Thomasite teachers and distributed to rural teachers on these field trips.

The Thomasites soon found out that many of the books and teaching tools made with American schoolchildren in mind were not suitable for children in a tropical country with a different historical background. The young teachers went about adapting these materials to the Filipino mentality and with Philippine history in mind. It did not take long for teachers working with American ABC readers to substitute mangoes and papayas for the red apples and blueberries in the American texts.

The many obstacles of their day did not lessen the fervor of the Thomasites as is attested by the comments of the many students they taught. As their students, many of them now illustrious Filipinos, point out, the chief contribution was the establishment of a free public educational system, soon taken up and adopted enthusiastically by Filipinos themselves. In 1910 there were 889 American schoolteachers in the islands and 2,167 Filipino teachers. Fifty years later there were only eight American public school teachers and 85,396 Filipino teachers in the public school system, all direct successors in the system laid down by the Thomasites and other American teachers who followed them.

The Thomasites left behind a heritage of good will which is still kept alive. General Romulo, Secretary of Education and contemporaneously President of the University of the Philippines, the oldest and most important state university in the Philippines and a leader among universities in East Asia, has written:

The American school teachers joined with us in creating the literature, the knowledge, the self-confidence, and devotion to democracy on which it was possible to establish our Republic.

In an article entitled "From the *Thomas* to Santo Tomas," a Thomasite student, a former Secretary of Education, Dr. Cecilio Putong, wrote of this accumulation of good will for the Thomasites.

I consider the development of the ideals of democracy, and of high regard for demo-

cratic institutions as the best contribution of the early American teachers to Philippine education.

Mrs. Pilar Hidalgo Lim, President of Centro Escolar University at Manila, and a veteran social worker, wrote of the Thomasite teachers:

They carried out the implementation of English language all over the Islands so that the Filipinos could understand each other in spite of all the many dialects.

A former president of the Philippine Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Concepcion M. Henares, wrote the following of the Thomasites:

They popularized education, which is no longer a privilege of the rich.

A former Associate Justice of the Philippine Supreme Court, the Honorable Alejo Labrador, wrote of the Thomasites:

They made the school attractive to the students.

Today one of the known surviving Thomasites of the group of 508 young schoolteachers who came to the Philippines in 1901 is Mr. Henry H. Balch, 90 years old, of 512 Eustis Avenue SE., Huntsville, Ala. 35801. Mr. Balch was cited in the October 1966 number of the Philippine Journal of Education as the "last surviving Thomasite."

Mr. Balch has pointed out that the work of the Thomasites, like the work of today's Peace Corps volunteers, is also an exercise in international diplomacy. In a letter to the American Embassy in Manila Mr. Balch wrote:

The Filipinos opposed United States assuming control of the Philippines at the end of Spanish rule in 1898, and fought us bitterly. The Thomasite teachers did much to heal that serious breach between Filipinos and Americans. As we ponder now over Vietnam, it may be well to know that in the end the Filipinos were our friends—not our enemies.

Mr. Balch says that to this day it is still a mystery to him how his name got to the Bureau of Insular Affairs as a prospective schoolteacher for the Philippines, but he is "happy about it nevertheless." Upon arrival in Manila in 1901, he was assigned to teach mathematics and English at Lucena, Quezon—then Tayabas—Province in southern Luzon, serving also on occasions as substitute music teacher and choir conductor. Among his former students were former Philippine Chief Justice Ricardo Paras, and Mrs. Paz M. Benitez who recalls that one day toward the end of World War II when she and her family were camped out in a tent, an American Army officer, Capt. Jackson Balch, searched her out on the instructions of his father. The old Thomasite teacher had asked his son to see if there was anything that could be done for his former pupils.

Henry H. Balch is now 90 years old. He left the Philippines in 1913 after 12 years of teaching, intending to return after ridding himself in the United States of a lingering case of malaria. He was not able to return, however, and instead joined the U.S. Foreign Service. Mr. Balch served in several posts around the world, achieving the rank of Consul General. One of the most treasured posses-

sions in Mr. Balch's Huntsville, Ala., home today is the original log of the transport *Thomas*, which carried the Thomasites to the Philippines.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to extend greetings to the Congress of the Philippines on the 66th anniversary of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers in the Philippines.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 160) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as follows:

S. RES. 160

Whereas on August 23, 1967, will occur the sixty-sixth anniversary of the arrival in the Philippines of the five hundred and eight American volunteer teachers aboard the transport U.S.S. *Thomas*.

Whereas these "Thomasite" teachers established a system of primary and secondary education in the Philippines, bringing the ideals of democracy and the benefits of public education to the Philippines in preparation for self-government and independence, and personally guided the education of many of the leaders of the Philippine nation today,

Whereas the laudable work of the Thomasite teachers represents the best in American ideals, perseverance under difficult conditions, and devotion to public service,

Whereas the Thomasites were in their day precursors of today's Peace Corps Volunteers, enjoying the same affection throughout the Philippine provinces as the Volunteers enjoy today,

Whereas the record of the Thomasite teachers is an inspiration to Americans and Filipinos alike and enduring evidence of the lasting esteem between the two peoples,

Resolved, that the Congress of the United States extend its greetings and felicitations to the Congress of the Philippines on the sixty-sixth anniversary of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers in the Philippines.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the Speaker of the Philippine House of Representatives.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 279

Mr. TOWER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1872) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONROY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

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

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to be asso-

ciated with the Senator from Minnesota. Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1484—SMALL BUSINESS CRIME PROTECTION INSURANCE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Small Business will hold hearings on S. 1484, to establish a Small Business Crime Protection Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes, on Wednesday, September 13, Thursday, September 14, and Friday, September 15, 1967. The hearings will commence at 10 a.m. each day in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with the bill should notify Mr. Reginald W. Barnes, assistant counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, telephone 225-3921, not later than Wednesday, September 6, 1967.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

William A. Meadows, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of Florida, term of 4 years—reappointment.

Guy W. Hixon, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of Florida, term of 4 years—reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, August 24, 1967, any representation or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the following nominations:

William A. Costello, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Trinidad and Tobago.

George J. Feldman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

William O. Hall, of Oregon, a Foreign Service officer of class I, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

Fredric R. Mann, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Barbados.

Robert G. Miner, of New York, a For-

eign Service officer of class I, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sierra Leone.

Geoffrey W. Lewis, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class I, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Central African Republic.

Albert W. Sherer, Jr., of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class I, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Togo.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

RIOT CAUSES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there appeared in the *Romney, W. Va., Hampshire Review*, on August 16, 1967, an editorial entitled "Riot Causes." It is a very thought provoking editorial and one which I think presents a very pertinent and cogent viewpoint with respect to riot causes.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

RIOT CAUSES

The spate of riots that have plagued the country this summer in such places as Newark, Detroit and even Cambridge, Maryland, has prompted the appointment of what is described as a Blue Ribbon Commission by President Johnson to make a study and report on the causes and some other features of these riots. The commission is also to answer such questions as, "Are federal aids to the cities hitting the targets of discontent of the Negroes and the poor?", "Why do the young people seem to hate policemen and why do they become snipers and looters?", "What do the people who live in the riot areas and engage in the riots really want and how can these wants be satisfied?", but their main job is to determine the causes before they can recommend any cures.

Although there are serious and even desperate problems of unemployment, poverty, slum conditions and even misery in all of our cities, large and small, these things are more of an excuse for the riots than they are causes. This is obvious when one realizes that these conditions have always existed in our cities to a greater or less degree and have rarely, if ever, caused rioting. The recent riots of this summer and the preceding two years, have been instigated by such people as the late Malcolm X, Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown and even Harlem Congressman Adam Clayton Powell. These men have been widely quoted as making such statements as, "We'll burn the country down, Honkies and all." "We are preparing urban guerrillas for our defense." "The riots are a necessary phase in the Black Revolution." This kind of leadership, radical and irresponsible as it may be, serves only to tip the balance from legitimate protest to insurrection.

Another cause that has been building over a period of years is disregard for law and order and disregard for the rights of others. When the pressure of civil rights legislation began to build a few years ago, the technique of the demonstration and the protest march was developed and when it achieved a degree of success, it was expanded to include demonstrations in defiance of local regulations and in utter disregard of the rights of individuals. This development was not only countenanced by the federal gov-

ernment, but frequently actively encouraged until it became almost a basic principle that no one had to obey any law if they didn't happen to like it.

The third basic cause of today's riots lies in the fact that the riots in the Hough area of Cleveland and the Watts area of Los Angeles of a couple of years ago resulted in the funneling of extra amounts of federal and state aid funds into these areas. This created a precedent for the current black-mall aspect of riots in which they are threatened for the purpose of getting larger subsidies and perpetrated when these demands are not instantly and completely met.

The Blue Ribbon Commission or any other study group, the Congress and the administration, can point out at great length the failure of modern society to solve the problems of the poor and of racial discrimination, and they can recommend all of the government programs their minds can devise, but they will do nothing to stop the indiscriminate slaughter, the malicious wounding and wanton destruction of property inherent in these riots until the sense of responsibility and belief in law and order has been restored in the hearts and minds of all Americans.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I regret that I was not on the floor last Tuesday when a number of warm remarks were directed to the birthday of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the able minority whip.

I rise to offer him tardy albeit heartfelt congratulations and best wishes. I regret that the well-deserved remarks of his many admiring colleagues leave little unsaid about TOM KUCHEL. But from the perspective of a freshman Member of this great body, it is clear that he brings great honor upon the Senate, upon his home State of California, and upon the Nation we all serve.

Perhaps the good people of California are also to be congratulated at the same time, for it is their good judgment that has sent him here repeatedly. It is their considered wisdom that has produced a magnificent career in public service. From the day the citizens of Orange County sent him to the California State Assembly up to the present day, some 30 years of devotion to Government constitute a bright chapter in the political history of a proud State and Nation.

I doubt that any newcomer to this Chamber could help but be impressed with the energy, the wit, the sensitivity, and the knowledge that our distinguished colleague brings to his work here. His devotion to the representation of the interests of his State and the Nation—such areas as conservation, civil rights, reclamation, and medicare, to name a few, have been an example to this Senate. He serves with poise and moderation, in the highest interests of his Nation.

The friendship, expressed in wise advice, counsel, and support have been of greatest value to me. I know I join all Members of this body in wishing a great number of happy, productive years to a great and distinguished Senator.

THE FAIRBANKS AND NENANA FLOOD DISASTERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the uncontrolled waters of the Chena and

Tanana Rivers in central Alaska this week demonstrated too emphatically what can happen when rivers go unharnessed and heavy rainfalls upset the tiny balance between control and chaos as rivers overflow their banks and roll unchecked across towns, cities, and countryside. Every home and facility in Fairbanks, Alaska, may be damaged. It is a major disaster.

As a result of these floods, an estimated 15,000 persons are homeless. Alaska's second largest city, Fairbanks, is paralyzed. At least two smaller towns Nenana and Minto are as badly off. The official Alaska centennial exposition site has been ruined. Some of the homeless are temporarily resettled at the University of Alaska, Fort Richardson, Lathrop High School, and the Fairbanks International Airport, Eielson Air Force Base.

Obviously these temporary facilities are cramped and inadequate.

Damage estimates vary, but the cost could exceed \$200 million. Their actual extent cannot be known until the waters have returned to normal.

Compounding the problems I have described, including the fact the American Red Cross reports that a high percentage of rental property in Fairbanks has been destroyed, is the fact that the area is 30 days from the first frosts and 60 days from hard freezes. The time in which to rebuild is brief.

These then are the facts available, the problems which exist and which must be solved as soon as possible. We know enough to realize that the impact of this disaster to the economy of central Alaska exceeds that of the 1964 Good Friday earthquake in south central Alaska although the dollar damage may be less.

The damage is greater because nearly an entire area has been rendered homeless. The 1964 earthquake came violently and did destroy many homes, but unlike the flood it left as abruptly as it began.

Flood waters do not vanish. In the case of the Fairbanks area their damage has been heightened because the city is situated in a flat area and the Chena River goes through the heart of the city. When the waters rose, they had but one place to go—across the city. The town of Nenana on the Tanana River underwent an identical experience, and the town was evacuated.

As a result, we have an enormous "people problem" which includes critical housing and feeding needs. Hinged with these dilemmas are the dangers of epidemics, contaminated water and backed up sewers. Fairbanks residents have a tight schedule ahead within which to remove mud and silt, repair homes, furnaces, electrical equipment, sewers, and the like. These are immediate needs.

Not to be overlooked are the long-range needs, including urban renewal and possibly revised city planning for Fairbanks and the homeless residents of Nenana and Minto.

I have outlined the problem areas. Now let me report on the relief measures undertaken by State and Federal officials since the floodwaters began to rise.

State officials, headed by Gov. Walter J. Hickel, have surveyed the damaged areas. Federal officials are on the scene.

The Alaska congressional delegation met yesterday with representatives of the Federal agencies concerned whenever a major natural disaster occurs. We learned, officially, massive Federal relief measures were ready if the area qualified as a natural disaster area. The President's Office of Emergency Planning, headed by Gov. Farris Bryant, was coordinating the program.

For example, the U.S. Army and Air Force personnel were busy evacuating refugees. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers members had made \$100,000 and 100,000 sandbags available and would survey the damage when waters receded. The American Red Cross was already in the devastated areas. The Department of Agriculture had made available donated food. The Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management and Alaska Railroad were relaying messages and had surveyed damage. Railroad service was expected to be restored within 36 hours after floodwaters went down. The Small Business Administration was preparing to make 3-percent loans to replace losses incurred in almost all of the private sector. The Bureau of Public Roads would be able to make repairs to public highways. The Department of Housing and Urban Development described programs for long-range restoration which might help the stricken areas.

This morning after consultations with his representatives and after receiving the formal request for Federal assistance from Gov. Walter J. Hickel as required by law the President issued a declaration of major natural disaster for the flooded areas. President Johnson immediately made available \$1 million in Federal funds for emergency disaster relief and recovery measures.

Concomitantly at the time of the President's declaration the Small Business Administration announced that the city of Fairbanks and the town of Nenana and all adjacent areas have been declared a disaster loan area.

The Fairbanks story would not be complete without reference to my fellow Alaskans who, having experienced disaster, now are ready to rebuild. This morning I talked by telephone with Mayor H. A. "Red" Boucher and told him that President Johnson had declared the area to be one of major natural disaster. The mayor expressed the appreciation of the residents of Fairbanks and then summarized their feelings as follows:

What do we need? We need the tools to rebuild. We don't need studies and we don't need visitors right now. We have lots of work to do, and we don't have much time before the freeze sets in.

As always, whatever the disaster, the spirit of Alaskans is undaunted.

THE WORLD FOOD PROBLEM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a conference recently was held at the University of Nebraska, in Lincoln, at which rural young people from 35 countries discussed world problems and particularly the world food problem.

It is significant that this meeting was

held in Nebraska, in the heart of our Nation's principal food-producing region, capable of providing the daily sustenance not only for its own people but also for people far beyond its borders.

It is also significant that these young people from the International Farm Youth Exchange program, including representatives from our own sponsoring 4-H families, did not engage in bitter accusations such as we hear so often from international bodies but rather discussed with calm deliberation and keen concern their search for a better life in freedom and security for young people everywhere.

And, of special interest to the Senate, the good bearing and good work of these young people were noted in a speech made before the group by Mrs. Frances Humphrey Howard, the sister of the Senate's distinguished Presiding officer, Vice President HUMPHREY.

I, for one, was impressed with Mrs. Howard's challenge to the young people from foreign countries to carry back to their homelands all the knowledge they can acquire together with a renewed determination to increase and improve their food production in order to better meet the needs of their own people, for we all know, Mr. President, that no matter how hard we try or how much we might desire to do so, our own Nation is not large or rich enough to feed all the hungry people in the world.

Because of her knowledge, training, and experience in this field, Mr. President, I hereby ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a biographical sketch of the Vice President's sister and the text of her speech to the 14th annual midpoint conference of the International Farm Youth Exchange at the University of Nebraska, August 2, 1967.

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

MRS. FRANCES HUMPHREY HOWARD

Frances Humphrey Howard is a career civil servant in the Agency for International Development of the Department of State. She is Chief of Liaison to Non-Governmental Organizations and Special Project Branch in the Office of the War on Hunger. She provides continuing liaison with the U.S. Non-Governmental Organizations and through them works with the many international organizations that are accredited to the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies.

For the past five years she has served as Liaison with U.S. Voluntary Agencies in Foreign Service such as CARE, Catholic Relief Service, the American Joint-Jewish Distribution Committee, Lutheran World Services, etc. She has been a U.S. representative for the Agency for International Development as well as a participant at international conferences, including the Pacific Conference on Urban Growth at Hawaii, 1967; the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization Seminar on "Young World Food and Development" at Des Moines, 1967; the Fifth Pan-American Conference of Social Welfare at Lima, Peru, 1965; the International Conference of Social Work in Athens, Greece, 1964; and the Asian Seminar on The Role of Asian Women in Economic and Social Development at Manila, Philippine Islands, 1963. Because of Mrs. Howard's special interest in the Inter-American Commission of Women and the Voluntary Agencies in

Latin America, she has been appointed to the International Advisory Council of the Sixth Pan American Conference and Congress of Social Welfare to be held in Venezuela, March 1968.

During World War II, Mrs. Howard served under Eleanor Roosevelt in the Office of Civilian Defense. She has also served as consultant to the National Conference of the U.S. National Commission of UNESCO in 1955, and to the White House Conference on Foreign Aspects of U.S. National Security in 1958. In 1957, she organized the first United Nations Association's People-to-People tour to Europe. In 1958, as Director of the AAUN in Maryland, she traveled to the Soviet Union, Jordan, Egypt, and East and West Germany.

A native of South Dakota, she holds a Master's Degree in Sociology from George Washington University in Washington, D.C., and has done advanced work in International Relations at Johns Hopkins University. She now serves on a part-time basis on the faculty of Maryland University's Graduate School of Social Work, teaching seminars in International Community Development. In 1962-63, as a member of the Graduate Faculty, she taught at the University of North Carolina School of Social Work. In March 1966, Lane College, Jackson, Tennessee, bestowed upon Mrs. Howard the honorary degree of Doctor of Humanities.

In 1960, she received the Business and Professional Women's National Business Week Award for her outstanding professional achievements and community service.

Mrs. Howard lives in North Arlington, Virginia, a suburb of Washington, D.C. She is the mother of two, William, 21, a senior at the University of Minnesota, and Anne, 18, now attending Boston University.

THE CHALLENGE OF YOUTH IN THE WAR ON HUNGER

(Address by Mrs. Frances Humphrey Howard, chief, special projects and organization liaison branch, Office of the War on Hunger Agency for International Development)

I am delighted and deeply honored to address the 14th Annual International Farm Youth Exchange Mid-Point Conference.

In a sense, what we have here today is a miniature United Nations General Assembly. But, in my opinion, that august international body could profit much from the example of the IFYE exchanges from some 35 countries participating in this Conference. Mercifully absent from our midst are the discordant notes and noisy propaganda diatribes often accompanying the deliberations in the United Nations.

The young men and women taking part in this Conference are motivated by the noblest aims and ideals that ever inspired man on this planet—the aims and ideals of common concern for achieving progress and a better life in freedom and security.

I understand, each and everyone of you has now spent about three months living and working with rural families in the United States and now you are about to go to a second state in another region of the United States.

In each state you will have lived with four to six host families. At the same time some 90 American delegates from 33 states are now visiting 35 countries. They, as well as you, are sharing ideas for a better agricultural and home life—working, living, teaching and playing beside their hosts.

The International Farm Youth Exchange was one of the early international rural youth exchanges. It was, therefore, appropriate that experience from this program should be incorporated into the Peace Corps. Since 1948, more than 4,000 young people have been exchanged between the United States and 70 cooperating host countries.

Thus, more than 33,000 host families in the United States and the cooperating coun-

tries have gained a greater understanding of others through their hospitality to IFYE's and other 4-H visitors.

More than ever before we now realize that peace and cooperation for the common good demand understanding. A sympathetic understanding of the aspirations, the hopes and fears, the traditions and prides of other peoples and nations is essential to the promotion of mutual prosperity and peace.

In a climate of understanding, the broad cooperation which is essential for the material, social, and intellectual progress of peoples develops naturally. Without this understanding, it is difficult to achieve any real cooperation.

And I know of no better single method of reaching mutual understanding than by multiplying our international contacts through people-to-people diplomacy.

We need more individual diplomats from Main Street, from our farms, schools, laboratories—from every walk of life. People-to-people diplomacy means thousands of part-time ambassadors—all working for better relationships among all peoples.

Our nation as well as free peoples everywhere owe a great debt of gratitude to the Cooperative Extension Service of the State Land-Grant Universities; to the United States Department of Agriculture; and to the National 4-H Club Foundation of Washington, D.C., who are conducting these programs.

We are also deeply indebted to the civic and international-minded business and industrial firms, foundations and individuals helping finance IFYE.

Every passing day brings new reminders of a closer relationship among the peoples of all nations. As the world moves through tensions and crises, the importance of our interdependence is strikingly being driven home.

John Donne wrote his "Devotions" almost 400 years ago. But his words become increasingly relevant to each succeeding generation: "No man is an island, entire of itself" he wrote. "Every man is a piece of the Continent . . . Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankind: And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

We are all involved in affairs extending far beyond our borders. Our involvement is international. We have come to learn that in our ever-shrinking world—a world of electronic communication and swifter-than-sound flight—the aspirations of the slum dweller in India or the farmer on the rice fields of Vietnam are as important as ours and their just aspirations for a decent life cannot be ignored.

We are involved in the awakening of hope and the emergence of unrest among disadvantaged people and nations around the world, asking for a better break.

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara recently pointed out the relationship between the living standards in various countries and the incidence of social unrest and violent political upheaval. He concluded that "Security is development."

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, on the other hand, last month wrote that he would like to narrow that statement a bit and say, "Security is food." Without an adequate supply of food in the developing countries, Secretary Freeman added, "the prospects for economic and political stability are not good."

The world no longer accepts the great disparity in living standards now prevailing around the world. We know that a world of independent nations able to secure a decent measure of economic and social progress for their people is the kind of world in which our own freedom and hopes are safest.

We seek to create that kind of world through our foreign assistance programs. These programs are major weapons in the Free World's war against the most immediate

enemies of its less-developed partners: poverty, hunger, ignorance and disease.

These programs, in the words of President Johnson, "help give the people of the less-developed world the food, the health, the skills and education—and the strength—to lead their nations to self-sufficient lives of plenty and freedom."

An important point to be made about American foreign aid is that its major concern must be people. Our aid cannot be concerned simply with dollars or plants or facilities.

Our own experience in America demonstrates that the vital ingredient of progress is people who are educated and healthy, people who have enough of the right food to eat, people who look to the future with hope.

Aristides, the ancient Greek philosopher, wrote in 600 B.C.: "Not houses fully roofed, or the stones of walls well built, nay, nor canals and dockyards, make the city, but men able to use their opportunity."

Today, I am sure all of us clearly recognize that economic development goes hand-in-hand with social development, human development.

More and more, our attention is directed toward training the younger members of our societies. In most developing countries, more than half of the population is under 20 years of age. In developed countries these statistics are even more dramatic. Within two to three years, the United States will be the youngest country in the world, with the average age to be 25 years or lower.

The youth of today will be the leaders of tomorrow. And the years of the future will be based on today and tomorrow. In other words, we and our immediate future will be the foundation of the years to come. In the same sense today and tomorrow are based on yesterday.

I fully agree with Mr. Grant Shrum, the able and personable Director of the National 4-H Foundation. He said: "In the lesser developed countries, youth can learn to be better farmers and better homemakers; they can demonstrate the application of new technology; they can be a part of not just the development of agriculture and home science, but of the total development of whole societies."

It is not a question of scrapping the past in hopes of creating some kinds of utopia for the future. Past generations have laid the foundations of our societies. We, therefore, owe a debt of gratitude to present and past generations. Your fathers and mothers and your teachers of the present and the past deserve much credit for their accomplishments. But improvements can and must be effected and that is where you come in. The young people of today must train and equip themselves for the great tasks awaiting them in the immediate future.

These are perilous times, but we cannot afford to let such times pull us down or make us lose our goals. We must simply do everything we can to help other people pull themselves up. This requires preparing yourself for the job ahead.

Ours is a faster moving, more scientific, more worldwide and space minded age. It is demanding much of you in study, in preparation. Those of you who still live on the farm are no longer the simple, plain boys and girls people used to write about. You and your city cousins are on an equal footing and are together preparing for a better world in which to live.

Above all, do not follow the example of some members of the farm youth of the past who moved to the city. The tendency of the better-educated to leave rural areas is indeed a serious threat to plans for raising agricultural productivity. Your respective countries will need you to stay in farming and to apply or teach the methods you are learning here and elsewhere.

Producing food through improved methods

of farming is a vitally important occupation. It is a noble occupation. And in today's War on Hunger it becomes a matter of highest priority to produce more food. As our Vice President put it, "Food is life. Food is wealth. Food is power, because a nation without food is powerless."

Secretary of State Rusk recently told a group of agricultural leaders in Washington that today there are two overriding problems facing the world. One is to keep the beast of nuclear power in its cage. The other is to keep the beast of hunger away from the door of families throughout the world.

Let us talk about the beast of hunger. That's where you and I have direct responsibility.

In his State of the Union message, on January 10, 1967, President Johnson stated the problem in these words: "Next to the pursuit of peace, the really great challenge to the human family is the race between food supply and population increase. That race tonight is being lost."

The stark fact facing humanity is that the world is running out of food.

That is a fact of life, and of death. Ten thousand children died today of malnutrition. Tomorrow, 10,000 more will die. And so through every day of this year 1967.

Hunger is not an occasional visitor but a constant companion to half of mankind. Half a billion humans suffer from too little food. Another billion lead brief half-lives because their diets lack proper proportions of protein, minerals, or vitamins.

We worry about our waistlines. These starving humans worry about survival. While we dither about considering a calorie cut-down for ourselves, three out of four people in the rest of the world lack sufficient calories daily to keep going. Unquestionably, hunger is the chief killer of man.

If anyone doubts that hunger is the most painful fact of life for these multitudes, let him experiment with a daily diet of a small bowl of rice or a crust of bread.

The blunt fact is that population is outstripping food supplies. We are producing people faster than we can feed them, just as the English economic philosopher Thomas Malthus predicted in 1798, that we would. Unless trends now gathering force are checked, the Malthusian nightmare will become a reality.

The fact is that food production is increasing at a rate of one percent annually, while population is growing at a rate of two percent. The situation now is: A million new mouths a week and no more food to feed them. And the situation will worsen.

Unless something is done now, the world's population will double by the end of this century—rising from three billion people to more than six billion. When we consider that it took from the beginning of time until 1967 to reach a world population of three billion . . . and will take only 33 more years to add the second three billion . . . this projection becomes both awesome and threatening.

And the most rapid gains in population are taking place in those lands least able to cope with them.

From net grain exporters a generation ago, the developing nations have now become importers of more than 30 million tons of grain a year in their desperate efforts to feed a populace that can no longer be sustained by the primitive tillage of their own soils.

The developing countries must look to rising per-acre yields for most of the additions to their food supply. They must generate a yield take-off—a sustained rise in yield per acre.

The ability to generate a trend of rapidly rising yields, however, has been confined largely to the more advanced countries. Over the past quarter century, all the increase in food output in both North America and Western Europe came from raising yield per acre. Yield per acre in North America, the

most advanced region, increased 109 percent; in Asia, the least advanced region, it increased only seven percent, and for the entire less-developed world, it rose only eight percent.

Nearly one-fifth of the United States' wheat crop was shipped to India to stave off famine in 1966. Yet the quantity of grain shipped in 1966—so huge that it had to be shipped in the largest flotilla assembled since D-Day—was still not enough to maintain India's food consumption levels of the early 1960's.

If nothing is done to alter present trends, if nothing is done to slow population growth and accelerate food production, the outlook for the future is a grim outlook, indeed. If the world pursues its present course; if population expansion is not controlled and food production greatly increased, the world will be a grim, sullen, hate-filled planet tottering on the brink of self-destruction.

What then are the battle plans for victory in a world war on hunger? What are our sources of strength and weakness? In what combination do we use our weapons?

We know that the only acceptable method of controlling population growth is reducing birth rates. We also know that science has provided the means to reduce birth rates. The challenge now is to clear the cultural, ethnic, religious and educational barriers.

Those among you who come from countries where the fertility of people is outstripping fertility of the soil can well take up this challenge and do everything you can in informing and urging the people and the authorities in your own areas to take the right measures and carry out family planning before disaster overtakes and engulfs us all.

A very encouraging beginning has already been made. Family planning efforts are being organized in a number of crowded nations. Japan, South Korea and Taiwan, for example, have achieved a reduction in birth rates since inaugurating family planning programs in recent years.

The examples of these countries now point the way. They have demonstrated that it can be done. They have shown that the right approach and the right measures can improve significantly the food/population balance.

The technical skills of the more advanced countries will, of course, help produce more food. Our own agricultural history shows what can be done. A century ago, one American farm worker met the food and fiber needs of himself and five others. Today, he provides for 37. One hour's farm labor today produces five times more than it did forty years ago.

What has been done in the United States, can be done in the developing countries. The awakening peoples of the developing countries could make great progress by using better fertilizer and tillage methods through the control of pests and doing the self-help things progressing nations have to do. Science and research have served our country well and the knowledge we have acquired can be shared with all nations. Research costing nearly \$900 million last year and embracing nearly 50,000 projects made possible new progress in pest control, nutrition, greater yield from acreage, new foods.

An entire lecture could be devoted to the breakthroughs in creating new sources of food—food extracted from a combination of crude oil, bacteria, yeasts, nitrogen, phosphate, and water. Now the new high lysine corn is not only an important source of protein in itself, but also promises an appreciable reduction in the cost of producing animal products. Pigs gain weight fifty percent faster on high lysine corn.

Science is now tapping every possible food resource the sea has to offer. Fin and shellfish will be cultivated and harvested and

seaweed and algae will be converted into nutritious food substances.

Only a few weeks ago, our Government announced it will locate in the Pacific northwest the nation's first pilot plant for the manufacture of fish flour. This is a high protein concentrate that has been described as one possible answer to helping feed undernourished millions.

Some of our country's leading food processors are making what they call "meatless meats" of spun soy protein fibers that resemble chicken, beef, ham, and other meats. "Imitation milk" made of vegetable fats already is on the market.

Such developments and others can lead us to hope that man may yet be able to stave off the impending calamity of world hunger.

The United States is, of course, one of the leaders in trying to find a solution to the problem. Congress has authorized the use of up to \$7.4 billion over the next two years in launching a world war on hunger.

The funds voted by Congress will mobilize greater U.S. technology and resources by transferring American farming techniques and equipment to the developing countries, constructing fertilizer and pesticide chemical plants; establishing more extension services, and financing research for better and nutritious crops.

To emphasize the importance attached to this effort, President Johnson four months ago created a new central office in the Agency for International Development of the Department of State, devoted to the War on Hunger. The office is headed by a very able government official, Herbert J. Waters.

Today, 1300 A.I.D.-financed agricultural experts are working overseas; 2,000 foreign agricultural professionals are studying in the country under A.I.D. auspices. We are thus helping train the leaders the developing countries send to us, and we are sending our experienced agents and specialists along with A.I.D. funds to help developing countries apply our successful experience to their own fields and cultures and local situations.

Even in war-stricken South Vietnam, we are helping its people open up a second front on agricultural production. Some of our best young Extension agents—some former 4-H'ers—have joined with other specialists to help increase food production there. The better living and stronger national economy that goes along with it will help win the war and the peace.

We have a pretty good idea of what the developing countries need.

They need increased quantities of fertilizer and other farm chemicals, improved varieties of seeds, increased availability of water, added credit, improved marketing facilities and expanded education. And what makes progress so difficult is that most of these must be brought together at the same time and place.

I have mentioned the problem of generating the yield takeoff. And the big question is: What is needed for a yield takeoff?

One factor facilitating a yield-per-acre takeoff is a reasonably high level of literacy. A trend of rapidly rising yields implies the continuous movement of new ideas and techniques from the research plot to the farmer, and this is much easier in a literate society.

A.I.D. projects are helping to irrigate more than a million acres in India, a half million acres in Pakistan, and a hundred thousand or more each in Korea, Afghanistan, Ecuador, Morocco, and Tunisia.

What other weapons can we muster in the War on Hunger? We have the "conventional" weapons, of course, the food products of our own and other advanced agricultural nations. The new Food-for-Freedom program will increase food aid shipments to fill the food gap while local output is being increased.

With these food products we can buy time

and prevent the threat of famine while modern agricultural techniques are being exported to developing countries. Part of the currency generated under food sales is reinvested in country agricultural development and food processing industries. The food supplied in many cases is used as wages in rural development programs.

As for the problem of population control, assistance is now offered under a new policy permitting United States funds to be spent for contraceptive material when it is requested for voluntary family-planning programs. Requesting countries, too poor to buy contraceptive pills on the world market, will get foreign-aid funds to buy American made pills or ingredients for making their own.

We trust that common sense will prevail and the world will finally find it possible to cope with the human tidal wave which has been washing away the benefits of millions of man-years of effort and billions of dollars in foreign aid.

I am an optimist. I am confident that at the turn of the century, population will have found its level and food production aided by new technologies may prove to be adequate, if we act now with drastic urgency. We must continue to strive collectively and individually to wipe out the specter of hunger.

Now, what can you—young men and women—contribute to this world effort to free the human spirit from hunger?

You can help by keeping your eyes and ears open and by absorbing as much knowledge as possible from personal observation of methods and techniques in our rural areas;

By learning the techniques of effective communication of what you have learned to your own people when you return;

By helping dissipate any remaining suspicion toward innovation and foreign ideas;

By impressing on the people of your area the importance of adopting new and better methods of cultivation in order to increase the yield per acre;

By helping organize various small-scale community development projects;

By working with other young people of your communities to improve environment, develop leadership skills and relate education to daily life skills;

By imparting to others what you have learned on food selection based on nutritional principles;

By helping young people learn about conservation and participating in erosion-control practices;

By helping establish and supervise tree-planting programs;

By urging youth to improve their food supply through vegetable garden programs;

By helping organize rural youth clubs, modeled after the 4-H Clubs in the United States, providing each of their members the experience and responsibility for selecting and managing his own crop, livestock, or home improvement project.

By doing all these things and more in your respective communities, you will be helping the rural youths to meet the challenges of our century and to find their rightful place in the sun.

Moreover, you will be helping win the War on Hunger and build a better world before the end of this century. This is the challenge of youth today. Go forward with renewed determination to set new goals for your respective nations, in an ever growing and changing world.

I thank you, you have been a wonderful audience.

REV. JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY, S.J.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the death yesterday of John Courtney Murray ends the work of one who made a significant contribution to the under-

standing of human rights and of one who worked actively to secure the respect of these rights for every person.

John Courtney Murray, a theology professor, was concerned with the real and serious problems of our times. He spoke and wrote extensively on the moral basis for religious liberty and interracial justice; in recent years he was also a leader in ecumenical thought and activities. "The Declaration on Religious Liberty of Vatican II," affirming the ethical doctrine of religious freedom as a human right both personal and collective, reflected his scholarship, judgment, and influence. He was a theologian—of the marketplace—as well as in retreat and academic halls.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement on Father Murray, published in the New York Times of August 17, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 17, 1967]

REV. JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY, 63, LEADING JESUIT THEOLOGIAN, DIES—ACTIVE IN RACE RELATIONS AND ECUMENICAL PROJECTS—WOODSTOCK PROFESSOR

The Rev. John Courtney Murray, the prominent Jesuit theologian who was head of the John LaFarge Institute, a Jesuit organization active in ecumenical activities and race relations died yesterday afternoon at the age of 63.

Father Murray, a professor of theology at the Roman Catholic seminary at Woodstock College in Maryland, was apparently stricken with a heart attack while riding a cab from the home of his sister, in Queens, to Manhattan.

The driver of the cab took him to White-stone General Hospital, where the priest was pronounced dead on arrival. The body was taken to Queens General Hospital where an autopsy was to be performed to determine the exact cause of death.

Father Murray, who was an editor of Theological Studies, a Jesuit publication issued from Woodstock, suffered a serious heart attack more than two years ago, according to friends.

Father Murray, native of New York City, went to parochial schools. He received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Boston College in 1926 and a Master of Arts there the next year. After being ordained a priest in 1933, he studied at the Gregorian University in Rome and at Woodstock College.

HELD HONORARY DEGREES

Father Murray, who joined the faculty at Woodstock in 1936, was the author of several books, including "We Hold These Truths," "Problem of God," and "Yesterday and Today." He held honorary degrees from Notre Dame, Harvard, Georgetown, LaSalle, and St. Louis Universities.

In recent years, as head of the LaFarge Institute, 106 West 56th Street, Father Murray had become deeply involved in the dialogue over Negro rights and aspirations in America. In the spirit of ecumenism following Vatican II, he addressed his energies to the dialogue between Christians and Marxists.

Last December, the Jesuit priest, sometimes a storm center in his own church because of his liberal beliefs, said that the Christian-Marxist dialogue was "a very tricky, but very necessary thing."

"We have to listen to the Marxist critique of religion," Father Murray said. "We can learn much about our faith." He compared the dialogue with Marxists to the earlier development of Protestant-Catholic dialogues.

"You don't inquire at the outset how it will turn out," he said. "Rather, you commit yourself to a learning process with the knowledge that you may wind up against a wall."

Father Murray's lifelong study was the interaction of his native America and Roman Catholicism, which caused some of his critics in his church to complain that the tall, scholarly Jesuit was more American than Catholic. It was a point Father Murray did not argue.

It was his view that Catholics could make a major contribution to an American society in spiritual crisis, and once, in terms that may have been startling to non-Catholics, observed that "the question is not whether Catholicism is safe for democracy, but whether democracy is safe for Catholicism."

NEW UNDERSTANDING ACCOMPLISHED BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND THE CHANCELLOR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President—

If President Johnson and Chancellor Kiesinger succeeded only in improving methods for consultation, the West German leader's visit to Washington will have been worthwhile.

This was the conclusion of an editorial in Thursday morning's New York Times—and I think we can say that the evidence points to a successful meeting. President Johnson's face-to-face talks with heads of state from every corner of the globe have become legendary. Indeed, those talks go far beyond heads of state. Even when newly arrived ambassadors come to the White House to present their credentials, the President invariably uses the occasion to take the ambassador aside for a frank and open talk. What used to be a mere ceremonial formality has become, in Mr. Johnson's hands, a valuable diplomatic tool.

The President is a skilled negotiator. He is firm in his own position, but he always makes the extra effort to understand the other person's point of view.

I am certain that this was the case during the Kiesinger talks. Their joint communiqué indicates that both nations are determined to do all that is possible to build a more stable and peaceful community of nations.

No miracles were accomplished. But a basis for understanding and mutual respect—begun when these two world leaders met in Germany earlier this year—was strengthened and expanded. And that in itself is cause for hope.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the New York Times inserted in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 17, 1967]

THE KIESINGER VISIT

If President Johnson and Chancellor Kiesinger succeeded only in improving methods for consultation, the West German leader's visit to Washington will have been worth while. No miracles had been expected; indeed, many Germans feared that the two-day encounter might worsen Bonn-Washington relations.

It seems clear that this did not happen despite frank exchanges on the usual delicate issues: Troop levels and support costs in Germany, and Bonn's attitude toward a nuclear nonproliferation treaty. No final deci-

sions could have been taken on these matters at this meeting in any case, and each leader must now understand better the other's political problems.

On troops, each side had presented the other in advance with a *fait accompli* and any change in either's position was bound to be minor. Bonn agreed reluctantly in May that the United States could withdraw 35,000 of its troops in Germany. Bonn then astonished Washington by deciding abruptly last month to cut its own defense budget by \$2.3 billion over four years.

Bonn now says this will not mean a reduction of 60,000 in the Bundeswehr, as Defense Minister Schröder had forecast. But even cuts of 15,000 to 20,000, though buttressed by an expanded reserve, will weaken Bonn's contribution to NATO.

President Johnson's assertion that both countries are anxious to maintain their troop commitments and the communiqué pledge to bolster NATO must be considered in the light of these anticipated reductions. Both men, in fact, will be hard pressed to hold the line against further troop cuts.

The main trouble between Bonn and Washington has been faulty communication and inadequate consultation. Each side has a legitimate complaint against the other. It will be enough for this first Washington meeting if President and Chancellor have built the mutual trust and adequate machinery for overcoming this difficulty between allies.

THE ST. LOUIS CARDINALS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at the present time the St. Louis Cardinals baseball team is interesting all America and delighting all their fans around the country. It is a great ball team.

One of the reasons for their current sensational success is well expressed in the attached outstanding column by Bob Burnes. It shows perhaps more than anything I have read to date what a superb club those former roommates, when they were players, Stan Musial and Red Schoendienst, have put together.

This story by Bob Burnes should be of special interest to one of our colleagues, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], whose father years ago played ball in the Cardinal organization.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine article published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat be printed in the RECORD.

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

WINNING CARDINAL FORMULA

(By Robert L. Burnes)

The story of the Cardinals' success in this happy year has been one of beating down each opponent as that club challenges, of keeping constant pressure on the other team and having everybody on the Red Bird squad make a contribution to the cause.

Some of them, like regulars, Cepeda, Javier, Maxvill, Shannon, Brock, Maris, Flood and McCarver, make their contributions regularly, almost every day. But when help has been needed from other sources, it has been produced.

It was Jack Lamabe's night to make a substantial contribution to the Cardinal cause Saturday evening and he came through like all the others.

This may have been Lamabe's most heartening major league performance on a number of ball clubs. We suspect it is to him and it is one he will long remember.

On a happy ball club, life has been anything but that for Lamabe's since he joined

the Red Birds under emergency circumstances a month ago. The Cardinals suddenly needed help when Bob Gibson suffered a leg fracture. The Mets were in town the next day, Lamabe was the handiest because he was available and the Cardinals had talked of him to Bing Devine.

He underwent the traumatic experience of going to the ball park that Sunday expecting to start for the Mets against the Red Birds. Instead he found himself pitching that afternoon against the men who until three hours earlier had been his teammates.

It was not a good performance, understandably so, and Lamabe was charged with a defeat on a day of low ebb for the Cardinals as they lost twice to the Mets.

FANS QUICK TO BOO

Things rapidly went from bad to worse for Lamabe, a contradictory development for a man who had gone from a last place club to a potential pennant winner. Two days later, he was called upon again in relief at Cincinnati. He faced two men. One walked, the other flied out. But the one who walked ultimately scored the winning run and Lamabe suffered another defeat.

On Saturday of that week, against the Braves, the Cardinals played their worst game of the year. They contrived to make every mistake in the book, rallied to tie the score in the ninth, then managed to lose it in extra innings.

Lamabe took that defeat, too, after pitching several good innings. He ran out of gas. Almost anybody or everybody on the ball club could accept some of the blame for that horrendous loss but the fans put full responsibility on Lamabe.

From then on, in the fans' minds, his name was La Mud. They booed him every time he arrived on the scene. The moaned when he was announced.

In that state of mind, few noticed that he was improving slowly.

He made his first important contribution in a big victory over Cincinnati a week ago Sunday. The Cardinals were nursing a 3-2 lead when Lamabe was called on with two on and two out in the ninth to dispose of the dangerous Tommy Harper, who earlier had homered in the game. Lamabe jammed him, got him on a pop fly.

Orlando Cepeda, who had given Lamabe an encouraging slap on the back as he strode by en route to the mound, was the first to meet him after Lamabe had done his job. They engaged in the hand slap routine perfected by Cepeda. Others congratulated him as they raced by. Red Schoendienst came out of the dugout for a handshake. Lamabe was beginning to contribute.

Saturday night he came full circle. He arrived in the third inning with the Giants already leading 2-1, and with two on and none out.

A TRIBUTE FROM TEAMMATES

The veteran newcomer, worked out of that jam unscathed, kept the Cardinals close. Now it was a horse race between Lamabe and Lindy McDaniel, who was just as sharp. McDaniel hadn't allowed a base runner until Lamabe singled. The latter disdained a jacket on the cool night. He was in this game up to his eyebrows and didn't need any protection.

Now it became a question whether either reliever would tire. Neither had gone a distance in quite a while. Manager Schoendienst had two men up working in the bull pen and he was on the steps when Lamabe encountered his only real jam, two on, one out and Jim Davenport and Willie Mays in sight. But he nailed Davenport on a fly to right and Roger Maris' perfect throw to the cutoff man sent Tito Fuentes scurrying back to the safety of third base.

Then Lamabe faced his greatest crisis—Willie Mays. But Lamabe was throwing strikes and he threw a third one past Willie and he

had survived the crisis. The next inning the Cardinals took the lead when the pros, Curt Flood, Maris and Cepeda, went to work. They produced two runs and a 3-2 lead. Now it was up to Lamabe to hold a lead.

Sitting there, we kept hoping, for a particular reason, that Lamabe would have enough to go all the way. We wanted to see the reaction of the players.

It was a sight to behold. When that last out was secured, the infield erupted. Tim McCarver and Cepeda were the first to reach him and they mauled him and hugged him. The other infielders got there in time for a handshake.

They knew what that victory meant, not only to them, but to Lamabe.

And then, in the wonderful unconscious gestures that only the great pros can make, the other Cardinal players left a final touch. They quickly departed.

Each inning, as he strode to the dugout, Lamabe had walked with head down—not because he was ashamed or embarrassed but obviously because he wanted to concentrate on the intense job at hand.

But now, as the players sped away, Lamabe walked alone to the dugout to hear the cheers he richly had earned.

This time his head was up.

Once again the patience of the Cardinals had paid off.

Jack Lamabe had made a contribution to the pennant drive.

He will make more.

ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, it has been alleged by some that organized crime is a tiny part of the entire crime picture. But yet each day we hear more and more of the fantastic number of activities in which organized crime is involved.

Recently I placed in the RECORD a news article concerning the activities of organized crime in a suburban county of New York City. My attention was called also to an article entitled, "Mafia Invades Business, Suburban Government," published in the Los Angeles Times.

The article, written by D. J. R. Bruckner, details the activities of organized crime in the Chicago area. Mr. Bruckner writes, at one point, that during the trial of Rocco Pranno, an oldtime Mafia chieftain, "witnesses recounted that Pranno had completely taken over one large suburb, even to the point of assuming enough immunity to allow him to beat up a schoolteacher in the presence of the suburb's police."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this further evidence of the seriousness of the threat posed by organized crime to our law-abiding society be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 17, 1967]
MAFIA INVADERS BUSINESS, SUBURBAN GOVERNMENT—FEDERAL, LOCAL OFFICIALS DISTURBED OVER SYNDICATE'S SCHEMES IN CHICAGO AREA

(By D. J. R. Bruckner)

CHICAGO.—Despite more successes in the war against organized crime here in the last three years than in the previous 30 years, federal and local officials say the battle is only beginning.

They are especially disturbed now about some trends in crime indicated in several

recent cases of grave significance—mostly representing moves by the crime syndicate into business and into suburban government.

It is noted, that Rocco Pranno, an oldtime Mafia chieftain, recently was sentenced to 15 years in prison for extortion. But during the trial, witnesses recounted that Pranno had completely taken over one large suburb, even to the point of assuming enough immunity to allow him to beat up a school teacher in the presence of the suburb's police.

Similar conditions have been reported to federal and state investigators by residents of five other Chicago suburbs and three counties, two in Illinois and one in Indiana. The mayor of one Kane County suburb told investigators that Mafia efforts to take over the coin vending machine industry in his city had turned into an all-out effort to take over the county government.

ATTORNEY CONVICTED

And an agent of a state investigating agency said there is "little reason to believe a syndicate operator would be apprehended for doing almost anything at all," in suburban Will County, Ill., south of Chicago.

A more curious case of syndicate influence turned up recently in two cases involving Arthur Nasser, formerly a Chicago regional attorney for the Internal Revenue Service, who was convicted of violating federal laws against conflict of interest. Convicted with him was Richard Hauff, a nightclub playboy who also was convicted of mail fraud in efforts to persuade people to invest in a non-existent Las Vegas nightclub. Named as a co-conspirator with Nasser and Hauff in the conflict of interest indictment was August Circella, brother of Nick Circella, the "Nick Dean" of Capone mob infamy.

IRS investigators testified during the trial that they had taped a telephone conversation in which Nasser was giving advice on how a Chicago police captain who was under investigation could avoid tax prosecution, and that this same captain was at the time on leave, serving as the chief security officer of a huge Chicago area racetrack.

Nasser previously had been indicted on a charge of being a party to a \$250,000 jewelry fraud involving people in Chicago and New York. Later he turned up as a close personal friend and next-door neighbor of Mandel Skar, a front man for Mafia interests in local motels who was shot to death in his garage one night.

If the connections in government run wide, so do those in the world of business. Last month one of the crime syndicate's top Chicago leaders, Marshall Caifano, was sentenced to 12 years in federal prison after pleading guilty to participating in an interstate fraud scheme. This Chicago Mafia leader was already in prison for a California extortion plot, but his fraud plot had an even wider scope.

LUMBERMAN VICTIM

The victim was an Indiana lumberman who was forced to pay Caifano and his friends \$42,000 for the use of \$250,000 in counterfeit stocks to be used as security for a bank loan. Caifano's associates in this bizarre adventure came from Chicago, Miami and Scottsdale, Ariz. The jury convicted them after Caifano confessed.

A scheme which is not much more subtle is outlined in the indictment last month charging Louis Fratto, the crime syndicate boss of Iowa, and three Chicago syndicate leaders with trying to use a \$52,000 fraudulent check in a scheme to fleece an Indiana aircraft manufacturer.

In the older style, the Mafia often muscled its way into businesses here, usually into nightclubs, service businesses or bars. Thus, syndicate leaders now own several major linen and restaurant supply houses. Thus, in one recent 12-month period the Mafia took over at least 10 floundering bars and turned them

into lucrative hangouts for homosexuals on the city's north side.

Thus, they have a complete domination of the city's \$18 million a year juke box industry. Some of these businesses they run like any other businessman would. Some, like the jukebox business, they maintain with terror and threats.

A more serious incursion was turned up this year when top Mafia chieftain Charles English, along with jukebox industry king Frank Padula, were revealed as owners of three financial acceptance corporations which conveniently can be used as conduits of Mafia money into private business.

BUY BUSINESS

Robert Walker, chief investigator of the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission, says "There is reason to believe the syndicate is becoming involved in all types of business. They have just too much money which they have to put somewhere. It all comes in to them as cash. For instance, they get \$40 million a year from off-track betting. And they are greedy. Well, what do they do with that much money? They would need an awfully big hole to bury it. They buy businesses with it, that is what they do. All over the country Chicago syndicate guys are buying all the time, everything available."

It is noted by some investigators that a combined federal-state effort is on here to recruit at least 30 officers of Mafia owned companies as informants on this type of mob operation. That would seem to indicate the next step in the war on crime.

What will happen next in Chicago, however, is a serious question to the crime fighters. They believe they have the Mafia seriously upset. For instance, there are persistent reports now that the quick jailing of two successive chiefs of the Mafia in two years has produced such convulsions inside the syndicate that retired crime chief Anthony J. Accardo has come out of his retirement to resume the day-to-day control of operations.

The enthusiasm in the city for this war against crime is surprising. Largely it seems to spring from the air of cooperation. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the IRS, the Secret Service, the Treasury Department, the Chicago police and the Cook County sheriff all work readily under the direction of whichever agency initiates any investigation. The chief spurs to action seemed to be U.S. Atty. Edward Hanrahan and Charles Siragusa, the executive director of the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission.

Siragusa, operating on a total budget of little more than \$200,000 a year, borrows agents from other state and city agencies and keeps tireless pressure on the Mafia. He has conducted startling and sometimes terrifying public hearings on crime; he has led the effort to push the state legislature to pass a long series of anti-crime laws aimed at the syndicate. His more than 20 years as a top agent for the Treasury Department against the narcotics traffic gives him extraordinary rapport with federal agencies.

On top of all this, all the investigators give the credit to the prosecutors. Walker, Siragusa's top aide, says "it would be impossible to give too much credit to Hanrahan in all of this. He started it in the courts and made it stick. It makes a lot of difference when you know your work will make it through the courts and that the prosecutors will fight and make the judges and juries aware of what they are dealing with."

In the same way the federal agents praise the prosecutors in the office of Cook County state's attorney. One federal agent said "we used to investigate for years and we could not even get a case through federal courts, much less the state courts. Now we can turn over a lead to local agencies and we know that the work will get done and that cases will be tried in the courts in this town and won. We have the feeling we are all in this together."

THE NEED FOR A COMMISSION ON BALANCED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Government Operations Committee has recently completed a highly successful and informative set of hearings on legislation (S. J. Res. 64) which I introduced to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development.

Witness after witness testified as to the staggering problems that will be confronting our Nation in the not-to-distant future unless the exodus of Americans from the rural areas into the cities is stopped. In addition, they cited the complete lack of information available as to how this could be brought about.

The Washington Post of Sunday, August 13, contains two articles which touch on this problem. One was a column by Eric Wentworth, describing a speech by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman. The second was the lead editorial, which also commented upon the Secretary's speech.

Although I have not had an opportunity to read the complete text of Secretary Freeman's address, it is clear from the two articles that he supports the concept of a Commission to study population shifts and, in particular, the migration to the cities. This is encouraging in view of the adverse testimony of the administration's Bureau of the Budget. It is not surprising, however, that members of both parties are pushing such a proposal. When my resolution was introduced, it gained wide bipartisan support among its 23 cosponsors.

As the Post editorial points out, the riots in many of our larger cities are warning signals that something must be done to get the whole country thinking about ways and means of getting off this collision course with our environment. I expressed this same sentiment several times during the hearings. We must be realistic about this problem. We have neglected it too long already.

The best start that we could make is to pass Senate Joint Resolution 64. This will provide us with the means to gather the necessary information. It would be a far more significant effort than that proposed by Secretary Freeman, which would be holding a symposium of planners, sociologists, economists and other experts. As the Secretary himself described such a move, it would be only "a first infant step toward charting a national course for our people and their land." We need more than an "infant step." We need a giant step now before it is too late. Passage of Senate Joint Resolution 64 is such a step.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

FREEMAN CONCOCTS A CURE—AGRICULTURE SECRETARY LINKS CITY PROBLEMS WITH THOSE OF COUNTRY COUSINS

(By Eric Wentworth)

Among the physicians prescribing salves, ointments, lotions or pills to ease America's outbreak of angry urban sores is Orville L. Freeman, the irrepressible Secretary of Agriculture.

Freeman, by the nature of his job, is a specialist and seeks equal billing for his specialty in whatever treatments are undertaken.

"The ills of the city," he argues in the wake of violence in Newark, Detroit and other urban areas, "can never be cured in the city alone. It will take action in both rural America and the cities."

The Freeman diagnosis takes note of two linked problems which he describes, in jargon befitting a medical professional, as "rural depopulation and urban impaction."

He says that between 500,000 and 600,000 people are quitting the countryside each year and moving to the cities. They add to the burdens on municipal services and many incur new burdens and frustrations of their own.

To Freeman, it's "a tragic waste of human lives and of land" that more than seven of every ten Americans are jammed into only one percent of the Nation's real estate.

The country-to-city migration has been going on for decades, and the results are visible not only in crowded urban slums but in countless rural communities that are gradually becoming ghost towns with stores boarded up and grass growing through neglected sidewalks.

Probably the main cause is lack of opportunity in the countryside, both for those who can find no jobs and those for whom the available jobs prove unrewarding.

Not only the rural poor, many of them Southern Negroes, are moving to the cities; better-off young people, potential community leaders, also join the parade in quest of greater challenge.

Farming's technological revolution, which the Federal Government has helped foster, is forcing millions off the land. For example, cotton pickers and other machines have slashed the need for harvest labor on Mississippi Delta farm from 750,000 man-days to 95,000 man-days in a mere six years, Freeman reports. (Production cutbacks to work down a huge cotton surplus presumably figure here, too.)

The President's National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber recently reckoned that only one farm boy in ten can hope to become a commercial farmer. The Commission added that no matter how much food the Nation's farms are called on to produce, farm labor needs will decline by another one third by 1980.

Meanwhile, rural America is lagging on other fronts: roads, schools, housing, health care.

While much has been written about the plights of Indians, Mississippi's hungry sharecroppers and Appalachia's jobless ex-coal miners, rarely if ever do the afflictions or rural America approach the drama of recent ghetto violence. But there are real problems nevertheless.

The National Farmers Organization staged a milk strike earlier this year to call attention to the dairy farmers' profit pinch.

In June, a band of Spanish-Americans raided a county courthouse in northern New Mexico. Those who peered behind the incident glimpsed sorry living conditions in that area's remote mountain hamlets.

Though Freeman repeatedly calls attention to the needs of country folk—and sometimes is criticized for failing to do more for them—rural America has relatively few champions in Washington and is gradually losing whatever political clout it once enjoyed on Capitol Hill.

A study by Congressional Quarterly showed 212 "rural" (by one definition) House seats out of a total of 435 in the 1961-62 Congress, trimmed by redistricting to 203 seats in the Congress that followed. Continuing shrinkage is in the cards.

The human tide flowing into the cities cannot be reversed, but if Freeman has his way it can at least be slowed.

His prescription for urban sickness in-

volves a "national policy of urban-rural balance." It's a vague concept at best, but Freeman uses it to stress the links between depressing conditions in the countryside and the frustrating and at times traumatic results when millions of exrural dwellers "pile up" in crowded cities.

He has announced, to promote this idea, a December symposium of planners, sociologists, economists and other experts in Washington as "a first infant step toward charting a national course for our people and their land."

To be sure, rural problems have been studied and restudied over the years. Development plans have been drawn and redrawn.

Washington has managed to produce (by one count) 197 programs that promise aid to rural areas. And yet, funding falls far short of needs.

While there have been "rural renaissance" success stories in some communities where local leaders pitch in and have a knack for Federal "grantsmanship," there have also been confusion and disappointment elsewhere when hoped-for Government dollars weren't forthcoming.

The Freeman prescription calls for setting a higher national priority on Government investments in rural areas, to improve public services and facilities, to help create more jobs and generally to make the countryside a more inviting alternative to city life.

DEMOGRAPHIC COLLISION

A little-noticed speech by Secretary Freeman the other day to the National League of Cities contains what may well prove to be, in the long reach of our national evolution, the wisest words yet spoken on our current malaise. Mr. Freeman sees the violence of recent weeks as a collision of man with his environment. Its origin runs back at least 50 years when millions of young men in rural America were uprooted by World War I. They began what Mr. Freeman calls "the 50-year march to the cities" which has now produced so much misery, disillusionment and violence.

While this great migration has been taking place the country has given far to little thought to it. Nearly 600,000 persons a year have been flowing into the cities, most of them displaced from the countryside, as Secretary Freeman acknowledges, by the revolution in agricultural technology. They have gone to the cities in search of a better life, but what they have usually found has been poverty, slums and only the dreags of urban living. In a very real sense they are refugees from a rapidly changing economy.

The result is that 70 per cent of our people are jammed into 1 per cent of our land—the 1 per cent that is largely covered by macadam, houses, factories and places of business. Many have found jobs but largely of the low-income varieties because the newcomers usually lack the skills that most industrial employment requires. So the glamor of the city that once lured them fades into the sodden dullness of ghettos, smog and social decay.

For some years the country has been vaguely aware of this demographic revolution but has done very little about it. Further concentration of people has seemed inevitable. But what will happen if this trend is allowed to run its course until the turn of the century when the country will have another 100 million persons to house and to absorb into its social structure? Will they, too, be crowded into our five vast strip cities?

It is this prospect of "an airless, waterless, joyless—and perhaps hopeless—existence" in a metamegalopolis of the year 2000 that frightens Secretary Freeman. And so he has pointedly raised the basic question: "Should we try to check the accelerated movement of people from country to city?"

Six members of the Cabinet are sponsoring a symposium designed to bring together "the best minds in the world" to discuss this problem in Washington next December. As for Mr. Freeman, he has already committed himself to pursuit of an urban-rural balance that will save the cities from destroying themselves. He is not of course recommending that the rural refugees be sent back to the farm where they have been displaced by machinery. But he does see a brighter future for these rootless millions in towns and small cities where industrial jobs can be provided without the high costs, the congestion and the social overheating that have become so common in the large cities.

The Secretary suggests giving "a high investment priority to building up opportunity in rural America" and points to what some small cities have accomplished. But the chief significance of his speech does not lie in any specific recommendations. Rather, it is to be found in his impressive call for a change of direction. It is not necessary for this rich, resourceful and powerful country to strangle itself in its own congestion. The warning signals that have been sounded in one large city after another should set the whole country to thinking about ways and means of getting off this collision course with our environment.

"PA IS GOING TO RUN FOR GOVERNOR"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the West Virginia Hillbilly, a weekly published in Richwood, W. Va., is a country newspaper of the old-fashioned type. It is down-to-earth, homey, and a real joy to read. It makes no pretensions and is "just plain folksy."

One of its delightful articles was printed in the August 19 edition. It is entitled "Pa Is Going To Run for Governor."

With everyone else declaring himself for this job the possibility of "Pa's" doing so is not so farfetched. For in this age of never-ending surprises, I would be willing to venture that what is today's satire may become tomorrow's headlines.

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:

PA IS GOING TO RUN FOR GOVERNOR

Pa called a pore man's press conference the other day. A pore man's press conference is Aggie who can write readin' and read writin' right smart. She learnt hit in the special Mary Alice Smith School. That's a school for adults to git a headstart so's they can work new math and new English and new geography fer their own kids. Pa had to call the pore man's press conference because when he invited the legitimate press they didn't come. He cussed and called them something unprintable which means the opposite of legitimate, and told Aggie to take a letter about him goin' to run fer govner and send hit to all the editors of the daily papers and to the gentleman who runs Hillbilly.

He said there's no inspiration fer a press conference if you don't have a audience, so he had Ma to come in from the still house and fer Fiddlin' Clyde to bring his wife and his children and her children and their children, and the perfesser to come from up the holler. The Perfesser comes every night and interprets Huntly and Brinkley to Pa, but Pa said he orto be here now fer the tossin' of his hat in the political ring. The Perfesser is awful smart and can pernounce any word that there is that ain't got a r in it. How he come to be here is a mystery to me.

He spoke in gibberish when I ast him onest how he got here. He said he turned left from Havad, went south to Washington, then got on the New Frontier Highway and come into West Virginia to hunt indigents which anybody knows was kilt off by Daniel Boone years and years ago, and Pa gave him a sample of old Hag & Hag which Ma and her Ma makes, and, well, he jest never kired to go back. He rented the old Jukes place up by the slag heap and drinks and thinks.

So it was a nice little party we had and Pa glowed at the unanimity. Pa said the first thing was to pass out the drinks as that's the way they do at press conferences. Ma fixed some crackers with sour deens on them and a fine time was had by all. When everybody was fed and Pa and the Perfesser was lubricated, Pa pulled the soap box out from under the bed and he got upon it and made a speech.

"Ladies and gentlemen," he said. "It is time fer a change."

Fiddlin' Clyde sniffed and motioned to Fiddlin' Clyde's wife and she took Baby Bird into the house.

"This state has been bogged down by too much damn goggery, if the ladies will excuse my language."

The Perfesser cleared his throat loud and Pa stopped and looked at him. That's a sign that Pa's wrong somewhere.

"I think you mean the word demagogue, Pa. It is of diverse derivation, the French demagogue, the Spanish demagogo, the Swedish demagog, the Russian demagogu. In good times, that was before the birth of a democracy, it signified leadership, but today it is more indicative of an unprincipled popular orator or leader, one who endeavors to curry favor with the people or a fraction of a faction, meaning, well, if you will excuse the remark, a minority group for block voting. The great James Russell Lowell summed it up nicely with a quote, if I can recall it, after my thinking apparatus has been adequately stimulated by some of Ma and her Ma's best Hag & Hag."

He took a deep drink, and Pa said maybe he had better have one too, just for the load, which was Pa's sly way of saying that he wisht he hadn't stopped when the Perfesser cleared his throat.

The Perfesser's memory was jogged more than tolerable by the drink and he quoted:

"The doctrine of State rights can be so handled by an adroit demagogue as easily to confound the distinction between liberty and lawlessness in the minds of ignorant persons."

Pa said, "See, that's what I mean, Aggie, that's what I want you to write to the press of West Virginia. Write it and send it to the Morgantown Damnation News, the Clarksburg Exploit-it, the Bluefield Sunset-Noose, and Charleston Hoffmann-Male. Send it to all ov'em. Tell them that I am a candidate for govner on a platform of . . . What kind of platform, Perfesser."

"A non-demagogic platform, Pa, one that is free of demogogy, non-exploitive of demagoguism, completely bereft of demogoguery. That is your platform, Pa."

"That is my platform, Aggie . . . Now what does that mean, all that?" Pa ast the Perfesser.

"It means that you are going to stay clear of oratory, that you are making no speeches, that you are letting your light shine and your actions speak for you."

And I could see that Pa was might proud. But Ma, she wasn't. There was something wrong with her. She rocked some and then she ast Pa something.

"Pa," she ast, "Jist how do you intend to be elected when you ain't got neither the wad nor the nod?"

Pa looked at the Perfesser and the Perfesser looked at Pa and they both looked at the kag of Hag & Hag and had one.

"What is wad, Ma, and what is nod, Ma?"
Pa ast.

And Ma told him. "Wad is money and hit takes a heap of givin' to make a mansion a home. And nod is what the incumbent gives you before you start. Hit is customary fer the present guvner to give the state its next guvner and hit is customary fer the governed to give the picked candidate the wad. Hits the wad and the nod which a man has to have and you ain't got neither, Pa."

You know, Pa didn't bat a eyeball. He jest looked Ma straight in the eye without havin' a drink first. That's a sure sign that he has a answer to her brigginess.

He took out his watch and he said, "Precisely in two minutes you will see my wad and my nod. They are comin' suddenly like a chariot from heaven. They are the angels who are going to make me guvner of the state of Westbygodvirginia."

Pa had barely time to set down and quaff a quaff before a shinning big station wagon stopped in the road at the end of the path that leads to our house.

Pa looked up in the air with prayerful conference on his face, and said to Ma, "Ma, jest tell me who's gittin' outen that chariot of a car."

"Well, Pa, I cain't see too well. But I would say hit is a woman. Cain't tell, her back is turned. Now she's turnin'. She's a woman and she's got a beard."

Pa jumped up and screamed at Ma. "Don't you know the new styles and things? That ain't no woman, that is Mr. Throckmorton Harriman Vanderbilt the Flifth and he's down in these mountains of ourn a-dedicatin' hisself to the proposition that we orta be learnt something."

Mr. Vanderbilt come up the path and before he got to the porch he yelled to Pa if he would let his voice be heard and make a loud noise and mebbly demonstrate er riot the federal government would fix him up a nice class-A road from the highway to the porch. Pa said fer Aggie to take a letter on that too.

Then he come in and took his guitar from off his back and Pa introduced him around. He was dressed in high heel shoes with sharp toes and a turtle neck sweater and pants that looked like they'd been painted on. Pa invited him to have a drink, and he said, "No thank you, Dad. I just had a pot of grass." Nobody made nothing out of that, so Pa said he would like to explain to the Perfesser what his job was. He said he would be glad to.

"I am employed by the O.E.O. And my job is to conduct community action groups and lead the way to progress in these hills, and to see that there is liberty and justice for all."

That inspired Fiddlin' Clyde to yodel and he yodeled right purty.

"O.E.O. ladyeo, O.E.O. ladyeo. Owe eee Owe ladyeo, how much are we going to Owe eee Owe the old ladyeo when the O.E.O. spends all the dough. OEO ladyeo. OEO ladyeo."

He started strummin' his guitar and Mr. Vanderbilt started strummin' too and they both yodeled oooooeoo and I never heered sech purty yodelin'.

Then Mr. Vanderbilt said he would like to introduce the members of his party, the fine Vista girls that he travels with in the hills and leaves here and there to learn the people what they are missin' not gitting in on the fine things that Warshington has so much of. He whistled and waved, and the doors of the station wagon opened and out they come.

"I know what it is, Pa," Ma said. "Hit's freak day at the high school."

Pa told her to hesh her mouth that that was the way people dressed when they was in the Vista. Then Ma took another look and buried her head in her hands and said fer goodness sakes somebody tell the girl with the long white hair that she had fergot

her dress. Pa was ashamed too, only it was of Ma fer bein' so ignernt and not knowing that girls nowadays, especially the Vista workers, wear blouses and call 'em minny skirts. But I guess one has to admit that they did look different. One wore long underwear under her minny skirt with flowers weaved in it. Some had their hair in two little twists, one had it cut short like a boy's, and some had it long and white and could pert'nigh set on hit. Their lips wuz frosty like they'd got froze on a popsickle.

The O.E.O. man introduced them and they had the funniest names and they come from places that you cain't get to from here a-tall they are so far away.

Then they got down to business. Mr. Vanderbilt said that he was goin' to work for the party and git a lot of community action fer the Grate Society and he was so happy that Pa was runnin' and that he personally felt that the country needs people like Pa who are willin' to be learnt new things and didn't have a lot of things to unlearn. He said Pa was the salt of the earth and of such was the Kingdom of Lyndon and that everywhere they went they was goin' to preach the new redemption and git roads bilt fer people and hot lunches fer everybody and legal aid and medical aid and political aid. Pa said if he didn't want some Hag & Hag mebbly he'd like some Koolaid.

The young man was inspired and he ignored Pa. He said:

"We stand for the people who have been appressed too long. We stand for the little man."

I could see that Pa agreed, only he was fer the little woman too, especially the one who showed her savin' ways by wearin' her little sister's blouse. He kept stealing little looks at her.

One of the Vistas was so carried away that she jumped up and throwed her arms around the O.E.O. man with such vigor that she lost her eyelashers. She said she was turrible proud of him fer his stand and that they would overcome.

Then they said goodbye and he spun his wheels and left a streak and was gone.

"Real gone," said the Perfesser, but, then, agin, nobody ever knows what he means.

Pa jest set and glowed, but I could see that Ma was preplexed.

"Pa," she said, "how do you figure that these furriners can elect you guvner? To begin with they look mighty peculiar, like they ain't right somewheres, what with false eyelashes and heavens knows what else false, and wearin' skirts that show their appendectomies when they set down. Pa, I have allus seen eye to eye with the Grate Society and Lyndon Johnson and Lady Bird and Bob Byrd, but these birds, I am a little bit skeered of. I am afereed people will see 'em, and listen to 'em, and turn away from the Grate Society. Pa, I don't see as to how they can h'ep a Democrat a-tall."

Pa put his Blengo glass down unfinished and looked at Ma.

"Oh, Ma," he said. "I left something out of my announcement. I ain't runnin' as a Democrat. I am runnin' on the Republican ticket. That's what I mean by saying them O.E.O.'s and Vistas will elect me if they just tell people they are Democrats."

And he took a deep draft of Hag & Hag and warshed it down with a shot of Old Crowson. And the Perfesser and Ma didn't say a word.

A CRASH PROGRAM FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, the Johnson administration has taken unprecedented steps to involve private enterprise in the production of low- and moderate-income housing. In 1961 the moderate-income program was greatly expanded. Then the rent supplement

program was initiated to utilize private industry and financing to provide housing for the poor. In the established public housing program a new approach to construction, the Turnkey program, was provided. That, in essence, is an arrangement whereby private developers replace public agencies as the planners and supervisors of construction, delivering a completed building or series of buildings to a local housing authority.

Both the rent supplements and moderate-income housing rely upon non-profit and limited-profit sponsors. However, from the start, many of us realized that this was only a partial answer and that such sponsorship would require time to develop. Likewise, we were concerned about using profit-motivated sponsors to produce and manage housing for low-income families, looking to this type of developer to provide a large volume of construction over a shorter timespan.

Low- and moderate-income housing requires some form of significant public subsidy. Where public subsidies are involved, the government needs to take special care that these subsidies are used for a public purpose and not diverted into unreasonable profits. In a like vein, private industry has to be concerned lest it be vulnerable to charges of profiting at the expense of the poor.

Because of the inherent complications in this situation, President Johnson appointed a Commission on Urban Housing, under the Chairmanship of Edgar Kaiser, to determine how private industry could be most effective in producing low- and moderate-income housing. Obviously, this Commission cannot make its findings at once. But there is hope that its recommendations will be available in time to be reflected in the 1968 legislative recommendations. That will be a strategic period, for then we shall have to consider an omnibus housing bill, since authorizations for many housing programs expire at that time.

In light of these developments, it would be unwise and premature to attempt now to develop a longrun program for greater utilization of private enterprise in the production of low- and moderate-income housing. Yet we are faced with a clear and pressing need for a crash program to increase appreciably the volume of housing for the poor.

Therefore, President Johnson has, today, proposed a pilot program which will use the existing financial tools available to public housing and redirect them so as to involve private industry in the construction and management of low- and moderate-income housing.

His proposal would enable local public agencies to enter into Turnkey contracts for new construction. Upon delivery of these dwelling units to them, the local bodies would enter into long-term management contracts with private, profit-motivated firms.

I agree with the President that we should not embark upon a new major program for low-income housing prematurely. But also I recognize that we can no longer afford a delay in the production of such housing. This proposal would pioneer one more approach while we consider new legislation.

President Johnson should be com-

mended for this novel and innovative proposal. I urge Senators to offer their support.

S.S. "HOPE": MOST WELCOME SHIP

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial published in the *Peru, Ind., Tribune* of Thursday, August 3, 1967. The subject is Project Hope, which is, perhaps, this country's most effective effort in international assistance. The white hospital ship *Hope*, now quietly at work in Colombia, is winning new friends and new respect for the United States, just as she has done in six other nations on three continents.

The achievements of Project Hope contrast sharply with the news of strife at home and abroad which seems to dominate the news today. I feel certain that Senators will enjoy this refreshing editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the *RECORD*:

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

MOST WELCOME SHIP

Currently berthed in Cartagena, Colombia, is a unique American vessel which has been called "the most welcome ship in the world."

The gleaming white SS *Hope* has richly earned that accolade the past seven years. To thousands, she has brought the gift of life and health, from people to people.

The SS *Hope* is a floating hospital, essentially manned by American medics who contribute their services in two-month stints. She has modern surgical suits, 130 beds and related medical and training facilities. Once in a port, the mercy ship stays 10 months, serving the populace and conducting training programs for native doctors and health workers.

In one month at Cartagena, the SS *Hope's* staff treated 2,619 patients abroad or at shore clinics, performed 225 operations—more than seven a day—and immunized 12,300 children against polio, diphtheria, smallpox and tetanus.

That's a big contribution to health in one small area. Yet when weighed against global medical needs, it's a disheartening drop in the bucket.

The tragedy is that there is only one SS *Hope* from only one of the world's affluent countries. There could be many more—and should be. All told, the SS *Hope* costs about \$5 million, the price of one small jet bomber.

One magazine writer said it all in a single paragraph:

"In an insane world of idiotic spending for fratricidal wars and 'defense,' the comparatively small expenditures for SS *Hope* have lighted a tiny, inexpensive candle in the darkness. Imagine America's image, to say nothing of the world health, if a thousand ships of *Hope* moved upon the waters of the earth for the alleviation of mankind's ills."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MEETINGS WITH CHANCELLOR KIESINGER WERE VERY SUCCESSFUL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this week President Johnson held important talks with one of our Nation's most valued partners—Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger, of West Germany.

From all reports, these talks were extremely valuable to both our nations. And there is little doubt but that the Chancellor and the President succeeded in tightening still further the already close ties

of understanding that exist between them.

West Germany is a staunch friend and ally of the United States. And both countries are working toward the common goal of a peaceful world. To quote from the communique jointly issued yesterday:

We share the view that a policy of relaxation of tensions can help to avoid conflicts. Such a policy can remove the causes of existing tensions, can overcome differences and in this way lead to mutual understanding and trust among peoples. It is only by following such a policy that the division of Europe and the division of Germany can be ended and a just and permanent peace established in Europe.

Since the end of World War II, West Germany has earned the trust, admiration, and respect of the American people.

I believe that under Chancellor Kiesinger's leadership, this warmth and affection will continue as will the close partnership between our two nations.

The Congress and the American people join in wishing the Chancellor every success as he returns to Bonn after his successful American visit.

We are all delighted that he and President Johnson have so quickly established such a close and friendly personal relationship. And it is good to have such loyal friends during these difficult times.

LUMBER STANDARDS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, because of other Senate business, I was unfortunately, not able to be in Washington and in the Senate Chamber last Thursday when the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, led a discussion on a problem which is facing the lumber industry in this country.

My interest in this problem stems from the fact that I believe American consumers, whether in the housing industry or any other segment, should be able to have the advantages made possible by improvements brought about through technological change. I feel that it is not in the public interest to set up a rigid standard or standards which prohibit innovation and the acceptance of new methods and new materials when they are, in fact, to the advantage of industry or the consumer.

As was stated by the Senator from Alabama, I introduced an amendment to the 1965 Housing Act which provided authority to the Federal Housing Administration and in fact required that Administration to accept as satisfactory for FHA construction any materials demonstrated to be technically suitable. The amendment was approved by the Committee and by Congress and became a part of the 1965 Housing Act. As a result, the FHA has accepted, among other things, a smaller size standard for lumber which contains a lower moisture content.

It is with this background that it is difficult for me to understand what has been taking place over the last few years in the Department of Commerce, the Federal agency which is given the responsibility of helping set up acceptable

industrywide standards. I ask unanimous consent that a letter I sent to Secretary Trowbridge on July 20, expressing my concern over this problem, be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

JULY 20, 1967.

HON. ALEXANDER B. TROWBRIDGE,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have had my attention called to the fact that a panel you appointed to advise you on lumber standards has recommended that the softwood lumber standard be continued, even though it has been endorsed by only 20 per cent of the producers and the remaining 80 per cent of the producers and 93 per cent of the users want it changed.

I think there is grave question as to whether or not the Department should continue in forcing a standard which the National Bureau of Standards has declared to be technically inadequate, "not in the public interest," and which provides an artificial economic disadvantage, and is therefore "not in the public interest."

To continue support of SPR 16-53, it seems to me, would deprive the consumer of a superior product at less cost. The charge is made that the present standard should be continued because to change it might cause a disturbance in the industry. Actually, while there might be a temporary disturbance it seems to me that long term values that would be provided by the new standard would be well worth this slight risk. It is my understanding that the Federal Housing Administration, the General Services Administration, and the Defense Supply Agency of the Department of Defense are in favor of the withdrawal of SPR 16-53 in favor of the new standards. I hope you will review this problem. I feel quite sure that such a review in depth will reveal the value of a reversal of position.

My interest in this problem arises out of the fact that as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee I was largely responsible for legislation affecting FHA standards which would open up the possibility of using materials that had been developed since the original standards were issued, but which for one reason or another could not meet the old and often antiquated specification. The lumber problem happened to fall inside this area. What I think we are dealing with here primarily is the difference between green, wet lumber, which has certain very serious disadvantages if used in buildings, and the same basic sizes that when properly treated inevitably shrink in dimension. Because I believe both of us are interested in helping the American people take advantage of every new development in products and techniques as a balance against the constantly rising cost of construction, I think this problem is worth another look.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

WALLACE F. BENNETT.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, over a period of about 6 years, as I recall, the lumber industry, builders, architects, and homeowners have been deprived of the benefits of an up-to-date, properly engineered softwood lumber standard as a result of the Department of Commerce's indecision. The lumber industry has been joined by those who use their product in its attempt to have the Department of Commerce accept a standard for lumber sizes which would allow size and moisture content to be properly correlated in the finished product. As is

well known, the Department of Commerce has procedures set up under which such industry standards can be established. Under the Department's procedures more than 3 years ago, the American Lumber Standards Committee which was appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, approved standards for lumber sizes. This proposal was subsequently approved by a majority of interested parties through the balloting procedure of the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce, however, ruled that the standards were not supported by a consensus of the industry. Following this action, the American Lumber Standards Committee was reorganized by the Secretary of Commerce, effectuating a broader representation among consumers. The newly constituted committee studied the earlier proposal and modified it in an attempt to overcome the problems that the Commerce Department said resulted in its not being accepted as an industry standard. The committee then voted out a recommendation which, according to the legal counsel of the Commerce Department, met all of the necessary Department of Commerce criteria and was acceptable for industrywide balloting. The proposal was distributed to a carefully selected sample of the industry involved and the returns indicated that 80 percent of the softwood lumber producers supported the new standard. The acceptance among consumers was 93 percent.

One would have thought that since the new standard had received the endorsement of the Forest Products Laboratory, the Federal Housing Administration, and the General Services Administration, and since it was approved by an overwhelming majority of producers and consumers, the Department would promulgate the new standard. Against this apparent overwhelming acceptance of the new standard, however, the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce ruled that it was not a consensus. An appeal against that ruling was filed, but it was rejected. The Secretary of the Commerce Department then appointed an advisory committee of three individuals and gave them the responsibility of determining whether to withdraw the present standard and whether to seek authority from the Congress authorizing the Secretary to impose mandatory softwood lumber standards. The panel found that the withdrawal of the standard is a matter to be determined by the Secretary. It also found that the present lumber standards appear to be technically inadequate and that present lumber standards handicap consumers by impairing their ability to choose lumber best suited to their needs. It suggested, however, that any change in the present standard could result in severe dislocation in the industry and operate to the detriment of the consumer. A final recommendation by the panel was that the Secretary seek legislation authorizing or requiring him to issue a uniform softwood lumber standard.

It seems to me that this has already gone too far and that it is time for the Department of Commerce to accept the

responsibility of assisting the industry to establish a reasonable standard in which the size is related to moisture content. I see no reason why the Department of Commerce should be allowed to restrain the lumber industry from improving its product and thus providing better materials for home building throughout this country. Indeed, it seems to me that it is incongruous for a panel of three individuals to sit in judgment on American Lousing and do what it did.

The Secretary has the power to withdraw the present standard, and it seems that he should do this since both industry and consumers have requested it, as has the FHA, the GSA, the National Bureau of Standards, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I see no advantage to be gained from further delays. Nor can I accept the recommendation of the panel for legislation enabling the Secretary to set up arbitrary standards. Certainly, Congress can enact legislation determining industry standards, but it is my view that this is not a proper function of a legislative body.

If the Department of Commerce is unable to resolve the issue, or if it does not desire to do so, it should withdraw and allow the industry to set up its own standards.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS AND LATIN AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on this sixth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, we have reason to be concerned over Latin America's inability to feed its rapidly increasing population. But I am encouraged by the Latin Americans' recognition of this as a serious problem, and I see hope that our cooperation may be effective in helping them to solve it.

The problem is simple enough. Latin America is producing more people faster than it is growing more food for them. The Food and Agriculture Organization's recently published report, "The State of Food and Agriculture 1966," estimated that Latin American food production had fallen by about 2 percent in total and by 4 to 5 percent on a per capita basis, so that per capita food production in 1965-66 was a good deal less than before the war.

A projection of this trend into the next decade or two would spell malnutrition, disease, and a cruel and unnecessary waste of human talents and opportunities on an immense scale.

If agricultural development were impeded long enough, it could spell failure for the area's general economic development. Agriculture is the key to the political and social stability of the entire region. It provides the livelihood of about 60 percent of the people of Latin America. The irony is that Latin America, which has the largest areas yet remaining to be brought under cultivation anywhere in the world, and which ought to be exporting food surpluses to the rest of the world, is not yet able to do so.

Fortunately, that is not to be the end

of this story. When the American chiefs of state met at Punta del Este last April, they put the stamp of priority on the modernization of agriculture and of rural life, along with education and health.

The Presidents declared:

We will modernize the living conditions of our rural populations, raise agricultural productivity in general and increase food production for the benefit of both Latin America and the rest of the world.

The key word here is productivity. Agriculture, through increased productivity, could provide both more food for urban markets and a better life for the man who labors in the fields. It could provide additional savings for industrialization, contributing directly to this process through the development of agro-industries. By assuring adequate earnings to the farmer so that he can become a better customer for goods manufactured in the urban areas, agro-industries expand the national market. This gives further impulse to industrialization and avoids the common misconception that a nation must choose either industry or agriculture. If a nation is to prosper, it needs both agriculture and industry, growing side by side.

The immediate problem is low productivity per unit of land. We need fertilizers, pesticides, improved seed varieties and even new crops and new production methods. Services such as research, credit facilities, transportation and, especially, adequate marketing facilities are as essential as the technology. Above all, the agricultural sector must be provided with adequate incentives to produce—and this means, especially, fair prices—if modern science is to raise yield per acre dramatically.

We have a hopeful example in Central America. Expanded trade in processed foodstuffs has been one of the bases for the success of the Central American Common Market. And many of the smaller countries, in building up their industrial bases, are giving priority not only to increasing their agricultural output but also to those industries using raw materials grown by their farms.

Given the variety of soils and climates in Latin America, there is no reason to doubt Latin American ability to produce almost any agricultural product economically. The region, as a whole, can save well over \$600 million a year in foreign exchange by expanding its regional trade in agricultural products. This saving, in turn, can help finance the investments necessary for increased productivity in both agriculture and industry.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION BACKS WHEAT EXPORT CERTIFICATE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, meeting in Denver, Colo., last week, the executive committee of the National Farmers Union, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, passed a series of resolutions dealing with legislation on agricultural matters.

Among them was a resolution on wheat and feed grains, urging that the Department of Agriculture do everything pos-

sible to counter the depression of farm prices on record crops, and urging Congress to enact S. 7, a bill I presented early this year authorizing the issuance of a 65-cent-per-bushel export certificate on 35 percent of the wheat crop to give farmers a fair price for wheat produced for our foreign assistance programs.

Other resolutions passed by the National Farmers Union executive group urged passage of S. 109, which is already through the Senate, but with criminal penalties for coercion of farmers who join bargaining groups eliminated.

The Farmers Union opposes authorization of the sale, lease or transfer of acreage allotments, it calls for a reversal of the trend toward higher and higher interest rates, requests the passage of the bill limiting dairy imports, and urges that the Department of Agriculture hold the line on cotton production, regardless of trade recommendations that acreage be increased.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place the National Farmers Union Executive Committee resolutions in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, DENVER, COLO.

Although American agriculture this summer is producing unprecedented abundance on limited acreage, these bumper crops regrettably are a mixed blessing for the farmer who produces them.

Ideal weather that has brought high response from fertilizer and other scientific advances has brought crop yields that surpass even the most optimistic estimates of our farm program planners. The result is a much greater supply than the market can handle, at least for the harvest season, and depressed grain prices.

The wheat crop, estimated at a record 1,511,847,000 bushels, is not the only one in trouble. The Agriculture Department yesterday estimated this fall's corn crop at a record 4,651,848,000 bushels. The soybean crop was forecast at 998,974,000 bushels. Grain sorghum and other crops also look exceptionally good across the country.

This abundance on American farms calls for action, both by the government and by farmers themselves, to avoid glutting the market. It calls for action that will put some strength back into the grain market situation.

Farmers Union was instrumental in developing the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program and has given it strong support through the years. We still consider it the best way to bolster farm prices and to promote orderly marketing.

We urge, therefore, that the Department of Agriculture make use of every available authority to give producers strong incentives to hold grain off the market through the CCC programs and to participate in an orderly storage effort that will keep large quantities of grain on the farm.

We recommend that farmers place their grain under Commodity Credit Corporation loans and that they utilize all available government programs that will help them avoid economic loss by waiting for market improvements.

We urge Congress to act favorably on Senator McGovern's wheat export certificate bill so we can get some money into the pockets of farmers now producing wheat at depressed prices for our overseas commitments.

We urge further that the House Agriculture

Committee expedite its action on a grain reserve bill so that a reserve can be set up in time to draw several million bushels of wheat feed grains and soybeans out of the market stream in the next few months. This will provide some relief for the price situation in the major over-supply commodities.

And finally, we urge the Department of Agriculture and the State Department to accelerate purchases for P.L. 480 program needs. We urge these agencies to notify their food representatives in embassies around the world of this unprecedented U.S. grain abundance so new purchase and foreign aid agreements can be signed.

It will take the enthusiastic efforts of farmers, government agencies and Congress to rescue farmers from this unprecedented abundance. We hope this effort will get underway without delay.

The Senate has struck a timely blow for the rights of farmers in passing S. 109, the farm co-op bargaining bill, in the face of heavy opposition from canners, packers and other processor-buyers of farm products.

Farmers Union has long insisted that co-operators are discriminated against and that members of cooperatives are being black-listed, coerced and deprived of their fundamental rights. This legislation will help right these wrongs.

We are disappointed, however, at the actions that deleted criminal penalties from this bill. Violators are not likely to be dissuaded by civil actions because payment of a fine as a penalty is not a serious problem for a big processor or other major buyer of farm products.

We commend the Senate Agriculture Committee for trying to hold the line against the many attempts of processor groups to get themselves exempted from this legislation. We are disappointed, however, that the Senate-passed bill does exempt tobacco and cotton groups and recommend that this be remedied before the bill becomes law.

We urge the House Agriculture Committee to schedule hearings on this important bill. We also urge restoration of criminal penalties so the bill will be an effective deterrent to those discriminating against cooperatives and their members and expansion of the bill's coverage to include tobacco and cotton groups.

The attempts by conglomerate corporation and other non-farm interests to take over agriculture are being aided and abetted by efforts in this session of Congress to ease restrictions on the transfer, through sale or lease, of acreage allotments, base acreages and quotas.

Earlier this year Congress authorized the sale or lease up to five years, and transfer within counties, of allotments for fire-cured, dark air-cured, and Virginia sun-cured tobacco. This week a House Agriculture subcommittee is considering several bills that would further undermine the restrictions on tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-purchase quotas.

The moves to make it legal to sell, lease or transfer allotments, bases and quotas also involve peanuts. The House Agriculture Committee has recommended passage of a bill to authorize, under certain conditions, the sale or lease of peanut acreage allotments.

These changes open the door wider to corporation farming, lead to further depletion of human resources in rural areas, encourage speculation by non-farm investors, and disrupt the existing peanut and tobacco programs. They reinforce the position of those pushing for a corporate agriculture and undercut the independent farmer.

We urge the Agriculture committees of Congress, therefore, to stand firm against these attempts by rejecting all proposals aimed at easing restrictions on sale, lease or transfer of allotments.

With the many involvements of our Government at home and abroad making heavier demands upon the Federal Treasury, a tax increase appears necessary.

Farmers Union, therefore, supports the proposal to levy a surtax on corporate and personal net incomes above \$5,000.00 in keeping with our historic position in favor of taxation based on ability to pay.

Farmers are observing the new trend of advancing interest rates with much concern because they are acutely aware from long experience that high interest rates are promptly and inexorably reflected in higher costs of all of the things farmers must buy in order to produce the Nation's food.

Farmers have no opportunity to reflect these increased costs of production in the sale of the products they bring to market. In fact, increasing interest rates tend to depress the price of farm commodities in the market place because they reduce the purchasing power of all consumers.

The damaging effects of the excessive interest rates initiated a year ago by the Federal Reserve Board continue to be felt on the farms and in the cities and towns which serve farmers.

We urge, therefore, that immediate steps be taken by the President, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Treasury to arrest and reverse the present interest rate increase trend.

The tremendous flow of imports of Colby cheese and other foreign dairy products the last year through evasion of quotas has held milk prices down at the support level for months. It also has forced the Commodity Credit Corporation to accumulate large stocks of dairy products and enabled importers to build up huge supplies of these imports for resale to cheese processors, ice cream manufacturers, and others in the industry.

Although the imports have been sharply cut by the recent action of President Johnson, the damage has already been done as far as dairy prices for the next few months is concerned.

The \$4.00 dairy support price, as a result, is the only milk price farmers can count on for months to come. It is estimated that it will take from six months to a year for the trade and the Commodity Credit Corporation to work off these stock buildups to the point where the market could again move above the support level.

It is not surprising, then, that farmers are getting out of dairying in record numbers. A recent report by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture shows 1,418 farmers quit dairying in that state in a recent 4-month period—an average of 88 per week. The trend is much the same over all the areas that produce large quantities of milk for manufacturing purposes.

Production figures for June show sizeable drops for several Midwest states from the year-ago levels. The production drops reported by the Department of Agriculture include Indiana, 6%; Illinois, 6%; Michigan, 6%; Minnesota, 1%; Iowa, 2%; North Dakota, 8%; and Nebraska, 9%. All of these states are in what has traditionally been considered the Country's low-cost milk production areas.

To meet this serious problem we urge, first, that the Secretary of Agriculture increase the support price to \$4.21 from the current \$4.00 level so enough producers can remain in dairying to assure the nation of an adequate supply of milk.

The current \$4.00 level is well below the 90% of parity the law authorizes. The latest 90% of parity figure, adjusted to reflect constantly increasing production costs absorbed by dairy producers, is \$4.21.

Although we want dairy support prices increased, we do not consider this anything more than a stop-gap dairy income move. We recognize that moving the price to \$4.21 will exhaust the Department of Agriculture's

present authority to do anything permanent and significant in the dairy income area.

We urge, therefore, that the Senate Agriculture Committee schedule hearings immediately on the direct payment bills introduced by Senators Eugene McCarthy and Gaylord Nelson. This direct payments approach will make it possible to increase income of dairy farmers, to keep the prices of dairy products competitive with synthetics and substitutes, and to give consumers these high quality dairy products at reasonable prices.

Finally, we urge the House Ways and Means Committee to hold hearings on the Dairy Import Act, which now has 59 sponsors in the Senate and 192 in the House. Although we recognize that the present quota level produces a market for our traditional suppliers, and no others, we feel this level should be made permanent by Congressional action.

Recent reports reflect adequate stocks of all qualities of cotton, either in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks or in the hands of the trade, and point up reduced domestic consumption during the last six months. Under favorable conditions, we can expect carryover stocks next year to meet or exceed what is needed for strategic reserves without increased acreage.

Price improvement as a result of vigorous competition for reduced supplies of good quality new crop cotton is a natural and beneficial result of an effective cotton program. Farmers are pleased with the present program because it has achieved this objective. They are not interested in producing more cotton at cheaper prices.

We urge, therefore, that the Secretary of Agriculture resist pressure from the trade to increase cotton production in 1968.

We also urge regulations and administrative interpretations which would (1) *hold the line on production*; (2) improve quality and enhance grower income by increasing the production payment to the maximum level allowed and by relaxing arbitrary and restrictive skip row penalties; (3) permit the orderly marketing of the 1968 crop through a prudent sales policy which truly avoids market competition with producers; and (4) use vigilance to see that differences reflected in the price support program accurately indicate utility value.

THE ELECTIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, the trouble with the spreading of false information is that the damage it does can seldom be nullified by later retraction. Rumor has fanned the flame of riot in this country. And this past week, as the President pointed out yesterday, many critics of the administration have been quick to make mountains of the molehills of complaint about the fairness of the elections soon to be held in South Vietnam. I am sure that many of my colleagues have received, as I have, letters from constituents concerned about what they thought was happening.

There is no doubt the civilian candidates have complained. There is no doubt the incumbent presidential candidates have made derogatory remarks about their opponents—about their platforms—about their ability to prosecute the war successfully and secure the peace afterward. But is all this so different from the political campaigns here at home? The civilian candidates complain that the incumbents are not cooperating with them because they refuse to share speaking engagements. Is this so different from

what happens here? The civilian candidates complain that voters are being intimidated—that election procedures will be rigged—that pressure is being applied to government employees. To even the casual observer of the American political campaign, it is all too familiar.

It is within the responsibility of the press to report these complaints. However, I am disturbed—just as President Johnson is disturbed—by the hasty, almost eager exaggeration of these complaints, mostly by critics of the administration's Vietnam policies. I am disturbed by the readiness of those who should be politically sophisticated to pursue the interests of those anxious to aggravate the current dissension in this country over the Southeast Asian war. I am disturbed by what seems to be a tendency among some of us to interpret in the worst possible light whatever news comes from Saigon.

The emphasis being placed on the presidential election in South Vietnam has pushed offstage the greater significance that this September 3 election will put into office the 60 Members of the South Vietnamese Senate. It ignores the fact that on October 22 there will be another election for the South Vietnamese House of Representatives. It must be pointed out that in these elections, future political leaders are being chosen by the people. In these elections, the seeds of a democratic government are being born.

It has taken us many long years to develop our own democratic form of government. And, even now, it is not yet perfect. Is it not too much to expect that in its infancy—and in the midst of war—a new nation's electoral process should be without fault?

During the South Vietnam elections last September for representatives to the Constitutional Assembly, the Vietcong did everything possible to discourage the voters. In one city, mortar shells were lobbed into lines of citizens waiting at the polling places. The people took cover as the shells exploded. But a short time later, they were back in line. It is interesting to speculate on what might have happened here under similar circumstances. In those same elections last September an overwhelming percentage of the eligible voters went to the polls to cast their ballots. On that basis, while we have much to teach the people of South Vietnam about the desirability of democracy, they, in turn, have set an example for our own people to follow.

Mr. President, if public opinion in the United States is a magnificent musical instrument, with the members of the press and Congress as its keys, I fear frequently that those who play it best are foreign politicians whose tunes are medleys of their own self-interest.

JOSEPHINE B. RIPLEY, JOURNALIST

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, one of the Nation's most distinguished journalists, Miss Josephine B. Ripley, is terminating an outstanding career as Washington correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor to open her own office as a freelance writer.

Jo Ripley has been a member of the

staff of the Washington news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor since 1945, covering legislative stories on Congress, political conventions, and some of the newsmaking travels of First Ladies. For many years, she wrote a weekly column entitled "An Intimate Message From Washington."

But her activities have not been limited to Washington. Instead she has gone where the news was in the making—where the news was in the making throughout the world. She has gone to the scene in Germany, Italy, Hungary, Austria, Israel, Holland, Switzerland, Greece. You name the place and she has been there on the spot seeing the news with her own eyes—hearing it with her own ears—and feeling it. That is why she has been such a superlative interpreter of the news as well as accurate reporter.

In 1949 she toured displaced persons camps in Germany and Italy, and flew into Berlin on the airlift, along with a load of coal. She was on the Hungarian border during the revolution in 1956 and watched refugees from the Communist takeover come plunging out of the darkness to the safety of an Austrian farmhouse just over the line.

In 1957 she flew to Israel following the Sinai campaign of that year and wrote a series of articles on the economic upsurge which followed that victory. Three years earlier, she had traveled to Berlin, Holland, Switzerland, Italy, and Greece to obtain information for a series on the world's first attempt at organized migration. This series was later published in a booklet called "Peoples on the Move," by the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration.

By her work and writings in the field of migration, she has become a widely acclaimed and acknowledged authority on the subject of migration and refugees.

As a representative of the Defense Advisory Committee for Women in the Services, to which she was appointed by former Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy, she interviewed women in the military services overseas and authored a series entitled "The Miss Behind the Missile."

Her tenure as president of the Women's National Press Club in 1951-52 is regarded as one of the most productive in the history of that organization. In connection with her activities in that organization, she has been the editor of two cookbooks published by the club, "Who Says We Can't Cook?" and "Second Helping."

Before Jo made the scene in Washington with the Monitor, she was a member of the city staff of the Monitor in Boston, copy editor in the foreign department, and wrote a weekly column called "The World, Briefly."

Although she is terminating a long, happy and successful career with the Monitor, Jo Ripley will continue her affiliation with the Cowles publishing organization. I predict great success for Jo Ripley as she ventures out on her own as a freelance writer. I know that her many friends and colleagues share my confidence in her future success and wish her the very best of everything.

ALLIANCE ESSAY WINNERS VISIT UNITED STATES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on this, the sixth anniversary of the signing of the Charter of Punta del Este, I want to call attention to the presence of a very important group of visitors to our Nation's Capital.

They are not state dignitaries, ambassadors, sports heroes, or movie stars. Even though their visit is connected with the Alliance for Progress, they are not economists, engineers, or planning experts. They are instead secondary school students from various Latin American countries. They are here in Washington as winners of a hemispherewide essay contest on the Alliance for Progress.

These young people range in age from 13 to 19. They come from countries as huge as Brazil and as small as El Salvador. For most, this is their first visit to our country, but a number of them speak English, in addition to Portuguese or Spanish, their native languages. Some even speak Indian dialects, like Guarani, the second language of Paraguay.

Diverse as this group is, they are united in their understanding—a surprisingly profound understanding—of the challenge to youth in the great programs of economic and social development that are gathered together in Latin America under the banner of the Alliance for Progress. Thousands and thousands of young people in 12 Latin American countries participated in the essay contest. The 29 top winners with us in Washington were selected by some of the most distinguished persons in their countries: educators and representatives of ministries of education; officials of the Organization of American States and members of National Commissions for the Alliance for Progress; economists and experts in development planning.

The contest was sponsored by the Pan American Development Foundation, a private foundation established by the Organization of American States to open the way to individual and corporate participation in development programs of the Alliance. In most countries, the foundation had the close cooperation of officials of the U.S. Embassy, the Agency for International Development, and the U.S. Information Agency. The purpose of the contest was explained by Dr. José A. Mora, Board Chairman of the Pan American Development Foundation and Secretary General of the OAS, in this way:

To stimulate thinking by Latin American students on the vital issues of economic and social development in their countries, because they must play a principal role in the vast effort of the Alliance for Progress to bring a better life to the peoples of the continent.

These 29 students will remain with us in Washington until the end of this week. Then they will begin a monthlong tour of the United States. They will visit factories and farms, small towns and great cities. At a number of stops along the way, they will stay with American families in their own homes. At the end, they will carry back to their own countries a better understanding of the United States and its people.

And that, Mr. President, is of crucial importance. I said that this group contained no statesmen or politicians, economists or engineers. I should add the phrase "as yet." For these young people are, of course, the future leaders of their countries. They have already expressed a profound concern for the economic and social problems of their people; they have shown that they have faith in the ability of their nations to attack underdevelopment and social inequity. They give all of us renewed hope for progress and justice in this hemisphere in the years ahead.

We owe a vote of thanks to the Pan American Development Foundation and to the General Secretariat of the OAS for their splendid initiative in sponsoring this essay contest, and bringing the winners to the United States as part of the sixth anniversary celebration of the Alliance for Progress. We wish these 29 Latin American students a pleasant stay in Washington and a fruitful trip around our country. We look forward to the day when we shall see them again—as the leaders and developers of their own nations.

A QUESTIONNAIRE ON ISSUES

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, from time to time I use my newsletter to my constituents to receive information instead of passing it on. At least once each year I enclose a questionnaire covering some of the issues important to me on which I may be able to obtain guidance from the people of New Hampshire.

This year, the questions were multiple choice, and I asked each person responding to check off only one answer to each question. My staff has tabulated the answers in percentages, and I feel that they are of sufficient interest to justify their insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I might point out that only one of the topics on this questionnaire had been asked about in previous years. That question dealt with firearms control. This year, as last year, the overwhelming majority of the respondents favored some sort of Federal legislation on this subject. For some reason, my regular mail has never reflected this sentiment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the questionnaire included with my July "Report Home" be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with a tabulation of the answers received.

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

1. A controversy rages in Washington over proposals to start work on an anti-ballistic missile system to protect our nation from nuclear attack. One side says the system will be prohibitively expensive (\$41 billion), offer only partial protection and will merely serve to escalate the arms race. Those who favor the proposal argue that even partial protection is worth the huge expenditure and they believe that such a system will serve as an added deterrent to enemy attack.

How do you feel?

	Percent
We should go ahead and build such a system	38.3
We should not build such a system	32.3
Not familiar enough with the proposal	29.4

2. Some authorities believe the rise in crime rate, as well as promiscuous use of

firearms in riots, stems from laxity in federal laws regulating purchase and possession of firearms. Others contend that any federal regulation would restrict legitimate use of firearms for hunting and target purposes. Do you believe it would be in the public interest to [check one]

	Percent
Have laws prohibiting mailorder purchase of firearms	41
Have laws requiring the national registration of firearms	40
Have no Federal legislation of firearms	19

3. The national crime rate has been on the increase. Some believe this has been caused by court decisions which safeguard the legal rights of the accused—which, in turn, degrade the effectiveness of prosecution. Others believe crime has increased because of crime producing environments, poverty and lack of job opportunity. Do you believe a reduction in the crime rate would best be achieved by [check one]

	Percent
Increased efficiency in crime detection methods and programs designed to alleviate crime producing environments, with the rights of suspects strictly maintained	46
More militant police enforcement with less emphasis on the rights of the accused	54

4. Do you believe the path to permanent peace in the Middle East rests in [check one]

	Percent
Israeli withdrawal to her former borders with a solution by the United Nations	15
Leaving things as they are so that the nations involved can work out a settlement among themselves	85

Insofar as action by our own government is concerned—and regardless of what the Soviet Union does—should we [check one]

	Percent
Support Israel	40
Support the Arabs	1
Keep our hands off	59

5. The television industry is currently under fire from many quarters. Complaints range from "too many commercials" to "too few public affairs programs." Since many of these complaints may find their outlet in legislative proposals, I would like to find out your own views on television programming. What is your biggest complaint, if any, about television [check one]

	Percent
Program quality	50
Number of commercials	37
Too few public affairs programs	12
Too many public affairs programs	1
Other	

6. What is your major source of news? [check one]

	Percent
Television	25.4
Radio	14.1
Newspapers	49.3
News magazines	11.2

THE SATURDAY EVENING POST ON VIETNAM

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, some of the most thoughtful, tough-minded observations on U.S. policy with reference to the Vietnam struggle have appeared in the editorial columns of the Saturday Evening Post. This great American journal has been steadily upgrading the quality of its articles, its editorials, and its general format in recent years.

I invite the attention of Senators especially to an editorial entitled "The

Numbers Game," published in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, and ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE NUMBERS GAME

"The war is not a stalemate. We are winning, slowly but steadily."

—Gen. William Westmoreland.

It has been 21 years now that Ho Chi Minh has led the Communist insurgency in Vietnam. Boys have been born, raised, recruited and killed all within the span of this endless war. It was some 15 years ago that the United States began subsidizing the French forces fighting Ho's Communists, and countless millions of dollars worth of planes and armaments and supplies all ended in the apocalypse of Dien Bien Phu. It has been about 10 years now since the United States began "helping" the South Vietnamese with dollars and then guns—five years since American troops appeared on the scene, and two years since they engaged in full combat. And during all these years, during battles and during lulls, somebody has been prophesying victory in much the same words that General Westmoreland used last month.

When General Westmoreland took command of the Vietnam campaign three years ago, he had an expeditionary force of about 25,000 troops. Now he has 460,000, and, "to reinforce our mounting pressure," he wants still more. Defense Secretary McNamara, who must find the means of providing such additional troops, was reluctant to agree. One of his first questions to General Westmoreland was how he could achieve more results with the forces already in Vietnam. In the end, it seems a foregone conclusion that more men will be provided—fewer than General Westmoreland wants, more than Secretary McNamara wants. It also seems a foregone conclusion that these forces will not be enough, and that it is only a matter of time before General Westmoreland asks for more.

To provide still more troops, and yet to deny Westmoreland the forces he asks, seems to be an evasion of the real questions of how this war is going and how it can be brought to an end. Despite Westmoreland's claims of victory, his request for 140,000 more troops seems in itself a confession of failure—not of defeat but of the stalemate that he denies. If all these troops are really necessary, it seems hard to see how he can be "winning," slowly or otherwise. Still, let us assume that the average commander is an optimist, and that he invariably feels a good job could be done even better if there were just more troops to throw into the fight.

The more fundamental evasion seems to be that of Secretary McNamara. For if our commander in the field declares that he needs a certain number of reinforcements, how can anyone from Washington tell him he doesn't really need them? But conversely, if he is not really winning the war with the 460,000 men he now has, how can a "compromise" reinforcement of a few thousands achieve victory? In short, if our force in Vietnam is too small to achieve its goals, then it's presumably a lot too small. The likeliest explanation for McNamara's reluctance is that the political and financial cost of sending massive reinforcements is more than the Administration wants to face.

Behind this evasion, of course, is the evasion of the whole American people. According to the latest Harris Poll, 58 percent of Americans want an increased military effort, whereas only 36 percent want a greater effort at negotiating a settlement. As for specifics, 72 percent favor the continued bombing of North Vietnam, and no less than 48 percent favor a ground invasion of North Vietnam. Despite their belligerent views, how-

ever, one can't help wondering whether these hawks don't somehow expect somebody else to do the shooting. According to most estimates, the war, as it is now being fought, will last for years, perhaps five, perhaps ten. Thus, if Americans are now getting killed at a rate of 7,500 a year, the question becomes: Are we prepared to sacrifice 75,000 American lives in order to win the war in Vietnam?

Perhaps a majority would answer yes, but the implication of these appeals for greater military effort is that a greater effort would end the war sooner and at smaller cost. It is an unrealistic implication. If it takes a half million men to win the war "slowly but steadily," how many would it take to win the war quickly? A million? Even more? Then the questions to be asked in a poll are: Do you favor calling up the reserves? Do you favor ending all draft exemptions? Do you favor increasing taxes by, say, one quarter?

One of the great illusions about our struggle in Vietnam has always been that it could be won fairly easily, that the Communists, facing our overwhelming strength, would simply end their 20-year struggle and give up—that it is not, in short, a real war. One suspects that Secretary McNamara himself was once a victim of this illusion, and that the Communists' dogged refusal to give up has provided him with a terrible lesson in the illogicality of warfare. For though he can provide still more forces, the fact is that the Communists, too, still have reserve forces that haven't yet even entered the battle. And who, on either side, dares tell his followers that the goal may not be worth the cost?

THE 10-PERCENT SURTAX A MISTAKE, ECONOMIST SAYS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, one of the most persuasive and competent brief analysis I have seen of the proposed 10-percent surtax increase appeared in the Roanoke Times recently.

The author is Dr. Spencer Gervin, chairman of the Department of Economics and Business of Emory and Henry College.

Dr. Gervin has ably summarized a strong case against the proposed tax increase. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Roanoke Times, Aug. 6, 1967]

INCOME TAX HIKE HAZARDOUS AT PRESENT, ECONOMIST SAYS

(By Dr. Spencer Gervin, chairman, Department of Economics and Business, Emory and Henry College)

Prime argument in the renewed push for an income tax increase is the 0.3 per cent June rise in the Consumer Price Index (CPI), bringing the rise to 2.7 per cent since June 1966. Dramatizing this jump is the fact that June's dollar was worth 86.2 cents in 1957-59 dollars, 70.3 cents in 1947-49 dollars, and 41.8 cents in 1939 dollars. Avowed purpose of the higher tax on personal and corporate income is to restrain such inflation.

All but certainly under existing circumstances a tax hike will not accomplish the promised restraint. More likely, even with the higher tax take, prices will continue to move upward, with the actual effect being to arrest the business expansion just getting under way.

Obviously the 0.3 per cent CPI rise did not occur alike for all goods and services comprehended in the index. Some segments rose more, some less (new cars 1 per cent), some not at all (furniture 0 per cent), and some declined (gasoline and oil -3 per cent).

Leading the risers was food, up 0.9 per cent from May. Principally involved were fruits and vegetables (4.7 per cent) and meats (4.1 per cent). Among fruits, grapefruit jumped 37 per cent and oranges 15 per cent, as the Florida citrus crop neared completion. Apples were up 6 per cent as storage supplies dwindled. Among vegetables, lettuce rose 13 per cent and potatoes 6 per cent, in each case due to scarcity as unfavorable weather delayed maturity.

Meat price increases came from hogs (5 per cent at wholesale) as fewer piggies went to market. Beef and lamb were also offered in inadequate quantities. Wholesale livestock prices as a whole were up 2 per cent in June.

Will the tax increase zero in on demand for food commodities so as to relieve price pressures? A tax hike must reduce demand for these commodities specifically if it is to be effective in restraining inflation. Such specificity is unlikely.

Important cause of the CPI rise in the past year has been medical services. Up .6 per cent in June, the rise since last June is 9.2 per cent. Primarily responsible are higher hospital service charges and increased doctors' fees, as heightened demand for these services has met a relatively stable supply. Much of this increased demand has of course been of government doing, with medicare and Medicaid.

Due to government subsidization here, it is unlikely that an income tax increase will deflate this segment of demand, which has led all others in inflationary advance in the last year.

Where then will a tax increase hit? While it is impossible to predict exactly just what the consumer will buy less of when his disposable income is cut by taxation, experience indicates the falloff will be in demand for industrial goods, most especially hard goods (up 1.1 per cent in price in the last year).

In this likelihood lies the great hazard of present tax rise. For industrial production, at 155.2 in June (1967-59=100) is still way off its 159.0 high of last December. Due somewhat to output drop but more importantly to increments to capacity (164.0 end of 1965, 179.3 end of 1966, 185.1 now; 1957-59=100), manufacturing is presently operating at only 84.7 per cent of capacity, down from 90.9 per cent in the 1966's second quarter.

Experience further indicates that automobile sales fall quickly from a paring of disposable income. Just now recovering from slow sales during the first quarter of this year, auto sales will probably lag again with the tax increase. New car prices have not risen in the last year.

Another problem attending drop in demand for industrial goods is the effect upon plant expansion. With corporate profits off in the last nine months, even the recent restoration of the 7 per cent investment tax credit and rapid plant amortization can scarcely induce industry to expand, with demand sinking. Such a failure of investment spending brings stagnation of personal income, recession's first step.

With continued heavy government deficit spending, much for nonconsumable military goods, price pressures in the last quarter of 1967 will probably require anti-inflationary measures. But why a tax increase? Most economists tend to accept a tax increase because of their belief that government deficit spending will not be reduced. Given first choice, most would prefer a deficit reduction because of its less significant effect upon allocation of resources.

Furthermore, a tax increase is cumbersome to levy and to cancel, requiring each time action by the Congress. Dynamics of the economy are such that the alert steering needed to avoid both recession and inflation cannot be done by slow legislative process.

Real alternative is the tapered cutting of expenditures as the economy approaches

capacity. The President of the United States had authority—witness, withholding of road construction funds in late 1966—to withhold portions of many appropriations made by the Congress. This withholding-release rhythm can be done promptly, as the economy needs tuning.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I should like to comment on the technical assistance program of the Agency for International Development. This is the area of AID's program that furnishes knowledge and ideas. It is the portion that deals not just with meeting today's crises, but with anticipating and eliminating tomorrow's problems before they start.

The research aspect of AID's technical assistance program should be emphasized. We fully recognize that to get economic development abroad we may need to know the answers to questions we have never encountered in the United States. This is the role of research: to generate new knowledge and ideas, and to cope with new kinds of problems. AID has a positive obligation to build a strong research program to help make the rest of its program really effective.

It is important that we support American universities in the kind of research program that the United States needs if its overseas assistance efforts are to be successful. AID cannot do this by itself but it can do so with the help of well-trained and capable university personnel. Therein lies the best resources available for research. University personnel grow and benefit by sharing in research on problems of development, and they will, in the process, train young people—both in this country and abroad—to build on the knowledge which today's scholars produce.

I would like to describe the experience my own University of Wisconsin has had in building a research program with AID. It has demonstrated good results with a modest investment of funds. The Wisconsin experience has convinced me how important it is for AID to give greater financial support for a stronger and more integrated research program.

The University of Wisconsin has a long and distinguished history of service of the State and Nation. Its professors work in close cooperation with State, local and Federal officials. The Wisconsin idea is that "the campus knows no boundaries."

Its college of agriculture works with AID in Nigeria and Brazil to make Wisconsin professors available for teaching and research at local universities. In the United States, we can call upon our university professors for policy analysis and counsel. Development of a similar capacity for service on the part of universities of the less developed countries is of the greatest importance. The University of Wisconsin is helping to build stable and competent local university staffs to participate in policy analysis and program formulation.

One highly successful program of the University of Wisconsin is its Land Tenure Center. This Center was established in 1962 and has been financed largely by the Agency for International

Development. It has a program of research that includes training of students, both United States and foreign, through research participation. Cooperative research is conducted with universities, government agencies, and AID missions in Chile, Colombia, Bolivia, Brazil, Central America, and Venezuela.

The kind of research done in each country depends on its own problems and circumstances. The Land Tenure Center focuses on land ownership, operating arrangements and their effect on agriculture.

Through this plan, AID generates ideas and facts not previously available. For example, methods are researched for expediting land title procedures and distributing farm information to new landowners. The role of farmer organizations and the impact of new land taxes are also studied. Ways to increase farm production are explored and water law questions are resolved. In addition, publications, documentary film footage, and other means distribute this knowledge to policymakers all over Latin America.

The highly successful Chilean land reform program has gained much from the research carried out by the Center's United States and Chilean researchers. When Prof. Peter Doren completed 2 years as director of the Center's program in Chile, President of the Republic Eduardo Frei said:

Please accept my sincere appreciation for this very real contribution which you have made to the agricultural development of Chile through your clear interpretation which has been very much applauded in Government circles.

In Bolivia, Prof. Ronald Clark has worked closely with the Inter-American Committee for Agricultural Development, Bolivian ministries, and the AID mission to speed up the processing of clear land titles to the 50 percent of farmers who are still without them. This will greatly increase the stability of production in Bolivian agriculture.

These are but a few of the many instances in which the Center's work has led to improved and accelerated action programs in agricultural development.

Such programs strengthen and build on a university's previous involvement in an area of research. The Land Tenure Center has assembled a highly competent staff that is frequently called upon by country agencies and AID missions to give technical advice and short term assistance. The Center's research publications are in great demand and many are available in two or three languages.

Latin American participants in the Center's program have gained a great deal of firsthand knowledge about rural people and their problems. In the United States we take for granted the social scientists' close contact with rural questions. But social scientists in Latin America frequently have little experience with rural life. The Center's program has given a large number of potential researchers firsthand knowledge of the agricultural conditions in their countries.

Let me make it clear that our own universities benefit, also. Returning professors and researchers are able to give more meaningful classroom instruction.

This is of great significance when we consider the large number of foreign students studying at U.S. universities—and the equally large group of our own students learning about the social and economic organization of agriculture abroad.

The U.S. contribution will always be a small part of total development expenditures of any country. The direct and immediate results of U.S. university research programs, plus the increasing number of competent local social scientists can geometrically multiply the value of our aid. This case is well illustrated by the effective programs at the University of Wisconsin.

Establishing centers of professional competence cannot be achieved in a year or two, nor can it be done by any university from its own resources. Universities need long-range support from the Federal Government if they are to build staff to develop the expertise needed by AID missions and foreign governments. The money we invest in research in AID's technical assistance program is the kind which makes possible these programs. What we invest here now will bring us untold returns in many years to come.

HOBERT ROWEN ON THE TAX INCREASE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Mr. Hobart Rowen, the distinguished economics analyst of the Washington Post, has written a penetrating analysis of the administration's proposal for a 10 percent tax surcharge as it relates to the Vietnam war and other American interests.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Rowen's brilliant column, published in the Washington Post of Wednesday, August 16, be printed in the RECORD.

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

GUNS NOT BUTTER: L. B. J. TAX POLICY STRESSES THE SHIFT (By Hobart Rowen)

Belatedly, the Johnson Administration is confessing that even the rich American society cannot have unlimited amounts of guns and butter. Its request for a \$7.4 billion, 10 per cent tax surcharge is an admission that this much money, at least, must be diverted from vacations and color TV sets to buying guns, helicopters and ammunition for the shooting war in Vietnam.

But the impact is even deeper than that, and Budget Director Charles L. Schultze yesterday drew a clear blueprint—somewhat unintentionally—of the shift from butter into guns.

His figures show that mountains of dollars have been poured into Vietnam in the past three years—and only pitifully small amounts into troubled U.S. cities and for social needs.

For example, in response to questions by Chairman Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.) of the House Ways and Means Committee, Schultze estimated that of a \$44 billion increase in the projected fiscal 1968 budget compared with fiscal 1965, \$29.7 billion has gone to defense, all but \$3.8 billion of which was for Vietnam.

Measure that \$26 billion increase for Vietnam against increases in the following items:
For the anti-poverty program—\$1.6 billion
For public housing—\$600 million

For other low-cost housing—\$600 million
For secondary and elementary education—\$1.4 billion

For public assistance—\$1.4 billion
Schultze's tally showed that lumping all poverty, housing, education, and welfare programs together, the increase in spending amounted to only \$6.2 billion in the three-year period.

One Administration rebuttal to this line of argument is sure to be that additional billions are poured into socially desirable programs through trust fund operations.

But that cannot conceal the fact that at a moment of great national crisis, the Johnson Administration finds itself limited on what it can spend at home by the billions of dollars it has committed the nation to spend in Southeast Asia.

But we are not yet at the end of the cycle. As Schultze and Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler made clear, the President's program of fiscal responsibility in meeting the costs of the Vietnam war contemplates not only the tax increase, but further sizable reductions in non-military spending.

Thus, Schultze boasted that if we realize \$1.5 billion in civilian expenditure reductions in fiscal 1968, non-Vietnam spending will constitute only 14 per cent of the Nation's total output, compared with 16 per cent in fiscal 1964, and 16.5 per cent during the Eisenhower Administration.

So the Great Society becomes a not-so-great society. Not only is there no consideration being given to a Marshall plan for the cities, as proclaimed by Vice President Humphrey, but even existing programs are being whittled back.

And if the Administration and Congress should try to limit the size of the fiscal 1968 deficit to \$14 billion—the lower end of the range that Secretary Fowler yesterday said is tolerable—there would have to be cutbacks deeper than that \$1.5 billion mentioned by Schultze.

Revenues, with the surtax, are now estimated at \$122.5 billion and expenditures at a potential \$143.5 billion—prior to the President's commitment to restrain, cut and control.

That's a gap of \$21 billion—and if the \$14 billion figure isn't in the Administration's propaganda just to make Congress feel a bit less sick, that target would require reductions of \$7 billion somewhere.

Or, it will require more sales of "participation certificates" for a cosmetic touchup of the deficit.

In any event, the Administration finally did face up to the need of putting a tax-revenue bill before Congress. It helps show dramatically how deep and costly is our involvement in Southeast Asia, which Fowler said offers "no clear prospect of any early ending."

But do we have the whole story, even on statistics?

For example, the cost of 45,000 additional troops in Vietnam is put at from "zero to \$4 billion." But cleverly, this is a net figure, which includes offsetting savings that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara has been ordered to find.

One wonders, therefore, whether the real figure for the additional troop cost is not the \$5 to \$6 billion predicted earlier by Sen. John Stennis (D-Miss.) and so vigorously denied by the Administration.

NONRATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS A DEPARTURE FROM THE AMERICAN TRADITION OF FREEDOM—CXXII

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, each time I address this body to urge the ratification of the human rights conventions—and this is the 122d time I have done so—I am struck by the incongruity

of having to fight for the cause of human rights in the United States of America.

In 1776 an infant alliance of 13 Colonies of the British Crown decided to stake their lives, fortunes, and honor for the sake of political rights. The Founding Fathers fought a war for these rights.

In 1861 we fought another war, a civil war, brother against brother, to preserve the Union. And out of that war came the abolition of slavery.

In 1917 this Nation decided to break out of its isolationism and fight a war on the Continent of Europe because we felt that the interests of the United States were directly tied to the preservation of democracy there.

In 1941 we fought again. This time against one of the ugliest men and most diabolical war machines the world has ever known. In this conflict we took up the cause of freedom in the face of armed racism, tyranny, and genocide.

To be ready at a moment's notice to fight, ostensibly for one freedom or another, but to be unwilling to sign a treaty of peace, freedom, and human rights strikes me as bitterly ironic. This inexplicable discrepancy between our supposed ideals and our actions requires some serious self-scrutiny.

Mr. President, let us show the world that we mean what we say when it comes to human rights. Let us ratify the human rights conventions, and let us do it now.

THE NATIONAL COURT ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] recently made a thoughtful, comprehensive speech to the Conference of State Chief Justices on the subject of improved judicial administration, specifically the National Court Assistance Act. The leadership which Senator TYDINGS has given the Senate, through his dedicated service as chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, of the Committee on the Judiciary, will be remembered years after the more dramatic events of these days are forgotten.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD, so that they may be more widely available.

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

THE NATIONAL COURT ASSISTANCE ACT

(An address by Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS before the Conference of State Chief Justices, Honolulu, Hawaii, August 4, 1967.)

I shall talk with you today generally about programs to improve judicial administration, and, more specifically, about the National Court Assistance Act. I introduced that bill in the 89th Congress, where it was designated as S. 3725, and again during this session of the 90th Congress. The bill is currently designated as S. 1033, and my Judiciary Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery has held hearings on it during the past few months.

This audience is especially aware that today it is the courts themselves that are really on trial, for the current "litigation explosion," with attendant congestion and delay in the process of judicial administration, has focused sharp criticism on that process.

Certainly criticism of the judicial system is not a new development. The need for

major improvements in the administrative machinery of our courts has been evident for many years. In 1839, David Dudley Field, writing of the New York courts, observed that "Speedy justice is a thing unknown; and any justice, without delays almost ruinous, is most rare."¹ Present indictments of our congested courts are made all the more poignant by the fact that the problem has been recognized for more than a century.

There are fine examples of reform measures in New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Oregon and California. We are still a long way, however, from attacking the problem on the national scale necessary to cope with the litigation explosion.

Time and time again, I have cited statistics to illustrate the dimensions of lagging justice in our courts.² There is no need to repeat the dismal recital at length to this audience. But, the recognition of the magnitude of the problem is becoming so widespread that it has even reached the man in the street as the plight of the courts makes headline news. Howard James, writing in the *Christian Science Monitor*, relates the case of a New York housewife. "Driving her auto down a Bronx street [in 1967] she is hit by another car. Doctors say she is seriously injured and expenses pile up. If the other driver's insurance company haggles over a settlement, it could be 1972 before she collects a dime. It often takes that long to get a civil case before a jury."³ Instances of delays of 2, 3, or even 5 years between the time when a case is filed and the time it is finally brought to trial are common. Justice William M. McAllister, of the Supreme Court of Oregon, in his testimony before my Subcommittee observed that in the trial courts, "unconscionable delay is chronic in many areas, and undue delay is becoming the rule rather than the exception in much of the country. Chief Justice Robert C. Finley of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington said, at the same hearing, 'I do submit as emphatically as possible, that we have outgrown the American court system as it exists today....'"

Court congestion and delay create several problems. On the one hand, our courts pay dearly in terms of loss of confidence by our citizens. Peaceful settlement of disputes in an appropriate forum is a basic concept of our democratic process. If our citizens lose faith in the courts as a means of settling their disputes and instead seek alternative answers for redress, our social order will be weakened, if not destroyed.

Another pernicious result of delay in the courts is summarized in the often quoted maxim, "Justice delayed is justice denied." Delay exacts its toll in terms of financial loss and confusion to litigants and attorneys alike. The *Washington Post*, for example, recently reported the case of an attorney and his client who were required to appear every court day for three months while awaiting trial on a "30 minute call calendar."⁴ The financial effect on both client and attorney was disastrous. Furthermore, delay can open the door for unfair or fraudulent practices by unscrupulous defendants. The threat of a 4 to 6 year delay in trying a case is a potent lever which may be used to extort the unjust settlement of a just claim. The Circuit Court

¹ See Vanderbilt, "Clearing Congested Calendars," 14 NACCA Law J. 326 (1954).

² See Tydings, "Helping State and Local Courts Help Themselves: The National Court Assistance Act," 24 *Washington and Lee L. Rev.* 1, 2 (1967); Tydings, "Modernizing the Administration of Justice," 50 *Judicature* 258 (1966); Tydings, "A Fresh Approach to Judicial Administration," 50 *Judicature* 44, 45 (1966).

³ Howard James, "The Crisis in the Courts: Justice Delayed is Justice Denied," *Christian Science Monitor*, April 19, 1967, p. 9.

⁴ "Judge Rescinds Contempt Citations Caused by Snarl in Court Scheduling," *Washington Post*, July 6, 1967, p. B6.

of Cook County, Illinois, found that by the use of dilatory tactics insurance companies could actually defraud the public by deferring payment of claims, maintaining insufficient reserves and dissipating assets in operating costs.⁵

Congestion and delay is also financially costly to taxpayers. Through better management techniques, courts could handle more cases at a lower per unit cost. Generally speaking, money spent by state and local legislatures on judicial systems is pitifully insufficient. This makes it even more imperative that the courts operate as efficiently as possible. I hasten to emphasize, however, that efficiency is not an end in itself, and certainly should not be sought at the expense of due process of law. Assembly-line justice is no better than delayed justice.

Although the problems posed by poor judicial administration are not novel, little imagination has been shown in pursuing solutions. As explained by Professor Hans Zeisel of the University of Chicago Law School, in testimony before my Subcommittee, there are basically three ways to reduce congestion in the courts: to increase the available judge time necessary to handle cases, to reduce the number of cases, and to reduce the time necessary to try a case. As to the first solution, the cry is always for more judges. Yet the experience of the Federal courts, for example, indicates that adding more judges can at times be no solution at all.

During the decade from 1955 to 1965, the number of Federal district judges was raised from 235 to 287—an increase of slightly more than 22%.⁶ Yet, during the same period, the total number of cases disposed of by the Federal district courts remained constant, and the backlog increased by almost 10%.⁷ I might add, that during the same period, the number of criminal cases commenced in the district courts actually declined by about 16%.⁸

As to reducing cases, this can be done either by shifting jurisdiction of certain matters to a court that is less crowded, or by curtailing jurisdiction through adoption of administrative procedures as alternatives to the judicial process.

The first technique is obviously a temporary expedient, and the latter concedes that our adversary system of justice cannot satisfy the need for peacefully settling disputes in an increasingly complex world.

Some would suggest enlarging the jurisdiction of the Federal courts so as to transfer large numbers of cases from the state courts to Federal forums. Not only does this tactic avoid facing up to the real problem, but it also threatens the vitality of the state courts and, indeed, is inconsistent with our system of Federalism. Furthermore, it is increasingly obvious that the Federal courts are themselves falling behind.

As to reducing the time necessary to try

a case we are talking first about shortening the length of time between the filing and the trial of a case, and second, about decreasing the time consumed by the trial itself.

It is probably safe to say that perhaps 70% of the cases in the courts are terminated prior to trial. By decreasing the span of time between the filing and the trial of a case we may expect to remove these cases from the system more swiftly and thereby we will reduce the number of untried cases contributing to the congestion in the system at any time. If by appropriate mechanisms we also can reduce the amount of time consumed by the trial itself, without spending more time on the bench judges would be able to handle more rapidly those cases which do not drop out of the system before trial.

So far, a variety of hit-and-miss experiments have been undertaken with such mechanisms as pretrial arbitration, new discovery techniques, certificates of readiness, and many other schemes. There has not been any coordinated and controlled experimentation to evaluate these ideas. A plan executed successfully in one court will fail in another, and we don't really understand the reasons for either the success or the failure. A carefully programmed approach to simplifying and compressing the trial processes must be devised.

Even though attempted remedies have thus far been inadequate, the "crisis in the courts" is by no means insoluble. But, if the courts themselves are to eliminate congestion and delay, their first need is to gain a complete and accurate understanding of their own administrative operations. During our hearings, Professor Maurice Rosenberg of the Columbia Law School said:

"A State that keeps fastidious records on how long it takes a flock of geese to overfly its territory will have no idea how long it takes a flock of litigants to get to trial in its courts. A state that knows the precise number of cases of measles or bourbon it had in its borders last year will have no count on the number of cases of burglary or personal injury in its courts."

The first goal of self-analysis should be to identify precisely the problems of judicial administration. Without reliable information regarding caseloads, the nature of the backlogs, bottlenecks in case flow, and the distribution of judicial work, comprehensive solutions cannot be developed. Thus the first step is to gather and organize data on the courts and their work.

Once the proper data for the identification of problems has been accumulated, it must be used to develop new ways of approaching judicial administration. Unfortunately, our courts today are administered essentially the same way they were two hundred years ago. Many of our courts seem to apply the doctrine of *stare decisis* to administrative practices, maintaining a procedure merely because it has been followed for many years. I ask you, if that tenet had guided the leaders of industry, finance, science and technology, where would our nation be today?

Many judges have ignored business experts as a source of ideas for improving judicial administration. There are a number of explanations for the reluctance of our courts to utilize the services of such experts as management consultants and systems analysts. One is the understandable distrust by much of the bench and bar of the new and unfamiliar. Another is the notion held by many that only judges and lawyers understand the real needs of the courts. Some judges may fear that their judicial functions will be usurped, either by computers or clerks. Further, if a court itself is unable to employ management consultants, there may be an aversion to accepting "consultation" from experts whose fees are paid by a county board of supervisors or the state and who thus are suspect as minions of the body that foots the bill.

It is also true that management consultants have not adequately made their potential usefulness known to the judiciary. They have failed to explain in clear terms exactly what they can do to improve judicial machinery and the administration of justice. Understandably, the judges want to be assured that consultants will not tamper with the decision-making process or the substantive rights of litigants. Only when the "communications gap" between management consultants and the legal fraternity has been closed can real progress be made in employing modern methods and techniques.

By the way of partial illustration, let me list for you some of the ways that modern management techniques can be utilized to assist a court in handling its business:

1. To evaluate the forms, systems, and procedures currently employed in court administration, for functions such as: Filing papers and records; preparing and printing calendars; notifying attorneys, litigants, and witnesses; calling calendars and scheduling cases for pre-trial and trial; empaneling and scheduling juries; indexing and docketing of court actions; accounting for fees; and, transferring cases to other courts.

2. To determine what information is needed for effective management of court operations.

3. To appraise equipment needs for communications and for filing, retrieving, processing and preserving cases, records, and administrative and statistical data.

4. To review space utilization and facility needs.

5. To provide an objective basis for estimating judicial and non-judicial manpower requirements and for establishing compensation levels.

6. To assess the adequacy of the administrative organization of the court.

7. To evaluate the soundness of non-judicial personnel policies and practices in such areas as recruitment, training, and career development.

8. To review opportunities for revision in statutes and court rules that would result in administrative improvements without affecting judicial decision-making prerogatives and the substantive rights of litigants.

One important and immediate need is for the courts to utilize electronic data processing. Eldridge Adams of the UCLA Law School, testifying at our hearings, focused on the problems of current filing systems. He stated: "Trial courts typically organize their files by collecting all the documents for a given case in one jacket and file the jacket case-files in the order that they are created. Only superficial indexes are maintained." A Los Angeles judge once gave this detailed picture:

"If I know the name and number of a case I can in about 20 minutes of walking, searching through docket volumes and waiting at file counters, get access to most of the information about the case, although to be certain of each court action I might need to spend twice or three times this amount of time hunting through minute books. . . ." Automatic data processing is especially adaptable to remedying situations such as this.

Computers can also be put to work on circumventing administrative drudgery. Assuring maximum efficiency in the flow of cases is, in simple terms, the problem of "getting the right people to the right place at the right time." A calendaring system can be devised with the aid of computers which will take into consideration in scheduling trials such factors as the average length of certain types of trials and the workload and commitments of attorneys practicing before the court. Backlogs can then be analyzed to sift out the deadwood that will never get to trial. Such analysis could reveal how much court time and staff effort is being dissipated because counsel is unprepared or engaged in

⁵ See Transcript of Hearings on S. 1033 Before the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, 90th Congress, 1st Sess. Vol. 1, p. 24 (1967) (Testimony of John S. Boyle, Chief Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois.)

⁶ Compare the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, 1955, p. 56, with the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, 1965, p. 92.

⁷ Compare the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, 1955, Tables C1, p. 162 and D1, p. 195 with the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, 1965, Tables C1, p. 174 and D1, p. 213.

⁸ Compare the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, 1955, Table D1, p. 195 with the Annual Report of the Director of the Admin. Office of the U.S. Courts, 1965, Table D1, p. 213.

more than one court at a time. Indeed, computers can expedite trials by automatically preparing notices for the court appearances of litigants, witnesses and lawyers, as well as by addressing envelopes, and printing minute orders and other pertinent information.

A more sophisticated use of the computer is to build an electronic simulation of a court's operation. Once the resources of a court are translated into mathematical formulae and reproduced in the computer model, it is possible to conduct and evaluate experiments in procedural and administrative changes without actually disrupting the day-to-day business of the court. Such a model would also be helpful in predicting, with reasonable certainty, the future manpower requirements of the court to allow timely preparation for growing caseloads.

These few observations merely indicate the possibilities in the application of modern technology to solving the problems of delayed justice. When computers are viewed in their proper perspective—not as "giant brains," or "thinking machines" but rather as highly efficient organizers—then the prospect of their use by our courts certainly cannot be viewed as a threat to our traditional system of judicial decision-making.

By emphasizing all that needs to be done in the field of judicial administration, I do not mean to imply that nothing is being done. Such organizations as the American Judicature Society, the Institute of Judicial Administration, the National College of State Trial Judges, the North American Judges Association, the American Bar Association, as well as state and local bar associations and citizens' groups, have played an important role in encouraging court reform through improvements in judicial administration. The fact is, nevertheless, that the work of private organizations in the field of judicial administration, while extremely valuable, has not proven equal to the task of solving, on a nation-wide basis, the problems of our courts. Delmar Karlen, Director of the Institute for Judicial Administration, made the following statement when he testified in support of the NCAA, "I could give you many instances where good projects have not found support financially or have been unduly delayed even though there was a good deal of urgency about them." We have heard from officials of almost all of the leading groups working for court reform, and they confirm that financial and technical support for their efforts has been grossly inadequate.

It was in an effort to meet the need for improving the administration of state and local courts that I introduced the National Court Assistance Act. This bill would provide two major resources for state and local courts: grants-in-aid to foster programs for reforms in judicial administration, and an Office of Judicial Assistance.

The bill currently proposes, in terms of Federal spending, a small financial aid program of \$5 million annually. It is contemplated that grants would be available for such programs as these: supporting activities of organizations concerned with judicial administration; fostering studies by management consultants; continuing education for state and local judges and supporting court personnel; and encouraging the bench and bar in other activities that are related to improved court administration.

In the area of technical assistance for courts, ample testimony at our hearings established that the statistical reports on court operations available today are little better than nothing at all. There are no uniform guidelines for analyzing court dockets or for comparing the business of various courts. Statistics begin at different places and measure different things. An Office of Judicial Assistance could help develop guidelines for evaluating judicial administration.

Witnesses have also decried the paucity of qualified people trained in matters of court administration.

The Office of Judicial Assistance could help train a corps of experts who would be available at the request of a state or local court to evaluate programs of improvement or to offer suggestions for reform.

The Office of Judicial Administration could also house a comprehensive library of materials and information on judicial administration. There is no reason why the limited funds available to public and private institutions should be expended in the costly task of maintaining libraries.

A less tangible but equally important facet of the National Court Assistance Act is that it would demonstrate a national commitment to judicial improvement, focusing the public eye on what has traditionally been an area of public indifference.

The majority of letters I have received about the National Court Assistance Act from judges, bar associations, and court administrators across the nation have been encouraging, and there appears to be widespread support for legislation of this nature. As could be expected, there have been some doubts expressed about the wisdom of the bill. Let me discuss these with you now.

One objection raised is that court administration involves local problems that cannot appropriately be solved at the national level.

Certainly the roots of congestion are in local problems, and it must be local judges who initiate and implement reforms in judicial administration. In this regard, I would like to share with you what Maurice Rosenberg said in response to that objection at our hearings:

"It is true, of course, that every court has its own local texture of business, that is to say, the kind of cases it has; and it has its own local bar, and the morale and spirit differs from place to place, and there are other local variations, just as, I suppose, there are among individuals who go to see doctors for this malady or that symptom . . . and yet we do not put it out of the range of medical science to know some universal principles about treating patients and diagnosing their ills. . . . I would think there is in this area, also, a developing body of theoretical knowledge of universal application."

Or, as Professor Zeisel stated to the Subcommittee, "I submit that the administrative problems of the courts are not as different as they seem to be to some of the judges. . . ."

But many judges have found that when they have taken the initiative to accomplish reform they have been unable to marshal the necessary resources to support their efforts. Often state legislatures may fail to provide the money and expert help necessary to assist the courts. When courts need guidance in developing plans for administrative improvement, there are few places for them to turn. Judges at our hearings testified that when searching for new ideas they have had to correspond with a variety of institutions and with many other judges in time-consuming inquiries for information. The Office of Judicial Assistance could, however, easily make available reports of successful experiments, and it could disseminate ideas for experiments that have been recommended by experts in judicial administration and business management.

A second objection is that the legislation may overlap other public or private programs, existing or proposed. It is true that there are Federal programs that can provide grants to state or local courts. The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, located in the Department of Justice, provides resources for the improvement of law enforcement and criminal justice. The proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Bill of 1967* expands the

role of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance and is a comprehensive program to enable the states to institute broad-fronted attacks on crime. Although criminal courts might be an appropriate subject for "Safe Streets" resources it is unlikely that significant amounts of money would be provided for the study of the business administration of criminal courts under this proposed Act, which has as its primary objective an all out "war on crime." The likelihood of overlap with the National Court Assistance Act is slight, and there is no sound reason to fragment programs for court assistance into a variety of agencies and approaches. One office devoting its full energies to problems of judicial administration is necessary if significant progress is to be made.

Further, there seems little likelihood of overlap with the private sector. Indeed, representatives of private institutions indicated to me at our hearings that they would welcome the resources contemplated by the bill. There is no reason to believe that S. 1033 would discourage the efforts of private organizations to foster judicial improvement. The intent of the National Court Assistance Act is to supplement, not supplant these efforts.

S. 1033 provides that the Office of Judicial Assistance would be established in the Department of Justice, and some doubts have been expressed regarding the wisdom of doing this. It has been suggested that since the Office of Judicial Assistance is designed to help courts, it would more appropriately be located in the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. Although attractive at first glance, this suggestion ignores the fact that the Administrative Office is a federally-oriented agency and traditionally has been responsible to the Federal judiciary. It is easy to doubt that either the Administrative Office or the state and local courts would benefit from this suggested marriage.

Another suggestion is to establish the Office of Judicial Assistance as an independent agency. Although certainly the optimum solution, this idea contravenes the strong policy of the Bureau of the Budget to resist the creation of more independent agencies. Perhaps in the future, once there is a reservoir of experience in working with the courts, there will be ample evidence to support the establishment of an independent agency.

For the present, the location of the Office of Judicial Assistance in the Justice Department represents a compromise with reality. But allow me to make two observations. First, the Justice Department, although essentially a law enforcement agency, is becoming increasingly familiar through the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, with problems confronting the States in the criminal justice area. Therefore, it is not completely inappropriate for the Justice Department to be the "administrative home" of a program which would help state and local courts. Second, semi-autonomous offices, such as the Bureau of Prisons, already exist within the Justice Department. The Office of Judicial Assistance would be lodged in the Department of Justice for housekeeping purposes only and would be virtually autonomous under the provisions of the National Court Assistance Act; thus, its essential state and local orientation could be kept intact.

A third objection is that the legislation invites encroachment by the Federal government upon the independence of the States. Certainly I would strongly oppose such a result, and the act was drafted to avoid that possibility. The National Court Assistance Act can represent a profitable exercise in creative federalism as a cooperative venture between Federal and state authorities.

The specific provisions in S. 1033 that prohibit interference with the independence of the courts are these: First, assistance to courts would be provided only with the approval of appropriate state judicial authori-

* S. 917, 90th Congress, 1st Sess. (1967).

ties; second, the act directly prohibits the Office of Judicial Assistance from exerting any control or influence over state or local courts.

Even with these safeguards, during our recent hearings we have been exploring additional ways to insulate state courts from the possibility of Federal encroachment under the Act. We have been working on a plan for an advisory council made up of representatives of the state judiciaries, the state bars, and administrators and business counsellors as well. The council is envisaged as a policy-making board that would have final authority to approve standards promulgated by the Office of Judicial Assistance for securing grants-in-aid. The council could assure that the programs encouraged by the Office of Judicial Assistance would be compatible with good court administration and the independence of the state judiciaries. This proposal has been greeted with enthusiasm by state judges and court administrators, and we are continuing to study the idea.

Another aspect of encroachment involves the matter of designating the appropriate authority within the state to approve applications for assistance pursuant to the Act. The current language of S. 1033 would permit assistance merely on approval of the chief judge of the court involved. There has been some objection to this provision on the basis that it is inconsistent with the superintending control of the State chief judge in those States that have a unified court system. On the other hand, this may be an appropriate designation in non-unified states. We merely need to give careful thought to developing statutory language to meet the requirements of the differing systems of the several States, and this is yet an open question.

Many times I have stated my belief that intrusion by the Federal government into matters more appropriately within the domain of state government is to be deplored and discouraged. I reaffirm that belief today. I hasten to add, however, that too often, state and local governments have not been responsive to the pressing demands of our modern society. The result is pressure for Federal action to directly meet the expressed needs of the people. The National Court Assistance Act, however, would provide resources with which the states themselves can respond to the challenge of the litigation explosion, and thereby eliminate any pressure for direct Federal action in matters of local justice. I believe, therefore, that my bill will strengthen, not weaken, our system of creative federalism.

Enactment of the National Court Assistance Act will not be the whole answer, but it is a start. Indeed, some people have suggested that the job of improving state judicial administration far exceeds the limited resources contemplated by the bill.

Mr. Howard James of the *Christian Science Monitor* stated at our hearings that the authorization in the bill is pitifully small. He said:

"The \$5 million a year now proposed seems hardly enough to water the face of the nation when the state court system is so varied and problems so deep-rooted. What does it cost now to build highways? A million dollars or more a mile? You suggest we spend \$5 million a year on justice. By using the highway yardstick, we won't get across country for many years."

Despite limited resources, the National Court Assistance Act will represent a significant step forward in the battle for more efficiently administered courts. At the very least it will serve to affirm a national commitment to the cause of better state and local courts.

Consider the following words of the Magna Carta: "we will not sell, deny or delay justice or right to anyone." The late Arthur T. Vanderbilt tells of the highly appropriate observations on these words made by a com-

mittee of the Massachusetts legislature in 1859:

"The barons compelled King John to bequeath this matter to our courts; it is engraved on their seals. It is the language of all well-regulated governments on the subject. It is written in Latin in most of our courtrooms. It is well it is disguised in a dead language. If the delayed parties and witnesses who sit in the back seats could read it, they would disturb or break up the courts by the explosions of their laughter or their rage at the monstrous incongruity betwixt the theory and the practice."¹⁰

ILL-ADVISED APPROPRIATION CUTS IN HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to submit further testimonial support, supplementing that which has already appeared in the *RECORD* in recent days, suggesting the wisdom and necessity of restoring cuts made in the House-passed appropriation for the high speed ground transportation program in the Department of Transportation.

All of us are painfully aware, of course, that this is a time of difficult choice and decision regarding appropriations for the current fiscal year. We face a mounting Federal deficit, aggravated by a costly and unpopular war and necessitating a special increase in Federal taxes on personal income. Clearly, we must be prepared to hold down Federal spending wherever we can.

But even when all of these circumstances are acknowledged, I must say that I find the 44-percent cut made by the House in the budget of the high speed ground transportation program to be extreme and ill-conceived. I am not convinced that the cut was based on a full understanding of the implications of this promising program.

In this connection, I was especially impressed by an editorial which appeared in the August 12 issue of *Traffic World*, a publication which serves all modes of our national transportation industry. The editorial suggests that the proper test of whether an appropriation is valid in these particular circumstances should be a determination as to whether the project involved will result in savings and other public benefits great enough to justify the cost.

I am pleased to note that the editors of *Traffic World* believe that the projects being undertaken by the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation meet that test. They point out that one of the projects which would be deferred by the House cuts, research and development of tracked, air-cushioned vehicles, could have great promise for linking airports with nearby metropolitan centers as well as relieving urban traffic congestion in general. And they hold that a second project, the auto-train which would haul private automobiles and their passengers over long distances, could suggest a new alternative to mounting congestion on interstate highways. *Traffic World* concludes that "failure of Congress to provide adequately for continuance of the DOT research and demon-

stration work would be regrettable and not in the public interest."

Mr. President, it seems to me that this editorial is one more authoritative statement indicating that a misjudgment was made in the appropriation procedure in the other body and that the Senate should take corrective action. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Detours on Avenue to Transport Progress," published in the August 12, 1967, issue of *Traffic World*, be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

DETOURS ON AVENUE TO TRANSPORT PROGRESS

Two of the objectives that Congress had in mind when it passed the bill that is now the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 931), as set forth in one of the provisions of the statute itself, were "to stimulate technological advances in transportation" and "to provide general leadership in the identification and solution of transportation problems." President Johnson, in his message to Congress calling for enactment of legislation to create a Department of Transportation, said that the "role" of the department would include the bringing of "new technology to a total transportation system, by promoting research and development in cooperation with private industry."

In furtherance of the above stated objectives the DOT has carried forward, and would like to continue its work on, a number of transportation research and demonstration projects, including several that were started when transport research programs were among the activities of the office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, prior to the establishment of the DOT.

Three of the research and/or demonstration undertakings that appear to us to be of special interest and potential value to the American public and on which good starts have been made are: (1) The so-called high-speed ground transportation research and development program, including the Northeast Corridor project, for the development of which four specially designed test cars, capable of speeds of 150 miles an hour, have been acquired by the DOT with a view to placing them and a number of similar cars in operation experimentally on the New Haven and Pennsylvania Railroads, between Boston, Mass., and Washington, D.C., some time in the autumn of 1968; (2) the tracked air cushion vehicle project in which, operating on or between two vertical surfaces (either in the center or at either side of the guideway) against which positive force, in the form of powerful blasts of air ("vertical air cushions") can be extended to propel the vehicle, and (3) the auto-train project, described in an illustrated article on page 27 of the August 5 issue of *Traffic World*—an article in which the proposed air-cushion vehicle also was pictured and described.

Before it passed the appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 1968 and sent the bill to the Senate, the House of Representatives in Congress made some big cuts in the budget estimates for research and development ("R & D") work of various "offices" and "administrations" in the department, including those requested for the Office of High-Speed Ground Transportation, which attends to programs directed separately by the Federal Railroad Administration and the Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Research and Technology (yet to be appointed). The director of the Office of High-Speed Ground Transportation is Robert A. Nelson, who was appointed to that position by Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd in 1965 when the latter was Under Secretary of Commerce for Trans-

¹⁰ See Vanderbilt, "Clearing Congested Calendars," 14 NACCA Law J. 326, 336 (1954).

portation. Mr. Nelson was professor of transportation at the University of Washington for 10 years before he came to Washington, D.C., and before that he was professor of economics at Boston University.

For the High-Speed Ground Transportation activities for fiscal year 1968 (the year ending June 30, 1968), the budget requests totaled \$18.6 million, of which \$9,611,000 was for high-speed ground transport (HSGT) demonstrations, \$8 million was for "R & D," and \$989,000 was for administration. Allowing \$5,650,000, \$3,850,000 and \$800,000 for those three items respectively, the House cut the total for the Office of High-Speed Ground Transportation to \$10.3 million thus deleting \$8,850,000 from the total amount requested for that office. For the "Northeast Corridor" part of the HSGT demonstration outlay proposed, \$2,500,000 was the amount of the budget estimate. The House cut that by \$250,000, to \$2,250,000. (We won't weep about that one; this part of the research HSGT research program fared fairly well in the House.)

Unenviable is the situation in which House and Senate appropriation committees find themselves when budget requests to finance essential government activities are placed before them at a time when federal expenditures far exceed federal revenues and when many of the legislators' constituents are complaining about already high levels of taxes. The answer to the inevitable question faced by the appropriations committee members (and, later, by all their colleagues in the House and Senate), "How and where can we trim these proposed costs of government?", is seldom easy to find. Probably the line of least resistance for the legislators in their search for ways to cut the budget estimates is the reduction of money requests for "research and development," since it's often difficult for research advocates to prove that the need for allotment of funds for "R & D" projects is urgent and that work done on such projects will result in savings and other public benefits great enough to justify the cost.

In the cases of the tracked air cushion vehicle project and the auto-train demonstration (the latter already scheduled for experimental operation on the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad between Washington, D.C., and Jacksonville, Fla., some time next year), we believe that failure of Congress to provide adequately for continuance of the DOT research and demonstration work would be regrettable and not in the public interest. The tracked air cushion vehicle studies and experimental operations hold promise of pointing the way to solution of the present problem of slow surface travel to and from airports and the continuing problem of providing adequate transportation for commuters and relieving urban-area traffic congestion. Equally important as a means of maintaining the transportation progress that the United States can and should maintain, among the nations of the world, is the financing of the auto-train project, that promises to make it possible for long-distance travelers by automobile to reach their destinations quickly, safely and comfortably, at very reasonable cost, riding in or with their automobile aboard specially built railroad cars and thus relieving the constantly growing traffic on the nation's highways. At the rate of population growth of this country, all available means of transportation will be needed, and all possible steps should be taken to keep the highways from being so densely occupied by vehicles that attainment of anything like a fairly reasonable speed becomes almost impossible.

FORBES MAKES MUTUAL FUND PROBLEM UNDERSTANDABLE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the toughest and most complicated

problems confronting Congress this year is the proposed regulation of the mutual fund industry.

For the past several weeks the Committee on Banking and Currency, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], has been holding hearings on the Securities and Exchange Commission's highly controversial proposed changes in the law regulating this industry, which has skyrocketed from an industry of a few hundred million dollars to a gigantic \$45 billion behemoth that has a profound influence on our economy in a myriad of ways.

Because the legislation proposed by the SEC is necessarily complex and technical, many Members of Congress have not had a chance to study it. But in the next few months we shall have to make some profound and far-reaching decisions, the quality of which will be based largely on our understanding.

For this reason, Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a balanced, thoughtful, and highly readable analysis of the mutual fund problem as it comes to Congress that was published in the current issue of *Forbes* magazine. 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:

FUNDS ON THE DEFENSIVE

(NOTE.—The SEC has opened its legislative battle to trim mutual fund fees. The outcome is still in doubt, but the industry has long since learned never to underestimate the resourcefulness of SEC Chairman Manny Cohen.)

This week, as the Senate Banking and Currency Committee launched its second round of hearings on a Securities & Exchange Commission bill to cut mutual fund sales charges and management fees, many a fascinated onlooker was almost prepared to suspect that SEC Chairman Manuel F. Cohen had held Machiavelli's hand during the writing of *The Prince*.

That wily Florentine gentleman's advice, that minority activists can succeed only by fragmenting the opposition, was the very core of Cohen's strategy. And as a strategy it has already been successful enough to propel the \$45-billion mutual fund industry into the high-ceilinged hearing room in the new Senate office building nine months after the SEC issued its report on the "Public Policy Implications of Investment Company Growth."

THE CONSUMER TAG

The unusual speed (for Washington) with which the report took legislative shape, says an attorney for a mutual fund trade association, "left us divided over what tack to take. We just couldn't get our people together on the question of whether to compromise or fight. Manny Cohen has lobbied this thing so skillfully that he's got some of the Senators on the banking committee brainwashed."

The industry, of course, knows its way around Capitol Hill, too. Further, a number of funds managers have tried to fight back by retaining such Washington influentials as Milton P. Semer and John H. Sharon. Semer was formerly chief counsel to John J. Sparkman on the Senate Housing Subcommittee. Sparkman is also head of the Senate Banking Committee. John H. Sharon is a law partner of Clark M. Clifford, one of President Johnson's closest advisors.

But Manny Cohen is not without powerful support of his own. It was the President him-

self who in his consumer message early this year gave Congress a mandate to do something about "unnecessarily high" mutual fund charges. His description was an echo of the "excessive" label the SEC pinned on them in its report of last December. "The name of the game," says Manny Cohen, "is whether the consumer gets a fair shake."

Of course, much of the mutual fund industry sees things differently. The issue to these fundmen is how far the Government should go in telling them how to price their product.

Nevertheless, Cohen's battle cry has struck a resonant note among some legislators who—lacking countervailing pressures of one kind or another—seem to feel that God must love consumers because he made so many of them. In the end, mutual fund sales charges (up to 9%) and management fees (up to 50 cents per \$100 of assets per year) are all but certain to come down. That the mutual fund industry is getting this kind of pressure is a perverse tribute to its truly incredible growth.

WORTH FIGHTING OVER

When the Investment Company Act was passed back in 1940, fewer than 300,000 Americans owned mutual fund shares. There are now a dozen times that many, at upward of 3.5 million; and most people in the industry feel that the saturation point is still a long way off. Over a quarter-century ago, mutual fund net assets stood at a mere \$450 million. They are now 100 times as great, at \$45 billion.

The dynamics of that growth, much of which reflects hard selling rather than inspired portfolio management, has raised such prickly questions as those enumerated in the box on p. 42. (Sample: What has been the funds' impact on stock prices? For the moment, the SEC is playing a waiting and watching game on them. Prudently and in good Machiavellian fashion, the SEC limited its current legislative push primarily to the charges paid by the buyer of mutual funds—that is, the consumer. In that way it avoided the danger of attacking on so many fronts that the industry's Nassers and King Husseins are pushed into joining forces.)

The sums involved are not trifling. Last year mutual fund shareholders shelled out about \$140 million in advisory fees and about \$300 million in sales loads, besides footing the bill for about \$200 million in brokerage commissions. What have they been getting for their money?

In general, says the SEC tactfully, the industry "can be justly proud" of the record. But it contends that shareholders need "additional protection . . . in areas which were either unanticipated or of secondary importance in 1940," notably, "excessive costs in the acquisition and management of their investments."

Tactically, the industry, like the Arabs vis-à-vis Israel, is presenting a united front. Francis S. Williams, chairman of the Investment Company Institute, contends that the Congress ought not to legislate "an all-pervasive system of governmental controls over prices and profits" that might wind up hurting not only mutual fund managers but investors as well. But, also like the Arabs, the funds are not as united as they say they are. The "doves" in the industry think that limited accommodation is a good idea. "If the SEC doesn't get what it wants this year," says one moderate, "it will be back again next year. They can throw a lot of mud around, and the publicity is not going to help sales." But industry hawks are holding out for the status quo.

Who's going to win? At the moment, the mutual funders feel pretty cocky. The Senate hearings are ending on a fairly inconclusive note, and the chances are strong that the House of Representatives' Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee won't get around to hearings until early next year (see box, p. 54).

But the talk in Congress is that there will be some kind of mutual fund bill next year. Few government agencies have a higher reputation than the SEC, and Manny Cohen is a shrewd lobbyist for causes he believes in. His talk of "compromise," moreover, is a good tactic; it leaves the mutual funders looking like reactionaries standing against progress.

The bill the Sparkman committee is airing would amend the Investment Company Act to:

Reduce sales charges from the currently permissible maximum of 9% of the amount invested to a ceiling of 4.5%;

Outlaw entirely the "front-end load" on long term "contractual" monthly investment plans, where sales commissions typically absorb 50% of an investor's first-year payments; and

Expressly state that advisory fees must measure up to a judicially enforceable standard of reasonableness.

GROW AND GET RICH

Though the SEC claims it is not trying to force any basic changes in the industry's structure, it maintains that there is "a conflict of interest between mutual fund managers and shareholders." "There is a bias in the industry," says Manny Cohen, "that we're trying to mitigate in favor of the investor without changing the funds' traditional shape."

All mutual funds are owned by their shareholders, but in reality they are controlled by separate entities that by contract provide them with investment advice and managerial services. Many funds have still another umbilical cord tying them to a sales organization that wholesales (or "underwrites") their shares to broker-dealers around the country. All three companies often have officers and directors in common.

At the moment, it is the sales function more than the investment function that is worrying the SEC. None of the sales charge—typically 8.5% of the offering price, which is equal to 9.3% of the amount actually invested—goes to work for the investor. It gets whacked up among the principal underwriter (from 0.5% to 2.5%) and retail dealers, who usually split their end (6% to 8%) with the salesman who brings in the business.

All of the funds battle for new business, but the distribution system is such that only those with "captive" sales forces such as Investors Diversified Services, the biggest complex in the industry, compete directly for the favor of individual investors. The others—they hold 60% of total fund assets—are out there jostling for the attention of broker-dealers. Given a wide variety of merchandise to choose from, the dealer looks for incentive. He is a merchant and wants, not unnaturally, to push the merchandise that gives him the best markup. Increasingly, then, the result has been what Edward S. Herman, associate professor of finance at the Wharton School, calls "perverse price competition"—that is, the broker-dealer tends to prefer and his salesmen tend to push the funds which reward them most and which cost the consumer the most in sales charges.

PRICE TO PAY

The results of those pressures show in an SEC survey of 30 of the biggest funds, ranging alphabetically from Affiliated to Wellington. In 1950 half of the 30 charged a load of 7.5% or less, while only seven levied 8.5% or more. By last year, the ratio had flip-flopped: Only seven of the funds were getting 7.5% or less, and 18 were getting 8.5% or more. And not only was the total load growing: Many funds were giving dealers a much bigger slice of this bigger pie.

For example, while Eaton & Howard Balanced Fund jacked up its sales commission by 25%, the dealer "concession" climbed by almost 42%. Chemical Fund and Colonial Growth & Energy each raised their loads 13.3%, but the dealers' gross take expanded by 30%.

Sales charges are the biggest cost fund investors have to shoulder. The SEC report maintained that they are, by any standard of comparison, much too high. Its argument: \$200 put into a fund at an 8.5% load, for example, costs 40% more than a purchase and sale of like size in a listed stock trading at \$40 a share, the then average price of a Big Board stock. Since a mutual fund load remains constant until the first "break point"—usually \$12,500, when it drops to 7.5%—while stock exchange commissions fall at a much faster progressive rate, the disparity increases with the increase in the amount of money involved. Thus the government agency calculates that a \$4,000 fund purchase costs 4.76 times the two-way commission on a round-trip stock exchange transaction.

Even on a \$260,000 order, when the load has dropped to 2.6%, it still costs almost one-third more to buy a fund than a listed stock. Not until the \$1-million break point is reached does the typical fund charge fall below the comparable stock exchange commission. Moreover, besides the sales charges, the mutual fund buyer must also pay, indirectly, the brokerage charges on the stock transactions of the fund.

The fund industry argues that interfering with its commission structure would seriously slow its sales efforts. While Manny Cohen does not say so directly, he leaves little doubt that he feels this might not be a bad idea. The SEC suspects that some of the mutual fund industry's growth has been forced growth, and that the high commission scale has led dealers to push investors who might be better off in other securities into funds.

Because commissions are so much higher on fund shares, salesmen certainly have a powerful incentive to push them rather than other securities. Registration figures suggest that there is one salesman in the field for every 70 mutual fund shareholders, a ratio that Manny Cohen maintains is the mark of "an inefficient, oversized distribution system." By Cohen's estimate, "up to 70%" of these salesmen are part-timers, and turnover is high.

LOSING CONTRACT

That pattern is endemic on the "contractual" side of the business, where the salesman's appetite is whetted by the "front-end load"—which is usually 50% of the first-year payments.

Profiled statistically, the typical contractual plan holder willing to put \$10 a month and up into a ten- to 15-year investment plan is a married white-collar or blue-collar worker with three dependents and a high school education. He makes between \$5,000 and \$10,000 a year, and carries life insurance coverage of between \$10,000 and \$15,000. However, one out of four carries less than \$5,000 worth of life insurance or none at all. And one out of ten (according to a Wharton School study made for the SEC) had no liquid assets whatever, such as a savings account, savings bonds or other securities.

When such an investor gets in a financial bind and has to terminate his plan or let his payments lapse after the first year, he has in effect laid out commissions equal to the money that is working for him. The sales bite becomes progressively less as the plan nears completion—the "penalty" provisions, of course, being theoretically designed to goad him into keeping up his payments.

But even the contractual plan holder who makes it to the ten-year mark will not do as well as if he had chosen a "level load" (equal commissions taken out of each installment) voluntary program. The reason: On average, only 87% of his payments have been working for him over the life of the plan. In a long-term rising market, this can make a substantial difference.

Statistics supplied to the SEC by four big contractual companies make it plain that

the problem is far from theoretical. About one-half of the ten- and 12-year plans they sold in 1951 and 1953 never got beyond the first year's installments; one-fourth to two-fifths did not get beyond the first three years; and in the case of one company, only 22% of the contracts were fully paid up.

"Many of these persons," Cohen told the Sparkman committee, "paid sales loads of more than 25 cents, 50 cents and \$1 for every \$1 invested in fund shares." Cohen contends that sales charges of that kind, except for the sanction granted them by the Investment Company Act as currently written, would be "unconscionable or grossly excessive."

NO SHARING?

Despite the obvious pitfalls of contractual plans, which in recent years have generated less than 10% of the funds' net capital inflow, more and more fund managers have begun to offer them. The reason, says the SEC, is the fund managers' natural desire for more assets that will yield more management fees.

With the growth of the fund industry, both the management fees and the profits therefrom have soared. Between 1961 and 1964, Cohen told the Senate committee, Dreyfus Corp.'s advisory fees almost tripled to \$3.4 million, thanks to the impressive growth of the Dreyfus Fund. But operating costs increased only 80%. The principle is clear: It does not cost ten times as much to run a \$1-billion fund as it does a \$100-million fund. The SEC's plaint is that few of these economies have trickled down to fund stockholders—though it is true that some management firms, moved by a flurry of about 50 stockholder suits that followed issuance of the Wharton School report in 1962, did scale down their fees somewhat. Investors Mutual, for instance, cut its fee from 0.5% to 0.37%. But many funds still hold the line at or near 0.5%.

To suggest what is "reasonable," the SEC has seized on the few internally managed funds such as Massachusetts Investors Trust and Massachusetts Investors Growth Stock Fund as a yardstick. These are funds that hire no management adviser, but set up their own staffs and manage their own portfolios. The two Massachusetts funds paid their five trustee-directors an average of nearly \$450,000 each last year, so that it can't be said that the management is suffering. Still, MIT's management cost was only 0.19% of assets last year, the Growth fund's charge was only 0.35%. So, says Cohen, the higher charges are difficult to justify. Moreover, he claims, "The very same investment advisers who charged their multi-million-dollar fund clients in the neighborhood of 0.5% often charged their nonfund clients [with portfolios of only \$1 million to \$2 million] substantially less."

FROM THE OTHER SIDE

To all this, the industry makes a simple rebuttal: The SEC has not made its case in either economics or equity and is pillorying fund managers because it feels they are "making too much money." The industry contends that in matching fund sales charges against stock exchange commission rates, the SEC is trying to compare apples and oranges. A fund share represents a diversified group of securities which, if bought individually in small lots, would cost an investor a good deal more than the funds' 8.5% load.

By extension, the industry also maintains that the SEC ignores the fact that mutual funds are not merchandised in the same way as listed or over-the-counter stocks. "Individual securities," says Chairman John R. Haire of Anchor Corp., which manages more than \$1.8 billion of fund assets, "are sold by securities salesmen over the telephone to existing customers. This permits a high-volume, low-cost-per-transaction form of distribution."

But mutual funds, he continues, "require considerable explanation" and "time-consuming, face-to-face interviews in which the salesman must seek out and educate the

customer." The average salesman, Haire maintains, puts in about 19 hours per sale. His point: that the load has to be high to compensate the salesman for the prospects who got away. Signing up the prospect, the industry contends, is a highly competitive affair, no matter how much the SEC argues that competition has benefited the broker-dealer rather than the investor.

BATTLE OF THE FIGURES

In some ways, the debate between the SEC and the funds has become as stylized as a ballet, only using statistics instead of steps. Thus, to the SEC contention that commission rates have been climbing, the industry argues that the average commission on total industry sales has declined from 7% to 5.73% since 1956.

Much of the drop apparently reflects discounts on quantity purchases, though some 170 major funds do not reduce commissions on orders of less than \$10,000; and since the median fund purchase is \$1,240, the average purchaser has gotten little benefit from this reduction.

The industry has reserved some of its hottest fire for the "magic" 5% to which the SEC wants sales loads cut. The funds maintain that the figure was pulled out of thin air without any "economic data" to support it. What the funds appear to mean by "economic data" is a study of what impact almost halving the load would have on their own sales and broker-dealer profit margins.

A recent study by the National Association of Securities Dealers indicates that the proposed cut in the load would either force small broker-dealer firms (those with gross income of less than \$2.5 million) into the red, or roll back their net profits by "more than half." The income sheets of larger firms (gross income of \$2.5 million or more), however, would take a cut of only 8%. All of those figures assume not only a rollback on the load, but an SEC crack-down on customer-directed "give-ups"—portfolio brokerage commissions parceled out by fund managers to broker-dealers as additional compensation for the sale of fund shares, or other services.

HOW MIDDLE?

Cohen won't get everything he has asked for—nor does he expect to. Senator Sparkman has already voiced approval of a proposal that would insert a third force between the mutual fund industry and the SEC. This role would be played by the NASD, the trade group that polices the over-the-counter market under SEC supervision. The NASD has suggested that it might be willing to make an "economic study" of fund loads and perhaps offer an alternative to the SEC's suggested 5%.

There might be still other areas of potential compromise on front-end loads and management fees. The former, for example, might turn on a combination of a load spread over several years and a more liberal refund policy for drop-outs. Management fees might end up directly under SEC jurisdiction—with appropriate guide lines—rather than in the province of the courts.

Manny Cohen concedes that his proposals may very well put some broker-dealers out of business, but he argues that "no one has a vested right to sell mutual funds." He adds, "These people do a lot of talking about profit margins, but nobody talks about the customer."

But, when Manny Cohen says he's not trying to change the structure of the mutual fund industry, that he's merely trying to bring down costs to consumers, he's not quite telling the whole story. By reducing sales incentives, he is well aware that he will put at least a minor crimp in the industry's growth. He's not doing so out of malice, but because he and his aides think that high commissions have produced a certain amount

of hot-house growth that's good neither for the investor nor for the long-range interests of the securities industry.

By what right does the SEC tell an industry what to charge for its services? The Investment Company Act already gives it the power to ban "unconscionable or grossly excessive" sales charges, but since the Act also permits loads of 9%, that power is academic. Cohen is attempting to change the numbers, but is hardly establishing a new principle.

Can the mutual funds compromise? Says Cohen: "All legislation is a compromise. Everything that comes out of the Commission is a compromise." But when he says compromise, he means on numbers, not on his basic position—which is that the costs of buying and owning mutual funds must come down, way down.

[From *Forbes* magazine, Aug. 15, 1967]

JUST THE BEGINNING OF THE CRUNCH?

The SEC has been studying the mutual funds in depth for almost a decade now, but there are two major questions for which it does not pretend to have the answers—investment company impact on stock prices and the funds' potential for controlling companies in which they invest. These questions are, at bottom, far more important to the economy than fund commissions and fees.

Both questions are part of a much bigger ball of wax—the rate at which the funds and other institutional investors (pension funds, insurance companies and the like) have been gobbling up common stocks. The institutions have been able to attract new money at such a velocity that they now account for almost one-third of the trading volume on the New York Stock Exchange.

The mutual funds are the swingers. On balance, they deal in bigger blocks of stock and tend to move in and out of the market much more rapidly than other institutional investors. Consequently, the funds' portfolio turnover rates average out at more than twice those of noninsured private pension funds and almost three times those of property and casualty insurance companies.

The funds, of course, are sold as long-term investments, but lately the emphasis, perhaps as a result of some of the unfavorable publicity that has come out of the SEC studies, has shifted to short-swing "performance" (*FORBES*, June 15).

Yet the relationship between the amount of trading a fund does and how well it does for stockholders is a tenuous one. The Manhattan Fund in the first six months of this year, for instance, showed a portfolio turnover of 140% and an increase of net asset value per share of 20.7%. Rowe Price New Horizons Fund, on the other hand, reported a 10.5% turnover and a 47% increase in net asset value per share.

Brokerage on portfolio trades costs the mutual fund shareholder money. Because of the peculiar economics of the business, however, brokerage can make money for the mutual fund manager. By way of the customer-directed give-up—which the SEC hopes to eliminate—the manager can parcel out brokerage commissions to dealers as an additional form of sales incentive. They are called aptly, *reciprocals*. The faster a portfolio turns over, the more commission it generates. The greater the sales incentive, the greater the rate at which fund sales and assets—and advisory fees—expand.

Further, because the funds buy big and sell big—and not infrequently arrive at the same investment decisions at the same time—they can have a decided effect on the market. For instance, Walter Frank, former chairman of the New York Stock Exchange and one of Wall Street's most respected specialists, remembers when Motorola was trading at around 184 last year. When a fund moved into the sell side of the market, the stock was pushed to 175 and then "quickly went down to 159."

On the up side, Frank recalls the time that "a fund went into Xerox while it was selling at 250 a share. Their tremendous demand," he told a seminar at the University of Pennsylvania early this year, "forced the price of the stock up some 10% or 12%, to a completion of the order at 280."

Moves of that kind on a series of closely related trades are really not consistent with what the stock exchange likes to think of as a continuous auction market. That, apparently, was what William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, had in mind last May when he warned that short-swing institutional trading was beginning to take on some of the "poisonous qualities reminiscent in some respects of the old pool operations of the 1920's"—when insiders sold back and forth to each other, until the resulting activity and apparent rise in price attracted outsiders on whom the shares could be unloaded.

The weight of the institutions in the market will continue to grow. Short of urging a continuing watch on "this new cult of short-run market performance," Martin had no therapeutic suggestions. Neither, at this point does the SEC. But Cohen thinks cutting fund fees may also help to ease strains on the securities markets.

Equally imponderable, given the growing amount of leverage the institutions exert on the stock market, is the question of their relationship with the companies they invest in. The mutual funds—and other institutions—make a fetish of diversification. But on a cumulative basis, they tend to concentrate their bets.

The SEC report pointed out, for instance, that the funds own 10.5% of Xerox, 17.9% of International Telephone and 20.3% of Columbia Broadcasting. The Puritan Fund's vote swung the outcome in the proxy fight for control of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. In other instances, the funds have had an important voice in portfolio companies' approach to financing, dividend distributions and mergers. How much leeway the institutions should be permitted is still a long way from resolution.

Congress is going to hear a lot about mutual funds over the next few years.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS SUPPORTS \$450 MILLION FOR CLEAN WATER

Mr. MUCKIE. Mr. President, this year the administration requested, and the House approved, a budget request of \$203 million for the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to assist States and communities in constructing waste treatment facilities. I believe this amount grossly underestimates both the need and the demand for sewage treatment facilities throughout the Nation.

Last year the Congress made a substantial commitment to these States and communities by authorizing a total of \$3.4 billion to be spent over the next 4 years for the construction grants program; \$459 million was authorized for fiscal 1968. In response to the July 1, 1967, deadline for filing water quality standards and to the lifting of old dollar limitations on grants, States have been preparing and submitting applications at an extraordinary rate. I am distressed at the potential effects which the failure of the Federal Government to appropriate the full \$450 million might have on these States and communities. I believe the Senate has a responsibility to meet this commitment by voting to ap-

appropriate the full amount authorized by last year's Clean Water Restoration Act.

Mr. President, I was delighted to read in the August 7 edition of the Washington Post a letter to the editor from Mrs. Julia D. Stuart, President of the U.S. League of Women Voters, urging the Senate Appropriations Committee to recommend the full \$450 million for the construction grants program. Mrs. Stuart's concern parallels my own, and her letter is well worth reading. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

FINANCING CLEAN WATER

The League of Women Voters of the United States hopes that the Senate Appropriations Committee will recommend appropriation of \$450 million for the Federal sewage treatment facility grant program in FY 1967, the amount authorized by the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

Everyone—the Congress, the President, the Budget Bureau, and the public—knows that pollution of U.S. rivers must be reversed. But words, promises, even standards will not make the water cleaner. The most direct way toward stream improvement is to cut down on the wastes discharged into the water. Federal money is needed to accomplish this cut back in sewage discharge.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 called for setting standards of water quality for interstate streams. States have spent time and effort in establishing criteria that, if met, will result in water quality suitable for the use desired for each section of the stream. Everyone knows that many towns and cities must install or upgrade sewage treatment before these standards can be met.

State agencies, city officials, even the local public know by name the cities that offend and must spend. Applications for Federal assistance far beyond the amount of money available have always come in from municipalities. Standard setting, which has made it clear that more municipalities must spend more money for improved waste treatment, clearly will bring an avalanche of requests for needed Federal help.

And Congress has offered that help, more help than ever before, in the Clean Water Restoration Act. Removing the dollar ceiling on Federal grants-in-aid for municipal treatment facility construction, offering 40 per cent help if the state puts up 30 per cent, offering 50 per cent Federal aid if the state, in addition to putting in its money, set standards for the receiving waters—these are the inducements offered to encourage investment of state monies and establishment of intrastate stream standards. But how inadequately financed these offers will be unless the Senate appropriates \$450 million!

Having removed the dollar ceiling, having offered a larger per cent of project cost in Federal aid, having required standards that enhance water quality, will \$50 million more than the appropriation for FY 1966 be enough for FY 1967? The League of Women Voters of the United States thinks not. We think it will not do what Congress knows must be done. We think it will not bring the states to make the effort that Congress has preferred to encourage by assistance rather than require by enforcement. We know it will not satisfy the public, particularly the ever-growing number of citizens who have been working for local, state, and Federal investment for clean water.

Federal funds appropriated for treatment facility construction and not obligated this year will be available for later use. In a program where many arrangements must be fitted together on many levels of government,

it is important to have money in the pipeline. Municipal wastes must receive a higher degree of treatment. The Senate Appropriations Committee can make the Water Quality Act and the Clean Water Restoration Act function in reducing sewage discharges if the Committee puts enough money behind the promises in these Acts. This we hope the Committee will do.

OCEANOLOGIC ATTAINMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in the burgeoning oceanologic attainment of this country, it is my hope that a larger and larger share of the activity will be carried out by U.S. industry. At present, the lion's share of both applied and basic research in the family of sciences that comprise oceanology is Government funded. Those of us who see a profitable future for the United States in developing the marine resources believe strongly that private enterprise should emerge before long as the prime mover in both applied research and developmental activity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article entitled "Room at the Bottom: Top U.S. Firms Plunge To Reap in the Deep," published in the August issue of the magazine, *Finance*, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ROOM AT THE BOTTOM: TOP U.S. FIRMS PLUNGE TO REAP IN THE DEEP

Oceanography is the new glamour frontier of American business. The undersea environment is mysterious and hostile, but its profits potential has induced a dozen major firms to plunge in and 600 other companies to dip a toe in the water.

Development is about where it was in outer space 10 years ago, with the Government giving increasing support to research and exploration. Although expenditures are unlikely to be as great as on space, they add up to a booming market conservatively estimated at \$3-billion annually. Robert L. Clark, a vice president and senior analyst at Hayden, Stone & Co., a conservative Wall Street investment banking house, says annual volume could well reach \$5-billion by 1975.

Only about 28 per cent of the earth's surface is land. This supports approximately 3.3 billion people, a number expected to triple in the next century. By then, agronomists say that the land, much of which is desert, will not be able to feed that vast a population. By then, too, economists predict, machines and the energy which drives them will have seriously depleted mineral and chemical resources.

Undismayed, scientists point to the ocean as an almost limitless source of food and mineral-chemical riches. Of 92 natural elements, 12 are concentrated in the sea, although only six are being extracted. If the water could be desalinated, there would be enough to moisten all of earth's arid wastes. The scientists speak hopefully of fish protein and new medicines to help the needy.

Thirty-two Federal agencies are concerned with aspects of ocean activity. The Department of Commerce has its Environmental Science Services Administration; Interior has the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The National Science Foundation and the Atomic Energy Commission have projects. In 1958, the Government spent \$20-million on ocean research; this year, almost half a billion is budgeted. Uncle Sam's interest is wide and diversified.

The ocean is a world system. The Gulf

Stream and the Atlantic Drift flow past eight countries. Salmon caught off Japan are spawned in the United States and Russia. What happens in one part of the ocean is closely related to events thousands of miles away.

Scientists pool their information, but not all aspects of ocean use and exploration are cooperative. International law is indefinite on boundaries and realms of control. There is a long history of conflict among fishermen. Offshore limits do not apply. The U.S. has sold old leases 100 miles out. Peru is demanding a 200-mile fishing limit. Currently, the U.S. and Russia are vying for world leadership in oceanography.

U.S. Government exploration is spearheaded by the Navy, under the direction of Rear Admiral O. D. Waters, who is the Navy's first official oceanographer.

While much of the Navy's research is military, Admiral Waters says the emphasis is on education and instrumentation. Any information of value is made available to industry. Through predictions of water temperatures at specific spots, the Navy has helped increase the U.S. fish catch fourfold. The annual U.S. per capita use of fish (63.5 pounds in 1964) is the world's highest, but the figure includes vast amounts that are consumed as pet food and fish meal that is fed to livestock.

The fish marketer must contend with established consumer preferences and prejudices. The bottom fell out of a thriving market in "sea steak" when consumers learned that it was squid. Certain forms of kelp and seaweed, delicacies in Asia, are not acceptable to Western palates. A nutritious gray tuna, plentiful off Africa, can't be sold in the U.S. because Americans have been educated to eat only white tuna.

But there is progress. Recently, after long deliberation, the Food and Drug Administration approved the controlled use of fish protein concentrate, a tasteless food additive that supplies a child's protein requirement for a penny a day.

The first commercial attention to undersea possibilities was focused by the oil industry, and most present explorations are directed toward mineral recovery. One fortunate venture was the mining of millions in alluvial diamonds off South Africa. There have been notable coups in the salvaging of sunken treasure from old Spanish ships off Florida.

The sea is difficult to understand and difficult to use, but oceanographers are compiling blocks of knowledge that will help business build the ocean market. The extent of marine life is enormous and diverse. Almost every expedition turns up new plants and sea creatures, and in the discoveries researchers see great medical possibilities.

But working in the sea is hazardous and unsatisfactory. Instruments aren't always effective. Sonar is thrown off by whales and schools of fish. It is impossible to illuminate large areas in the murky depths. Corrosion and fouling of gear are great obstacles.

The Government is striving to coordinate existing programs and to establish new ones. Illustrative of the trend, a combination desalination and nuclear energy plant is projected for Huntington Beach, Calif.

Making sea water fresh, a simple task in the laboratory, is rapidly becoming practical for water-poor countries. The cost is now less than \$1 per 1,000 gallons.

Many companies are hazarding their own capital on undersea projects. W. R. Grace has a fish meal venture in Peru and is eyeing mineral extraction. Goodyear is developing mineral-resistant compounds. Westinghouse is keenly interested in economical sea water distillation plants and submersible vehicles. Republic and United States Steel produce high-strength steels designed for undersea use. Other firms are manufacturing submarine detection, acoustical, recording and communications equipment.

The Navy is stressing research in many non-military areas. High on the list is its Man-in-the-Sea program, which derived its initial thrust from the loss of the submarine Thresher. Of equal interest are its Sealab experiments, testing man's ability to live in a submarine environment, and its Deep Submergence Vehicles program, from which much experience was gleaned in the recovery of the lost H-bomb off Spain.

STRANGE-LOOKING SUBMERSIBLES

Naval projects have attracted a number of companies from the space program. Cashing in on their ability to build vehicles that withstand a hostile environment, they have produced an assortment of strange-looking submersibles.

Union Carbide and General Precision Instrument have a joint venture, Ocean Systems, which is writing history on the ocean floor. Lockheed Missiles & Space built a 50-ton underwater laboratory that can take four men down 8,000 feet and stay 48 hours. The Link-Perry Cubmarine, conceived for sport, has been converted to a research craft. Grumman and General Dynamics have built fleets of submersibles and more are on the drawing boards. General Motors and North American Rockwell are blazing new submarine trails. Their machines core the ocean's floor and have mechanical arms that lift 50 pounds.

Says Ocean Systems' president, Arthur C. Smith: "Routine deep diving to below 400 feet today is impressive evidence of our technological growth. We believe we can gain access to the world's continental shelves at depths up to 1,000 feet—and thereby open up a new area equal to the continent of Africa."

AMERICAN MOTORS HAS DONE MUCH FOR THE UNITED STATES; DESERVES HELP NOW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, few Members of Congress or the public realize the remarkable contribution that American Motors has made over the years to our economy, to competition in the automobile business, and to the financial support of our Federal Government.

American Motors is the only surviving competitor of the big three automotive giants. As such it has provided a lion's share of the innovations in the industry, including the compact car, many engineering changes, and a vigorous competition with overseas automobiles. Although American Motors does only about 3 percent of domestic automotive business, it sells 18 percent of American cars that are sold overseas.

It also greatly helps our balance of payments by competing far more effectively both in price and size with imported foreign automobiles.

And the American consumer found reason to bless this hard-hitting fourth competitor earlier this year when it announced a 10-percent price cut that went far to keep auto prices generally down.

In the last 5 years American motors has paid more than \$400,000,000 in tax revenues to the Federal Government.

Now Senator NELSON, Congressman REUSS, and I have introduced a bill to provide a modest but essential amount of relief to this company that has an excellent chance to continue to compete, but obviously needs working capital help and needs it now.

I ask unanimous consent that a fine, concise editorial on the American Motors

need for this assistance be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

AMERICAN MOTORS NEEDS HELP

There can be little doubt that American Motors is in dire straits. On one side, it is appealing to the public for help in the form of a tax break. On the other side, it is appealing to its employees for help by foregoing any wage or fringe benefit increases for the next two years, other than cost of living increases.

Wisconsin Sens. Proxmire and Nelson and Rep. Reuss have introduced legislation to amend the tax laws so that American Motors can get a \$20 million tax refund at once. That money is urgently needed now to see AM survive. If the law is not amended, AM could still get the \$20 million refund, except that it would be a couple of years hence when it might very well be too late to do any good.

Even with the tax break, it appears that AM's fate will depend on how the members of the United Auto Workers react to the company's plea to forgo wage and fringe benefit increases.

If both congress, acting for the taxpaying public and the employees, through their union, co-operate, then American Motors would appear to have a good fighting chance to get back in the thick of the automotive industry competition.

All of Wisconsin must pull for AM to emerge from its straits stronger than ever, for if it were not to, it would be an economic disaster equivalent to several Detroit riots.

SOME POSITIVE SUCCESSES IN CREATIVE FEDERALISM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in the wake of the news of the past few weeks, it is not easy for one who has pressed vigorously for many years for a more creative federalism and for improved intergovernmental relations to speak with optimism.

I would be less than candid if I did not say that a vast new effort has got to be made in planning and rehabilitation in our core cities and in deteriorating rural centers. The model cities program, and the recent agreement between the Departments of Housing and Urban Development and Health, Education, and Welfare, to coordinate their resources, must be augmented with greater funding and more effective administration—not just at the Federal level, but by greater initiative among the State legislatures, greater coordination of resources by State executives, and more enlightened ghetto-assisted action by local authorities. It has to be a joint approach, and the experience of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations indicates that such joint action is beginning to move ahead—however slowly.

At the same time, Mr. President, I think that in these days a little accentuation of the positive may be heartening to those who are concerned about the future of American federalism.

Some of this is reflected in the 10 outstanding awards and 16 meritorious awards made by HUD at the recent National Association of Counties Conference. I ask unanimous consent that the press release from HUD describing these awards be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press re-

lease was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUD CITES 26 FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL AWARDS

Twenty-six public bodies and agencies were cited today for Urban Development Intergovernmental Awards by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Announcement of the 10 Outstanding Awards and 16 Meritorious Awards was made today at the National Association of Counties conference in Detroit, Mich.

Among the activities that won special awards for efforts to promote cooperation across intergovernmental lines were: opening up of an entire metropolitan labor market area for a city's unemployed (Oakland, Calif.); combining city, county, and school library services to provide better library service for all (Alice, Texas); and development of a study course in law enforcement instruction for high school students (Des Moines, Iowa). Other activities included manpower, regional and local planning, transportation, and health, education, and school services.

Selected from 96 entries, the award-winning public bodies represent a wide variety of governmental units from 20 different States, ranging from county boards to large, complex State departments. Outstanding award winners are:

City of Oakland, Calif., for its coordination of manpower activities and long term development plans with State and Federal agencies.

City of Des Moines, Iowa, for its "Science of Law Enforcement and Police Procedures" course for high school students.

Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, for development and approval of its "master plan" for a regional mass transportation system.

Wayne County, Board of Supervisors, Mich., for accomplishments in health services to low-income school children, air pollution, and inter-municipal police services.

New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, for its technical assistance program to help communities applying for and working with Federally aided programs, including Model Cities.

Joint Legislative Committee on Metropolitan and Regional Areas Study, New York State Legislature, for legislative proposals strengthening county planning and financial incentives for joint facilities serving two or more communities.

Cleveland Association of Governmental Officials, Shelby, N.C., for its support of Neighborhood Youth Corps, Head Start, and community action programs.

University of Oklahoma, Urban and Community Development Center at Tulsa, for its work with governments on problems of metropolitan Tulsa.

City of Alice, Texas, for its work with Jim Wells County on areawide thoroughfare, library, and school district problems.

City of Norfolk, Va., for effective coordination of government efforts in establishing the Tidewater Rehabilitation Institute.

Commenting on the awards program, HUD Secretary Robert C. Weaver said, "One of the most talked-about topics in government today is intergovernmental cooperation. The quality and number of entries in this competition is concrete evidence that localities are taking action, not just talking, in this vital area."

"The units of government that submitted entries for HUD's Urban Development Intergovernmental Awards have recognized that the most efficient response to many demands for services from their citizens requires action that crosses jurisdictional lines. I congratulate all of these organizations on their courage and ingenuity."

Meritorious award winners are: Board of Commissioners, Madison County, Ala.; Maricopa Association of Governments, Phoenix,

Ariz.; Association of Bay Area Governments, Calif.; League of California Cities; City of Ontario, Calif.; City of North Miami, Fla.; Board of Commissioners, Clarke County, Ga.; City of Pomona, Calif.;

Also, Shawnee Development Council, Karnak, Ill.; City of Detroit, Mich.; Office of State and Regional Planning and Community Development, State of Missouri; City of Greensboro, N.C.; Philadelphia Port Corporation, Philadelphia, Pa.; Tocks Island Regional Advisory Council, Stroudsburg, Pa.; South Carolina State Development Board; City of Alexandria, Va.

Details of the Outstanding Awards are:

City of Oakland, Calif., for its coordination of manpower activities and long term development plans with State and Federal agencies. The city formed the Oakland Manpower Commission in January 1967, to promote effective use and coordination of governmental manpower and employment activities. It involves all levels of government and cooperates with business, industry, and labor. As a result of its efforts, the California State Employment Service has made a major policy change to include the entire San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area labor market as a source of jobs for Oakland's unemployed.

In addition, an Oakland Model Cities Task Force was created in cooperation with other governmental units for cohesive planning in applying for a Model Cities grant, and for other local problem needs.

City of Des Moines, Iowa, for its pilot "Science of Law Enforcement and Police Procedures" course for high school students. The two-semester project is designed to acquaint high school students with the nature and design of law enforcement, practical application of police and court procedures, and the relationship of the Constitution and Law Enforcement. It was established in cooperation with the Des Moines Public Schools, using a Department of Justice grant.

Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, for development of its "master plan" for a regional mass transportation system involving 79 cities, towns, and State agencies. This plan, subsequently approved, proposes a \$369 million immediate action program of route extension and modernization of route stations, vehicles, shops, and related items.

Wayne County, Mich. Board of Supervisors, for accomplishments in health services to low-income school children, air pollution, and inter-municipal police services.

Working with the City of Detroit to create a county-wide health department serving a population of approximately 3 million, the Board had been instrumental in creating "PRESCAD," which provides comprehensive and continuing health care to Preschool, School age, and Adolescent children—particularly those of low-income families; and the Downriver Air Pollution Control Project, in cooperation with nine local communities, Wayne County, and the Federal government.

New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, for its technical assistance to communities. The Department was foreshadowed by the Governor's Task Force on Model Cities and Metropolitan Development whose major purpose was to decrease the information gap between State and Federal governments and the municipalities concerning Federal policies and programs, and to provide technical services. Among its activities are a conference on Model Cities for local officials; visits to 22 municipalities and counties to explain the programs in detail; preparing and circulating explanatory papers on the Model Cities application requirements; undertaking research on related State statutes; and distributing questionnaires and interviewing mayors on the role of the State in providing municipal technical assistance. As a result, many cities which otherwise might not have responded were encouraged to undertake at least some stages of planning.

Joint Legislative Committee on Metropolitan and Regional Areas Study, New York

State Legislature, for legislative proposals strengthening county planning and financial incentives for joint facilities. One example is a law providing that towns, cities, and villages must submit zoning and other land use changes to the county planning agency for review if the proposed change affects land within 500 feet of any existing or proposed county or state road and other specific areas. The Committee also sponsored a bill to provide State grants, subject to county approval, concerning the full cost of feasibility studies by two or more municipalities wishing to provide a joint facility or service.

Cleveland Association of Government Officials, Shelby, N.C., for its support of Neighborhood Youth Corps, Head Start, and community action programs. The Association sponsored two Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs for 231 high school youths, Head Start Program for 600 children, and a Community Action Development program, as well as organizing the Cleveland County Community Action Committee, Inc., a community action agency. At CAGO's suggestion, the Community Action Committee developed a Family Improved Project, a program designed to deal with poverty families as a total family unit.

University of Oklahoma, Urban and Community Development Center at Tulsa, for its work with governments on Tulsa metropolitan problems. The university has developed a comprehensive program of community services for Tulsa. Various projects include city and university representation on the Tulsa Community Services and Continuing Education Advisory Council; assistance in preparing Tulsa's application for a Model Cities grant, development of a report on "Professors of the City: One Approach to Urban Problems"; conferences on venereal disease education, with the cooperation of the Oklahoma State Health Department and the U.S. Public Health Service; and a project sponsored by the University, the Tulsa City-County Health Department, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the U.S. Public Health Service for employing residents of hard-core poverty areas as medical aides.

City of Norfolk, Va., for effective coordination of government efforts in establishing the Tidewater Rehabilitation Institute, for children and adults, on a region-wide basis.

A non-profit corporation, the Tidewater Health Foundation planned and now operates the Institute under contract. It has joined its planning efforts with the Norfolk Area Medical Center Authority, a public body created by the Virginia General Assembly. In addition, the Norfolk Redevelopment and Housing Authority made land available for the Institute.

The State of Virginia, through its Departments of Health and Vocational Rehabilitation and the State organizations, provided assistance in developing planning services and physical space for the Institute. The coordination of these efforts by the City of Norfolk in establishing the Institute has significantly contributed to the improvement of treatment services.

Alice, Texas, for its work with Jim Wells County on areawide thoroughfare, library, and school district problems.

Several years ago, all of the city's streets were made part of the county road system. Because of the size of the Alice street system, it was unreasonable to expect the county to assume full maintenance and construction responsibility.

The Alice City Council and the Commissioner's Court formally approved an agreement defining responsibility in street maintenance. This agreement for joint maintenance and development of a major thoroughfare system between the city and the county, based on a Comprehensive Master Plan developed by local governmental units and private utility companies, is unique for Texas. It is being used as a model for proposed new

Texas legislation for joint governmental undertakings.

Two small cities near Alice had inadequate library staff, services, and books. The city and county cooperated with the Alice Independent School District to provide a joint library service with two branch libraries 20 miles from Alice, and the new central library was itself made possible by cooperation among the three governmental units. Alice administers the entire library program from its central facility, and also provides trained librarians for the "branch libraries." The county bears part of the operating cost for the three libraries.

A SALUTE TO CULVER MILITARY ACADEMY AND THE BLACK HORSE TROOP

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, there is a breed of men devoted to the horse and the high ideals of the equestrian life in its noblest tradition. Among the outstanding examples of this breed are the alumni of the Black Horse Troop, of Culver Military Academy, Culver, Ind.

More than 300 of the 2,800 living graduates of the Culver Black Horse Troop will gather on the shores of Lake Maxinkuckee August 17-20 in celebration of the 70th anniversary of the troop's founding in Culver Winter School and the 60th anniversary of the summer program. They will return from virtually every State in the Union and from as far away as the Philippines and England.

Theirs is a proud history. The Culver Black Horse Troop has appeared five times in Presidential inaugurations—twice for President Wilson and, more recently, for Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. In addition, this distinguished troop has performed countless times for the heads of foreign countries, military heroes, and the people of the Middle West.

But of greater importance, the men of the Culver Black Horse Troop have been taught by word and deed, honor, integrity, duty, patriotism, and compassion, by their instructors, who have been over the years almost without exception retired officers of the U.S. Army Cavalry. There is a psychological benefit and resulting discipline which is derived by the individual who rides horses that is missed in today's generations. The more than 150 young men ages 14 through 18 who comprise the Culver Black Horse Troop each academic year and each summer receive this training at the most formative period of their lives.

Culver is the last great stronghold in the United States of the glorious cavalry tradition. The Black Horse Troop is the largest equestrian unit in the country.

I salute the troop on its anniversary.

LET US SHOW THE WAY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I wonder if you and I and the rest of us here can really understand the frustration a disabled person in a wheelchair must feel when on the job, or at the theater, or during a visit to one of our national parks he is confronted by a door designed too narrow to allow him passage; or by a flight of steps with no ramp or elevator available; or by a corridor which turns just a little too sharply to allow him en-

try or exit—little things which could have been avoided by a little more thought on the part of the architect, little things requiring no additional money. It must be especially frustrating, Mr. President, to encounter unthoughtfulness and carelessness like this in a public building paid for by all the people and supposedly available to all the people.

We have a chance to insure that no such barriers will be built into our public buildings constructed with Federal funds in the future. The Committee on Public Works has completed hearings on my bill, S. 222, which would insure accessibility to the physically handicapped. Hopefully it will be reported favorably in the near future and gain speedy enactment. Without incurring any additional expense to the Government we can in this way help to eliminate many of the barriers to a more normal life which now confront the physically handicapped.

By taking steps to insure freedom of access to the disabled, the United States will be leading the way to a solution of a problem which also exists in other countries. The August 5 issue of the *Economist* reports a study published by the Disabled Living Activities Group of the Central Council for the Disabled, called "London for the Disabled." Written by Miss Freda Bruce Lockhart, the publication describes many situations similar to those in America which prevent the more normal functioning of a disadvantaged part of our population.

The article in the *Economist* states:

In her analysis of the accessibility of shops, hotels, restaurants, theatres, and so forth there is constant reference to deterrents such as lavatories down flights of steps, or with doors too small to close on a wheelchair. Planners have never given much thought to the disabled, and still do not.

The article further states:

A recently modernized shop, Miss Bruce Lockhart says, "is impossible for a disabled person (in a wheelchair) to enter unaided." The potential loss of custom from the disabled is infinitesimal, and presumably unimportant, but to the disabled every inaccessible place means another barrier to leading as normal a life as they can, and to which they have a right.

Mr. President, we shall have an opportunity when S. 222 comes to the floor to set a precedent for fair treatment of the physically handicapped the world over. It is a precedent of which the 90th Congress could be proud.

MAINE'S GOVERNOR CURTIS TOURS RIO GRANDE DO NORTE, BRAZIL

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, under the dynamic leadership of Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis, the State of Maine is now participating in the Partners program of the Alliance for Progress. Accompanied by six Maine citizens, who are leaders in their communities, Governor Curtis recently completed a 3-day visit to Maine's partner State of Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil.

Upon his return to Maine, Governor Curtis commented on his impressions of Rio Grande do Norte and the potential of the Partners program for fostering economic development and international understanding. 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:

STATEMENT BY GOV. KENNETH CURTIS, OF MAINE, MADE AT CONCLUSION OF HIS VISIT TO MAINE'S PARTNER STATE, RIO GRANDE DO NORTE

I have just returned from a three-day visit to Rio Grande do Norte, Maine's Partner under the Alliance for Progress.

This visit has been one of great historical significance to our Partners of the Alliance program—and in a large context, it has revealed to me three important concepts integral to international understanding, they are:

I

Geographical and historically Maine and Rio Grande do Norte have much in common. They are both in the Northeast areas of their countries, both relatively small states with populations under two million, both agricultural and fishing economies, and both populated with energetic, creative, deeply moral people who want to participate in the Alliance for Progress. The people of Maine recall with pride that Rio Grande do Norte played a vitally important role in World War II when the capital of Natal was a key ferry point for U.S. aircraft operations. Many Maine pilots passed through this airport. For this reason among others the two states feel particularly close, and are joining together for international progress.

II

I was accompanied to Rio Grande do Norte by six citizen-leaders of the state of Maine. Those in my party include Allan A. Rubin, President of the Gardner Shoe Co., and Chairman of the Maine Partners of the Alliance Committee; Dr. T. Hedley Reynolds, President of Bates College; Dr. Clement Hiebert, a prominent Portland "open-heart" surgeon who visited Latin America on the Hospital Ship HOPE; Dr. Robert Dow, Director of Research Maine Sea and Shore Fisheries Department; Kenneth E. Gray, chief photographer of the Agriculture Department who is making a documentary film of this historic visit; and Shep Lee, of Auburn, a businessman, and a member of the national board of the Small Business Administration.

These men are now travelling throughout Rio Grande do Norte with their counterpart Brazilian Partners committee to examine economic and cultural projects of mutual interest. Already projects in the fields of health; administration; education; agriculture; and business and industry have revealed surprising opportunities for mutual assistance. Foremost among the new projects is the agreement by Rio Grande do Norte Governor Walfredo Gurgel to visit Maine next April as the guest of the State of Maine where he personally will visit economic and cultural entities and private organizations of mutual interest. He will also lecture at Maine educational institutions; and will be awarded an honorary degree at Bates College.

III

I personally visited fifteen institutions of educational and social interests in Rio Grande do Norte. I was overwhelmed with the courtesy of the city people, the workers, the farmers, businessmen, educators, and the state administration. I was deeply touched, everywhere I went, by the zeal, enthusiasm, and intellect of students. In fact, at the John Kennedy School, in Natal, while making a brief speech, I was almost overrun by hundreds of boys and girls trying to shake my hand. This zeal, friendship and sincere hospitality has a special meaning for those active in international development.

I have concluded:

Our nation needs friends like these as never

before, and I am grateful for having a small part in the friendship development process.

I can say, without reservation, we need more, many, many more American leaders in every field of endeavor to visit Brazil not just as "camera-carrying" tourists, but as friends, counsellors, partners, to see the students in schools, the people in hospitals, industries, and the cultural organizations, in addition, to the natural beauty of this growing land; to learn from Brazilians; and, at the same time, to offer our own wisdom, experience and technical know-how to these fine, strong, generous people who are anxious and willing to join with us in positive efforts to engender growth and development under the Partners Program of the Alliance for Progress. It is people and people alone who through creative efforts build and better a nation. I urge all the people, of not only my own state, but those of all America, to join in this non-government private cooperation Partners program.

I commend and compliment those of the Partners of the Alliance for conceiving this unique development process. Fourteen states of Brazil are now partnered with 14 U.S. states with its potential of some one hundred million people. It is of vast scope involving masses of people at practically negligible cost to both governments. At the same time, it has in it powerful, creative seeds of economic and social growth germinating in the hearts and minds of men. It will yield rich fruits of progress, friendship and understanding between our nations in the years ahead.

GROWING SUPPORT FOR COOPERATIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on July 13, I introduced proposed legislation authorizing the U.S. Department of Agriculture to make available to officials and residents of the District of Columbia its pool of trained leadership in cooperative services for homes and youth. That bill (S. 2105) was also sponsored by Senators COOPER, HATFIELD, ROBERT KENNEDY, MCGOVERN, MONTOMY, and TYDINGS.

I have been delighted with the reaction engendered thus far by this important proposal. The tragic riots in several of our major cities in recent weeks have called the attention of all Americans to the many-faceted ills of our great urban centers. They have also called attention to this modest but important proposal; for S. 2105 is designed to demonstrate the tremendous contribution which 4-H type programs, long so successful in rural America, could make to the despairing, frustrated, and directionless residents of the ghetto.

Mr. President, radio station WMAL has recently editorialized its own support for legislation of this sort. The two-part editorial, broadcast on August 10 and 11, excellently points up the urgent need for the enactment of S. 2105. It also describes well the sort of activities this proposal envisions. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and a number of letters I have received from Minnesota and elsewhere regarding the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

[Broadcast by WMAL radio during the week of Aug. 6, 1967]

A 4-H FOR WASHINGTON

We salute the hundreds of teenagers who are cleaning up Washington's filthy streets

and alleys. We have only praise for Pride, Inc., the Labor Department-funded project that this week put nearly a thousand teenagers to work almost overnight. There may be those who say cleaning up filthy streets and alleys "lacks dignity." We believe such a meaningful community service demands respect. Pride, Inc. is well named.

This project is funded, however, for only five weeks. These hundreds of young people and others like them must continue to improve their communities and themselves, even when in school. Several Congressmen have introduced bills proposing an exciting solution. These bills would include the District in the 50-year-old national 4-H program. "4-H" stands for development of head, heart, hand and health. Tomorrow we will discuss what 4-H is and what the 4-H program can do for the young people of Washington.

[Broadcast by WMAL radio during the week of Aug. 6, 1967]

A 4-H FOR WASHINGTON—II

Congress should include Washington in the national 4-H program. 4-H will help ambitious young people, such as those now cleaning the city's streets and alleys in the Pride, Inc. project, to continue learning and doing. A national 4-H official says that, if Congress includes Washington, 25,000 District young people could be reached the first year. They would range in age from nine to nineteen.

Several Congressmen have introduced bills to include the District in the 50-year-old 4-H program. Though 4-H was founded for rural young people, programs now operate successfully in many cities. Some 40 projects have been planned to develop the heads, hearts, hands and health of young people of the inner city. Boys learn skills such as mechanics, electronics, woodworking, photography and landscaping. Projects for girls include sewing, child-care and cooking.

We urge Congress to pass legislation extending 4-H to Washington before the summer ends.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,

St. Paul, Minn., August 10, 1967.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: May I take this opportunity to express the appreciation of members of the University of Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service for informing us about the proposal to make Cooperative Extension Work available to the residents of the District of Columbia. Our experience thus far in working with young people in the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis and their suburbs leads us to believe that, properly organized and staffed, Extension Service programs could be of significant benefit to District of Columbia residents. We will follow with interest the progress of the proposal.

The introduction of S. 2105 carries with it the implication that Cooperative Extension work in the states and territories has made significant contributions to the economic and social well-being of residents of those areas. I am sure that I speak for others of the Minnesota Extension Staff as well as myself in expressing our appreciation for the evaluation which you must have made before introducing and supporting this new legislation. We hope that our efforts may continue to merit the confidence which you expressed in your remarks in the Senate.

As you suggested in your remarks, the Cooperative Extension Work of the University of Minnesota has had a long history of work in dealing with youth development, programs for farmers and others of the agricultural community, for homemakers, and assisting communities in dealing with local problems. I am reminded of Professor T. A. Erickson's

book in which he relates his 40 years of work with youth in Minnesota. As a county superintendent of schools in Douglas County, he and several other county superintendents organized boys and girls corn clubs and similar activities which were the beginning of 4-H club work in Minnesota as we know it today. From the beginning "Dad" Erickson, as he is affectionately known by all who came under his influence, focused his concern on the development of the boy and girl. While my knowledge of District of Columbia problems is exceedingly limited, I would speculate that one of the most significant contributions which a District Extension Service could provide would be in the development of boys and girls.

Sincerely,

ROLAND H. ABRAHAM,
Acting Director.

AGRICULTURE EXTENSION SERVICE,
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, Minn., August 8, 1967.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I endorse wholeheartedly your efforts to authorize the Department of Agriculture to make Federal Extension Service programs available to residents of the District of Columbia. The thoughts you expanded to the Senate members, as reported in the Congressional Record, is an excellent description of what the Federal Extension is and has been and what it can mean to the citizens of the Nation's Capital City.

Since the Capital City also has several institutions of higher learning, both public and private, there should develop a closer contact of these institutions with all the citizens of their area. It would seem that there should be few, if any, negative reactions to your proposal. The manner in which the programs of the Federal Extension Service have had the support from state and county governmental groups and other local agencies and associations does enable effective community development. The manner in which local people in counties throughout the United States view their county extension service as something that is "their program and service" is evidence of the value and confidence this public service has rendered during its lifetime.

I hope your proposal is enthusiastically received and becomes a reality in ways that will truly justify the effort you have spent in its behalf.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD C. PEDERSON,
Program Leader.

AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., August 3, 1967.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The American Home Economics Association was pleased to learn of your bill S. 2105, to establish the Cooperative Extension Service in the District of Columbia.

We have been concerned for a long time that 4-H Youth Development and Home Economics programs, which are available to the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, have not been available to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Home Economics Extension programs provide the homemakers with learning opportunities that make her a better citizen, as well as a wiser homemaker.

The program reflects the needs of contemporary living, with emphasis on the following areas of national concern: family stability, consumer competence, family health, family housing, and community improvement.

These educational programs are designed for specific audiences such as teenagers, young homemakers, handicapped homemakers, the elderly, residents in low-rent public housing projects, recipients of donated foods, families using food stamps, and members of Extension homemaker groups.

Young people have an opportunity for learning experiences through 4-H Youth Development. They grow and develop personally, they improve in their role as family members, they learn how to strengthen relationships with their peers and adults, and they develop a new appreciation for their neighborhoods and communities.

As an Association we are concerned for the well-being of individuals, the improvement of homes, and the preservation of values significant to home life.

We would like you to know that the 28,000 members of our Association strongly support the programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. We therefore endorse S. 2105 and offer you our assistance.

Sincerely,

MRS. HELEN J. MANDIGO,
President.

BENTON COUNTY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
Foley, Minn., August 3, 1967.

To: Senator MONDALE.

Thank you for the copy of your remarks concerning S. 2105. We in the Extension Service appreciate your interest and support for our work. I hope your proposal is accepted.

Sincerely,

BURTON OLSON,
Agricultural Agent.

NATIONAL 4-H SERVICE COMMITTEE, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., August 10, 1967.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We are tremendously excited about pending legislation proposing a Cooperative Extension Service in the District of Columbia, which will include educational efforts in 4-H youth development and home economics.

For many years we have been concerned about this gap in providing the benefits of 4-H and home economics to the residents of the District of Columbia. Your bill would solve this problem and bring to these people a program many of them have requested for years. I have every confidence that the combined knowledge base of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Howard University and other rich resources available would make this program a dramatic success.

Your bill is of great importance to the District of Columbia. This obviously must be the primary intent of the legislation. There are additional significant ramifications, however, which may interest your colleagues. If the bill is enacted, it will be the first time in history that the Cooperative Extension Service will have an opportunity to mount an intensive program in a congested urban area. Yes, it's true that some work has been done in urban areas in several states. This work, however, has been hampered by lack of resources. It has been felt that Smith-Lever funds were intended primarily for rural residents even if this Act does state "for the people of the United States". As a result, it was not deemed appropriate to channel these resources into urban areas at the expense of the rural program. I have always agreed with this philosophy. Now, however, the Cooperative Extension Service could move forward in the District of Columbia with a specific program designed for these people. It would be completely urban-oriented in design. The professional extension workers would be selected on the basis of their training and background to deal with this particular clientele. Likewise, the information and methodology would be specific for this group.

Assuming this legislation is enacted, a program is inaugurated and meets with success, it will prove enormously beneficial to the whole country. It would serve in effect as a model or pilot effort from which we could learn many things to help move this work forward in other urban areas throughout the country.

You are to be commended for your foresight in presenting this legislation. We hope it will be supported and enacted.

Sincerely,

NORMAN C. MINDRUM,
Director.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
August 10, 1967.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I would like to thank you for sending me a copy of your proposal to the United States Senate regarding the establishment of the Cooperative Extension Service in Washington, D.C. I am especially pleased that a senator from my state of Minnesota would feel strongly about the able contributions that the Cooperative Extension Service could make to education in our nation's capital.

I heartily agree that an active Extension Service operating in Washington, D.C. could have a profound effect on the educational growth of the residents of that city. I feel that in most areas of the United States the total effect of the Cooperative Extension Service on the urban clientele has not reached the proportions that would be possible. I know that right here in Minnesota we are deeply interested in expanding our service to urban people. I am sure the results will be a better educated citizenry, able to play a more active role in the growth of our country.

Congratulations on your fine proposal.

Yours truly,

PATRICK J. BORICH,
District Supervisor, County Extension
Work.

POPE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL
EXTENSION SERVICE,
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
Glenwood, Minn., August 4, 1967.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for your letter and copy of your proposal, S. 2105, which would make the services of the Cooperative Extension Service available to residents of the District of Columbia.

This is a praise worthy proposal. I have been an extension worker in Minnesota for four years. I am keenly aware of the efforts of the extension service to keep its services in tune with modern-day life.

Certainly this would be a rewarding relationship for the residents and the Cooperative Extension Service.

Congratulations for sponsoring the proposal.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. MORRIS,
County Agent.

WILKIN COUNTY AGRICULTURAL EX-
TENSION SERVICE, UNIVERSITY OF
MINNESOTA,
Breckenridge, Minn., August 4, 1967.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: It certainly pleases me to have received your letter of July 28. (Reference to the S. 2105 bill.) Pleases me because it is very important to include Washington, D.C., also because you and your colleagues recognize the many avenues of assistance that are available today through the Extension program.

The availability of knowledge through today's Extension program can be tapped from all segments of today's University staff plus many others that are qualified.

Certainly my desire is for S. 2105 bill to be approved.

We appreciate hearing from you Senator.

Sincerely,

GLEN R. CHAMBERS,
Agricultural Agent.

MARTIN COUNTY AGRICULTURAL EX-
TENSION SERVICE, UNIVERSITY OF
MINNESOTA,
Fairmont, Minn., August 7, 1967.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Best wishes in your efforts to make Federal Extension Service programs available to residents of the District of Columbia.

As a 4-H Club member for eleven years and as an extension worker for approximately fifteen years, I sympathize with your undertaking and hope that eventually people in the District of Columbia might gain from extension service leadership, enthusiasm, and educational programs characteristic of this branch of federal, state, and local government.

Sincerely,

FLOYD H. BELLIN, Jr.,
County Agricultural Agent.

STEELE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL EX-
TENSION SERVICE, UNIVERSITY OF
MINNESOTA,
Owatonna, Minn., August 14, 1967.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I read with real interest your letter and statement to Congress in regard to making Extension Service available to the people of Washington, D.C.

I recognize that Steele County with its 1500 farms, a county seat town of 14,000 and three smaller towns, is far different from Washington, D.C. However, based on 31 years experience as a county agricultural agent, I believe an Extension service based on the needs of people could perform a real service to the people of Washington, D.C. I base this on my experience of working with farm people and the people in towns, I have found both groups very appreciative of the educational information we have given them for their individual and sometimes group problems.

For example, a few days ago I visited three homes in Owatonna to help people with a lawn, elm tree and shrub disease problem. These visits take time. Manytimes one question leads to others. In addition, we receive many telephone and office calls for information which can be answered without a visit to the residence. These things we do regularly in addition to working with farm people and industries related to agriculture.

We have three local 4-H Clubs with all of their members living in Owatonna. We have 4-H members in other towns who are members of 4-H Clubs. These are all a part of the county 4-H program. We have 29 4-H Clubs with 878 members this year. There are 120 local adult leaders. Based on advanced entries, we expect 4-H'ers to have over 2,100 exhibits at our Steele County Fair this week.

We have five of our 27 home project groups in the county located in town. They are a part of the regular Extension Home Program. In addition, there are many individual calls from homemakers for information.

I do know that it takes time to become acquainted with people and gain acceptance by local people. There is a continual job of explaining what the Extension Service has available and get people to make use of the information and programs available. I would expect the same to be true in Washington, D.C. as well as in Steele County.

Our objective has been to help people to help themselves with educational information. I feel people have been very appreciative of the educational information whether on an individual basis, small group or helping coordinate and get groups to work together.

Steele County's Extension Service staff consists of a home agent, associate agricultural agent and myself. We have one full-time and one part-time secretary.

I have tried to give you a very brief summary of my observations. If you have any other questions, I will be glad to try and answer them for you.

Sincerely,

J. RUSSELL GUTE,
Agricultural Agent.

DANGERS OF INCREASED TEXTILE IMPORTS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I was glad to join recently as a cosponsor of S. 1796, introduced by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS]. The bill is designed to meet the problems now existing in our domestic textile and garment industries as a result of the rising level of textiles and finished garment apparels into the United States. The adverse effect of these imports is readily apparent, and the problems they have created must be solved if our American textile and garment industries are to stay healthy and dynamic.

The significance of the ever-increasing textile and garment imports and the dangers they pose to our domestic textile and garment industries were graphically stated in two articles recently published in the Daily News Record, the largest trade press in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

MANY SHIRTMAKERS WEIGH PLANTING SHIRTTAILS ABROAD

NEW YORK.—Many dress and sport shirt manufacturers are thinking about starting overseas operations.

They agree with Lawrence Phillips, president of Phillips-Van Heusen Corp. (DNR, July 18, Page 1), that, if imports of man-made fiber apparel continue to rise, American producers will be forced to move their operations overseas.

No two manufacturers seem to agree on how soon such a move may be necessary. Some shirt makers have already opened plants outside the Continental United States. Other manufacturers see the need for moving as something in the future—an eventuality that can be upset by proper Government action.

There are smaller non-branded shirt producers that admit that financial positions won't allow them to open plants abroad, although some would like to.

Marshall Finck, sales vice-president of Colonial Corp. of America, recalls how his company recently made a major change of direction away from low-end shirts.

Although Colonial manufactures shirts in Jamaica, it couldn't compete with Far Eastern goods. "There isn't a low-end domestic shirt industry any more," he said.

Mr. Finck wouldn't say whether Colonial was planning any more foreign production, although he said it was a possibility.

At McGregor-Doniger, Inc., Gus Van Sant, marketing vice-president, said: "I agree with Mr. Phillips. There is an import problem and it is getting worse. Eventually, it may reach

a point where American manufacturers won't be able to compete. Right now, though, we have no plans to move outside the country."

A non-branded sport shirt maker put his case this way. "We are being hurt more than the brands. Even though we would like to move, the company doesn't have the capital."

Another shirt maker to back Mr. Phillips was Jack Purdue, vice-president of Apollo Apparel, Inc. "There are some very good shirts coming in from the Far East and our industry is going to have to get on the bandwagon and force controls."

He said he could see a move overseas being looked at as a parallel to the soft goods industry's trek from New England to the South.

He pointed out, however, that he knew of no plans for his parent company, Alabama Textile Product Corp., to shift any operations abroad.

Ed Wilde, executive vice-president of Imperial Reading Corp., said he backed Mr. Phillips stand but wouldn't comment on whether his firm was thinking of taking the step abroad.

One strong voice against moving the apparel industry overseas was Larry Leeds, president of The Manhattan Shirt Co.

"It must be remembered that when the apparel and textile industries are taken together they are the largest employers in the nation. The Government must, in time, come to realize that we cannot face low-labor-cost competition indefinitely. If nothing else, they should think of the vital role we play in defense production when they listen to our pleas for controls," Mr. Leeds said.

Clothing manufacturers were split on their reactions to Mr. Phillips' statements. Alexander Lerner, president of Phoenix Clothes and chairman of the Clothing Manufacturers Association's import committee, said:

"What Mr. Phillips said makes sense. He has an acute problem that we in the clothing industry aren't faced with. But if clothing imports were to reach that point, it would force us to manufacture clothes out of the country."

Michael Daroff, chairman of Botany Industries, took a different view: "I'm not complaining about imports. After all, in the tailored clothing industry all our fabric needs couldn't be supplied by domestic mills alone. It's a free country. If Mr. Phillips wants to take his production overseas, that is his privilege. However, I wouldn't make that threat, because it requires much more to set up a clothing factory than a shirt plant."

Speaking for the knitwear industry, Sidney S. Korzenik, executive director and counsel of the National Knitted Outerwear Manufacturers, said:

"The statement by Mr. Phillips is neither surprising nor novel. A displacement of United States production by foreign imports has been going on for years. This points up the fact that if domestic manufacturers can't fight imports they became importers themselves, through contract work or plant acquisition."

EASE IMPORTS OR SHIRT FIELD WILL HAUL
ANCHOR: PHILLIPS
(By David Platt)

NEW YORK.—The head of one of America's major apparel companies said bluntly Monday his industry would move production overseas if import relief was not forthcoming.

Lawrence Phillips, long an outspoken import critic, declared, "If there is a negative answer to our pleas for controls on imports of apparel using manmade fibers, our industry will have no choice but to go offshore for production."

The comments of the president of Phillips Van Heusen Corp. bear the seal of approval of the American Apparel Manufacturers Association, he declared. A member of the

AAMA's executive committee, he had been at the group's Washington headquarters last week.

It is no secret that AAMA is increasingly unhappy about the import situation. Mr. Phillips cites as one reason the 62 per cent rise of manmade fiber apparel to 133 million square yard equivalents for the January-May, 1967, period.

But just what representations are being made to the Government in his capacity as member of the Management Labor Textile Advisory Committee have not been disclosed. Presumably some such warning of moving production facilities abroad have been sounded.

Mr. Phillips makes it clear that the industry's concern is not with the outcome of the Kennedy round of Tariff reductions.

"When not one Far Eastern country pays its workers more than the 35 cents our minimum wage increased in the past two years, what difference will any tariff changes make?"

He goes on to point out that in men's and boys' dress shirts, the percentage made of cotton has dropped from 85 in 1962 to 15 in 1966. This means the nature of the industry has changed since the signing of the long-term cotton agreement. Now that polyester and blended fabrics make up the bulk of these categories, it is time for import controls on them, he asserts.

What is particularly upsetting to Mr. Phillips is what he calls the Government's failure to live up to a "commitment of intent" to take greater cognizance of the industry's needs. This unwritten agreement was made in return for the industry's assistance and approval of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act, which opened the way for the Kennedy Round.

"The LTA started off being an adequate device to fulfill this promise. But the orderly growth of imports was disregarded by our 'turn the other cheek' State Department, which constantly pressured for the giving away of more and bigger chunks of our domestic market to developing countries."

In answer to the question of why the apparel industry should have special treatment vis-a-vis Far Eastern competition, Mr. Phillips states:

"The apparel industry has the highest component of labor of any U.S. industry."

"It doesn't really make any difference to us where our goods are made. But as Van Heusen, for example, we have responsibilities to 10,000 employees. We do not want to be forced to move offshore."

BUSINESS WEEK MAGAZINE CALLS FOR A NEW VIETNAM STRATEGY

MR. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, for many months I have opposed the sending of more and more American troops and planes to Vietnam. It has seemed to me that it was a mistake for us to assume the major burden of a struggle which can be resolved only by the people of Vietnam.

This point of view is well stated by the editors of Business Week magazine in an editorial published in the August 12 issue. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

WE NEED A NEW STRATEGY IN VIETNAM

Assessing a military situation always is a difficult task for civilians. But there is a growing feeling in Congress, and among responsible citizens across the country, that the war in Vietnam is stalemated. Massive U.S. military intervention over the past two years has prevented a Communist takeover in South Vietnam, but an end to the fighting

is nowhere in sight. Sending another 45,000 American troops, as President Johnson proposes, will raise the cost of the war in blood and money, but it is unlikely to turn the tide of battle. Indeed, it is doubtful whether several times that number of reinforcements would tip the scales in the war.

This bleak prospect calls for a change of strategy in Vietnam. To say this is not to say that we should simply pull out or that we should give up our intention of containing Communism in Southeast Asia. Few, even among the critics of present U.S. policy, would advocate that. But pullout is not the only option open to us in Vietnam.

Our national interest and our commitments in Vietnam do not require a continual escalation of the war. Indeed, any further drain on U.S. manpower and resources may weaken rather than strengthen the nation in its ability to defend its vital interests around the world and to deal with pressing domestic problems.

Instead of tying down more troops in South Vietnam and pouring even greater amounts of money and equipment into an attempt to pacify the entire country, the Administration should start thinking in terms of a policy that could be pursued indefinitely if necessary without exorbitant cost in men and money. This means defining the areas in Vietnam that are defensible and taking up positions there rather than seeking to put ever mounting pressure on the enemy throughout the entire area. The aim must be to keep casualties and costs to a minimum, accepting the fact that victory will not come for years and that total victory in the sense of driving all Communist forces from the whole country may never be attainable.

Such a shift does not imply the failure of U.S. policy in Vietnam. Much less does it mean the abandonment of our basic objective: to halt the spread of Communist aggression and thus enable the other nations of Asia and the Western Pacific to go their own way, free of the threat of Communist blackmail.

Policy must be flexible enough to adapt to changing circumstances. In the two years since the big buildup of U.S. forces in Vietnam began, the overall Communist threat in Asia has diminished considerably. Indonesia's slide toward Communism has been reversed; China is preoccupied with its own internal power struggles. Meantime, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Australia, and other nations in the area, shielded by the firm U.S. stand in Vietnam, have grown stronger and more prosperous, less vulnerable to Red Chinese pressure. In other parts of the world, too, the Communist threat is subsiding: the Middle East crisis showed once again that the Soviet Union will stop short of risking a war with the U.S. in its attempts to spread its influence and ideology.

KEEPING THE OPTIONS OPEN

Thus, despite the frustrations of the war in Vietnam, the over-all power balance around the world is favorable to the U.S. and its allies. This situation allows for greater latitude in U.S. policy in Southeast Asia.

At the same time, the deteriorating political situation within South Vietnam is a warning that the Administration should be more wary than ever of committing additional American troops there.

From the beginning, the basic premise of U.S. policy has been that the main burden of the war should be carried by the South Vietnamese themselves. American help was to provide protection against Hanoi's aggression, while the South Vietnamese tried to build a more effective government and a more viable society. Gradually, however, U.S. troops have taken on practically all of the fighting. The program to pacify rural areas appears to be bogged down. Moreover, the military junta in Saigon is making a mockery of the presi-

dential election campaign. There is less and less likelihood that next month's election will produce a government with any semblance of popular support, and that will probably mean that the last chance to provide the country with a fresh political impulse has been lost.

In these circumstances, the U.S. cannot withdraw—such a move would indeed upset the equilibrium in Southeast Asia and expose the area to new Communist pressures. But by limiting the U.S. military commitment, the Administration can keep open a variety of future policy options. These could range from negotiations with Hanoi to a renewed effort at pacification—when and if the South Vietnamese show that they are able to do their part of the job. Meantime, the shift in strategy would bring into better balance the ends we wish to achieve in Southeast Asia, and the cost of achieving them.

STRONG SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL BOARD PROPOSAL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today President Johnson has submitted to Congress a proposal vital to the welfare of the citizens of Washington. I am referring to the plan for the election of members of the District of Columbia school board.

I strongly support this proposal.

The District of Columbia school board has done a fine job over the years. But the fact remains that the 800,000 residents of Washington are entitled to a direct voice in deciding how their school system will be managed.

This, it seems to me, is a basic right of any taxpayer. And in fact, Washington is one of the few cities to deny its residents such a basic right.

The President's reorganization plan for the District government is now in effect. Election of school board officials is a logical and necessary additional step to expand citizen participation in the affairs of the Nation's Capital.

I urge Senators to support this plan as fully and as enthusiastically as they supported the District of Columbia reorganization plan. For if we are truly committed to good government and to across-the-board progress for the District, we can do nothing less.

A NEW MARYLAND MUSEUM DOWN ON THE FARM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one result of the rapid urbanization of America is ignorance on the part of entire generations of what life on the farm is like. Many city children do not know where eggs and milk and flour come from. They have no conception of how people lived before electrification and mechanization. Of course, most people today do not have to know these things in order to live, but I think that such knowledge should be a part of everyone's education.

For this reason, I think we are very fortunate to have in Maryland a farm run as it was in the 19th century. Last Sunday the New York Times published a fascinating article about the Carroll County Farm Museum. Located in Maryland's most beautiful fox-hunting country, the farm is near Interstate Highway 695 and is open to tourists on weekends for a reasonable charge. Visitors can see an authentic 19th century kitchen, com-

plete with fireplace, ladderback chairs, and a dough box. The barn area has been supplied with carriages, harnesses, yokes, and implements for making brooms and for shoeing horses. On August 18, September 7-10 and October 14, special demonstrations of tobacco harvesting and farm crafts will be given. A visit to this farm would be educational as well as entertaining for tourists from any State.

Because the Times article of August 13 describes the farm more fully and gives complete directions for reaching it, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "A New Maryland Museum Down on the Farm," be printed in the RECORD.

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

A NEW MARYLAND MUSEUM DOWN ON THE FARM

(By Anne Christmas)

WESTMINSTER, Md.—A 19th-century farm filled with relics of a nearly forgotten era is the setting for the Carroll County Farm Museum, one of Maryland's newest tourist attractions.

The story of how the museum came into being is an interesting one. Some years ago, residents of Westminster noted that subdivisions were encroaching rapidly around a beautiful 142-acre tract of county-owned land within the city limits. This last bit of farmland inside Westminster was known as "The Old Folks Home," and, when its inhabitants dwindled to six, the facility was phased out.

This left the place unoccupied, and an immediate target for real-estate developers. They envisioned an extension of the attractive communities already flanking the property's boundaries.

The Carroll County Commission named a Citizens Committee to establish a farm museum to preserve some memories of the area's rich agricultural heritage—"just in case a generation might grow up without being able to recognize a plow, or even a cow," as one of the group commented.

BANK BARN

The building of "The Old Folks Home" were well suited to the project. The key structure was a bank barn, which ranks among Maryland's best examples of early 19th-century construction. A series of rooms—they are built along one side of the barn to serve as a dormitory—was ideal for small exhibits of farm crafts, such as spinning, butter-churning, weaving, chair-caning and baking.

The main house, somewhat dreary and in need of refurbishing when the museum's board of governors inherited it in 1965, nonetheless was stoutly built with classically simple lines. Its 30 rooms underwent a major overhaul last year.

Most of the rooms of this typical farm dwelling are now open to the public for the first time. Many a Maryland attic was raided and many a long hour was spent by antiques buffs in acquiring furniture suitable for the house.

QUAINT KITCHEN

The Citizens Committee is particularly pleased with the results it has produced in setting up a quaint old kitchen. Items there include fireplace implements, a dough box, a hutch cupboard and ladder-back chairs.

A child's bedroom has a four-poster walnut bed and a complete set of 19th-century doll furniture. Two other bedrooms, the customary "summer kitchen" and a bake-oven room recently were furnished with suitable antiques and opened for inspection by visitors.

Most of the land in surrounding Carroll County is used for growing corn, wheat and

hay, with beef and dairy cattle as important by-products. In keeping with local custom, the farm museum's acreage has been planted in grass, along with demonstration crops of wheat, corn, tobacco, buckwheat and broom-corn.

Before its formal opening last summer, the museum received some 1,000 articles from 200 individuals and organizations. Now that the farm is open regularly each weekend and holidays, many more people have become interested in contributing antiques and farm memorabilia.

One of its treasures is a wagon that was one of the first to deliver mail in Carroll County, where rural free delivery was begun in 1899. Also in the barn area are early reapers, threshing machines, furrow and shovel plows, harnesses, oxen-yokes and carriages.

Implements for shoeing horses, making brooms, quilting, woodworking and the like also are on view every weekend throughout the season, which ends Oct. 31. Visiting hours are noon until 7 P.M. during August, and from noon to 5 P.M. in September and October. Admission is 75 cents for adults and 25 cents for children between 12 and 18 years old.

CRAFT DAYS

In addition, on "craft days" experts in many of these nearly forgotten arts are on hand to show how the pioneers performed these tasks. Dates for such demonstrations are next Saturday, when the accent will be on threshing and tobacco harvesting; Sept. 7-10, when the Mason-Dixon Steam Society holds its annual show, and Oct. 14, when "Fall Harvest Day" will attract thousands of visitors to enjoy Maryland's spectacular autumn foliage, as well as the farm operations.

Westminster is only 35 miles from Baltimore, and can be reached by taking the Baltimore Beltway (Interstate 695) west to the Pikesville-Reisterstown exit and then U.S. 140. The highway goes through some glorious open land, including Green Spring Valley, Maryland's most beautiful fox-hunting country.

The village of Glyndon, only a mile or two east of Reisterstown on U.S. 140, is the home of the Maryland Hunt Cup each April. Many enthusiasts of timber racing make a special trip there to view the tremendous fences on the course, which is regarded as one of the most difficult steeplechase tests in the world.

QUEEN MOTHER ELIZABETH'S VISIT TO THE ROOSEVELT CAMPOBELLO INTERNATIONAL PARK ON JULY 13, 1967

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on July 13 it was my privilege, as vice chairman of the Roosevelt Campobello International Park, to help to welcome England's Queen Mother Elizabeth to the park. She had graciously come to officially open the park's new Visitors' Center, for which President Johnson and Canadian Prime Minister Pearson laid the cornerstone in August last year.

The opportunity to greet the Queen Mother was one of the most memorable and delightful experiences of my career. She is a gracious lady. She also is a warm and endearing human being, a mother and grandmother, who, during a quiet meal or an official ceremony has the marvelous quality of making all those around her feel comfortable and at ease. Her charm is disarming, her personality engaging, and her spirit contagious. As she had done during her visit to the United States 28 years ago, she won the hearts of all of us at Campobello Island. We learned again how this woman helped to rally her own nation during the crises

of World War II, and how she helped to solidify and strengthen the ties among Britain and America and our other Allies during that era of great trial.

The significance to all Americans of the Queen Mother's visit to Campobello was described in a letter to her from President Johnson.

The enchantment of her visit was evident in the welcoming remarks by the Honorable Alan A. Macnaughton, Canadian Senator from Montreal and chairman of the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission, and, I hope, my own.

Her own response reflects her graciousness and cordiality.

Newspaper accounts of the occasion in the New York Times; the St. John, New Brunswick, Telegraph-Journal; and the Portland Press Herald and Bangor Daily News of Maine tell the story.

Mr. President, the Queen Mother's visit to Campobello was an important event in relations between Canada, England and the United States. I ask unanimous consent that President Johnson's letter to her, the welcoming remarks by Senator Macnaughton and myself, the Queen Mother's response, and the newspaper stories heretofore mentioned be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
July 12, 1967.

Her Majesty, QUEEN ELIZABETH.
The Queen Mother.

YOUR MAJESTY: My fellow citizens join me in welcoming you once again to the American Continent. Your visit recalls a memorable courage and renews a meaningful commitment.

It reminds us all of the dark days of World War II when you and your family were an inspiration and a symbol of sustaining strength to the entire free world. It reawakens fond thoughts of the gratitude and admiration we all felt when you visited our nation in 1939.

As you open the Information Center at the Franklin Roosevelt Campobello International Park, Americans everywhere relive the proud history of a time-honored friendship. And together we enrich a common commitment to the peace and progress in which that friendship thrives.

Your participation in this joint venture between Canada and the United States is a fitting tribute to a great American leader—and to the enduring strength of the transatlantic union for which he lived and worked.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

REMARKS BY SENATOR ALAN A. MACNAUGHTON

On behalf of the Prime Minister of Canada, and as Chairman of this Commission, it is my signal honour today to welcome Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother to the Roosevelt Campobello International Park.

In 1963 the late President John Kennedy, whose death soon thereafter was so grievous a tragedy, met with Prime Minister Lester Pearson at Hyannisport and, thanks to a generous and most public-spirited bequest by the Hammer family who were then the owners of the Roosevelt properties at Campobello, reached agreement for the establishment of an International Park, which would be a perpetual memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

In the following January, President John-

son and Prime Minister Pearson formally signed the agreement, legislation was passed in both countries, and that summer of 1964 Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Pearson together declared the Park open. As is known to Your Majesty, such an international association, such a shared venture between two Nations is unique, a vital and growing symbol of friendship between the peoples of Canada and the United States of America.

Since then, the Commission, composed equally of Americans and Canadians, and with funds equally provided, has worked to restore the Roosevelt summer cottage and grounds to their pristine state. We have also purchased surrounding lands which we plan to develop as a quiet recreation area for the public.

Last year the President and the Prime Minister together laid the cornerstone of this Reception Centre, a simple modern building in which we take pride. But more than that, it gives us great pleasure, on this unforgettable occasion, that Your Majesty has agreed to declare the Reception Centre open, and will then be the first Visitor to enter.

I now invite Your Majesty so to proceed. (Notes for short address by the Honourable Senator Alan A. Macnaughton, P.C., Q.C., on the occasion of the visit of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, on July 13th, 1967.)

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE AT THE ROOSEVELT CAMPOBELLO INTERNATIONAL PARK ON THE OCCASION OF QUEEN MOTHER ELIZABETH'S VISIT FOR THE OFFICIAL OPENING OF THE NEW VISITORS' CENTER, JULY 13, 1967

In 1939, as a young man, I fell in love with the Queen of England. That was not an uncommon experience among Americans of all ages upon the occasion of your visit with the King to our country.

The warm friendship which you so graciously expressed—in your person and in your response to our American exuberance—immeasurably strengthened and humanized the ties which bind our two countries, and endeared you to us all.

They were a fitting and timely prelude and preparation for the trials which we were to share in the years that followed.

It is equally fitting and timely that you should share with us this ceremony on this island at this place at another time of testing and trial. We are grateful that you find it possible to do so.

You have expressed the symbolism of this park in words which are eloquent in their simplicity and which establish the common theme of your earlier visit and this one.

More than that, they identify the values which, above all others, will permit us to surmount the challenges that perplex and frustrate us and to move on to a higher plateau of understanding and justice among all peoples.

Here in this park we hope to develop a demonstration of cooperation among nations and create also an international meeting place.

Here we hope to build a place where the people of two nations, and others from abroad may visit, mingle with each other, and contemplate the high ideals and natural beauties which influenced the life of Franklin Roosevelt.

Your presence today adds a distinctive grace and a cherished memory to the traditions which are unfolding on Roosevelt's beloved Campobello.

REMARKS BY QUEEN MOTHER ELIZABETH AT THE OPENING OF THE RECEPTION CENTER AT CAMPOBELLO, JULY 13, 1967

In 1939, that beautiful summer overshadowed by the thought of war, The King and I spent a brief and happy time with President and Mrs. Roosevelt at Hyde Park.

Today, 28 years later, as Britannia made the passage across Passamaquoddy Bay, through the narrow waters between New Brunswick and Maine and to this fair Island of Campobello, I have been remembering our meeting.

For each of us memories are personal things, of places and people, of strength and weakness, of joy and sorrow.

There are few human beings whose service to mankind has been so noble that a whole world—a world indeed of strangers, remembers them in a personal sense. Such a man was Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

We know that he spent the summers of his youth at Campobello, and that here he was struck by crippling illness. And it is most fitting that the memory of so gallant and illustrious an American should also be honoured on the Canadian Island which he loved.

Here in this corner of the North American Continent there has been established this joint domain—the Roosevelt Campobello International Park—a symbol of the firm and enduring friendship of our nations.

We live again in times of strife and passion, and people perhaps tend to forget the simple truth, that we are all brothers one of another, here to serve the world but not to master it. If we can see through the fog of our differences to that truth, then we may indeed make a better world.

I am glad to see with us, this afternoon, members of the family of Franklin Roosevelt, and of his wife, Eleanor, in her own right a beloved ambassador of the United States of America.

Through this building will pass many people from many lands. They will, I pray, draw inspiration from this place of friendship.

And now it is my great pleasure to declare the Reception Centre open.

[From the St. John (N.B.) Telegraph-Journal, July 14, 1967]

FOG, MIST DIDN'T DAMPEN WELCOME GIVEN QUEEN MOTHER

(By Ann Hellmuth)

WELSHPOOL, N.B.—Queen Mother Elizabeth Thursday received a message of welcome to North America from President Johnson of the United States.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine delivered the message when the Queen Mother arrived at the Roosevelt International Park near this tiny Campobello Island community.

President Johnson praised the Queen Mother for her "memorable courage and example" she and her family set for the people of the free world during the Second World War.

The President's message recalled the Queen Mother's visit to the United States in 1939, when she and her husband, King George VI, met and spent some time with President Roosevelt.

The Queen Mother described the late American President as an "illustrious American" and his wife, the late Eleanor Roosevelt, as a "beloved ambassador of the United States."

Thick fog and mist clouded the island as the Queen Mother arrived on the royal barge. A crowd of about 2,000, mostly women and children, greeted her.

Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis of Maine and his wife were late arriving due to the fog. And Premier Robichaud arrived only moments before the Queen Mother left here. The premier, who had intended to fly in, reached the island in a fishing boat and barely had time to greet the Queen Mother before she left.

The Queen Mother, wearing a pale green silk coat and dress with matching hat, spent several minutes touring the red-shingled, 34-room Roosevelt cottage, summer home of the late President.

She was escorted through the cottage by members of the Roosevelt family, including grandson Christopher Roosevelt and a 14-year-old granddaughter Joan Roosevelt.

The cottage is located in the park officially opened in 1964 by Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, wife of the U.S. President, and Mrs. Lester Pearson, wife of the Prime Minister. The cottage was donated to the U.S. and Canadian governments by the Hammer family, who bought it after President Roosevelt died.

After spending less than two hours on the island, the Queen Mother was scheduled to return to the royal barge, which would take her back to the Royal Yacht Britannia, anchored in Passamaquoddy Bay.

The yacht was scheduled to sail Thursday night for Halifax where the Queen Mother will visit today.

[From the Portland Press Herald, July 14, 1967]

MUSKIE DELIVERS JOHNSON MESSAGE TO QUEEN MOTHER

WELSHPOOL, N.B.—Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine, delivered a greeting from President Johnson to Queen Mother Elizabeth Thursday after she arrived at Roosevelt International Park on Campobello Island.

The President's message praised the Queen Mother for the "memorable courage and example" she and her family set during World War II.

It recalled the Queen Mother's visit to the United States in 1939, when she and her husband, King George VI, visited President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Queen Mother came to Campobello Island, where Roosevelt had a vacation home, on a tour of Canada's Atlantic provinces. The Canadian Island is opposite Eastport, Maine.

Apparently moved by Johnson's message, the Queen Mother said the "beautiful summer of 1939" had many memories for her.

Thick fog clouded the island as the Queen Mother, wearing a pale green silk coat and dress with matching hat, arrived on a royal barge. About 2,000 persons were there to greet her.

Maine Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis and his wife were late arriving because of the fog and Premier Louis Robichaud of New Brunswick did not arrive at all. He had intended to fly in but was trying to reach the island by boat.

The queen Mother spent several minutes touring Roosevelt's old red-shingled, 34-room summer home.

She was escorted through the house by members of the late president's family, including grandson Christopher Roosevelt and granddaughter Joan Roosevelt, 14.

The house is in the park opened in 1964 by Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Lester B. Pearson, wife of Canada's prime minister.

The royal barge was to take the Queen Mother back to the royal yacht Britannia, anchored in Passamaquoddy Bay. The yacht was to sail Thursday night for Halifax, N.S.

[From the Bangor Daily News, July 14, 1967]

QUEEN MOTHER DEDICATES CENTER AT CAMPOBELLO

(By Ken Buckley)

CAMPOBELLO, N.B.—". . . There are few human beings whose service to mankind has been such, that a whole world, a world indeed of strangers, remembers them in a personal sense. Such a man was Franklin D. Roosevelt."

And so, with tribute paid, Queen Mother Elizabeth of Great Britain quietly drew back a brown curtain covering a memorial plaque to the late President and declared the reception center at Roosevelt Campobello International Park as officially open Thursday.

FOGGY DAY

It was a foggy day with H. M. Yacht Britannia shrouded in mist as it lay at anchor in Welchpool Harbor. But the day sparkled with the flashing gold of flags, scarlet tunics of Mounties, as the air was interlaced with the swirl of pipes and warmed by tributes of speakers.

Resplendent in a light green silk coat and matching hat laced with purple strands, the Queen stepped ashore at Welchpool from the royal barge to the flag emblazoned dock of this tiny island fishing community.

ESCORT QUEEN

An honor guard of veterans, park attendants and Royal Canadian Mounted Police escorted the Queen to a black limousine for a short drive to the Roosevelt Campobello International Park where she was officially welcomed by Sen. Alan A. Macnaughton of Montreal, chairman of the park commission, and Sen. Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, who is vice-chairman.

The Queen was greeted by a standing ovation from about 2,000 persons in front of the new reception center as she trod a scarlet red carpet to the center's piazza while pipers of Saint John, N.B., cut the foggy afternoon with their piercing wail.

ARTICULATE SPEAKER

In a smooth, articulate voice, the Queen recalled the time when in 1939 with her husband, the late King George VI, she had visited Franklin D. Roosevelt in whose memory the park is dedicated, at his second favorite retreat—Hyde Park, N.Y.

"... For each of us, memories are personal of places and people, of strength and weakness and of joy and sorrow . . ." And she recalled her initial visit "... overshadowed by the threat of war . . ." and her present visit when "... we live again in times of stress . . ." She called the park a symbol of a fine and enduring friendship.

Sen. Muskie read greetings from President Lyndon B. Johnson to the Queen praising her for her courage and example set during World War II. And the senator nostalgically recalled, how when as a young man "... Your Majesty, I fell in love with the Queen of England . . ."

AN INTERNATIONAL PLACE

The senator, in paying tribute to Roosevelt, said the hopes of the park were to develop an international meeting place where people may visit and contemplate the natural beauty that inspired FDR.

The small high ceilinged reception center sits at the left of Roosevelt's summer residence as visitors cross the international Roosevelt bridge. In it, tourists and visitors can relax while browsing through mementos of the late president.

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and Mrs. Lester B. Pearson opened the park Aug. 20, 1964. President Johnson, and Premier Lester B. Pearson laid the cornerstone of the center two years and a day later in 1966.

After officially declaring the center open the queen, clutching a bouquet of roses presented to her by Tammy Lord, eight-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Lord of Welchpool, toured the center.

After the tour of the new facility, the Queen in the company of Christopher Roosevelt, FDR's grandson, left the building and greeted other members of the Roosevelt family on the steps of the summer retreat.

The Queen shook hands with Mrs. Christopher Roosevelt, Mrs. Fred Adams, first cousin of FDR, Mrs. Clark Roosevelt, Joan Roosevelt, granddaughter, and Mrs. George Roach, niece of the late Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Sticking to a tight schedule, the Queen briefly surveyed the house before joining guests on the rear lawn facing Eastport, where she exchanged greetings with hundreds.

Because of foggy conditions, Gov. Curtis' plane landed at Princeton, but he received a State Police escort to the reception on the lawn. It was reported that New Brunswick Premier Louis Robichaud was taken to the island by boat from Eastport, because of poor traveling conditions.

Throngs standing behind ropes along the narrow artery pointed movie and still cam-

eras as the Queen drove back to Welchpool. Along the entire route, Mounties stood guard, as others circled the buildings in the park.

With the tour concluded, the Queen descended a white gangplank to board the royal barge, a sleek 40-footer sparkling with white ropes and snappy salty sailors, who with deft maneuvering swung the barge between fishing boats and cheering families and headed out to the Britannia.

Wednesday evening the Queen reportedly reviewed the Canadian Black Watch regiments at Camp Gagetown, Friday, she is expected at Halifax, N.S.

[From the New York Times, July 14, 1967]

QUEEN MOTHER RETURNS TO CAMPOBELLO

(By John Fenton)

CAMPOBELLO, N.B., July 13.—Queen Mother Elizabeth of Great Britain crossed the fog-shrouded Bay of Fundy today to become the first official tourist to enter the reception center of the Roosevelt Campobello Park.

After a speech recalling a visit she and King George VI made to President and Mrs. Roosevelt at Hyde Park, N.Y., in 1939, the Queen Mother unveiled a plaque at the entrance to the center.

The mother of Queen Elizabeth II was introduced by Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat of Maine, who brought the greetings of President Johnson. A crowd of 1,500 was present.

Senator Muskie and Senator Alan Macnaughton of New Brunswick, chairman of the international joint commission that administers the park, were the only other ranking officials who were able to get to this island off the Maine coast on time despite the bad weather.

Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis of Maine arrived during a reception at the Roosevelt summer cottage, and Premier Louis Robichaud of New Brunswick made the scene in time to bid the Queen Mother farewell at Welchpool Pier before she boarded the royal barge for the Britannia, the royal yacht, offshore.

Asserting that her trip across the Bay recalled her 1939 visit to the President, the Queen Mother said:

"It is most fitting that the memory of so illustrious an American should be so honored on a Canadian island he loved."

President Roosevelt's family spent many summers in the rambling building, known as The Cottage, which is the center of the park.

Recalling that war overshadowed "that beautiful summer" of 1939, the Queen Mother said:

"We live again in times of strife and passion, and people, perhaps, tend to forget the truth that we are all brothers, one of another, here to serve the world and not to master."

"If we can see through the fog of our differences to that truth, then we may, indeed, make a better world."

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and Mrs. Lester B. Pearson, wife of the Prime Minister of Canada, officially dedicated the park Aug. 20, 1964.

Last year, President Johnson and Prime Minister Pearson jointly laid the cornerstone of the reception center. The plaque that was unveiled today marked the dates of the three ceremonies.

Campobello, once accessible only by sea, was joined to the mainland at Lubec, Me., in August of 1962 by a bridge.

TEACHERS FOR INNER CITY SCHOOLS

Mr. NELSON, Mr. President, during this turbulent summer of 1967, close attention has been focused upon the unique problems facing the inner cores of major cities throughout the United States.

In hearings before congressional committees, extensive testimony has been heard concerning the inadequate opportunity of education afforded slum children.

When the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, and I drafted the Teacher Corps bill in 1965, we intended to attract the dedicated and imaginative young people so desperately needed in the teaching profession to come and work in the severest disadvantaged areas of the Nation.

We said at that time that extraordinary efforts are needed to improve the ghetto schools and to uplift the quality of education poor children receive. Teachers working in these schools must have special qualities of dedication and vigor to accomplish their difficult task.

A survey recently completed for the Grade Teacher magazine reinforces and confirms our statements of 1965.

The survey reveals that only 13 percent of the June 1967, graduates of teacher colleges and universities plan to accept teaching positions in disadvantaged inner-city schools, and only 5 percent are willing to teach in Appalachia.

A majority of these graduates, 76 percent, prefer to teach in suburban areas, and only 17 percent favor a large city.

These figures indicate dramatically the need for such programs as the Teacher Corps, to attract teachers willing to serve in the Nation's most difficult and trying education positions.

While only 13 percent of Teacher Corps interns thus far recruited have been certified teachers, 80 percent of the interns have declared their intention to remain in teaching after they complete the Teacher Corps program. This demonstrates the success of the Teacher Corps recruitment goals.

We in Government have a special responsibility at this time to exert leadership in dealing with the major problems facing our cities. Education is a vital element of those problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the survey of Grade Teacher magazine be printed in the RECORD.

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

INTRODUCTION

Objective: The purpose of this survey was to determine the preferences and attitudes of prospective teachers toward the areas and conditions in which they might be teaching upon completion of their education.

Scope: Interviews were conducted at colleges and universities throughout the country.

Method: Field work was conducted by Opinion Research Corporation, using self-administered questionnaires. All tabulation and preparation of this report was done by Trendex for Grade Teacher magazine.

Sample: A total of 867 completed questionnaires were used in obtaining the information for this report.

Field dates: Spring 1967.

Question 1. Please rank the regions of the country according to where you would prefer to teach, if given the choice. Give the region where you would most like to teach the rank of 1, then rank all other regions in order of your preference. Do not give two or more regions the same rank.

Base: Total Sample (867).

[In percent]

	New England	Middle Atlantic	North Central	South-east	South Central	Mountain	Pacific
Rank:							
1st.....	7.0	19.0	17.0	18.0	8.0	3.0	28.0
2d.....	19.0	13.0	8.0	10.0	5.0	16.0	19.0
3d.....	20.0	11.0	11.0	9.0	5.0	13.0	18.0
4th.....	17.0	13.0	15.0	13.0	6.0	14.0	11.0
5th.....	12.0	14.0	15.0	13.0	8.0	17.0	6.0
6th.....	7.0	9.0	16.0	20.0	14.0	13.0	4.0
7th.....	5.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	40.0	11.0	5.0
No preference.....	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
No rank given.....	11.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	11.0	7.0
Overall rank.....	3.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	7.0	6.0	1.0
Mean rank ¹	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.9	5.4	4.2	2.8

¹ Based only on those respondents ranking each region.

Question 2. What is your preference for the type of school system in which you would like to teach? Which one of the following would you prefer?

Base: Total Sample (867)

	Percent
A large city.....	17
A suburban city, next to a large city.....	47
A medium-sized city or small town.....	29
A rural or farm area.....	2
Have no preference.....	5

Question 3. What grades would you prefer to teach? Which one of the following is your first choice?

Base: Total Sample (867)

	Percent
Preschool and/or Headstart.....	1
Kindergarten.....	5
First to third grade.....	34
Fourth to sixth grade.....	27
Seventh to ninth grade.....	9
Tenth to twelfth grade.....	21
Ungraded.....	2
Have no preference.....	1

Question 4. Have you talked to representatives of any school systems about employment?

Base: Total Sample (867)

	Percent
Yes, have talked to representatives and have accepted an offer.....	19
Yes, have talked to representatives and have been given an offer, but have not yet accepted one.....	14
Yes, have talked to representatives but have not been given an offer as yet.....	20
No, have not talked to representatives.....	46
No answer.....	1

Question 6. Do you have a preference for a specific school system? If you could teach anywhere you wanted to, what one school system would you prefer?

Base: Total Sample (867).

	Percent
Yes, would prefer to teach at.....	47
Have no preference.....	53

Question 7. Specifically, what is there about this school system that appeals to you?

Base: Those preferring a specific system (407).

	Percent
Roots here, hometown.....	18
Administration, faculty, school board.....	16
Salary.....	15
Location (general).....	15
High standard of system.....	15
Progressive.....	13
Visual aids, teaching aids, materials.....	10
Facilities.....	10
New methods, techniques.....	9
Modern building, improvements.....	7
Types of programs.....	7
Type of community.....	7
Trained to teach in system.....	6
Caliber of children, want to learn.....	6
Family ties, husband's employment.....	6
Size of classes, classrooms.....	5
Proximity to cultural advantages.....	4
Team teaching.....	4

	Percent
Suburban area.....	4
Academic freedom.....	3
Like the city.....	3
Opportunity for advancement.....	3
Ungraded classes.....	3
Climate.....	3
Inclusion of disadvantaged children.....	2
Challenging.....	2
Respect shown to teachers.....	2
Fringe benefits, vacations.....	2
Tenure.....	1
Integrated.....	1
Other miscellaneous.....	5
No answer.....	4

Note: Multiple responses possible.

Question 8. If you were offered a teaching position in one of the "inner cities" with particularly disadvantaged children, do you think you would accept it?

Question 9. How about Appalachia? Do you think you would accept a teaching position there?

Base: Total Sample (867)

[In percentages]

	Inner Appalachia	Percent
Yes, definitely would accept it.....	13	5
Might probably accept it.....	44	27
Probably would not accept it.....	19	20
No, definitely would not accept it.....	10	25
Don't know what I would do.....	14	23

Question 10. What is there about teaching in such disadvantaged areas that might appeal to you?

Base: Those who would definitely or might possibly accept a position in either an inner city or Appalachia (534)

	Percent
Be able to give help where needed.....	25
Challenge.....	24
Rewarding to work with disadvantaged children.....	13
Opportunity to give children a better life.....	11
Ability to help disadvantaged children.....	8
Satisfaction with progress made.....	8
Feeling of accomplishment.....	7
Children's need of someone being interested in them.....	6
Great need for teachers.....	6
Training for this type of teaching.....	6
Personal experience with similar background.....	4
Contribution to community, society.....	3
Opportunity to understand children from all walks of life.....	3
Excellent training for the future.....	3
Service to mankind, humanitarian reasons.....	2
Aid to culturally deprived.....	1
Other miscellaneous.....	3
No answer.....	6

Note: Multiple responses possible.

Question 11. Why do you think you would not like to teach in such disadvantaged areas?

Base: Those who probably would not or definitely would not accept a position in either an inner city or Appalachia (441).

	Percent
Too far from home, family, husband's job	16
Unqualified to teach in that situation	12
Lack of experience	11
Environment (general)	9
Emotional strain, involvement	9
Lack of understanding of cultural background	6
Would not teach in a rural area	5
Discipline problems	5
Not interested in disadvantaged children	3
Salary	3
Low intellectual levels	3
Living conditions	3
Too far from cultural advantages	3
Would not teach in a large city	3
Facilities	3
Lack of patience	3
Environment not suitable for bringing up children	2
Standards of system	2
Discouragement with slow progress	2
Area breeds crime and corruption	1
Different standard of values	1
Transportation problems	1
Prejudices	1
Treatment and respect of teachers	1
Could not tolerate the people	1
Need for social workers, not teachers	1
Other miscellaneous	3
No answer	12

Note: Multiple responses possible.

Question 12. Do you think it is necessary to provide special courses for those who are going to teach in disadvantaged areas?

Base: Total Sample (867)

	Percent
Yes	91
No	4
Don't Know	5

Question 13. Would you be interested in taking such a course?

Base: Those who feel special courses are necessary for teachers in disadvantaged areas (787)

	Percent
Yes	72
No	10
Don't know	18

Question 14. Which one of the following statements comes closest to your opinion about federal aid to education?

Base: Total Sample (867)

	Percent
Favor all Federal aid to education with no reservations	42
Favor some Federal aid to education, but have reservations about other types of aid	42
Opposed to all Federal aid to education	2
No opinion	14

Question 15. Have you heard of the so-called "national assessment of education"?

Base: Total Sample (867)

	Percent
Yes	12
No	88

Question 16. From what you have heard about it, what is your opinion of the "national assessment of education" program?

Base: Those who have heard of the "National Assessment of Education." (103)

	Percent
It is a good program that will be beneficial to education	17
It could be a good program, but I am concerned about how it might be used	67
It is not a good program	3
No opinion	13

Question 17. Here's a different kind of question. Please think about it carefully. Suppose, in seeking your first teaching position, you can choose between several offers. Look over the following list of factors, and select the three or four that you would give the most consideration to, assuming you had

good information about all of them, in deciding on which offer to accept.

Base: Total Sample (867)

	Percent
The starting salary and benefits	65
The teaching facilities of the school system	63
The educational philosophy of the administration and board of education	62
The geographic location	60
The type of school system	49
The community's attitude toward education	42
The teaching challenge offered by a particular kind of student	23
The maximum attainable salary	17
The chance for movement into administration	5

Question 18. Now, one last question. Suppose you now have several years of teaching experience, and have been given tenure. Look over this list of factors carefully and select the one factor that you think would most likely attract you to another school system.

Base: Total Sample (867)

	Percent
A greater teaching challenge	30
Better teaching facilities	20
A better salary at the time of change	16
A more "enlightened" community	10
A higher maximum on the salary schedule	10
An administration position	9
Better behaved children	2
Easier-to-teach children	1
No answer	2

Classification of respondents

Base: Total Sample (867)

	Percent
Class standing:	
Upper third of the class	41
Middle third	52
Lower third	3
Don't know, no answer	4
Sex:	
Male	22
Female	77
No answer	1
Date of graduation:	
Spring 1967	72
Later than spring 1967	27
No answer	1

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 18, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 17 (legislative day of August 16), 1967:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William A. Costello, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Trinidad and Tobago.

George J. Feldman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

William O. Hall, of Oregon, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

Frederic R. Mann, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Barbados.

Robert G. Miner, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sierra Leone.

Geoffrey W. Lewis, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Central African Republic.

Albert W. Sherer, Jr., of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Togo.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

John F. Kincaid, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice J. Herbert Hollomon, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 17, 1967

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Trust ye in the Lord forever: for in the Lord God is everlasting strength.—Isaiah 26: 4.

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land, all our people, and all our leaders, that under the guidance of Thy wise and good spirit we may not grow weary in working nor wavering in worship.

Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and prejudice and from every evil way. Fashion us into one people, united in purpose and spirit, faithful to Thee and fruitful in all good works as we seek the welfare of all. Endow with wisdom and charity these leaders of our Nation that there may be justice at home and peace in our world. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with gratitude; and in the day of trouble, let not our trust in Thee fail; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 664. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that bagpipes and parts thereof shall be admitted free of duty.

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

S. 1124. An act to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes;

S. 1899. An act for the relief of Ritva Butrum; and

S. 1938. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando Hipolito Maytin.